

RP
301.32
H495

FINANCE

FERTILITY, SOCIAL CLASS, AND OUTMIGRATION FROM
TWO RURAL COMMUNITIES IN THE PHILIPPINES

by

Gerry E. Hendershot

Brown University

Prepared for the SEADAG Population Panel Seminar

July 6-8, 1972

San Francisco, California

RP Fertility, Social Class, and Outmigration from...
301.32 Brown Univ.
H495 Fertility, Social Class, and Outmigra-
tion from Two Rural Communities in the
Philippines. Gerry E. Hendershot. 1972.
25 p. appendices.
Prepared for the SEADAG Population Panel
Seminar, San Francisco, July 6-8, 1972.

A.I.D.
Reference Center
Room 1656 NS

1.Fertility - RP.2.Social classes - RP.3.Migration,
Internal - RP.4..Rural-urban migration - RP.I.
Hendershot, Gerry E.II.Title.III.Outmigration from
Two Rural...

- 1 -

PH-ABI 118

FERTILITY, SOCIAL CLASS, AND OUTMIGRATION FROM
TWO RURAL COMMUNITIES IN THE PHILIPPINES

Gerry E. Hendershot
Brown University

Introduction

In its "Statement on Population Policy and Program" the presidentially appointed Commission on Population of the Philippines recommended the adoption of a national population policy including the following elements:

To promote the broadest understanding by the people of the adverse effects on family life and national welfare of unlimited population growth and to provide the means by which couples can safely, effectively, and freely determine the proper size of their families.

.
To adopt policies and establish programs guiding and regulating the flow of internal migration, and influencing spatial distribution in the interest of development progress. (Commission on Population, 1970, pp. 254,256)

Thus, the Commission explicitly recognized both rapid population growth and maldistribution of population as national problems, and recommended national programs of fertility and migration control for their solution. The Commission did not explicitly recognize, however, that the problems of rapid population growth and maldistribution of population may be causally interrelated; nor do its recommended programs of fertility control--dissemination of family planning information and services--and migra-

tion control--resettlement and "provision of facilities such as safe water supply and other amenities to make rural life more attractive" (p. 257)--seem to be interrelated solutions.

In the view of some scholars, however, rapid growth and maldistribution of population are interrelated phenomena. The views of eminent social scientist Gunnar Myrdal are illustrative:

Despite the roughness of the data and the varying conceptions of "urban" and "rural" among the countries, the evidence supports a relatively rapid increase in urbanization in South Asia. Yet the sex composition and mortality differences between urban and rural areas yield lower rates of natural population growth in urban centers than elsewhere. It is clear, then, that net migration from rural to urban areas is the main reason for the more rapid growth of the latter. But the movement cityward is largely unrelated to any vigorous expansion of urban employment opportunities, for, as will be discussed later, the cities are beset by serious unemployment and "underemployment" problems of their own. And in view of the squalor, overcrowding, inadequate housing and sanitation in urban centers, the movement toward the cities cannot in general be motivated by any increase in their "net attractiveness"; recent studies indicate the reverse.

If this is so, then the principal cause of South Asian urbanization must be an increase, relative to urban areas, in rural poverty and insecurity, at least in certain strata of the rural population, which creates a "push" toward the cities. The dynamic element would therefore appear to be the very rapid growth of population in the region; this, in the first instance, presses on the lower strata in the rural sector and then spills over, as it were, into the towns and cities. Urbanization is thus more a reaction against the lack of vigorous economic growth than a response to rising levels of income per head. Indeed, much of it is due to factors inhibiting economic development, such as civil wars, instability, and crop failures, as well as to excessive rates of population growth. Instead of standing as a symptom of growth, as it was in the West, urbanization in South Asia is an aspect of continued poverty. (1968, pp. 470-471; emphasis added)

A similar argument is made by some students of Philippine society;

Carroll (1970), for instance, writes:

