

PN-AA4-162

100 51973

IPC | **WOMEN IN DEVELOPMENT**
| **SPECIAL STUDIES 4**

**THE EFFECT OF MARRIAGE, CHILDBEARING
AND MIGRATION ON THE LABOR FORCE
PARTICIPATION OF WOMEN**

Jennifer L. Lauby

THE EFFECT OF MARRIAGE, CHILDBEARING
AND MIGRATION ON THE LABOR FORCE
PARTICIPATION OF WOMEN

Women in Development Special Studies 4

Final report submitted to the
Philippine Institute for Development Studies
through the Institute of Philippine Culture,
Ateneo de Manila University
in December 1979

Jennifer Lauby

Behavioral Sciences Department
De La Salle University
Manila

This volume represents the final report of one of seven Special Studies undertaken for the Women in Development (WID) component of the Economic and Social Impact Analysis/Women in Development (ESIA/WID) Project sponsored through the Philippine Institute for Development Studies by the National Economic and Development Authority and the United States Agency for International Development. The Institute of Philippine Culture (IPC) of the Ateneo de Manila University manages the WID Component which includes sponsoring selected researchers in undertaking studies of women. The reports in this WID Special Studies series are the following:

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| 1. A Study of Women Workers in Women-Dominated Manufacturing Establishments in Metro Manila | Virgilio C. Aganon
Marie E. Aganon |
| 2. Women, Work Force Participation and Underutilization | Imelda Z. Feranil |
| 3. Migration and Social Mobility: A Study of Single, Female Migrants in Three Cities of Southern Mindanao | Beverly Hackenberg |
| 4. The Effect of Marriage, Childbearing and Migration on the Labor Force Participation of Women | Jennifer Lauby |
| 5. Indicators of the Perceived Effectiveness of Low-Income Women's Organizations | Cristina Montiel |
| 6. Low-Skilled Working Women in Cagayan de Oro: A Comparative Study of Domestic, "Small-Scale" and Industrial Employment | Marilou Palabrica-Costello
Michael A. Costello |
| 7. Women in Agriculture: A Social Accounting of Female Workshare | Emmanuel S. Santiago. |

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
I	INTRODUCTION	1
	1.1 Statement of the Problem	2
	1.2 Objectives	2
	1.3 Significance and Policy Relevance	3
II	RELATED LITERATURE	4
III	METHODOLOGY	7
	3.1 Questionnaire Construction	7
	3.2 Sampling	8
	3.3 Data Collection	12
	3.4 Data Analysis	12
IV	RESULTS	12
	4.1 The Not Employed	15
	4.2 The Employed	17
	4.3 Job Satisfaction	19
	4.4 Lifetime Employment Indicators	21
	4.5 Indicators of Change with Employment Status at Marriage	25
	4.6 The Effect of Childbearing in Employment	26
	4.7 The Effect of Migration	30
V	CONCLUSIONS	33
	5.1 Suggestion for future indicators	35
	5.2 Policy Application	37
VI	TABLES	
VII	REFERENCES	

THE EFFECT OF MARRIAGE, CHILDBEARING AND MIGRATION ON THE LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION OF WOMEN

I. INTRODUCTION

There is a dilemma facing many women today including women in the Philippines. They are being encouraged to participate more actively in community activities and various occupations are becoming open to them. And yet they are still expected to play the roles of mother, homemaker and dutiful wife. How can these two types of expectations be reconciled?

The labor force participation of women is a commonly used indicator of the active participation of women in society. In general, the size of the female labor force is roughly correlated with the status of women in the society. Especially in developing countries there is an awareness that the skills and potentials of all citizens including women must be tapped. (Boserup, 1970)

On the other hand the societal expectations for woman include the care of the children and responsibility for household functions. These expectations and the work they entail often limit women's work outside the home. Migration is an important life cycle event which may also affect labor force participation. This

study is an attempt to measure to what degree marriage and childbearing affect labor force participation and to investigate the effects of migration on women's work. The life cycle approach will allow us to pinpoint critical time periods in a woman's life that determine the extent of her participation in society.

The collection and analysis of life histories (or life cycle data) is a relatively new field of research in the study of population problems. Information on the dates of important events is very helpful in understanding relationships between them. In this way we can analyze past events which may have contributed to the present situation of the respondent.

Statement of the Problem

This study aims to measure the effects of marriage, childbearing and migration on the labor force participation of women using the life cycle approach. Indicators to measure the changing effects of marriage, birth of children, and migration on labor force participation will be developed.

Objectives

1. To investigate the common employment patterns of women in the Philippines and compare them with those of men.

2. To relate these employment patterns to the marriage history, childbearing history and migration history of the women.
3. To formulate indicators of the changing effects of these variables on employment.
4. To use these indicators to measure differences between women in rural and urban areas and between age cohort's.
5. To indicate implications of these findings for possible policy alternatives.

Significant and Policy Relevance

This study is different from other labor force studies in that it traces the respondent's history of labor force participation, instead of only looking at her present position. This approach allows us to look at changes between generations. ?

The results will aid in the prediction of future participation by women as well as indicating some factors which may act as barriers to such participation. A successful development program should tap the resources of all the members of society and thus any barriers to the participation of half of the population are very important to discover.

Comparing the participation indicators for different age cohorts will allow us to trace changes over time and perhaps predict future trends.

The results of this study could indicate the need for such services as vocational training, employment referral or child care. Studying the effects of migration or women's employment could indicate some effects of government policies on migration, especially those aimed at reducing movement into urban areas.

II. RELATED LITERATURE

Social Indicators have been used to measure change in various aspects of society. They are especially helpful in planning for economic development and in locating areas in need of help because they are lagging behind (Andrew, 1973). Indicators are also useful in focusing public opinion on certain problems in society because of their quantitative nature. A good indicator summarizes as much as possible into just one figure and is aimed at making a difficult problem more understandable (Sheldon, 1968). Therefore, the use of indicators should help make women's problems and contribution more visible.

Many foreign studies have focused on women's labor force participation and only a few will be summarized here. A comprehensive British study used different methods to study women in different types of careers (Fogarty, et. al., 1971). A general survey investigated the effect of various variables on labor force participation of women. Many of the questions focused on the family situation and how women cope with holding several roles

at ones. Case studies of women in certain occupations like management, allowed indepth study of barriers and opportunities in career development.

A. U. S. study investigated the kinds of work usually delegated to women and the reasons for job discrimination. (Lloyd, 1975) Here again the traditional image of woman as homemaker acts as a barrier to women entering some kinds of occupations.

Recently more studies have focused on women in developing countries. Youssef (1964) has discovered four patterns of women's labor force participation. In industrial societies a large proportion of women work outside the home. In Latin America the pattern is for women to be employed mainly in domestic and trade services. In the Carribean women have high labor force participation and relatively weak family ties. The Middle East pattern is the most conservative with women expected to attend to the family and only a few working outside the home. Youssef finds that the marriage customs have a great deal to do with women's labor force participation. In Muslim Middle East societies the very young age at marriage and high fertility rates are very important factors limiting women's labor force participation.

Ester Boserup (1970) has traced the changes in women's role from the traditional village to the modern cities. In traditional agricultural areas, women have specific and important

roles in the economic system. It was the growth of small towns that raised the position of man and caused women to drop out of the labor force. In a modern industrial city many jobs are not appealing to women because of long, inflexible hours and lower wages given to women.

Philippine studies have also focused on working women. In Gonzalez and Hollnsteiners' (1976) compilation of studies, the attitudes towards working mothers was discussed. A majority of Filipinos seem to approve of mothers working in certain preferred jobs like office work or handicrafts. Women's reasons for working included, aside from the economic aspect, the need for fulfillment and the desire to meet and interact with more people.

Castillo's 1976 study of woman workers is a comprehensive analysis of the various surveys and census that have compiled statistics on employed women. Castillo found several factors which are increasing women's force participation. One is the increasing age at marriage and another is the slight reduction in the fertility rates. In fact, the study states that when the roles of being a worker and being a mother are incompatible, fertility is lessened.

The status of women survey, which is the source of data for this present study, has already produced some findings about working women (Social Research Lab, 1977). It was found that

whether a married woman works or not is dependent upon the husband's approval, whether her mother worked, and the family income. For single woman the predictor's are low income, whether her mother worked and the presence of servants. At least in the regression analysis, the number of children did not have much effect.

III. METHODOLOGY

Secondary analysis of a nationwide survey was used for this study. The survey, entitled "A Survey on the Role and Status of Women in the Philippines," was conducted in late 1975 and early 1976 with a nationwide sample of adult women, married as well as single, ages 18-59 plus a smaller sample of husbands. The survey was supported by the Philippine Social Science Council (PSSC) fieldwork was conducted by survey research centers affiliated with the PSSC network.

Questionnaire construction. The project started in July, 1975, with the researchers preparing schematic diagrams to show the relationships among variables to be studied. Next, questions were devised to measure each variable and, in a series of meetings, questions were improved, added, or deleted.

In September, the questionnaire was pretested with a sample of 48 female respondents. Of these 32 were from an urban area and 16 from a rural area. Urban and rural respondents were randomly chosen from Project 3, Quezon City and Paombong, Bulacan,

respectively. To insure pretesting of all questions, working, non-working, married and unmarried women respondents were obtained.

Both the frequency tabulations of the results and the personal insights of the interviewers were used in revising the questionnaire. The major problems encountered were with the Tagalog translation and with the unfocused nature of some answers.

The final questionnaire covered a variety of topics: family relations, decision-making, and housework; time budgets; work experiences; fertility desires and expectations; retrospective questions on one's own upbringing; attitudes toward women and the *querida* system; general cultural values; gender stereotypes and self-images; satisfaction with one's life; subjective judgments of the status of women; household composition; and several questions on socioeconomic characteristics, such as education, income, residential history, media exposure, and so on.

Once the questionnaire was finalized it was translated into Tagalog, Cebuano, Ilongo, and Ilokano by the Social Research Laboratory. Other translations, into Chavacano and Tausug for example, were done by the field staff in the respective areas. All translations were checked by back-translation into English for comparison with the original.

Sampling. For the survey a total of 1,997 adults were interviewed -- 1,596 women and 399 men. The women were between the ages of 18 and 59 and the men were all husbands of married

female respondents. Half the sample was selected from rural areas and half from urban areas as defined by the National Census and Statistics Office. The sample areas for the rural population consisted of 40 barrios with 25 respondents from each and the urban sample areas were 50 barangays with 20 respondents each.

The sampling for rural areas was done in three stages. First one province was chosen to represent each of 10 regions, excluding Western Mindanao. Then the rural sample of 40 barrios was allocated among the sample provinces according to the size of the rural population in the region it represented. Specific barrios were chosen randomly. From each barrio, a sample of 20 households was drawn, and one woman aged 18 to 59 in each household was randomly chosen to be interviewed. Five husbands in each barrio were also interviewed (Table A).

The urban sample was divided into two parts: large urban areas, (Greater Manila, Cebu Iloilo, Bacolod and Davao) and smaller areas with populations of 10,000 to 50,000. The 50 sample barangays were distributed among the urban areas according to their population size. A different sampling fraction was used for the large and small areas so that an adequate sample could be drawn from the small areas. The barangays were chosen randomly and 16 households from each barangay sampled. Sixteen women and four men from each barangay were interviewed. Some smaller urban areas were included in the sample because of the presence of the PSSC survey center, whereas other places

Table A: Sample provinces for rural subsample
and number of barrios

	Region and sample province	Non-urban popula- tion* of region	Percentage of total	No. of sample barrios
I.	Ilocos La Union	1,296,370	5.13	2
II.	Cagayan Valley Isabela	1,452,963	5.75	2
III.	Central Luzon Pampanga	3,636,368	14.39	6
IV.	Southern Tagalog Occidental Mindoro Cavite	4,928,546	19.51	8
V.	Bicol Camarines Norte	2,397,240	9.49	4
VI.	Western Visayas Iloilo	2,652,233	10.50	4
VII.	Central Visayas	2,186,590	8.65	3
VIII.	Eastern Visayas Leyte	1,919,416	7.60	3
IX.	Northern Mindanao Agusan del Norte	2,401,424	9.50	4
X.	Southern Mindanao Davao del Norte	2,394,725	9.48	4
T o t a l		25,265,875	100.0	40

*Population figures are from Philippine Population Data Sheet (1970) of the University of the Philippines Population Institute. Totals are slightly larger than Census totals because they include people in institutions as well as in households.

Table B: Urban areas in sample and respective proportions of sample

	Urban area	Rank by size	Urban Population	Percentage of subgroup	No. of sample barangays
.I	1. Greater Manila	1	3,182,116	100.0%	10
.II	Four following urban areas				
.III	2. Cebu City	2	347,116	37.4	4
	3. Iloilo City	3	209,738	22.7	2
.VI	4. Bacolod City	4	187,300	20.3	2
	5. Davao City	5	178,471	19.3	2
.V	Subtotal		922,625	100.0%	10
.IV	Smaller urban areas				
.VII	6. Cotabato City	27	51,328	19.6	6
	7. Jolo	29	46,586	17.8	5
.IX	8. Zamboanga City	31	42,001	16.0	5
	9. Legaspi City	34	35,911	13.7	4
	10. Dumaguete City	45	21,811	8.3	2
	11. Ozamis City	47	18,772	7.2	2
	12. Digos	48	17,891	6.8	2
	13. Tuguegarao	58	14,681	5.6	2
	14. Puerto Princesa	65	12,814	4.9	2
	Subtotal		261,791	99.9	30

excluded because no center could cover the area.

Data collection. The interviewing of respondents was done over a three month period, December 1976 to February 1977. Interviewers were recruited and trained at research centers in each region. Supervisors conducted spot checks to verify the data collected.

Data analysis. Information was coded and transferred to computer tape. For the present secondary analysis the (FORTRAN) and SPSS package of computer program were used.

IV. RESULTS

The discussion of results will be divided into three sections. First, different aspects of working life of women will be compared to that of men. The second part will deal with the effect of marriage and childbearing on the working life of married women. Finally, the effects of migration on the lives of women and men will be discussed.

The working lives of women and men. Tables 1-5 give a general description of the sample. A majority of the women are below 35 while 13% are over 47. The males tend to be somewhat older, probably because of the fact that all the men are married. Sixteen percent of the women are never married, and 80% are presently married and living with their husbands. Only 1% are separated and 3.6% are widowed. The number of separated respondents may be greater, however, because some may have not admitted to

being separated. The number of widows was limited because of the upper age limit of 59.

The respondents have a wide range of educational backgrounds. Over half of the women have at most an elementary school diploma. Another 25% have at least some high school or vocational experience, 8% have some college and 14% have completed college. Male subjects have slightly higher educational backgrounds, with more males than females completing high school. Most respondents live in households with four to nine members. Most households were made up of nuclear families and almost all of the respondents were members of the family of procreation of the household head.

A large number of female respondents (43%) were employed at the time of the survey. Another 17% had worked previously (Table 6). Of the 40% who had never worked there were several students who plan to work in the future. This indicates that the majority of women in this study do not fit the stereotype of the typical housewife. Some kind of employment will be important to most women at certain periods of their lives. Of course, more men than women are employed and 85% of the males surveyed were working. Only 3% had never worked.