[/The high rate of population growth/] is one of the major causes of pressure on the agricultural resources of the nation, fragmentation of land holdings and the increase of tenancy, destructive farming methods, migration, urbanization, unemployment, pressure on the educational system and on other public services. (p. 12; emphasis added)

Put more concisely, the argument is: (1) high fertility in rural populations causes poverty; (2) the impoverished migrate to the cities in search of a livelihood; and (3) the influx of migrants creates overurbanization, a maldistribution of population which impedes economic development. While all of these propositions and their underlying assumptions need testing in many cultural settings, it will be the more limited task of this paper to test one derivative hypothesis in a single culture. Using data from two rural communities in the Philippines, a test will be made of the hypothesis: the higher the level of fertility, the greater is the rate of outmigration.

The situation hypothesized to exist is as follows. As the children of married couples in the rural Philippines reach maturity, some decision must be made about their futures. The decision is one in which the affected children, their parents, and perhaps other family members may actively participate. The choices open for the children are basically two: (1) marry and set up housekeeping in the vicinity with a farm acquired from or through the parents or other family members; or

(2) migrate to the city or another rural area where land is more easily accessible to individuals. It is assumed that the former is the preferred outcome for most of those involved; therefore, the real determinant of the outcome is the accessibility to children of land in the vicinity of the family home. That accessibility depends largely on the land held--owned or securely tenanted--by the parents, and the number of siblings who have some legitimate claim to that land. In general the greater the amount of land held and the fewer the number of siblings, the higher the probability that the children can--and therefore will--remain near the family home on reaching their majority; on the other hand, the lesser the amount of land held and the larger the number of siblings, the lower the probability that children will stay and the higher the probability they will migrate from the barrio.

This is obviously a very simplified and generalized description of what is a very complex process with many variations in particular cases. Nevertheless, if the views expressed by Myrdal and Carroll are correct, then this situation--or something very like it--must occur with sufficient frequency to produce the hypothesized relationship between fertility and outmigration.

Data

The data for this study come from sample surveys conducted by the University of the Philippines Population Institute in the communities of Calasiao and Miagao. Murphy (1968) provides the following brief descriptions of each community.

Calasiao is in the north central part of Pangasinan province. It is bounded on the north by Dagupan City, the provincial city of the province, on the south by the municipality of San Carlos, on the east by Binmaley, and on the west by Santa Barbara. The 1960 Census counted 29,330 residents; the municipality has an area of approximately 4,340 hectares and a population density of about 5.5 persons per hectare. It contains 19 barrios and the poblacion. Calasiao is one of 45 municipalities in the province.

Pangasinan is a relatively prosperous area that has attracted migrants from neighboring regions. It has been, and still is, a melting pot for the Pampangos, Ilocanos, and Tagalogs who have built its essentially agricultural economy. The main crops are palay, coconuts, tobacco and sugar cane. Widespread cottage industries produce bamboo crafts, maguey and buri rope, nipa shingles for roofing, and coconut candy or "bocayo." Hats made from buri are also a major product, the weaving is done by families in the barrios and brought to town for forming and finishing. There are two finishing establishments in Calasiao. Because it is near to Dagupan City, communications are good. In general, Calasiao is a prosperous agricultural area. (pp. 1-2)

.....
Iloilo is one of three provinces on the Island of Panay in the Western Visayas, and Miagao is one of 42 municipalities in Iloilo. Located in the center of the province, Miagao is bounded by the province of Antique on the northwest, by the municipalities of Igaras and San Joaquin on the northwest and southeast, respectively, and by Iloilo Strait on the southwest. It comprises the remarkable number of 111 barrios plus the poblacion. Miagao had a population of 32,114 in 1960 residing in an area of 13,208 hectares; its population density was 2.4 persons per hectare.

Iloilo has small net immigration, and the population of Miagao includes the native Ilongos, others from the Visayas, as well as immigrants from Luzon. The terrain varies from

level plains to rolling hinterlands, and the economy is largely agricultural. Rice and sugar are the major crops although corn and mangos are also grown. There is little industry, and what home industry exists is centered around weaving.