The measure of unemployment used for this study is the percentage of respondents who were looking for work during the week before the interview. Of those not presently working, 13% of the females and 30% of the males were looking for work (Table 7). However, this does not mean that males have higher

unemployment rates. Table 8 shows that 9.5% of women in the labor force (those working and those looking for work) are unemployed while 3% of males are unemployed. Thus it seems that it is harder for women to find work than man. Similarly higher unemployment rates for women are found in the U. S. and other countries (Time, 1979). This fact usually leads to lower wages offered to women than to man.

Labor force participation is affected by marital status, but perhaps not to the extent we would expect (Table 9). Forty-eight percent of never married women are in the labor force versus 46% of married women. Interestingly, the unemployment rate is much higher for single women, perhaps because they are generally younger than the married women. A higher percentage of separated and widowed women work, often because they have children to support. The effect of marital status on labor force participation is significant at $p = .05$.

Urban dwellers, both male and female have significantly higher employment rates than do rural dwellers. (Table 10). Fifty-five percent of urban women compared to 40% of rural women are in the labor force. Unemployment is lower in urban areas, indicating more opportunities for women to work. It is not clear that women's status is higher in urban areas (Bulatao, 1979) but employment opportunities are greater there.

Age is another factor affecting labor force participation (Table 11). For women, participation increases with age. It

seems that more women enter the labor force after their child-bearing years. Males show the opposite trend, decreasing participation with age. Unemployment rates are highest for the youngest age group for women and lowest in the middle years of 38-47. For men, lowest unemployment is in the early 30's and highest for those over 47. These differences between patterns of males and females demonstrate that different factors affect the participation of women and that commonly used models of employment based on male patterns may not be applicable.

The not employed. Although our study focuses on working women, a look at those not employed is necessary for comparison. Fewer men than women were not working, however their reasons for not working are quite similar (Table 12). For women, the main reasons are because of child care responsibilities and other household chores. Other reasons include being too old to work (although no one was over the age of 59) and because of family objections. Rural women mentioned child care more often than urban women and more of them felt they were too old to work. Urban women on the other hand mentioned family objections more often, or said they had no time or not enough education.

Interestingly the men also gave child care as their main reason for not working. This may indicate that sex roles are changing, at least in some families. The civil status of a woman has an effect on reasons for not working (Table 13). Many of the younger single respondents were still studying,

others were too sickly to work or preferred to stay at home. Married women, of course, had more child care and household responsibilities.

However, inspite of these reasons for not working, many respondents wanted to work sometime in the future. Their reasons for wanting to work are mainly monetary (Table 14), although some wanted to avoid boredom or meet more people. Rural women felt the need to add to family income while more urban women gave personal reasons such as to satisfy her whims or to help out relatives. Monetary concerns were even more important to the men who wanted to supplement their wife's income. Never-married women wanted to help relatives and satisfy personal whims more than married women, who wanted to supplement family income (Table 15).

Of those who wanted to work, a third of the women wanted part-time work while only 9% of the men wanted less than full-time work. Perhaps this desire for part-time work, because of other responsibilities at home, is one of the reason women have more difficulty finding jobs.

When asked what type of occupation they would like to have, these respondents display rather modest ambitions. Women wanted service or sales jobs while the men chose service or farm occupations (Table 17). None chose professional jobs, which are held by 14% of employed women. This seems to indicate that the most educated and skilled women are already employed.

The employed. The women respondents have a wide range of occupations (Table 18). The largest numbers work in sales. Other occupation groups with large numbers of women workers are crafts, farming and the professions. As expected more rural women than urban women are in farming and in sales. More urban women are in service occupations, the professions and in clerical jobs. More men than women are farmers, managers and work in transport. More women are in the professions (mainly teachers and nurses), sales work and service jobs. On the whole, women are not more concentrated in lower prestige occupation groups than men, although within each type of job, women have the lowest prestige positions (Lauby, 1977). There are more professionals among the younger never married women than among the married (Table 19). Never married women are also more active in clerical and service jobs which are usually reserved for young, single women. More married women are sales workers and crafts and production workers, jobs they can sometimes do in the own home.

Differences in occupation among age groups can indicate two things: that employers prefer younger women for some types of jobs, or that occupations for women are changing. The clearest trend is that the number of farm workers increases with age. In general the number of professionals decreases with age, except that the youngest age group has fewer professionals perhaps because of the length of studies required. These two trends parallel changes in the Philippine labor force over the last 20 years. Clerical workers tend to be younger and managers tend to

be either in the youngest or oldest group.

The type of employment is also important to consider when studying working women (Table 21). More than half of women are self-employed, often either in cottage industries or as proprietor of a small store. One fifth are employed by private employers and almost as many are employed by the government. More women than men are self employed or work for family enterprises perhaps because these give them greater flexibility to combine housework and employment. More men than women work for private enterprise, although the differences between the sexes are not statistically significant. Both rural women and men are more likely to self-employed than people in urban areas and this difference is significant.

More ever-married women (including separated and widowed) are self-employed than single women (Table 22) supporting the hypothesis that self-employment is preferred because of other family commitments. A self employed women can usually work at home and care for the children at the same time.

We have seen that unemployed women would often prefer part time work. Working women work fewer hours a day than men do (Table 23). More women than men work less than 8 hours a day and more men work "overtime" or more than 8 hours. Women in the sample worked on average of 6.4 hours a day while the men worked an hour longer. In general rural women and men work fewer hours a day than their urban counterparts. Although we might expect married

women to work fewer hours because of other household responsibilities, this is not the case, and never married women are just as likely to work part time (Table 24). Therefore the part time work of women may be due to the type of work they do and not to responsibility for other chores at home.

Income is one area where the disadvantages of women workers is often seen (Table 25). This is also true of the present sample. The women workers had a mean income of around ₱256 a month while the men earned an average of ₱373. While part of the difference is due to longer hours of men, women do get less pay than men in similar jobs. Rural workers have lower incomes than urban workers and the difference is greatest among males. Rural women earned an average of ₱206 and urban, ₱289 while rural men earn ₱272 and urban men ₱441. Urban opportunities seem to be greater for men. Never-married women earn slightly more than do married; an average of ₱269 versus ₱259. Separated and widowed women have lower income (Table 26). These figures include only cash income and therefore may underestimate income of workers who receive non-cash benefits.

Job Satisfaction. The objective measures of employment have shown that women have different patterns from men. We would like to know if these are reflected in subjective measures of job satisfaction. On over-all satisfaction we don't find much difference (Table 27). Seventy six percent of women workers are satisfied with their jobs as 72% of men. Rural workers are generally more

dissatisfied even though they are self-employed and work shorter hours. Most probably the low income of rural workers explains their dissatisfaction. Married women are the most satisfied with their jobs while the widowed and separated are the least satisfied (Table 28). It is interesting that never married women also show greater dissatisfaction than married women even though they have higher prestige jobs. (Lauby, 1977).

In general, older people are more satisfied with their work than are young people (Table 29). This does not seem to be due to the type of job, since again age groups with higher prestige jobs have the lowest job satisfaction. It may be due instead to decreasing expectations on the part of older people.

Respondents were also asked about their satisfaction with different aspects of their jobs. As expected, income was the area where the most workers expressed dissatisfaction, the women more than the men (Table 30). On the other hand, women were more satisfied than men with the people they work with and with the tasks they perform (Table 31 & 32). Security provided by the job seems to relate back to the economic issue and here more men than women were satisfied (Table 33). Therefore men and women seem to derive satisfaction from different aspects of their work.

Another question about job satisfaction was directed to married respondents who were asked whether their source of greatest satisfaction was being with their family or working at their job.

Most respondents said their greatest satisfaction was with their family (Table 34). More women (80%) said this than men (63%) confirming that working women still see their family roles as most important. (this difference was not statistically significant) More urban women than rural find satisfaction with their job confirming the earlier findings. Separated and widowed women get even more satisfaction from their family than do presently married women (Table 35).

A final perception question asked workers to assess their chances for advancement on the job. We find no difference between the males and females, both rate their chances as "fair", although in reality men undergo more intragenerational mobility than do females (Lauby, 1977) (Table 36).

Lifetime employment indicators. So far, our analysis has focused on the present job of respondents. However our aim is to study the entire working life of women. The first indicator is the total length of time the respondent has been employed. (Table 37). The women in the sample had worked 8.2 years on the average, with 40% having worked 3 years or less. Men on the other hand, worked an average of 14.3 years with only 13% working 3 years or less. Rural women have generally worked longer than urban women, an average of 9.5 versus 7.3 years. Rural women may find working more necessary because of the lower income in these areas. For men, there is little difference between rural and urban residents.

Married women have generally worked longer than never married probably because of their older ages. Widows have worked the longest, almost as long as the male workers (Table 38). As expected, length of employment increases with age and in each age group men have worked longer than women, the gap becoming the longest in the oldest age group (Table 39).

Another measure of job history is the number of jobs held. Most women workers (82%) have held only one job. (Table 40). Fifteen percent have had two jobs and only 4% have had more than two. Men on the other hand had more jobs; 19% with two and 15% more than two, however when we consider that men generally have a longer working life, this does not mean that men spend less time in each job. In fact, they spend slightly longer in each job than do women. Because most workers had only one job there is no significant difference between mean number of jobs of men and women. Urban workers, both male and female have had more different jobs than rural workers reflecting the more varied opportunities in cities.

Interestingly, the number of jobs held does not increase directly with age for women (Table 41). The women with the greatest number of jobs held are those 28-47. However the oldest men do have the largest number of jobs.

Those people who change jobs however tend to remain in the same occupation. Of the 176 women who had more than one job, only

39 have had more than one occupation (Table 42). The same is true for men. Of 125 with more than one job, 20 have had more than one occupation. This means that workers tend to stay in one type of work throughout their life. However, the trend seem to be for increased changes for mobility, since the younger age group of women have had slightly more occupations (Table 43). The opposite trend is true for males.

A third type of indicator concerns the number of work interruptions in the employment life of the individual. In the West, a pattern of ~~women~~ working before marriage, dropping out of the labor force as their children grow up and returning when their children are ~~grow up~~ and returning when their children are grown is a common one (Fogarty et al, 1970). If this pattern also applied to the Philippines we expect women to have had more work interruptions (a period of a year or more without work) than men have had. However we find this is not the case. Only 9% of women have had interruptions, but 20% of the men have (Table 44). Urban workers have had more work interruptions perhaps because of more geographic and occupational mobility. Married women have had only slightly more work interruptions than have never married respondents (Table 45). This indicates that Philippine women usually do not interrupt their work career to have children. Perhaps one explanation may be the presence of relatives or maids to take care of the children while the women works. In this case, marriage

should not be as much of a disadvantage to women workers here as it is in other societies.

Since women in the labor force work for fewer years than men do but do not generally interrupt their work career, women must either start work at an older age or stop working at a younger age than men do. Our data, which may not adequately represent younger men, indicates that women start work at an older age than men do.

Although men had undergone more work interruptions, they were generally shorter than the interruptions experienced by women (Table 47). The mean number of years without work was 7.1 for women who interrupted their career and 5.2 for men. About half of both men and women had short interruptions of 1 - 3 years. However more women had longer interruptions than men. In general, rural workers had longer periods between jobs than urban respondents.

As stated previously, only 9% of working married women had interrupted their careers. However, those that did interrupt their careers had a much longer period without work (8.4) years than unmarried women (2.3 years) or married men (5.3) (Table 48). There are some women whose marriage affect work life.

The length of work interruptions increase with age. In the youngest group there is no difference in interruptions of males and females. It is in 38 years old and over group that the females have experienced longer interruptions than men (Table 49). This may indicate that younger women tend not to spend as much time away from the job as did the older women.

Since this study aims to measure the effect of marriage and childbearing on employment, the respondent's own reasons for leaving a job should shed some light on how they view these factors (Table 50). For instance, 22% of women and 16% of men left their first job because of marriage. As we will see later some of these subjects got another job right away. Eight percent of women, (but also 6% men) left jobs because of child care responsibilities. Other important reasons given by women are physical and health reasons (13%), being laid off (9%), unspecified personal reasons (6%), because of insufficient income (5%) or because of change of residence (5%). Using this indicator, it seems that marriage has the greatest effect on employment.

A question aimed at never married respondents tries to measure the same thing. When asked what they would do if they were to get married, 84% ~~would~~ they will continue working and 14% would stop (Table 51).

Indicators of change of employment status at marriage.

We have found that single women are more likely to be employed than married women. However we do not know if this is because women who are more committed to work are less likely to get married or because marriage entails responsibilities that are incompatible with employment. The indicator of change in employment status will shed light on this as it measures what happened to the respondent's work when they get married. Seventy-seven percent were not working before or after marriage and about 12%

stayed in the same job. (Table 52). Therefore the other 11% made changes at the time of marriage. Six percent stopped working, 4% started work and 1% changed jobs. Comparing rural and urban women, significantly more urban women started working, perhaps indicating a less traditional view of women's role in urban areas.

It seems that only 5% of the women's careers were negatively affected by marriage. For the 1% who changed jobs, the type of change was analyzed. It was expected that these women have decided to move to a part time job or less demanding position. However, among the 7 women who changed jobs, 4 changed from full time to full time and only two from full time to part time jobs.

Dividing the women into four age cohorts will tell something about changes over time, if we assume the women were married at similar ages. The first striking difference is that younger women are more likely to have worked before marriage (Table 53). Of women aged 48 and above, 84% did not work before or after marriage while 70% of 18-27 year olds did not work. The younger age group however tends to stop working when they marry (15.5%). From 10-15% of all age groups remain in the same job.

The Effect of Childbearing on Employment.

It is assumed that fertility interferes with employment, although there is evidence that the effect is not so great in the Philippines (Layo, 1977). The mean number of children of the female respondents is 4.3 for rural women and 4.2 for urban (Table 54).

Older women tend to have more children, although women over 47 do not have more children than women over 37 (Table 55). For working women, the care of their children is one of the greatest worries. They have a variety of ways to deal with this problem (Table 56). A third assign older children to care for younger or children look after themselves, 18% have maids. Eight percent have husbands who care for children, while 20% have grandmothers or other relations as baby-sitters. More urban than rural families have maids and more rural women ask older children to care for the younger. These different aids to childcare maybe one reason why childbearing does not have much of an influence on women's employment in the Philippines.

The indicator of change in employment status at birth of first child is similar to the indicator for marriage. (Table 57). We find that 79% of women not working before and after birth of first child. This means that about 3% stopped working between marriage and the birth of the first child. Fourteen percent remained in the same job, leaving only 5% whose jobs were affected by childbirth. Surprisingly, as many women started a new job after the birth as stopped working. Only one respondent changed jobs. Urban women were more likely to stay on the job or to start a new one while rural women were more likely not to work before or after birth but the difference was not significant.

Childbirth seems to have an increasing effect on employment when we compare age cohorts (Table 58). The older cohort tended either to be not working before and after childbirth or continued

working. The younger group more often either stopped working or started working. The increasing industrialization of the country may have the effect of increasing patterns of behavior which are similar to those in the West. This may mean either fewer options for childcare in a nuclear family and urban areas causing a new mother to drop out of labor force, or a need for extra income causing the mother to start working.

The birth of the second child has less effect on employment than did the first child. Now 83% of mothers were not working, indicating that 4% stopped work between birth of first and second child (Table 59). A similar 14% continued working. Only 2.5% had their employment affected by the birth, about half of these stopping work and half starting work. Again more urban women continued to work than rural women. Younger women tended not to work before and after the second child was born and fewer of them continued working (Table 60). Again it seems that childbirth is having a greater detrimental effect on women's employment among younger women. Similar trends continue at birth of third child (Tables 61 and 62).

A final indicator of effect of childbearing on employment is the present employment status of respondents by number of children (Table 63). It seems that the number of children a woman has does not affect her employment. Only 39% of women with 1 to 2 children work (many of them belonging to young age cohort) while 42-44% of women with 3 or more children work.

No substantial difference are seen between those who have 3 to 4 children and those who have 10 or more.

One variable that may have an effect on the relationship between number of children and employment status is family income. In this study family income was measured by adding the salaries or wages of household members plus non-wage income from business or gifts. An attempt was made to quantify non-cash income.

For women respondents, employment is positively related to family income; that is, the higher the income, the more likely a woman is to be employed. For men, family income has no relationship with employment status because in all income groups a great majority of men are presently working (Table 64). All the 13 men who have never worked are in the low income group.

When we control for income, the number of children still has very little effect on employment status of women (Table 65). In fact for the low income group, women with large families are more likely to be employed than those with few children. The trends are not so clear in other income groups which have fewer respondents. It therefore seems that a larger family income makes it easier for a woman to work, either because she has a better education or because someone can be hired to take care of household chores. However controlling for income still does not reveal any relationship between number of children and employment status.

The Effect of Migration.

The final variable to be analyzed is change of residence or migration, defined in this study as a move to a different barrio or municipality. The majority of respondents have moved at least once, with 29% remaining in the place of birth and 14% changing residence 4 or more times during their life (Table 65). More women now living in urban areas have migrated, only 20% of them having no change of residence, while 36% of rural women have not moved. The same pattern is found in male respondents.

In general married women have had more changes of residence (2.4 versus 2.0 for never married) perhaps because of their older ages (Table 67). The age groups that have undergone the most mobility are women aged 28-37. The youngest and oldest age groups have been less mobile (Table 68). The same patterns is seen in male respondents. This indicates that migration is becoming more common and we will see that most of this movement is toward urban areas.

An indicator of change of employment status at time of migration was calculated. It shows that particularly for the men, the first change of residence was often before they had entered the labor force. For those who were working, most stayed in the same job, indicating a relatively short distance of migration (Table 70). Only 2% of women started a new job the same year that they moved. For men, this group comprised 8% while fewer of them

stayed in the same job. Rural women most often remained in the same job. This maybe due to the nature of their self-employed type of jobs which they can continue in new places. Whether this is the case or not, it seems migration does not have much direct effect on employment.

The effect on married women is not much different from that on single women, except that married women are more likely to have started a new job (Table 71). Looking at changes over time as indicated by comparison of age cohorts, we find that migration is having less impact on employment than it used to, although the difference is small (Table 72). More of the older groups started a job after moving while more of the younger remained in the same job. For men there was no clear trend over time.

Succeeding moves had even less effect on employment. Of the 1004 women who had at least two changes of residence, only 3 started a new job at the time of the move while the others were either not working (74%) or remained in the same job (26%) (Table 73). Similar results are found for third to fifth moves (Tables 74-80).

The lack of effect of migration on employment is hard to explain. It may be that there is a lag period between the actual move and the change in job or start of employment. More data will have to be gathered on this.

Another way of studying migration is to divide respondents into migrant types. This was done by comparing place of first

residence with present residence categorizing each into rural and urban. Forty-seven percent of women have remained in rural areas. Among those who have lived in both rural and urban areas, most have moved from rural to urban (32%), only 3% of respondents moving from urban to rural areas.

Migrant type seems not to have much effect on labor force participation. Urban women whether migrant or not, have significantly higher participation rates than rural women (Table 81). However, migration does seem to affect unemployment. Migrants to urban areas have lower unemployment rates than urban-urban respondents while migrants to rural areas have higher unemployment rates than rural residents. Among men, migrants have lower unemployment rates than those who have remained in urban or rural areas.

Migrants seem to take slightly different types of jobs than do non-migrants. Women migrants to rural areas tend to be professionals like teachers, nurses or other government workers. Migrants to urban areas take lower prestige jobs than women who have always lived in urban areas. More of them are sales workers or service workers (Table 82). Related to this, migrants to urban areas are less satisfied with their jobs than are urban-born residents (Table 83).

Never married women seem to be more mobile than married women. More of them have moved from rural to urban areas while more married women have either remained in or moved to rural areas (Table 84).

Women in the middle age groups have undergone the most migration (Table 85). More women in 28-37 age group have moved from rural to urban areas. More of the oldest group have remained in rural areas while more of the youngest age group have remained in urban areas. This reflects the urbanization of the population.

We would also like to find out if the number of children is related to migrant type. Rural-born women have more children (4.8) while urban -born women have the least (4.0). The two migrant groups have a mean of 4.4 children (Table 86). However, it is not clear if this is the effect of migration or if the type of persons who move are those with fewer children.

V. CONCLUSIONS

This study yield some unexpected findings as well as confirming some assumptions about women in the labor force.

First of all, fewer women than men are in the labor force and among those women who do work, they are employed for a fewer number of years than men. However, women do not generally interrupt their work for marriage or childbearing. They usually start work at a later age and retire earlier than men do.

Women who are not in the labor force tend to be less skilled than those who are employed. Most of these women say they would like to work in the future.

Marriage does not have much immediate effect on employment status. However marriage does seem to have an increasing impact

on younger women causing them to leave the labor force. Although marriage does not usually determine whether a woman works or not, it does have an effect on the types of job she holds. Married women are more likely to be self-employed and in lower income jobs. Yet they are more satisfied with their jobs, perhaps not having as high expectations as single women.

Childbearing also has a minimal effect on whether a woman works or not. Even the number of children a Filipina has, does not seem to be related to whether or not she works; unlike findings in other societies (Fogarty, 1970). The ready availability of child care may be one factor allowing women with children to work, although many of the ~~women~~ who are not in the labor force said that child care responsibilities prevented them from working.

Surprisingly, even migration had a limited effect on employment. As with marriage and childbearing, the effect may be delayed so that the change in employment does not occur in the same year as the move. In this case other indicators should be devised to measure this lag. Women, especially unmarried women, are increasingly moving to urban areas where they find less unemployment but take jobs requiring less skill.

It seems, therefore, that the differences in male and female labor force participation cannot be explained by effects of marriage, childbearing or migration. This leads to the conclusion that other factors, most likely attitudes and tradition prevent women from

being fully utilized in the development process.

Suggestions for future indicators.

Further use of life cycle indicators is suggested to better understand various effects of different processes on women's lives. The indicators developed in this study have shown the inadequacy of available data and should point out areas of improvement.

First, more complete data is required on relationships between various processes. In the data of the present study, information on marriage, childbirth, migration and change of job were all collected in terms of the year of occurrence. Therefore, it was not possible to determine if a change in job happened months before or after marriage in the same year, for example. Thus a more accurate picture could be developed from detailed information on sequence of events. Moreover, investigation of reasons for migration or of reasons for starting work could help determine if a relationship between such events was intended by the subjects.

Thus we recommend a nationwide survey of women that would include a complete chronology of life events and relationships between them. Respondents would be asked to list events in the order of occurrence so that the precise effect of one on the other could be determined.

Such data would not have to be gathered often because we do not expect sudden changes in these relationships. A detailed survey every ten years would be very adequate. The use of age cohorts could again be used to study past experiences of women.

If possible, a panel study where the same respondents would be surveyed at regular intervals would be ideal.

Using this data, the following indicators are suggested:

1. Length of labor force participation.
2. Interruptions in labor force participation.
3. Change in labor force participation at time of marriage.
4. Change in labor force participation at birth of children.
5. Change in labor force participation at time of migration.
6. Interrelationships of marriage and migration.

The length of labor force participation indicator will be slightly different from that used in this study because it will include people looking for work. This measure will reveal changes in the commitment of women to work over a longer period of time.

The indicator of interruptions can be taken directly from questions asking if the woman has stopped working for any period of time. This will act as a check on present data gathered from the employment history.

The change in labor force participation indicators (3, 4 & 5) will include an added category of "started to look for work", in addition to the ones used in this study (ended one job and started another, stopped working, started working, continued working, and not working before and after change). This will give more accurate

information on unemployment. Another aspect which should be measured for those who either continued work or were not working is the time lag between the event (marriage, for example) and the effect on labor force participation.

The final indicator will measure the amount of migration around the time of marriage and show if the marriage or the migration came first. This will supplement studies of the U.P. Population Institute of the effects of migration on childbearing.

These indicators are feasible since the data they require can be obtained from surveys. Although the information gathered by the survey may not be directly verifiable, reliability can be tested by asking the same question in different ways. For example in addition to a complete job history, the respondent would be asked directly if they have ever stopped working for a period of time. Any discrepancies should be thoroughly investigated and explained. This will require well-trained and vigilant interviewers.

POLICY APPLICATIONS:

First of all, the surprising lack of much effect of marriage, childbearing and migration on employment may suggest to some that no policy changes are indicated. However, as long as women are underutilized in the labor force some help is needed.

We have seen that women have higher unemployment rates and that many of those not looking for work would like to work in the future. These women could be helped to gain employment not only through training and skill development but by provision of commu-

nity child care services or cooperative child care among groups of parents.

Another needed change is not easy to accomplish. This is the attitude of husband and relatives which often hinders women from working. The growing acceptance of working women and positive experiences of such women being publicized may help change this. A conscious effort should be made to shift conception of sex roles so that men do not feel threatened by working women and such women are not seen as less feminine.

Although childbearing does not have great effect on employment, it is agreed that employment does lessen fertility and thus aids in population control (Castillo, 1976). This is another reason to encourage female labor force participation.

Migrants to urban areas seem to have advantages in terms of employment over rural residents. This becomes an inducement to move to the city. If people are to be encouraged to stay in rural areas, more job opportunities of various types are very necessary. Regional development is important to offer rural residents not only more jobs but social and recreational services as well. Ways of helping the self-employed rural women increase her productivity and income would most probably also increase her satisfaction with her work. Thus, training in production and marketing of cottage industries or of expanding or joining sari-sari stores to form cooperatives should be useful.

The Filipina has education, skills and dedication which should be better utilized in the process of development.

Table 1: AGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS

A G E S	Female	Male	Total
	%	%	%
18 - 27	33.2	14.0	29.4
28 - 37	30.5	33.3	31.1
38 - 47	23.4	29.8	24.7
48 - 59	12.8	22.8	14.8
T O T A L	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(1598)	(399)	(1997)

Table 2: CIVIL STATUS OF RESPONDENT

Civil Status	Female	Male	Total
	%	%	%
Never Married	15.8	0.0	12.6
Married	79.6	100.0	83.7
Separated	1.0	0.0	0.8
Widower	3.6	0.0	2.0
T O T A L L	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(1598)	(399)	(1997)

Table 3: Educational Attainment in the City of...

Educational Attainment	Female %	Male %	Total %
Some Elementary	23.9	24.0	23.9
Completed Elementary	24.5	22.2	24.0
Some High School	13.0	13.3	13.1
Completed High School	10.8	13.8	11.4
Some College	7.8	6.6	7.6
Completed College	14.9	12.8	13.8
Some Law or Medicine	0.1	0.3	0.1
Completed Law or Medicine	0.1	1.3	0.3
Some Masters Units (MA, MBA)	0.1	0.3	0.1
Completed Masters	0.1	0.5	0.2
No Formal Education	4.0	2.3	3.6
Katon, Kaitilla, Kindergarden	0.2	0.3	0.2
Completed Vocational Training	1.4	2.5	1.6
T O T A L	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(1583)	(392)	(1975)

Table 5: RELATIONSHIP OF RESPONDENT TO HEAD

Relationship to Head	Female %	Male %	Total %
Household Head	4.3	96.7	22.7
Household Head's Spouse	75.7	0.0	60.6
Household's Siblings	1.6	0.2	1.3
Household Heads's Spouse Siblings	0.9	0.0	0.8
Sons	0.0	1.8	0.4
Daughters	12.6	0.0	10.1
Son's/Daughter Spouse	1.5	1.3	1.4
Relatives	2.4	0.0	2.0
Servant, Household Help	0.8	0.0	0.6
Boarder/Lodgers	0.2	00.0	0.2
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(1597)	(397)	(1994)

22

Table 6: EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF RESPONDENT

Employment Status	Female %	Male %	Total %
Presently Working	42.9	28.5	52.0
Work Previously But Not at Present	16.9	8.5	15.2
Never Worked	40.2	3.0	32.8
T O T A L	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(1598)	(392)	(1997)

$\chi^2 = 277.13$

d.f. = 2

significant at $p = .05$

Table 7: RESPONDENTS LOOKING FOR WORK LAST YEAR

Looking for Work	Female	Male	Total
	%	%	%
No	86.8	70.3	85.8
Yes	13.2	29.7	14.2
T O T A L	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(547)	(97)	(584)

11/11

Table 8: LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION BY SEX

Labor Force Participation	Female	Male	Total
	%	%	%
In Labor Force	47.4	90.9	56.0
a) Presently Working	90.5	96.1	92.6
b) Looking Work	9.5	3.1	7.4
Not in Labor Force	52.6	9.1	44.0
T O T A L	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(1597)	(396)	(1993)

5

Table 9: LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION OF WOMEN BY CIVIL STATUS

Labor Force Participation	Never Married %	Married %	Separated %	Widowed %
In Labor Force	47.6	45.9	93.8	65.5
a) Presently Working	81.7	91.4	100.0	100.0
b) Looking for Work	18.3	8.6	0.0	0.0
Not in Labor Force	52.4	54.1	6.2	34.5
T O T A L	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(252)	(1271)	(16)	(58)

$\chi^2 = 92.1446$

d.f. = 6

significant at $p = .05$

Table 10: LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION BY PLACE OF RESIDENCE AND SEX

Labor Force Participation	Female		Male	
	Rural %	Urban %	Rural %	Urban %
In Labor Force	39.5	55.3	87.5	94.4
a) Presently Working	89.6	91.2	96.0	97.9
b) Looking for Work	10.4	8.8	4.0	2.1
Not In Labor Force	60.5	44.7	12.5	5.6
T O T A L	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(800)	(797)	(200)	(198)

Table 11: LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION BY AGE AND SEX

F E M A L E

	18-27	28-37	38-47	48-59	TOTAL
Labor Force Participation	%	%	%	%	%
In Labor Force	36.9	49.8	54.3	56.4	47.4
a) Presently working	79.6	94.2	95.1	93.0	90.5
b) Looking for work	20.4	5.8	4.9	7.0	9.5
Not In Labor Force	63.1	50.2	45.7	43.6	52.6
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(531)	(488)	(374)	(204)	(1597)

for Female $\chi^2 = 70.1765$ d.f. = 6 significant at $p = .05$

M A L E

	18-27	28-37	38-47	48-59	TOTAL
Labor Force Participation	%	%	%	%	%
In Labor Force	94.6	92.5	91.6	85.6	91.0
a) Presently Working	96.2	98.4	97.2	94.8	97.0
b) Looking for Work	3.8	1.6	2.8	5.2	3.0
Not In Labor Force	5.4	7.5	8.4	14.4	9.0
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(58)	(133)	(119)	(90)	(198)