Miagao is about 42 kilometers from Iloilo city which is the principal urban city of Panay. Transportation is by bus or train. (p. 4)

The purposes and procedures of the surveys in Calasiao and Miagao have been described by Concepcion and Flieger (1968). In each survey a 25% random sample was drawn from a census listing of ever married women over 15 years of age, stratified by age and presence or absence of spouse. Home interviews were conducted with sample women beginning in September (Calasiao) and October (Miagao) of 1967; the KAP-type interview schedule used in both communities was identical, except that different local dialects were used. Response rates were very high--99% in Calasiao, and 94% in Miagao.

The present study focuses attention on outmigration of children from the parental home at the time of reaching their majority. This focus makes some parts of the community samples irrelevant, namely those women either too young or too old to have children in their late 'teens and 'twenties. For that reason women under 40 and women 60 or over were excluded from the analysis. Also, women whose husbands were no longer living were also excluded; the division of property and relocation of family members which might follow the death of the household head are possibly related to outmigration, but in ways probably

different from those hypothesized here; to have included widowed women would have confused the two sets of factors. Thus, the sample for the present study consists of ever married women between the ages of 40 and 60 and living with their spouses. There were 469 such women in Calasiao, about 31% of the total sample; in Miagao the number was 505, about 37% of the total.

Definition of Migrant

Near the end of the interview, women were asked the following question:

We would like to know if you have had relatives, 10 years old and over, who had lived with you till 1960 but have since left for another barrio, province, or abroad.

If the answer was affirmative, then the number of such persons was ascertained as well as certain additional information-- age, sex, marital status, destination, reason for leaving, etc.-- about a maximum of three of them. In this study all persons named in response to this question will be called "migrants" or "outmigrants." If the destination of a migrant was Manila or its suburbs, or any other chartered city in the Philippines (regardless of size or other characteristics), he will be called an urban migrant; a migrant to any other destination will be called a rural migrant.

Several features of this definition of migrant have a bearing on the interpretation of findings to be presented later, and should be carefully noted. First, although migrants are

relatives of the respondent, the nature of the relationship is not known; more specifically, it is not known whether or not the migrants are children of the respondent. This is important because much of the interpretation to be provided later will assume that migrants are children of the respondent. While there is no direct evidence to support the assumption, two facts provide indirect support: (1) by far the most common household residence pattern in the rural Philippines is the nuclear family alone--father, mother, and unmarried children--which makes it unlikely related outmigrants would be anything but children of the respondent (Carroll, 1970, p. 11); (2) the other known characteristics of the migrants--such as age--are consistent with the assumption that they are the children of the respondent.

Second, migrants had to be at least 10 years old at the time they migrated. This excludes most, if not all, moves by children accompanying migrating relatives. This exclusion is desirable in this study, because the presence of such "epiphenomenal" migrants in the sample would make it more difficult to determine the underlying causes of migration.

Third, persons who moved both very short and very long distances are included as migrants. They had to have moved at least outside the barrio, but that might be a very short move indeed, especially in Miagao with its 111 or more barrios; at the other extreme, some migrants from Calasiao (11 in number)

were destined for foreign lands. The distributions of migrants by broad geographic destinations are shown in Table 1. It will be noted that large majorities of the migrants in both municipalities did move at least to another municipality, and most of those moved outside of their own geographical region; on the other hand, some migrants in both municipalities--including substantial numbers among those classified as "rural" migrants--"only" moved to another barrio within the municipality. There would probably be little disagreement with defining persons who moved outside the municipality as migrants, but there may be disagreement about so defining persons who move to a nearby barrio. This is the problem Goldscheider (1971, pp. 59-64) has called "the minimum question"--what is the minimum travel distance or social change which must occur in order for a move to be called migratory? Goldscheider concludes that "all residence changes--from one domicile to another" should be included within the concept of migration (p. 64). Such changes, he argues, require the migrant to reorganize his total round of activity. If that is true generally, then it must certainly be true in the case of a Filipino who moves to another barrio, because the barrio is the most important "container" of life activities in the rural Philippines (Eggan, 1968). For these reasons, all persons who moved outside the barrio, even those who moved to an adjacent barrio, are defined as migrants in this study.

(TABLE 1 about here)

Finally, some data are lost to the study because personal information was obtained for a maximum of three migrants from each household; thus, if a household had, say, five migrants, information on age, sex, destination, etc., was obtained for only three (which three is not clear). About 10% of the migrant cases in Miagao are lost for this reason, while only about 3% are lost in Calasiao.

Characteristics and Motivations

In Table 2 the migrant samples are described with respect to age, sex, and marital status so that the reader may form some more specific idea of their composition. It will be noted that the migrants are predominantly young; most were in their 'twenties at the time of the interview, and would have averaged 3-4 years younger at the time they left the barrio. (The migration occurred between 1960 and the date of the interview in late 1967; if the annual rate of migration was about equal over that period of time, and if there is no serious memory bias in recalling the migration, then it can be assumed that the sample migrants are evenly distributed across the annual departure dates.) The youth of the migrants is circumstantial evidence in support of the assumption that they are the sons and daughters of the respondents leaving home for the first time.

(TABLE 2 about here)

The sex ratio of the total migrant samples in the two communities is near unity. Among urban migrants males dominate in Calasiao, females in Miagao; among rural migrants females dominate in Calasiao, males in Miagao. Thus, both males and females are well represented in both urban and rural migration, and such differences in sex composition as occur are not consistent across the two communities.

The migrants in the two communities differ markedly with respect to marital status; while more than two-thirds of the migrants from Calasiao are married, only one-third of those from Miagao are married. Although the rural migrants in both communities are more likely than urban migrants to be married, the greater prevalence of marriage in Calasiao is found among migrants to both rural and urban destinations. This difference between the two communities is consistent with the findings of Smith (1971), who reports both earlier mean age at marriage and higher proportions married at age 50 for the region around Calasiao than for the region around Miagao. Smith suggests that such differences in marriage patterns "may be the product of imbalanced sex ratios, rather than underlying cultural prescriptions (p. 167)."

One direct approach to uncovering the underlying causes of migration is to ask informants--the migrants themselves or others who know the circumstances--why migration occurred.

The sample women in Calasiao and Miagao were asked for each migrant: "Why did he leave this place?" The responses were coded by the interviewers into one of seven categories; the distributions of migrants by the categories of their reported reasons for leaving are given in Table 3. It will be noted that marriage and work reasons account for 95% of the migrants from Calasiao and 80% of the migrants from Miagao; none of the other reasons was named for as many as 10% of the migrants in either community. Only 2% of the migrants from Miagao were reported to have left for "lack of land," and none of the migrants from Calasiao is reported to have left for that reason.

(TABLE 3 about here)

The infrequent mention of lack of land as a reason for migrating may be regarded as evidence against the fertility-migration hypothesis under examination in this paper, but Gugler (1969) suggests several reasons why such evidence should not be weighed too heavily. First, recall of motivations for past actions, especially those of other people, may not be accurate. Second, there is a tendency for past actions to be attached in memory to culminating events, rather than to the known causes which built up to them; thus, an occasion such as a marriage or a reported job opportunity in the city may be remembered as the "reason" for a migration "really" caused by land shortage. Third, even though the "real" reason may be

accurately remembered, it is the "cause" of only one incident of migration, while what is wanted is a class of causes which can explain variations in rates of migration independently of such incidental causes. Gugler quotes Mitchell (1959, p. 32) on this point:

The personal factors of the type that have been mentioned as 'causes' of labour migration are of the type that operate independently of the underlying conditions. Tensions arise between kinsmen, regardless of changes in economic condition the desire to experience townlife and to savour the adventures of travelling, are probably constantly present. Therefore, as Durkheim so cogently argued concerning the operation of similar factors in causing suicide, these factors cannot explain the size and trends of the rate of labour migration.