5

Table 12: MAIN REASONS FOR NOT WORKING BY SEX AND AREA

Main Reasons	Female		Male		Total	
	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Female	Male
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Because of the family and children; no one to take care of the children, children to young	53.3	36.7	62.3	45.5	46.2	54.6
There are other chores to do; housework; <i>ayaw iwanan ang bahay</i>	11.2	12.9	9.4	18.2	11.9	13.4
No Time	1.5	7.5	0.0	4.5	4.1	2.1
I prefer to be in the house; <i>gusto sa bahay lang</i>	4.6	4.1	5.7	0.0	4.4	3.1
Husbands objects to working; Mother or Father objects to working	5.1	9.5	0.0	15.9	7.0	7.2
Husband can afford to support the family; <i>kaya naman kawing buhayin</i>	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0
Physical reason; sickly	4.1	7.5	5.7	4.5	5.5	5.2
Too old	11.7	3.4	11.3	4.5	8.1	8.2
Still studying	2.5	8.8	0.0	0.0	5.2	0.0
There is a farm to attend to	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0
Women are fit for home, should do housework	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0
No education not qualified	2.5	6.1	3.8	6.8	4.1	5.2
Others	2.5	2.7	1.9	0.0	2.6	1.0
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(197)	(147)	(53)	(44)	(344)	(97)

Table 13: MAIN REASONS FOR NOT WORKING BY STATUS

Main Reasons	Never Married	Married	Widowed	Total
	%	%	%	%
Because of the family and children; no one to take care of the children; children are young	2.9	52.4	21.4	46.2
There are other chores to do; ayaw iwan ang bahay	8.8	12.5	7.1	11.9
No time	0.0	4.7	0.0	3.1
Prefer to be in the house; gusto ko sa bahay lang	8.8	3.7	7.1	4.4
Husband objects to working; Mother or Father objects to work	2.9	7.4	7.1	7.0
Husband can afford to support the family, kaya naman kasing buhayin	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.3
Physical reasons; sickly	14.7	4.1	14.3	5.5
Too old	2.9	7.4	35.7	8.1
Still studying	52.9	0.0	0.0	5.2
There is a farm to attend to	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.3
Women are fit for house, should do housework	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.3
No education, not qualified	0.0	4.4	7.1	3.1
Others	5.9	2.4	0.0	2.6
T O T A L	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(34)	(296)	(14)	(344)

25

PLACE AND SEX

Main Reasons	Female		Male		Total Female %	Total Male %
	Rural %	Urban %	Rural %	Urban %		
To earn money, to buy food, clothing, things I need, Financial stability & support my studies	38.0	31.7	37.3	30.4	35.2	34.7
To supplement husband's income; husband's earning is not enough	36.6	34.8	38.7	50.0	35.8	43.0
To add or maintain family savings; for the future	2.1	2.7	0.0	0.0	2.3	0.0
To accumulate more properties and wealth; to acquire land	1.0	0.4	1.3	0.0	0.8	0.8
To be able to send children to school; to develop children	2.1	2.2	4.0	2.2	2.2	3.3
To have extra money for children to spend	0.9	6.4	1.3	0.0	0.6	0.8
To buy everything I like, to satisfy personal whims; have my own money	0.8	7.6	2.7	2.2	5.5	2.5
To help parents and relatives; makatulong sa pamilya; makapag-paaral ng kapatid	7.3	11.2	2.7	10.9	9.0	5.8
To have free food; to help with harvest in order to be fed	0.7	0.0	1.3	0.0	0.4	0.8
To use training; practice profession; develop professionally	0.0	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.0
To gain more experience and knowledge	0.7	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.0
To keep healthy; physically fit; exercise	1.7	0.0	1.3	0.0	1.0	0.8
To broaden circle of friends; meet more people have more acquaintances	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0
To help others thru work; make a contribution	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0

REASON FOR SEX

Cont't. Table 14: MAIN REASONS OF UNEMPLOYED FOR WANTING TO WORK BY PLACE & SEX

Main Reasons	Female		Male		Total	
	Rural %	Urban %	Rural %	Urban %	Female %	Male %
To avoid boredom; to avoid wasting time	3.8	3.6	8.0	2.2	3.7	5.8
Self-satisfaction in being busy; work enjoyable, pleasing, therapeutic	0.3	1.8	0.0	2.2	1.8	0.8
Work is a habit; hinahanap ng katawan	0.3	0.0	1.3	0.0	0.2	0.8
I simply likes to work	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0
Others	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(109)	(71)	(75)	(46)	(180)	(21)

AS

Table 15: MAIN REASON OF UNEMPLOYED WOMEN FOR WANTING TO WORK BY STATUS

F E M A L E

Main Reasons	Single %	Married %	Total %
To earn money, to buy food, clothing, things, financial stability & support my studies	37.8	34.3	35.0
To supplement husband's income; husband's earning is not enough	0.0	46.4	36.2
To add or maintain family earnings for the future	2.7	2.3	2.4
To accumulate more properties and wealth; to acquire land	1.8	0.5	0.8
To be able to send children to school; to develop children	0.0	2.5	2.0
To have extra money for children to spend	0.0	0.5	0.4
To buy everything I like; to satisfy personal whims; have my own money	17.1	2.3	5.6
To help parents and relatives; makatulong sa pamilya, makapag - aral ng kapatid	27.9	3.8	9.1
To have free food; help with harvest in order to be fed	0.0	0.5	0.4
To use training, practice profession, develop professionally	2.7	0.0	0.6
To gain more experience and knowledge	2.7	0.3	0.8
To keep healthy, physically fit, exercise	0.0	1.3	1.3
To broaden circle of friends, meet more people, have more acquaintances	0.0	0.3	0.2
To help others thru work; make a contribution	0.9	0.0	0.2
T O T A L	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(42)	(135)	(177)

50

Table 16: TYPE OF WORK WANTED

Type of Work	Female	Male	Total
	%	%	%
Part Time	32.0	9.0	29.2
Either	10.3	0.0	9.0
Full Time	57.7	90.9	61.8
T O T A L	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(78)	(11)	(89)

Table 17: TYPE OF OCCUPATION WANTED BY UNEMPLOYED BY SEX

Type of Occupation	Female	Male	Total
	%	%	%
Professional, Technical and Related Workers	0.0	0.0	0.0
Administrative, Executive and Managerial Work	0.4	0.0	0.4
Clerical Workers	13.1	0.0	12.3
Sales Workers	23.8	5.6	22.6
Farmers, Fishermen, Hunters	9.3	19.4	9.9
Minor, Quarrymen, and Related Workers	0.2	0.0	0.2
Workers in Transport and Communication Occup.	13.3	16.7	13.5
Craftsmen, Production process Workers & Laborers	6.2	16.7	6.9
Service sport and Related Workers	33.8	41.7	34.3
T O T A L	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(518)	(36)	(554)

Table 10: THE TYPE OF OCCUPATION OF EMPLOYED PERSONS

F E M A L E

Type of Occupation	Rural	Urban	Total
	%	%	%
Professional, Technical and Related Workers	8.8	17.9	14.2
Administrative, Executive & Managerial Workers	0.4	3.0	1.9
Clerical Workers	0.7	11.4	7.0
Sales Workers	33.6	27.6	30.1
Farmers, Fishermen, Hunters, Loggers and Related Workers	32.5	3.5	15.5
Miner, Quarrymen and Related Workers	1.1	0.0	0.4
Workers in Transport and Communication Occup.	0.0	1.2	0.7
Craftsmen, Production Process, Workers & Laborers	18.4	19.7	19.1
Service Sport and Related Workers	4.6	15.7	11.1
T O T A L	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(283)	(402)	(685)

M A L E

Type of Occupation	Rural	Urban	Total
	%	%	%
Professional, Technical and Related Workers	5.4	7.6	6.6
Administrative, Executive & Managerial Workers	0.6	15.8	8.6
Clerical Workers	0.0	6.0	3.9
Sales Workers	3.6	16.9	10.6
Farmers, Fishermen, Hunters, Loggers & Related Workers	65.5	4.9	33.9
Workers in Transport and Communication Occup.	6.1	24.6	20.5
Craftsmen, Production Process, Workers Laborers	5.4	16.4	11.1
Service Sport and Related Workers	1.8	7.1	4.6
Miner, Quarrymen and Related Workers	1.8	0.6	1.1
T O T A L	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(168)	(183)	(351)

58

Table 19: TYPE OF OCCUPATION OF EMPLOYED FEMALES BY STATUS

Type of Occupation	: Never Married :		: Married :		: Separated :		: Kidowed :		Total	
	:	%	:	%	:	%	:	%	:	
Professional, Technical and Related Workers	:	20.4	:	13.5	:	0.0	:	7.9	:	13.9
Administrative, Executive and Managerial Workers	:	2.0	:	1.9	:	0.0	:	2.6	:	1.9
Clerical Workers	:	19.3	:	6.6	:	0.0	:	0.0	:	7.0
Sales Workers	:	20.4	:	31.8	:	40.0	:	29.0	:	30.2
Farmers, Fishermen, Hunters, Loggers and Related Workers	:	12.2	:	15.4	:	13.3	:	26.3	:	15.5
Workers in Transport and Communication Occupation	:	1.0	:	0.8	:	0.0	:	0.0	:	0.7
Craftsmen, Production Process Workers and Laborers	:	14.3	:	20.3	:	20.0	:	15.8	:	19.2
Service Sport and Related Workers	:	16.3	:	9.4	:	26.7	:	15.8	:	11.1
T O T A L	:	100.0	:	100.0	:	100.0	:	100.0	:	100.0
(N)	:	(90)	:	(532)	:	(15)	:	(38)	:	(683)

TABLE 30: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT BY AGE AND SEX

Female

TYPE OF OCCUPATION	13-27	28-37	38-47	48-70	TOTAL
	%	%	%	%	
Professional, Technical and Related Workers	12.3	20.1	11.9	7.5	14.2
Administrative, Executive and Managerial Workers	3.2	1.3	0.5	3.7	1.9
Clerical Workers	10.9	7.4	3.1	7.5	7.0
Sales Workers	30.1	28.8	35.8	22.4	30.1
Barbers, Fishermen, Hunters, Loggers and Related Workers	12.2	10.5	20.2	22.4	15.5
Miner, Quarrymen and Related Workers	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.8	0.4
Workers in Transport and Communication Occupation	0.6	0.0	1.6	0.9	0.7
Draftsman, Production Progress Workers and Laborers	18.6	19.6	17.6	21.5	19.1
Service Sports and Related Workers	11.5	12.2	9.3	11.2	11.1
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(156)	(229)	(193)	(107)	(685)

65

TYPE OF OCCUPATION	15-27	28-37	38-47	48-59	TOTAL
	%	%	%	%	%
Professional, Technical and Related Workers	5.9	8.3	3.8	8.2	6.6
Administrative, Executive and Managerial Workers	3.2	7.4	11.3	9.6	8.6
Clerical Workers	0.0	4.1	5.7	0.0	3.1
Sales Workers	9.8	12.4	12.3	5.5	10.6
Farmers, Fishermen, Hunters, Loggers and Related Workers	35.3	23.9	33.0	42.5	33.9
Miners, Quarrymen and Related Workers	2.0	2.5	0.0	0.0	1.1
Workers in Transport and Communication Occupation	21.6	9.1	11.3	6.3	11.1
Construction, Production Process Workers and Laborers	15.7	23.1	19.9	20.6	20.5
Service Workers and Related Workers	5.9	4.1	2.8	6.9	4.6
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(51)	(121)	(106)	(73)	(351)

Table 21: TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT BY PLACE OF RESIDENCE AND SEX

F E M A L E

Type of Employment	Rural	Urban	Total
	%	%	%
Self-employed	62.9	43.8	51.7
Family Enterprise	9.9	9.5	9.6
Government	13.1	22.6	18.7
Private Business	14.1	24.1	20.0
T O T A L	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(283)	(402)	(685)

Comparing Rural & Urban Females $\chi^2 = 28.9259$ $df = 4$ significant at $p = .05$

M A L E

Type of Employment	Rural	Urban	Total
	%	%	%
Self-employed	53.3	23.0	37.4
Family enterprise	9.0	3.3	6.0
Government	0.4	24.6	16.9
Private Business	29.4	49.2	39.7
T O T A L	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(167)	(183)	(350)

Comparing Female & Male $\chi^2 = 6.6944$ $df = 4$ not significant

60

Table 22: TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT BY WOMEN BY STATUS

F E M A L E

Type of Employment	Never Married		Married		Separated		Widowed		Total
	%		%		%		%		
Self-employed	28.6		53.8		60.0		75.7		51.5
Family enterprise	14.3		9.4		13.3		0.0		9.7
Government	20.4		19.6		0.0		10.8		18.8
Private Business	36.7		17.3		26.7		13.5		20.1
T O T A L	100.0		100.0		100.0		100.0		100.0
(N)	(98)		(832)		(15)		(37)		(682)

$\chi^2 = 34.9374$ df = 9 significant at p = .05

Table 23: AVERAGE WORKING HOURS PER DAY BY PLACE OF RESIDENCE AND SEX

No. of Working Hours	Female			Male		
	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%
1 - 4	26.3	20.9	23.3	8.1	4.7	6.3
5 - 8	35.0	37.9	36.8	71.4	66.7	69.0
9 - 12	18.0	16.2	17.0	18.6	25.2	22.0
13 - 16	0.7	5.0	2.9	1.2	3.5	2.4
17 - 20	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.3
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(278)	(378)	(658)	(161)	(171)	(332)
Mean Working Hours	6.0	6.7	6.4	7.1	7.6	7.4

12

Table 24: AVERAGE WORKING HOURS PER DAY BY STATUS

FEMALE

Number of Working Hours	Marital Status				Total
	Never Married	Married	Separated	Widowed	
	%	%	%	%	%
1 - 4	25.3	22.8	38.5	18.2	23.3
5 - 8	59.7	57.1	46.2	51.5	56.8
9 - 12	10.4	17.6	7.7	27.3	17.0
13 - 16	4.6	2.5	7.7	3.0	2.9
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(88)	(522)	(13)	(33)	(656)
Mean working hours	6.3	6.5	5.9	6.1	6.4

23

Continuation: Table 25: Respondent's Average Monthly Income by Place of Residence & Sex

MALE

Monthly Income	Rural	Urban	Total
	%	%	%
200 and below	53.9	11.5	28.4
201 - 300	15.9	29.1	23.8
301 - 400	12.4	17.6	15.5
401 - 500	10.6	15.2	13.3
501 - 750	6.2	16.5	12.2
751 - 1,000	0.9	4.8	3.2
1,001 - 1,500	0.0	3.6	2.2
1,501 - 2,000	0.9	1.8	1.4
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(113)	(165)	(278)
Mean Income	272.1	441.3	372.5

10
Fr

Table 26: AVERAGE MONTHLY INCOME OF WOMEN BY STATUS

F E M A L E

Monthly Income	Never					Total
	Married	Married	Separated	Widowed	Total	
	%	%	%	%	%	%
200 and below	52.9	54.7	83.3	71.4	55.8	
201 - 300	12.6	13.6	0.0	10.7	13.1	
301 - 400	20.7	19.1	8.3	10.7	18.7	
401 - 500	6.9	6.1	0.0	3.6	6.0	
501 - 750	2.3	4.0	8.3	3.6	3.8	
751 - 1,000	4.6	2.1	0.0	0.0	2.3	
1,001 - 1,500	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.3	
1,501 - 2,000	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
T O T A L	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	
(N)	(87)	(477)	(12)	(28)	(604)	
Mean Income	268.5	258.3	205.8	209.3	256.4	