Finally, the individual may be an inappropriate unit of study for migration; while it may indeed be the individual who migrates, the underlying causes of his migration--despite the motives imputed to him--may be factors affecting the family which he leaves behind. Thus, it may be the family which is short of land, and this may be the underlying reason for his moving to Manila "to find a better job"; in this case his motive, even when accurately reported, is immaterial for present purposes. For all of these reasons, Gugler concludes that "motives adduced by migrants may therefore hide rather than reveal underlying causes (p. 141)."

A "Rate" of Outmigration

The measure of migration to be used in testing the fertility-migration hypothesis is a quasi"rate" of outmigration

for each household formed by dividing the reported number of outmigrants (urban or rural) by the number of children ever born to the respondent. This ratio is an attempt to approximate with the available data the rate of outmigration among children of the respondents between 1960 and 1967. That it is only an approximation is apparent from the fact, noted earlier, that the migrants in the numerator are not known to be children of the respondents, although for reasons already discussed, it may be reasonably assumed that most are. Of course, there may be other and unknown factors which make this measure less than a perfect approximation to its intended referent.

Basing the ratio on the number of children ever born to the respondent has theoretical advantages over some alternative possibilities. First, it makes the measure of migration a property of a family, rather than some class of individual; this is congruent with the theoretical assumption that population growth effects outmigration through the family, and permits the use of family characteristics as predictor variables. Second, children ever born is a commonly used measure of cumulative fertility; its presence in the ratio emphasizes the hypothesized relationship between fertility and migration. Alternative bases, such as the number of household members or the number of living children, while perhaps being better estimates of the population

at risk, would not have had this clear connection to fertility. In any case, children ever born, living children, and number of household members are so highly intercorrelated as to make the distinction among them of only theoretical interest for present purposes.

Distributions of sample women by the ratio of out-migrants to children ever born (multiplied by 1000) are presented in Table 4. It will be noted that in about four-fifths of the Calasiao households the migration ratio is zero; that is, it was reported that no related household member had left the barrio between 1960 and the date of the interview. In Miagao outmigration was more common, but even there more than two-thirds of the respondents reported no outmigrants. Thus, it is apparent that in these communities large majorities of families had not experienced outmigration; conversely, that migration which did occur was concentrated in a minority of the families. This skewed distribution of families by migration ratios should be kept in mind while interpreting the mean migration ratios presented below.

(TABLE 4 about here)

Social Class and Children Ever Born as Predictors

It is hypothesized that fertility and migration, as measured by the household migration ratio, are positively related. Fertility will be measured by the number of children

ever born to the respondents; since all of the women in this sample were 40 or over at the time of the interview, it is a measure of completed fertility. (Only one of the sample women was reported to have been pregnant at the time of the interview.) Distributions of sample women by number of children ever born--grouped into small, medium, and large numbers--are given in Table 5.

(TABLE 5 about here)

As noted earlier, however, fertility is not the only factor of theoretical significance as a determinant of propensity to migrate; the accessibility to children of farm land is also hypothesized to be related to the migration ratio, negatively in this case. The measure of accessibility to land used here was suggested by the work of Anderson (1962) on land tenure in a Pangasinan community. Anderson observes that:

Earning a living in the barrio under study is dependent upon one's relationship to the land, the primary means of production and source of wealth. The type of relationship that one has to this primary resource largely determines his standing in the community. (p. 45)

.
 A number of analytically derived but empirically verifiable vertical categories stood out on the basis of occupation and access to the land. These categories corresponded to certain behavioral differences among barrio members, and certain cultural symbols seemed to be associated with them. Furthermore, families so categorized could be ranked consistently by a sample of community members. Analytically I found them to be characterized by a progressive weakening of a claim to derive a living from the land. (p. 46)

In order of descending access to land, the categories identified

by Anderson (and their approximate numbers as a percentage of the total) are as follows: medium landowners (2%); small owners and secure tenants (17%); insecure tenants (44%); agricultural laborers (32%); and those regularly employed in non-agricultural work (5%). These categories are basically determined by access to land, but their social meaning is much broader; belonging to a category is an important determinant of the person's social status within the community. The categories have the character, then, of social classes.