57

Table 27: JOB SATISFACTION BY PLACE OF RESIDENCE AND SEX

Job Satisfaction	Female			Male		
	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Very Dissatisfied	7.0	5.9	6.4	7.8	6.0	6.9
Somewhat dissatisfied	17.1	15.3	16.0	18.7	15.9	17.2
Neutral	2.3	1.5	1.8	1.2	3.3	2.3
Somewhat satisfied	58.5	54.7	56.3	56.0	51.6	53.7
Very satisfied	15.1	22.7	19.4	16.3	23.1	19.8
T O T A L	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(299)	(406)	(705)	(166)	(182)	(348)

16

Table 28: JOB SATISFACTION OF WOMEN BY STATUS AND SEX

FEMALE

JOB SATISFACTION	NEVER				TOTAL
	MARRIED	MARRIED	SEPARATED	WIDOWED	
	%	%	%	%	%
Very dissatisfied	9.1	5.4	13.3	11.1	6.4
Somewhat dissatisfied	18.2	15.0	26.7	22.2	16.0
Neutral	4.0	1.4	0.0	2.8	1.3
Somewhat satisfied	49.5	58.0	53.3	50.0	56.3
Very satisfied	19.2	20.2	6.7	13.9	19.4
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(99)	(555)	(15)	(36)	(705)

67

Table 29: JOB SATISFACTION BY AGE AND SEX

FEMALE

Table 30: RESPONDENT'S SATISFACTION WITH THE AMOUNT EARNED

JOB SATISFACTION	18 - 27		28 - 37		38 - 47		48 - 59		Total
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	
FEMALE									
Very Dissatisfied	5.6		6.3		7.6		5.4		6.4
Somewhat Dissatisfied	23.1		13.5		16.8		9.9		16.0
Neutral	2.5		2.1		0.5		2.7		1.8
Somewhat Satisfied	50.6		59.5		57.3		55.0		56.3
Very Satisfied	18.1		18.6		17.3		27.0		19.4
Very Dissatisfied		8.2		8.2		7.8		7.8	
TOTAL	100.0		100.0		100.0		100.0		100.0
(Somewhat Dissatisfied)	(160)		(237)		(197)		(111)		(705)
MALE									
Neutral		4.8		4.8		4.8		4.8	
Somewhat Satisfied		47.7		54.6		50.0		50.0	
JOB SATISFACTION									
Very Dissatisfied	18 - 27		28 - 37		38 - 47		48 - 59		Total
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	
Very Dissatisfied	12.0		6.7		4.8		6.8		6.9
Somewhat Dissatisfied	18.0		20.8		16.2		12.3		17.2
Neutral	0.0		0.8		4.8		2.7		2.3
Somewhat Satisfied	52.0		41.7		45.7		53.4		53.7
Very Satisfied	18.0		10.0		28.6		24.7		19.3
TOTAL	100.0		100.0		100.0		100.0		100.0
(N)	(50)		(120)		(105)		(73)		(343)

69

Table 30: RESPONDENT'S SATISFACTION WITH THE AMOUNT EARNED

Degree of Satisfaction	:	Female	:	Male	:	Total
		%		%		%
Very Dissatisfied	:	7.2	:	8.9	:	7.8
Somewhat Dissatisfied	:	29.1	:	19.4	:	25.9
Neutral	:	4.8	:	4.9	:	4.8
Somewhat Satisfied	:	47.7	:	54.6	:	50.0
Very Satisfied	:	11.2	:	12.3	:	11.6
TOTAL	:	100.0	:	100.0	:	100.0
(N)	:	(705)	:	(350)	:	(1005)

Table 31: RESPONDENT'S SATISFACTION WITH PEOPLE SHE/HE WORK WITH

Degree of Satisfaction	Female	Male	Total
	%	%	%
Very Dissatisfied	1.0	2.4	1.5
Somewhat Dissatisfied	6.8	8.5	7.4
Neutral	16.0	13.8	15.2
Somewhat Satisfied	51.7	54.0	52.5
Very Satisfied	24.4	21.4	23.3
T O T A L	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N) :	(636)	(341)	(977)

2/10

Table 32: RESPONDENT'S SATISFACTION WITH THE TASKS THEY PERFORM

Degree of Satisfaction	Female	Male	Total
	%	%	%
Very Dissatisfied	1.7	2.3	1.9
Somewhat Dissatisfied	8.0	11.6	9.2
Neutral	8.5	4.0	5.2
Somewhat Satisfied	59.4	54.1	57.6
Very Satisfied	25.1	28.0	26.1
T O T A L	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(704)	(353)	(1057)

Table 33: RESPONDENT'S SATISFACTION WITH THE SECURITY AND JOB PROVIDES

Degree of Satisfaction	Female	Male	Total
	%	%	%
Very Dissatisfied	5.8	6.2	6.0
Somewhat Dissatisfied	15.5	12.5	14.5
Neutral	7.2	6.2	6.9
Somewhat Satisfied	48.6	50.4	49.2
Very Satisfied	22.8	24.5	23.4
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(705)	(353)	(1058)

12

Table 34: SOURCE OF GREATEST SATISFACTION BY PLACE OF RESIDENCE AND SEX

FEMALE

More Satisfaction	Rural	Urban	Total
	%	%	%
Being With Family	85.5	75.5	79.6
Working At Job	12.6	19.1	16.4
Equal, The Same	1.9	5.4	4.0
T O T A L	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(207)	(298)	(505)

MALE

More Satisfaction	Rural	Urban	Total
	%	%	%
Being With Family	66.0	60.3	63.0
Working At Job	27.7	33.0	30.5
Equal, The Same	6.3	6.7	6.5
T O T A L	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(159)	(179)	(338)

Comparing Females and Males $\chi^2 = 3.0417$ df = 2 not significant

Table 35: SOURCE OF GREATEST SATISFACTION OF WOMEN BY STATUS

Here Satisfaction	Married	Separated	Widowed	Total
	%	%	%	%
Being With Family	79.4	88.9	86.7	79.6
Working At Job	16.5	11.1	13.3	16.4
Both, The Same	4.2	0.0	0.0	4.0
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(480)	(9)	(15)	(505)

Table 37: TOTAL NUMBER OF ...

Table 36: PERCEPTION OF CHANCES OF ADVANCEMENT TO A HIGHER POSITION

Chances of Advancement	Female	Male	Total
	%	%	%
Poor	16.5	14.9	16.2
Fair	46.2	48.2	46.5
Good	26.1	27.7	26.4
Very Good	11.2	9.2	10.9
T O T A L	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(747)	(141)	(888)

Table 37: TOTAL NUMBER OF YEARS EMPLOYED BY PLACE OF RESIDENCE AND SEX

Number of Years	F E M A L E			M A L E			Total
	Never-Married	Married	Separated	Widowed			
	Rural %	Urban %	Total %	Rural %	Urban %	Total %	
1 - 3	50.4	40.5	31.2	20.9			40.9
4 - 5	29.8	41.8	40.9	16.5	7.0	9.6	45.3
6 - 10	14.9	20.8	19.5	12.6	20.9	3.9	18.3
11 - 15	10.7	15.0	13.2	15.4	11.4	9.3	17.4
16 - 20	6.1	6.7	7.0	18.7	4.7	3.4	15.0
21 - 25	4.0	3.2	3.6	8.8	11.6	5.4	21.0
26 - 30	2.7	1.7	3.4	6.0	2.9	2.3	11.2
31 - 35	2.9	0.4	1.5	1.6	4.7	2.7	11.2
36 & above	1.9	0.6	1.2	3.3	0.0	1.6	11.4
41 and above	0.2	0.4	0.3	2.8	1.6		2.2
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(420)	(538)	(958)	(182)	(187)		(369)
Mean Number of Years	9.5	7.3	8.2	14.2	14.4		14.3

Table 38: TOTAL NUMBER OF YEARS EMPLOYED BY STATUS OF FEMALE

Number of Years	:Never-Married:		Married		: Separated :		Widowed :		Total
	: %	:	%	:	%	:	%	:	%
1 - 3	: 50.4	:	40.5	:	31.2	:	20.9	:	40.9
4 - 6	: 26.2	:	18.9	:	25.0	:	7.0	:	19.5
7 - 10	: 8.5	:	13.5	:	18.8	:	20.9	:	13.2
11 - 15	: 7.1	:	10.0	:	0.0	:	11.6	:	9.5
16 - 20	: 5.0	:	6.9	:	6.2	:	16.3	:	7.0
21 - 25	: 2.1	:	3.6	:	12.5	:	4.7	:	3.6
26 - 30	: 0.0	:	3.6	:	6.2	:	11.6	:	3.4
31 - 35	: 0.0	:	1.7	:	0.0	:	2.3	:	1.5
36 - 40	: 0.0	:	1.2	:	0.0	:	4.7	:	1.2
41 and above	: 0.7	:	0.3	:	0.0	:	0.0	:	0.3
T O T A L	: 100.0	:	100.0	:	100.0	:	100.0	:	100.0
(N)	: (141)	:	(758)	:	(10)	:	(43)	:	(958)
Mean Number of Years	: 5.6	:	9.0	:	9.2	:	13.8	:	8.2

Table 39: TOTAL NUMBER OF YEARS EMPLOYED BY AGE AND SEX

Female

Number of Year	18-27	28-37	38-47	48-59	TOTAL
	%	%	%	%	%
1 - 3	66.3	35.9	26.1	25.9	41.0
4 - 6	23.4	22.0	18.8	7.4	19.6
7 - 10	6.7	17.1	16.7	11.9	13.2
11 - 15	1.8	13.1	12.0	8.9	9.5
16 - 20	1.1	7.9	10.7	11.1	7.0
21 - 25	0.7	1.3	8.1	6.7	3.6
26 - 30	0.0	0.7	6.0	12.6	3.5
31 - 35	0.0	0.0	1.3	7.4	1.4
36 - 40	0.0	0.0	0.4	6.7	1.0
41 and above	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	0.2
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(282)	(304)	(234)	(135)	(955)
Mean Number of Years	3.6	7.2	10.4	15.7	8.2

Table 39: CONTINUATION

MALE

Number of Years	18-27	28-37	38-47	48-59	TOTAL
	%	%	%	%	%
1 - 3	37.7	12.1	10.0	2.5	13.0
4 - 6	24.5	22.6	4.6	3.7	23.3
7 - 10	26.4	24.2	11.8	8.6	17.4
11 - 15	7.6	24.2	20.0	9.9	17.4
16 - 20	1.9	12.9	27.3	14.8	16.0
21 - 25	1.9	3.2	8.2	14.8	7.1
26 - 30	0.0	0.8	13.6	22.2	9.2
31 - 35	0.0	0.0	1.8	7.4	2.2
36 - 40	0.0	0.0	2.7	7.4	2.4
41 and above	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.6	1.9
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(53)	(124)	(110)	(81)	(368)
Mean Number of Years	5.9	9.9	14.6	23.5	14.3

Table 40: NUMBER OF JOBS HELD

Number of Jobs	FEMALE			MALE		
	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%
1 -	88.1	76.6	81.6	82.4	50.5	66.2
2 -	11.0	17.5	14.6	10.4	27.1	18.9
3 -	0.7	4.8	3.0	2.2	13.8	8.1
4 -	0.0	0.8	0.4	2.8	4.8	3.8
5 -	0.2	0.4	0.3	2.2	3.7	3.0
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(420)	(538)	(958)	(182)	(188)	(370)
Mean Number of Jobs	1.1	1.3	1.2	1.3	1.8	1.6

Comparing Males and Females - $t = 1.5326$
 Comparing Rural and Urban Females $t = 0.7332$

Not Significant
 Not Significant

06

Table 41: TOTAL NUMBER OF JOBS HELD BY AGE AND SEX

FEMALE

Number of Jobs	18-27	28-37	38-47	48-59	TOTAL
	%	%	%	%	%
1 -	84.1	80.1	79.9	83.0	18.6
2 -	12.7	15.0	16.7	14.1	14.6
3 -	3.2	3.3	3.0	2.2	3.0
4 -	0.0	0.7	0.4	0.7	0.4
5 -	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.3
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(283)	(306)	(234)	(135)	(958)
Mean Number of Jobs	1.2	1.3	1.2	1.2	1.2

MALE

Number of Jobs	18-27	28-37	38-47	48-59	TOTAL
	%	%	%	%	%
1 -	69.8	65.6	66.4	64.6	66.2
2 -	18.9	20.0	20.0	15.9	18.9
3 -	11.3	7.2	9.1	6.1	8.1
4 -	0.0	4.8	0.9	8.5	3.8
5 -	0.0	2.4	3.6	4.9	3.0
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(83)	(125)	(110)	(82)	(370)
Mean Number of Jobs	1.4	1.6	1.6	1.7	1.6

Table 42: NUMBER OF CHANGE OF OCCUPATION BY PLACE OF RESIDENCE AND SEX

FEMALE

Number of Change of Occupation	Rural	Urban	Total
	%	%	%
no change	98.3	95.1	95.9
1 -	1.4	3.0	3.5
2 -	0.2	0.8	0.5
3 -	0.0	0.2	0.1
TOTAL (N)	100.0 (420)	100.0 (538)	100.0 (958)

MALE

Number of Change of Occupation	Rural	Urban	Total
	%	%	%
no change	97.8	91.5	94.6
1 -	1.6	6.4	4.1
2 -	0.0	1.6	0.8
3 -	0.6	0.5	0.5
TOTAL (N)	100.0 (182)	100.0 (128)	100.0 (310)

20

Table 43: TOTAL OF CHANGE OF OCCUPATION BY AGE AND SEX

FEMALE

	18-27	28-37	38-47	48-59	TOTAL
Number of Changes	%	%	%	%	%
no change	96.5	94.1	97.0	93.0	95.9
1 -	3.5	4.3	3.0	2.2	3.4
2 -	0.0	1.3	0.0	0.7	0.5
3 -	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.1
TOTAL (N)	100.0 (283)	100.0 (306)	100.0 (234)	100.0 (135)	100.0 (958)

MALE

	18-27	28-37	38-47	48-59	TOTAL
Number of Change	%	%	%	%	%
no change	98.1	94.4	93.6	93.9	94.6
1 -	1.9	4.0	4.6	4.9	4.1
2 -	0.0	1.6	0.9	0.0	0.8
3 -	0.0	0.0	0.9	1.2	0.5
TOTAL (N)	100.0 (53)	100.0 (125)	100.0 (110)	100.0 (82)	100.0 (370)

Table 44: NUMBER OF WORK INTERRUPTION BY PLACE OF RESIDENCE AND SEX

FEMALE

Number of Interruption	Rural	Urban	Total
	%	%	%
None	94.8	88.5	91.2
1 -	5.0	10.4	8.0
2 -	0.2	0.8	0.5
3 -	0.0	0.4	0.2
TOTAL (N)	100.0 (420)	100.0 (538)	100.0 (958)

MALE

Number of Interruption	Rural	Urban	Total
	%	%	%
None	87.4	73.4	80.3
1 -	10.4	20.2	15.4
2 -	2.2	4.8	3.5
3 -	0.0	1.6	0.8
TOTAL (N)	100.0 (182)	100.0 (188)	100.0 (370)

Table 45: TOTAL NUMBER OF WORK INTERRUPTION OF WOMEN BY STATUS

FEMALE

Number of Work Interruption	Single	Married	Separated	Widowed	Total
	%	%	%	%	%
No Interruption	92.2	91.0	81.2	95.3	91.2
1 -	7.1	8.2	18.8	4.7	8.0
2 -	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.5
3 -	0.7	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.2
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(141)	(758)	(16)	(43)	(958)

5

Table 46: TOTAL NUMBER OF WORK INTERRUPTION BY AGE AND SEX

FEMALE

	18-27	28-37	38-47	48-59	TOTAL
No. of Work Interruption	%	%	%	%	%
No Interruption	94.7	88.9	91.0	89.6	91.2
1 -	5.3	10.1	8.1	8.9	8.0
2 -	0.0	0.3	0.9	1.5	0.5
3 -	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.2
TOTAL (N)	100.0 (283)	100.0 (306)	100.0 (234)	100.0 (135)	100.0 (958)

MALE

	18-27	28-37	38-47	48-59	TOTAL
No. of Work Interruption	%	%	%	%	%
No Interruption	88.7	80.8	80.0	74.4	80.3
1 -	11.3	15.2	15.5	18.3	15.4
2 -	0.0	3.2	4.5	4.9	3.5
3 -	0.0	0.8	0.0	2.4	0.8
TOTAL (N)	100.0 (53)	100.0 (125)	100.0 (110)	100.0 (82)	100.0 (370)

43

Table 47: TOTAL NUMBER OF YEARS WORK INTERRUPTED
BY PLACE OF RESIDENCE AND SEX

Number of Years	Female			Male		
	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%
None	95.0	89.4	91.9	88.5	78.7	83.5
1 - 3	2.4	4.6	3.7	5.0	11.2	8.1
4 - 6	0.5	1.9	1.3	2.2	4.3	3.2
7 - 9	0.7	1.3	1.0	2.2	3.2	2.7
10 - 12	0.7	0.9	0.8	1.1	1.1	1.1
13 - 15	0.0	0.4	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
16 - 18	0.0	0.8	0.4	0.6	0.5	0.5
19 - 21	0.5	0.2	0.3	0.6	0.5	0.5
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(420)	(538)	(958)	(182)	(188)	(370)
Mean No. of Years	7.2	7.0	7.1	6.1	4.8	5.3

10

Table 10: AVERAGE NUMBER OF YEARS OF MARRIAGE, BY STATUS OF FINAL MARRIAGE

N . OF YEARS	NEVER MARRIED	MARRIED	SEPARATED	DIVORCED	TOTAL
	%	%	%	%	%
NONE	32.9	91.2	81.2	95.3	91.4
1 - 3	6.4	3.0	6.2	4.7	3.7
4 - 6	0.7	1.5	0.9	0.0	1.3
7 - 9	0.0	1.2	6.2	0.0	1.0
10 - 12	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.8
13 - 15	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.5
16 - 18	0.0	0.7	6.2	0.0	0.6
19 - 21	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.3
22 - 24	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.4
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(141)	(758)	(16)	(43)	(958)
Mean N. of Years	(2.3)	8.4	8.0	2.0	5.3

88

Table 49: TOTAL NUMBER OF YEARS NOT EMPLOYED BY YEAR

FEMALE

Number of Years	18-27	28-37	38-47	48-59	TOTAL
	%	%	%	%	%
None	94.7	89.6	92.3	90.4	91.9
1 - 3	3.9	5.9	2.1	0.7	3.7
4 - 6	1.1	1.6	1.3	0.7	1.3
7 - 9	0.0	2.3	0.0	2.2	1.0
10 - 12	0.4	0.3	1.7	1.5	0.8
13 - 15	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.7	0.2
16 - 18	0.0	0.0	0.9	1.5	0.4
19 - 21	0.0	0.3	0.9	0.0	0.3
22 and above	0.0	0.0	0.4	2.2	0.4
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(283)	(306)	(234)	(135)	(958)
Mean Number of Years	3.2	4.8	10.1	13.5	7.1

Table 49: CONTINUATION

MALE

Number of Years	18-27	28-37	38-47	48-59	TOTAL
	%	%	%	%	%
None	90.6	83.2	82.7	81.7	83.5
1 - 3	5.7	9.6	10.0	4.9	8.1
4 - 6	3.8	5.6	1.8	1.2	3.2
7 - 9	0.0	0.8	4.6	4.9	2.7
10 - 12	0.0	0.8	0.9	2.4	1.1
13 - 15	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
16 - 18	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.4	0.5
19 - 21	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.4	0.5
22 and above	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(53)	(125)	(110)	(82)	(370)
Mean Number of Years	3.2	3.9	4.4	9.4	5.3

Table 50: MAIN REASON FOR LEAVING A JOB

Reasons	Rural	Urban	Total
	%	%	%
Finds place of work too far, does not like to be far from the family	3.0	0.7	2.4
Physical reasons could not cope physically, health, rested, relax, went on vacation	14.6	7.5	12.7
Want to practice his/her profession	0.5	0.7	0.6
Found a better job, found a new job, promotion	4.7	10.9	6.4
Work was only temporary, seasonal, no more opportunity for that job	2.5	2.7	2.5
Too old for present job	0.5	0.7	0.6
Far and other external condition	0.8	2.0	1.1
Marriage, got married, remarried	21.5	0.7	16.0
Husband objects to her working, objects to distance of work from home	2.2	0.7	1.8
No one had to take care of the children, had a new baby	8.2	0.0	6.0
Loss of relative or member of the family, father or mother or sibling died	1.0	0.7	0.9
Undecided, unstable mind, anyway single pa, kailangan na matatag na trabaho	0.0	0.7	0.2
Transfer of residence, moved out	5.0	5.4	5.1
Went on study leave, continue schooling	3.0	2.7	2.9
No need to work, children working	0.2	0.2	0.4
Personal reasons, family reasons	5.7	5.4	5.6
Discontent, dissatisfied with current job	2.5	8.2	4.0
Inefficient income, low salaries and wages slow financial return, want more money	5.2	17.0	8.4
Present job too difficult, too competitive	3.5	1.4	2.9
Lack of stability, political opportunity	1.7	5.4	2.7
Has enemies in the job, principal is against respondent	1.2	0.7	1.1
Laid off, bankruptcy, factory closed, strike	9.4	17.0	11.4
Wanted a different job	1.5	4.8	2.1
Others	1.7	3.4	2.2
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(404)	(147)	(551)

Table 51: WOULD UNMARRIED RESPONDENT CONTINUE COFFING WHEN GET MARRIED

D e c i s i o n	'	%
Stop	:	14.3
Continue	:	83.8
Others/Depends	:	1.9
T O T A L	:	100.0
(N)	:	(105)

Table 52: CHANGE IN EMPLOYMENT STATUS AT TIME OF MARRIAGE
BY PLACE OF RESIDENCE

Change in Employment Status	Rural	Urban	Total
	%	%	%
End one job and start another	0.2	1.1	0.6
End one job and not start another	6.0	6.6	6.3
Start a job - was not working before	2.8	3.5	4.1
Stayed in same job	11.4	13.7	12.4
Not working before and after marriage	79.7	73.1	76.6
T O T A L	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(615)	(542)	(1157)

$\chi^2 = 12.6766$

df = 4

significant at p = .05

Table 53: CHANGE IN EMPLOYMENT STATUS AT TIME OF MARRIAGE BY AGE GROUP

Change in Employment Status	18-27	28-37	38-47	48-59	TOTAL
	%	%	%	%	%
End one job and start another:	0.0	1.3	0.6	0.0	0.6
End one job and not start another	15.5	4.0	2.6	2.0	6.3
Start a job was not working before	4.4	4.8	4.2	1.3	4.1
Stayed in same job	10.1	14.8	11.3	13.1	12.4
Not working before and after marriage	69.9	75.1	81.3	83.7	76.6
T O T A L	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(296)	(398)	(310)	(153)	(1157)

Table 54: NUMBER OF CHILDREN BY PLACE OF RESIDENCE AND SEX

FEMALE

Number of Children	Rural	Urban	Total
	%	%	%
1 - 2	22.4	30.1	26.0
3 - 4	27.7	29.2	28.4
5 - 6	23.9	21.8	22.9
7 - 8	18.1	13.3	15.8
9 - 10	5.0	4.4	4.7
11 - 13	3.0	1.2	2.2
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(640)	(565)	(1205)
Mean Number of Children	4.8	4.2	4.5

MALE

Number of Children	Rural	Urban	Total
	%	%	%
1 - 2	24.2	28.0	26.1
3 - 4	24.8	29.1	26.9
5 - 6	23.7	21.7	22.7
7 - 8	17.5	15.4	16.4
9 - 10	5.2	4.2	4.7
11 - 13	4.6	1.6	3.1
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(194)	(189)	(383)
Mean Number of Children	4.9	4.4	4.6

Table 55: NUMBER OF CHILDREN BY AGE AND

FEMALE

Number of Children	18-27	28-37	38-47	48-59	TOTAL
	%	%	%	%	%
1 - 2	62.8	17.0	8.9	16.4	26.0
3 - 4	32.4	35.6	19.1	21.2	28.4
5 - 6	4.1	32.9	25.5	26.1	22.9
7 - 8	0.7	12.4	30.2	23.6	15.8
9 - 10	0.0	2.2	10.5	8.5	4.7
11 - 13	0.0	0.0	5.8	4.2	2.2
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(296)	(410)	(325)	(165)	(1205)
Mean Number of Children:	2.4	4.4	6.2	5.5	4.5

MALE

Number of Children	18-27	28-37	38-47	48-59	TOTAL
	%	%	%	%	%
1 - 2	77.1	32.5	13.4	6.8	26.2
3 - 4	16.7	39.7	22.7	20.2	27.0
5 - 6	0.0	21.4	30.3	27.0	22.8
7 - 8	2.1	6.4	26.9	24.7	16.5
9 - 10	4.2	0.0	2.5	14.6	4.7
11 - 13	0.0	0.0	4.2	6.8	2.9
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(48)	(126)	(119)	(89)	(382)
Mean No. of Children	2.3	3.5	5.4	6.3	4.6

Table 56: WHO CARES FOR CHILDREN BY PLACE OF RESIDENCE AND SEX

Who Cares for Children	Female		
	Rural	Urban	Total
	%	%	%
01) Husband	9.5	7.6	8.5
02) Other Children	35.7	10.8	21.9
03) Maid	4.0	29.3	18.0
04) Wife's Mother	8.7	10.2	9.5
05) Husband's Mother	4.8	3.8	4.2
06) Other Relatives	5.6	6.4	6.0
07) Neighbors	0.8	3.8	2.5
08) Nursery or School	2.4	3.8	3.4
09) They look after themselves	19.8	9.6	14.1
10) No one	1.6	10.8	6.7
11) Unspecified	0.0	0.6	0.4
12) Brings children with her to work	6.4	1.9	3.9
13) Others	0.8	1.3	1.1
T O T A L	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(126)	(157)	(283)

Table 57: CHANGE IN EMPLOYMENT STATUS AT BIRTH OF FIRST CHILD
BY PLACE OF RESIDENCE

Change in Employment Status	Rural	Urban	Total
	%	%	%
End one job and start another	0.0	0.2	0.1
End one job and not start another	2.7	2.8	2.8
Start a job - was not working before	2.3	4.6	3.4
Stayed in same job	12.9	16.1	14.4
Not working before and after birth of first child	82.1	76.3	79.4
T O T A L	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(599)	(527)	(1126)

$\chi^2 = 7.9022$ $df = 4$ not significant at $p = .05$

Table 58: CHANGE IN EMPLOYMENT STATUS AT BIRTH OF FIRST CHILD BY AGE GROUP

Change in Employment Status	18-27	28-37	38-47	48-59	TOTAL
	%	%	%	%	%
End one job and start another	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.1
End one job and not start another	7.0	1.8	0.7	1.3	2.8
Start a job- was not working before:	7.0	3.4	1.7	0.0	3.4
Stayed in same job	10.5	14.5	15.6	19.0	14.4
Not working before and after birth	75.4	80.1	82.1	79.7	79.4
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(285)	(387)	(301)	(153)	(1126)

$\chi^2 = 43.7304$

df = 12

significant at $p = .05$

Table 59: CHANGE IN EMPLOYMENT STATUS AT BIRTH OF
SECOND CHILD BY PLACE OF RESIDENCE

Change in Employment Status	Rural	Urban	Total
	%	%	%
End one job and start another	0.0	0.2	0.1
End one job and not start another	0.8	1.3	1.1
Start a job was not working before	1.0	1.7	1.3
Stayed in same job	13.4	15.0	14.1
Not working before and after birth of second child	84.8	81.8	83.4
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(605)	(522)	(1127)

100

Table 60: CHANGE IN EMPLOYMENT STATUS AT BIRTH OF SECOND CHILD BY AGE GROUP

Change in Employment Status	18-27	28-37	38-47	48-59	TOTAL
	%	%	%	%	%
End one job and start another	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.1
End one job and not start another	0.7	1.6	0.7	1.3	1.1
Start a job - was not working before	2.1	1.6	0.3	1.3	1.3
Stayed in same job	6.6	16.4	16.0	19.0	14.1
Not working before and after birth	90.7	80.5	82.7	78.4	83.4
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(289)	(385)	(300)	(153)	(1127)

**Table 61: CHANGE IN EMPLOYMENT STATUS AT BIRTH OF THIRD CHILD
BY PLACE OF RESIDENCE**

Change in Employment Status	Rural	Urban	Total
	%	%	%
End one job and start another	0.0	0.0	0.0
End one job and not start another	0.2	0.2	0.1
Start a job and not working before	1.0	3.0	1.9
Stayed in same job	11.7	12.1	11.9
Not working before and after birth	87.2	84.7	86.1
	100.0	100.0	100.0
	(612)	(532)	(1144)

107

Table 62: CHANGE IN EMPLOYMENT STATUS AT BIRTH OF THIRD CHILD
BY AGE GROUP

Change in Employment Status	18-27	28-37	38-47	48-59	TOTAL
	%	%	%	%	%
Left one job and start another	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Left one job and not start another	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.6	0.1
Start a job-was not working before	2.9	1.8	1.7	0.6	1.9
Stayed in same job	2.9	14.2	15.9	15.8	11.9
Not working before and after birth	94.2	83.7	82.4	82.9	86.1
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(308)	(386)	(302)	(158)	(1154)

Table 63: EMPLOYMENT STATUS BY NUMBER OF CHILDREN BY SEX

Number of Children	Female			Male		
	Not Working	Working	Total	Not Working	Working	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%
1 - 2	61.7	38.3	100.0	10.0	90.0	100.0
3 - 4	57.3	42.7	100.0	10.7	89.3	100.0
5 - 6	55.8	44.2	100.0	13.8	86.2	100.0
7 - 8	56.5	43.4	100.0	11.1	88.9	100.0
9 - 10	57.9	42.1	100.0	11.1	88.9	100.0
11 - 13	57.7	42.3	100.0	36.4	63.6	100.0
TOTAL	58.0	42.0	100.0	12.0	88.0	100.0
(N)	(699)	(506)	(1205)	(46)	(366)	(382)
Mean Number of Children	4.5	4.6	4.5	5.2	4.5	4.6