While no attempt was made in this study to exactly replicate the construction of social class categories identified by Anderson, the broad outlines of his analytical distinctions were followed. Two characteristics of the respondent's household were used in constructing social class categories: tenancy status and farm size. Respondents who reported neither they nor their husbands owned or were tenants of any farm land were classified as "non-farm." If either spouse or the family owned any farm land at all, they were classified as "owners." If either spouse or the family were farm tenants but owned no farm land, the family was classified as "tenant." With respect to size, farms were classified as "small" if they comprised less than 2 hectares; farms of 2 hectares or more were classified as "medium." (Since fewer than 2% of the families owned more than 5 hectares, no "large" farm size category can be said to

exist.) The "non-farm" category and the cross classification of the tenant status and farm size variables yields five categories. The distributions of sample women among the five categories, ordered from low to high by presumed degree of access to land, are given in Table 5. These figures are not, of course, comparable to those of Anderson, not only because different definitions have been used, but also because these data, in contrast to that of Anderson, refer to only a part of the total community. Inter-community comparisons are possible, however, and the most striking of these is Calasiao's much higher proportion in the non-farm category. Whether this is due to a greater actual demand for non-agricultural laborers in Calasiao, or to the formation of a surplus labor force (Takahashi, 1969, pp. 140-43) cannot be determined with the available data.

One other variable, age, was introduced into the analysis as a control. The propensity to migrate is much higher in the young adult ages than in any others (see, for instance, Morrisson, 1971); age, in fact, is one of few variables which are consistently and significantly related to the probability of migration. For that reason, a statistical control on age seems necessary to a test of the fertility-migration hypothesis. Unfortunately, the ages of the theoretically important population, the children of the respondents, are not known; instead, the ages of the respondents themselves are used, it being assumed that the

ages of mothers and their children are highly intercorrelated. The distributions of sample women by age groups are also shown in Table 5.

The statistical technique used in manipulating these variables to test the hypothesis under investigation is Multiple Classification Analysis (Andrews, Morgan and Sonquist, 1969). The technique is useful when it is desired to use several ordinal variables--such as age, social class, and children ever born--as predictors of an interval variable--such as the migrant ratio. An important assumption made in the technique is that the effects of the predictor variables on the dependent variable are additive; that is, it is assumed that the total effect on the dependent variable of the predictor variables is simply the sum of their individual effects.

Table 6 presents results of an analysis using age, social class, and children ever born as predictors of urban and rural migration ratios. The mean migrant-children ratios for the categories of each variable have been adjusted for the effects of the other two variables in the analysis. The results can be briefly summarized as follows: (1) the relationship between age and migration is positive, but not consistently linear; (2) the relationship between social class and migration is not linear, as expected, but curvilinear, with "lower" and "higher" social classes having the higher migration ratios, and the

"middle" classes having lower migration ratios (Cf. Lee, 1966, p. 56); and (3) the key relationship between fertility and migration is positive and linear as hypothesized in Calasiao, but slightly curvilinear in Miagao. Thus, there appears to be support, although limited, for the principal hypothesis under investigation.

(TABLE 6 about here)

Table 7 presents additional results from the analysis using age, class, and children ever born as predictors of the migrant ratio. The Betas are standardized measures of the strength of the relationship between each predictor variable and the migration ratio, adjusting for the effects of the other predictor variables. The R^2 is the square of the multiple correlation coefficient, adjusted for loss of degrees of freedom. In no case is children ever born more strongly related to migration than age, and in only one case (rural migration from Calasiao) is it more strongly related than social class. Furthermore, in only one case (rural migration from Calasiao) does removing children ever born from the list of predictors reduce the total explained variance by a statistically significant amount. In other words, very little support is found here for the hypothesis that high fertility is related to high rates of outmigration.