Comparing working and not working females

t = 1.0618

not significant

Table 64: EMPLOYMENT STATUS BY FAMILY INCOME BY SEX

FEMALE

Employment Status	: P500 & below :	501-1,000	: 1,001-2,000	: 2,001 & above:	Total
	%	%	%	%	%
Presently Working	38.6	50.8	45.6	78.7	42.9
Worked Previsouly But Not At Present	16.8	20.8	12.3	10.1	16.9
Never Worked	44.6	28.3	42.2	11.2	40.2
T o t a l (N)	100.0 (1211)	100.0 (240)	100.0 (57)	100.0 (89)	100.0 (1597)

$\chi^2 = 63.5703$

d.f. = 6

significant at $p = .05$

MALE

Employment Status	: P500 & below :	501-1,000	: 1,001-2,000	: 2,001 & above:	Total
	%	%	%	%	%
Presently Working	86.2	92.6	90.9	96.7	88.2
Worked Previsouly But Not At Present	9.3	7.4	9.1	2.9	8.5
Never Worked	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.3
T o t a l (N)	100.0 (289)	100.0 (68)	100.0 (11)	100.0 (30)	100.0 (398)

$\chi^2 = 6.7311$

d.f. = 6

not significant

Table 65.A: EMPLOYMENT STATUS BY NUMBER OF CHILDREN
BY FAMILY INCOME (500 & BELOW) BY SEX

FEMALE WITH INCOME \$500 & BELOW

Employment Status	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10	11-13	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Presently Employed	32.5	36.0	38.1	40.1	41.3	42.9	36.6
Worked Previously But Not At Present	23.6	17.6	13.3	13.4	8.7	19.0	17.0
Never Worked	43.9	46.3	48.6	46.5	50.0	38.1	46.3
Total (N)	100.0 (237)	100.0 (272)	100.0 (210)	100.0 (157)	100.0 (46)	100.0 (21)	100.0 (945)

$\chi^2 = 13.5953$

d.f. = 10

not significant

MALE WITH INCOME \$500 & BELOW

Employment Status	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10	11-13	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Presently Employed	87.3	85.1	84.6	86.7	93.3	75.0	86.0
Worked Previously But Not At Present	9.9	8.1	9.2	11.1	3.7	25.0	9.7
Never Worked	2.8	6.8	6.2	2.2	0.0	0.0	4.3
Total (N)	100.0 (71)	100.0 (74)	100.0 (65)	100.0 (45)	100.0 (15)	100.0 (8)	100.0 (278)

$\chi^2 = 6.14897$

d.f. = 10

not significant

134

Table 65.B: EMPLOYMENT STATUS BY NUMBER OF CHILDREN
BY FAMILY INCOME (501-1,000) BY SEX

FEMALE WITH INCOME

Employment Status	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10	11-13	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Presently Employed	50.0	65.1	50.0	60.0	33.3	50.0	54.2
Worked Previously But Not At Present	29.6	18.6	17.5	5.0	22.2	0.0	20.2
Never Worked	20.4	16.3	32.5	35.0	44.4	50.0	25.6
Total (N)	100.0 (54)	100.0 (43)	100.0 (40)	100.0 (20)	100.0 (9)	100.0 (2)	100.0 (168)

$\chi^2 = 12.5664$

d.f. = 10

not significant

MALE WITH INCOME

Employment Status	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10	11-13	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Presently Employed	95.7	100.0	91.7	85.7	66.7	0.0	92.2
Worked Previously But Not At Present	4.3	0.0	8.3	14.3	14.3	100.0	7.8
Total (N)	100.0 (23)	100.0 (18)	100.0 (12)	100.0 (7)	100.0 (3)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (64)

$\chi^2 = 16.8335$

d.f. = 5

not significant

Table 65.C: EMPLOYMENT STATUS BY NUMBER OF CHILDREN
BY FAMILY INCOME (1,000-2,000) BY SEX

FEMALE

Employment Status	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10	11-13	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Presently Employed	50.0	60.7	66.7	33.3	100.0	0.0	55.9
Worked Previously But Not At Present	25.0	8.3	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	11.8
Never Worked	25.0	25.0	33.3	50.0	0.0	100.0	32.3
Total (N)	100.0 (8)	100.0 (12)	100.0 (6)	100.0 (6)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (34)

$\chi^2 = 11.2438$

d.f. = 10

not significant

MALE

Employment Status	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10	11-13	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Presently Employed	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	-	-	90.9
Worked Previously But Not At Present	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	-	-	9.1
Total (N)	100.0 (2)	100.0 (4)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (4)	- (-)	- (-)	100.0 (100.0)

$\chi^2 = 11.00$

d.f. = 3

not significant

105

Table 65.D: EMPLOYMENT STATUS BY NUMBER OF CHILDREN
BY FAMILY INCOME (2,001 AND ABOVE) BY SEX

FEMALE

Employment Status	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10	11-13	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Presently Employed	85.7	80.0	90.0	75.0	100.0	50.0	83.3
Worked Previously But Not At Present	7.1	0.0	10.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	8.3
Never Worked	7.1	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	8.3
Total (N)	100.0 (14)	100.0 (15)	100.0 (20)	100.0 (8)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (2)	100.0 (60)

$\chi^2 = 13.8171$

d.f. = 10

not significant

MALE

Employment Status	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10	11-13	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Presently Employed	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	50.0	96.6
Worked Previously But Not At Present	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	50.0	3.4
Total (N)	100.0 (4)	100.0 (7)	100.0 (9)	100.0 (7)	-	100.0 (2)	100.0 (29)

$\chi^2 = 13.9821$

d.f. = 4

not significant

157

Table 66: NUMBER OF CHANGES OF RESIDENCES BY PLACE OF RESIDENCE AND SEX

Number of Residences	Female			Male		
	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%
1	36.3	19.6	28.0	37.2	18.3	27.8
2	34.0	39.6	36.8	36.7	35.0	35.9
3	18.9	22.5	20.7	17.1	25.4	21.2
4	6.5	14.3	8.9	4.0	9.1	6.6
5	2.9	4.5	3.7	2.0	6.6	4.3
6	00.9	1.3	1.1	1.0	3.0	2.0
7	0.4	0.9	0.6	1.0	2.0	1.5
8	0.1	0.4	0.2	1.0	0.5	0.8
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(799)	(796)	(1595)	(199)	(197)	(396)

Table 67: NUMBER OF CHANGES OF RESIDENCE OF WOMEN BY STATUS

FEMALE

Number of Residences	Never Married	Married	Separated	Widowed	Total
	%	%	%	%	%
1 -	39.3	25.6	31.3	29.3	28.0
2 -	35.3	36.8	37.5	41.4	36.8
3 -	13.9	22.1	25.0	17.2	20.7
4 -	7.1	9.4	6.3	5.2	8.9
5 -	3.6	3.9	0.0	1.7	3.7
6 -	0.8	1.1	0.0	1.7	1.4
7 -	0.0	0.7	0.0	1.7	0.6
8 -	0.0	0.2	0.0	1.7	0.2
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(252)	(1270)	(16)	(58)	(1596)
Mean Number of Residences	2.0	2.4	2.1	2.3	2.3

Table 68: NUMBER OF CHANGES OF RESIDENCE BY AGE AND SEX

FEMALE

Number of Residences	18-27	28-37	38-47	48-59	TOTAL
	%	%	%	%	%
1 -	31.7	24.0	26.7	30.0	28.0
2 -	36.4	35.7	37.7	38.9	36.8
3 -	18.3	23.8	20.3	20.2	20.7
4 -	9.4	8.8	9.6	6.4	8.9
5 -	3.0	5.5	2.7	3.0	3.7
6 -	0.8	1.4	1.1	1.0	1.1
7 -	0.2	0.6	1.3	0.5	0.6
8 -	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.0	0.2
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(530)	(488)	(374)	(203)	(1595)
Mean Number of Change of Residence	2.2	2.4	2.4	2.2	2.3

MALE

Num Number of Residences	18-27	28-37	38-47	48-59	TOTAL
	%	%	%	%	%
1 -	37.5	27.3	21.0	31.5	27.8
2 -	33.9	38.6	41.2	25.8	35.9
3 -	14.3	20.5	21.8	25.8	21.2
4 -	10.7	6.1	4.2	7.9	6.6
5 -	1.8	3.8	6.7	3.4	4.3
6 -	0.0	3.0	0.8	3.4	2.0
7 -	1.8	0.8	1.7	2.2	1.5
8 -	0.0	0.0	2.5	0.0	0.8
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(56)	(132)	(119)	(89)	(396)
Mean Number of Change of Residence	2.1	2.3	2.6	2.4	2.4

Table 69: NUMBER OF RESIDENCE BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS
BY SEX

FEMALE

NO. OF RESIDENCES	NOT WORKING	WORKING	TOTAL
	%	%	%
1-	28.6	27.2	28.0
2-	38.1	35.0	36.8
3-	19.1	22.8	20.7
4-	9.1	8.6	8.9
5-	3.3	4.2	3.7
6-	1.2	0.9	1.1
7-	0.4	0.9	0.6
8-	0.1	0.4	0.2
TOTAL (N)	100.0 (910)	100.0 (685)	100.0 (1595)
Mean number of change of residence	2.3	2.4	2.3

MALE

NO. OF RESIDENCES	NOT WORKING	WORKING	TOTAL
	%	%	%
1-	37.0	26.6	27.8
2-	34.3	36.0	35.9
3-	15.2	22.0	21.2
4-	6.5	6.6	6.6
5-	4.4	4.3	4.3
6-	0.0	2.3	2.0
7-	0.0	1.7	1.5
8-	2.2	0.6	0.3
TOTAL (N)	100.0 (46)	100.0 (350)	100.0 (396)
Mean number of change of residence	2.2	2.4	2.4

Table 70: CHANGE IN EMPLOYMENT STATUS AT TIME OF FIRST MOVE
IN PLACE OF RESIDENCE AND SEX

FEMALE

Change in Employment Status	Rural	Urban	Total
	%	%	%
End one job and start another	0.0	0.2	0.1
End one job and not start another	0.2	0.6	0.4
Start a job and not working before	2.4	1.9	2.2
Stayed in same job	32.5	13.6	23.6
Not working before and after first move	64.9	83.7	73.8
TOTAL (N)	100.0 (536)	100.0 (479)	100.0 (1015)

$\chi^2 = 52.5187$ $df = 4$ significant at $p = .05$

MALE

Change in Employment Status	Rural	Urban	Total
	%	%	%
End one job and start another	0.0	0.0	0.0
End one job and not start another	0.0	0.0	0.0
Start a job and not working before	7.9	2.9	5.6
Stayed in same job	6.7	6.4	6.6
Not working before and after first move	85.5	90.7	87.9
TOTAL (N)	100.0 (165)	100.0 (140)	100.0 (305)

$\chi^2 = 3.6695$ $df = 4$ not significant

104

Table 71: CHANGE IN EMPLOYMENT STATUS AT TIME OF FIRST MOVE BY STATUS AND SEX

FEMALE

Change in Employment Status	Never Married	Married	Separated	Widowed	Total
	%	%	%	%	%
End one job and start another	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1
End one job and not start another	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.4
Start a job was not working before	0.6	2.4	0.0	5.0	2.2
Stayed in same job	28.5	23.4	0.0	15.0	23.6
Not working before and after first move	70.9	73.6	100.0	80.0	73.8
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(165)	(796)	(14)	(40)	(1015)

Table 72: CHANGE IN EMPLOYMENT STATUS AT TIME OF FIRST MOVE BY AGE AND SEX

FEMALE

Change in Employment Status	18-27	28-37	38-47	48-59	TOTAL
	%	%	%	%	%
End one job and start another	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.1
End one job and not start another	0.3	0.6	0.0	0.7	0.4
Start a job - was not working before	0.9	11.6	4.9	3.6	2.2
Stayed in same job	28.0	20.6	22.6	21.6	23.6
Not working before and after first move	71.4	76.8	72.2	74.5	73.8
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(329)	(315)	(234)	(137)	(1015)

MALE

Change in Employment Status	18-27	28-37	38-47	48-59	TOTAL
	%	%	%	%	%
End one job and start another	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
End one job and not start another	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Start a job was not working before	6.1	5.9	3.4	7.4	5.6
Stayed in same job	0.0	5.0	11.5	7.4	6.6
Not working before and after first move	93.9	89.1	85.1	85.3	87.9
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(49)	(101)	(87)	(68)	(305)

Table 73: CHANGE IN EMPLOYMENT STATUS AT TIME OF SECOND MOVE
BY PLACE OF RESIDENCE AND SEX

FEMALE

Change in Employment Status	Rural	Urban	Total
	%	%	%
End one job and start another	0.0	0.0	0.0
End one job and not start another	0.0	0.0	0.0
Start a job was not working before	0.2	0.4	0.3
Stayed in same job	35.3	15.7	26.1
Not working before and after second move	64.3	83.9	73.6
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(532)	(472)	(1004)

MALE

Change in Employment Status	Rural	Urban	Total
	%	%	%
End one job and start another	0.0	0.0	0.0
End one job and not start another	0.0	0.0	0.0
Start a job was not working before	0.6	0.0	0.3
Stayed in same job	14.6	9.6	12.3
Not working before and after second move	84.8	90.5	87.3
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(164)	(136)	(300)

Table 74: CHANGE IN EMPLOYMENT STATUS AT TIME OF SECOND MOVE BY STATUS AND SEX

FEMALE

Change in Employment Status	Never Married	Married	Separated	Widowed	Total
	%	%	%	%	%
End one job and start another	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
End one job and not start another	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Start a job was not working before	0.0	0.3	0.0	2.5	0.3
Stayed in same job	29.1	26.1	0.0	20.0	26.1
Not working before and after second move	70.9	73.5	100.0	77.5	73.6
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(163)	(785)	(14)	(40)	(1004)

Table 75: CHANGE IN EMPLOYMENT STATUS AT TIME OF SECOND MOVE BY AGE AND SEX

FEMALE

Change in Employment Status	18-27	28-37	38-47	48-59	TOTAL
	%	%	%	%	%
End one job and start another	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
End one job and not start another	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Start a job was not working before	0.0	0.3	0.6	0.7	0.3
Stayed in same job	28.1	22.8	27.3	26.7	26.1
Not working before and after second move	71.9	75.9	72.3	72.6	73.1
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(327)	(311)	(231)	(135)	(1004)

MALE

Change in Employment Status	18-27	28-37	38-47	48-59	TOTAL
	%	%	%	%	%
End one job and start another	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
End one job and not start another	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Start a job was not working before	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.3
Stayed in same job	6.1	11.1	14.9	15.4	12.3
Not working before and after second move	93.9	89.9	83.9	84.6	87.3
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(49)	(99)	(87)	(65)	(300)

Table 76: CHANGE IN EMPLOYMENT STATUS AT TIME OF THIRD
MOVE BY PLACE OF RESIDENCE AND SEX

FEMALE

Change in Employment Status	Rural	Urban	Total
	%	%	%
End one job and start another	0.0	0.0	0.0
End one job and not start another	0.0	0.2	0.1
Start a job was not working before	0.2	0.4	0.3
Stayed in same job	36.0	16.0	26.6
Not working before and after third move	63.8	83.4	73.0
TOTAL (N)	100.0 (530)	100.0 (470)	100.0 (1000)

MALE

Change in Employment Status	Rural	Urban	Total
	%	%	%
End one job and start another	0.0	0.0	0.0
End one job and not start another	0.0	0.8	0.3
Start a job was not working before	0.6	0.8	0.7
Stayed in same job	15.2	9.8	12.6
Not working before and after third move	84.2	88.6	86.2
TOTAL (N)	100.0 (164)	100.0 (132)	100.0 (296)

Table 77: CHANGE IN EMPLOYMENT STATUS AT TIME OF THIRD MOVE BY STATUS AND SEX

FEMALE

Change in Employment Status	Never Married	Married	Separated	Widowed	Total
	%	%	%	%	%
End one job and start another	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
End one job and not start another	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1
Start a job was not working before	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.3
Stayed in same job	29.3	26.8	0.0	20.5	2.7
Not working before and after third move	70.7	72.7	100.0	79.5	73.0
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(164)	(783)	(14)	(39)	(1000)

Table 78: CHANGE IN EMPLOYMENT STATUS AT TIME OF THIRD MOVE BY AGE AND SEX

FEMALE

Change in Employment Status	18-27	28-37	38-47	48-59	TOTAL
	%	%	%	%	%
End one job and start a new job	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
End one job and not start another	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.1
Start a job was not working before	0.0	0.3	0.0	1.5	0.3
Stayed in same job	28.1	24.2	27.8	26.3	26.6
Not working before and after third move	71.9	75.3	72.2	72.2	73.0
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(327)	(310)	(230)	(133)	(1000)

MALE

Change in Employment Status	18-27	28-37	38-47	48-59	TOTAL
	%	%	%	%	%
End one job and start another	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
End one job and not start another	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.3
Start a job was not working before	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.6	0.7
Stayed in same job	6.1	11.1	16.5	15.9	12.8
Not working before and after third move	93.9	86.9	83.5	82.5	86.2
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(49)	(99)	(85)	(63)	(296)

121

Table 79: CHANGE IN EMPLOYMENT STATUS AT TIME OF FOURTH MOVE BY STATUS AND SEX

FEMALE

Change in Employment Status	Never Married	Married	Separated	Widowed	Total
	%	%	%	%	%
End one job and start another	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
End one job and not start another	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Start a job was not working before	0.6	0.4	0.0	2.6	0.5
Stayed in same job	28.7	26.8	0.0	18.0	26.4
Not working before and after third move	70.7	72.8	100.0	79.5	73.1
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(164)	(779)	(14)	(39)	(996)

27

Table 80: CHANGE IN EMPLOYMENT STATUS AT TIME OF FIFTH MOVE BY STATUS AND SEX

FEMALE

Change in Employment Status	Never Married	Married	Separated	Widowed	Total
	%	%	%	%	%
End one job and start another	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
End one job and not start another	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Start a job and not working before	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Stayed in the same job-	29.3	27.2	0.0	0.0	20.5
Not working before and after fifth move	70.7	72.8	100.0	79.5	73.1
T O T A L	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(164)	(779)	(14)	(39)	(996)

100

Table 1: LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION BY REGIONAL TYPE

FEMALE

LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION	RURAL - RURAL %	RURAL - URBAN %	URBAN - RURAL %	URBAN - URBAN %	TOTAL %
IN LABOR FORCE	39.7	56.5	38.2	55.0	47.7
a) Presently working	89.8	93.4	85.7	86.9	90.5
b) Looking for work	10.2	6.6	14.3	13.1	9.5
NOT IN LABOR FORCE	60.3	43.5	61.8	45.0	52.3
TOTAL (N)	100.0 (743)	100.0 (508)	100.0 (55)	100.0 (278)	100.0 (1584)

$\chi^2 = 49.3138$ $df = 6$ significant at $p = .05$

MALE

LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION	RURAL - RURAL %	URBAN - RURAL %	RURAL - URBAN %	URBAN - URBAN %	TOTAL %
IN LABOR FORCE	87.5	93.0	86.7	98.5	91.1
a) Presently working	95.7	99.2	100.0	95.3	96.9
b) Looking for work	4.3	0.8	0.0	4.7	3.1
NOT IN LABOR FORCE	12.5	7.0	13.3	1.5	8.9
TOTAL (N)	100.0 (184)	100.0 (139)	100.0 (15)	100.0 (65)	100.0 (392)

$\chi^2 = 13.0359$ $df = 6$ significant at $p = .05$

Table 82: TYPE OF OCCUPATION BY MIGRANT TYPE
BY SEX

TYPE OF OCCUPATION	RURAL - RURAL		RURAL - URBAN		URBAN - RURAL		URBAN - URBAN		TOTAL
	%	:	%	:	%	:	%	:	
1) Professional, Technical, and related workers	5.8	:	4.3	:	61.1	:	32.1	:	14.2
2) Administrative, Executive and managerial workers	0.4	:	3.0	:	0.0	:	3.2	:	1.9
3) Clerical workers	0.8	:	12.9	:	0.0	:	10.3	:	7.0
4) Farmers, Fishermen, Loggers hunter and related workers	33.2	:	4.7	:	16.7	:	1.9	:	15.5
5) Sales Workers	34.8	:	32.6	:	13.9	:	21.8	:	30.0
6) Worker in transport and communication occupation	0.0	:	2.2	:	0.0	:	0.0	:	0.7
7) Craftsmen, production process workers and laborers	18.9	:	21.5	:	8.3	:	18.6	:	19.2
8) Service sport and related workers	5.0	:	18.9	:	0.0	:	12.2	:	11.1
TOTAL (N)	100.0 (259)	:	100.0 (233)	:	100.0 (36)	:	100.0 (156)	:	100.0 (684)

MALE

TYPE OF OCCUPATION	RURAL - RURAL		URBAN - RURAL		RURAL - URBAN		URBAN - URBAN		TOTAL
	%	:	%	:	%	:	%	:	
1) Professional, Technical, and related workers	2.0	:	5.3	:	29.4	:	13.2	:	6.6
2) Administrative, Executive and Managerial workers	0.7	:	16.8	:	0.0	:	13.2	:	8.4
3) Clerical workers	0.0	:	3.5	:	0.0	:	8.8	:	2.9
4) Sales workers	5.0	:	19.5	:	0.0	:	13.2	:	10.7
5) Farmers, Fishermen, Loggers hunter and related workers	66.4	:	6.3	:	58.8	:	3.0	:	34.0
6) Worker in transport and communication occupation	5.4	:	12.4	:	55.9	:	23.5	:	11.2
7) Craftsmen, production process workers and laborers	18.1	:	27.4	:	0.0	:		:	
8) Service sport, and related workers	1.4	:	8.9	:	5.9	:	4.4	:	4.6
TOTAL (N)	100.0 (149)	:	100.0 (113)	:	100.0 (17)	:	100.0 (68)	:	100.0 (347)

Table 83: JOB SATISFACTION BY MIGRANT TYPE
BY SEX

FEMALE

JOB SATISFACTION	RURAL - RURAL		RURAL - URBAN		URBAN - RURAL		URBAN - URBAN		TOTAL
	%		%		%		%		%
Very Dissatisfied	7.1		7.0		5.6		3.8		6.4
Somewhat Dissatisfied	17.1		16.5		16.7		12.8		16.1
Neutral	2.5		1.1		0.0		2.3		1.8
Somewhat Satisfied	59.4		54.8		44.4		54.1		56.2
Very Satisfied	13.9		20.6		33.3		27.1		19.5
TOTAL (N)	100.0 (281)		100.0 (272)		100.0 (18)		100.0 (133)		100.0 (704)

MALE

JOB SATISFACTION	RURAL - RURAL		URBAN - RURAL		RURAL - URBAN		URBAN - URBAN		TOTAL
	%		%		%		%		%
Very Dissatisfied	7.9		7.7		7.7		5.3		7.0
Somewhat Dissatisfied	17.8		17.9		30.9		11.5		17.2
Neutral	1.3		3.4		0.0		5.3		2.3
Somewhat Satisfied	55.9		47.0		53.8		62.3		53.9
Very Satisfied	17.1		23.9		7.7		19.7		19.5
TOTAL (N)	100.0 (152)		100.0 (117)		100.0 (13)		100.0 (61)		100.0 (343)

27

Table 84: MIGRANT TYPE OF WOMEN BY STATUS

Migrant Type	Never Married	Married	Separated	Widowed	Total
	%	%	%	%	%
Rural - Rural	35.5	49.5	43.8	41.4	46.9
Urban - Rural	35.5	31.1	37.5	36.2	32.1
Rural - Urban	1.6	3.9	0.0	3.4	3.5
Urban - Urban	27.5	15.5	18.8	19.0	17.6
T O T A L	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	251)	(1259	(16)	(58)	(1584)

1/25

Table 85: MIGRANT TYPE BY AGE AND SEX

FEMALE

Migrant Type	18-27	28-37	38-47	48-59	TOTAL
	%	%	%	%	%
Rural - Rural	44.8	45.5	49.8	51.2	46.9
Rural - Urban	28.4	36.0	33.1	30.6	32.1
Urban - Rural	4.0	2.7	4.6	2.0	3.5
Urban - Urban	22.9	15.9	12.9	16.3	17.6
TOTAL (N)	100.0 (525)	100.0 (484)	100.0 (372)	100.0 (203)	100.0 (1584)
$\chi^2 = 24.6704$ $df = 9$ significant at $p = .05$					

MALE

Migrant Type	18-27	28-37	38-47	48-59	TOTAL
	%	%	%	%	%
Rural - Rural	42.9	46.2	36.6	51.1	46.9
Rural - Urban	30.4	29.2	36.4	34.1	32.7
Urban - Rural	5.4	5.4	4.2	0.0	3.8
Urban - Urban	21.4	19.2	12.7	14.8	16.6
TOTAL (N)	100.0 (56)	100.0 (130)	100.0 (118)	100.0 (88)	100.0 (392)
$\chi^2 = 5.5143$ $df = 9$ not significant					

101

Table 86: MIGRANT TYPE BY NUMBER OF CHILDREN
BY SEX

FEMALE

NO. OF CHILDREN	RURAL - RURAL	RURAL - URBAN	URBAN - RURAL	URBAN - URBAN	TOTAL
	%	%	%	%	%
1 - 2	21.8	26.7	29.8	35.4	25.7
3 - 4	27.8	28.8	27.7	30.9	28.6
5 - 6	24.4	24.3	19.2	17.1	23.0
7 - 8	18.1	14.9	17.0	10.0	15.8
9 - 10	5.1	4.3	2.1	5.0	4.7
11 - 13	2.9	1.1	4.3	1.7	2.2
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(591)	(375)	(47)	(181)	(1194)
Mean No. of Children	4.8	4.4	4.4	4.0	4.5

TABLE 26: CONTINUED

MALE

NO. OF CHILDREN	RURAL	RURAL	RURAL - URBAN	URBAN	URBAN - RURAL	URBAN	TOTAL
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
1 - 2	22.3	22.1	46.7	41.0	26.3		
3 - 4	24.7	28.7	20.0	31.2	26.9		
5 - 6	24.2	27.9	20.0	9.8	22.9		
7 - 8	18.5	16.4	6.7	13.1	16.5		
9 - 10	5.6	4.1	0.0	4.9	4.8		
11 - 13	4.5	0.8	6.7	0.0	2.7		
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0		
(N)	(178)	(122)	(15)	(61)	(376)		
Mean No. of Children	5.0	4.6	3.8	3.7	4.6		

R E F E R E N C E S

- Alford, Frank W. "Social Indicator and Socioeconomic Development." Journal of Developing Areas. 8(1973) pp. 5-12.
- Atchoff, Joel and William Cano. "A Reexamination of the Cross-Cultural Principles of Task Segregation and Sex Role Differentiation in the Family." American Sociological Review 40 (1975) 12-20.
- Bernay, Elaine. "Growing up to be Chairperson of the Board - Review of The Managerial Woman by Margaret Henning and Anne Jardine." ES 3(1977) 38 pp.
- Burcup, Ester. Women's Role In Economic Development. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd. 1970.
- Castano, Rodolfo A. "Philippine Urbanism and the Status of Women." Paper Prepared for Working Groups on Women in Cities, East-West Population Institute, Honolulu, March 1974.
- Castillo, Celia T. The Filipino Women as Manpower: The Image and the Empirical Reality. College, Laguna C.P. Los Baños, 1970.
- de Beauvoir, Simone. The Second Sex. New York: Bantam Books, 1952.
- Dehnbomond, Barbara Inell. "Social Status and Stressful Life Events." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 28 (1975) 227-233.
- Dearty, Rippoport and Rapport. Sex, Career and Family, London, 1973.
- Decker, Betty. The Feminine mystique. New York: Dell Publishing, 1963.
- Gonzales, Anna Miron and Mary Racelis Hollensteiner. Filipino Women as Partners of Men in Progress and Development. Quezon City, 1970.
- Gornick, Vivian and Barbara K. Moran. Women in Sexist Society. New York: Basic Books, 1971.
- Greenwald, Carol. "Part-time Work: When Less is More." ES 4 (1976) 41 pp.
- Goode, Louise Kapp. Pink Collar Workers, New York: Basic Books, 1977.
- Leibowitz, Lyne B. (ed). Women in the World: A Comparative Study. Santa Barbara, Calif. ABC-CLIO Books, 1977.

- Barney, Elizabeth. Between Myth and Morning: Women Awakening. New York, Morrow, 1974.
- Barovsky, Mina. Blue-Collar Marriage. New York: Vintage Books, 1967.
- Bundy, Jennifer. "The Struggle for Prestige." In Stereotype, Status and Satisfaction: The Filipina among Filipinos. University of the Philippines Social Research Lab., 1977.
- Caro, Leda. "Women in Work." In Stereotype Status and Satisfaction: The Filipina among Filipinos. U.P. Social Research Lab., 1977.
- Chen, Cynthia (ed.) Sex, Discrimination and the Division of Labor. New York: Columbia University Press, 1975.
- Chen, Mahor and T. Jayne-No. "Income and Labor Force Participation Rates of Women in the Philippines". Paper presented at Council for Asian Manpower Studies/Organization of Demographic Association Seminar on Labor Supply, Makati, 1976.
- Editors. "The Proper Study of Womanhood: A Sampling of New Finds in Women Studies." M B 2(1978) 89-92.
- Chen, Bernard and Carol Anshenel. "The Changelor Syndrome. A Social Psychological Dimension of the Female Sex Role." Journal of Marriage and the Family. 38(1976) 605-617.
- Chen, Phyllis. "A Housewife's Log: What She Really Does All Day." M B 4(1976) 54-57.
- Chen, Eleanor S. and Wilbert E. Moore (eds). Indicators of Social Change. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1968.
- Social Research Laboratory. Stereotype, Status and Satisfaction: The Filipina among Filipinos. University of the Philippines, 1977.
- Chen, Nadia Magang. Women work in Developing Societies. U.C. Monograph Series #5, 1964.
- Chen,ileen. "Reentry Ripoff - One Housewife's Story." M B 6(1977) 83 pp.