(TABLE 7 about here)

Combining Social Class and Children Ever Born as a Predictor

It is possible, however, that the effects of fertility and social class are not additive as has been assumed; it may be, instead, that fertility and social class interact in their effect on migration. On reflection this is a plausible assumption; the effect of increasing family size will certainly depend, it would seem, on the social class level of the family--an increase in number of children which would force a radical change in the organization of a lower class family might be accommodated by a higher class family with little or no change. If such interactions do exist, then the preceding analysis assuming additivity may be misleading. One approach to solving this problem is to create a new variable which includes as categories all possible combinations of the variables whose interaction is suspected. This was done by simultaneously classifying respondents by the social class and children ever born variables already discussed; this resulted in a 15-category combined variable, by which sample women are distributed in Table 8. It should be noted that the numbers of sample cases in some categories of this new variable are very small, making the mean migration ratios and the analyses based on them less reliable.

(TABLE 8 about here)

The mean migration ratios for categories of the combined social class-fertility variable, adjusted for age of respondent, are presented in Table 9. Examination of these figures leads

to no new conclusions regarding the hypothesized relationship between high fertility and migration; the most common pattern of relationship between children ever born and the migration ratio within classes, communities, and urban-rural destinations is positive, but this pattern is not consistent, especially in Miagao and among non-farm families.

(TABLE 9 about here)

Neither does Table 10 lead to new conclusions. The combined social class-fertility variable is still less strongly related to the migration ratio than age of respondent. Also, the combined variable adds no significant amount of explained variance; that is, the amount of variance explained by age and the combined variable is not significantly different from that explained by age alone. It can be concluded, therefore, that there is no significant interaction between class and fertility as causes of outmigration.

(TABLE 10 about here)

Summary and Conclusions

At the beginning of this paper it was noted that some scholars have argued that high fertility in rural populations leads to fragmentation of land holdings, poverty and economic insecurity, migration to the cities, and over-urbanization. As a partial test of that line of reasoning, this study investigated the relationship between fertility and outmigration

in two rural communities in the Philippines. Using the number of children ever born as a measure of fertility, and the ratio of outmigrants to children as a measure of migration, little support was found for the hypothesis that high fertility is related to high levels of outmigration, either to urban or rural destinations.

Despite the lack of support for the hypothesis in this study, it would be premature to reject it without further consideration. It is possible, for instance, that the two study communities are not typical of the thousands of Philippine rural communities, or of the smaller number from which there is unusually large outmigration. In this connection it may be noted that rates of farm tenancy are lower in the two study communities than in those areas of the nation which have experienced the greatest amount of agrarian unrest. It is also possible that the pressures of high fertility operate in different ways than those hypothesized here; for instance, population pressure may be a characteristic of whole communities, in which case it is inappropriate to look for its operation at the family level of social organization.

However, if the conclusions of this study are generally valid--that is, if high fertility is not related to high levels of outmigration from rural areas in the Philippines, what are the implications for a national population policy? First, it

is not to be expected that programs of fertility control, even if successful, will do much to alter the existing pattern of large scale rural-urban migration--if rural high fertility is not an important cause to begin with, its reduction will not have an important effect on the rate of outmigration.

(Of course, reducing fertility will make the absolute number of migrants fewer than otherwise even if the rate is unchanged.)

Second, other programs of migration control, treating other "causes" of rural-urban migration should be considered. On the basis of other analyses of the sample survey data from Calasiao and Miagao, the present author has previously argued that rural-urban migrants in the Philippines are above the rural average with respect to aspirations and potential for upward social mobility; moreover, such evidence as exists suggests that many realize their ambitions in the city (Hendershot, 1970 and 1971). If rural-urban migration leads to maldistribution of the population, it may be because the real or perceived opportunities are maldistributed. A change in patterns of rural-urban migration would require, therefore, some change in the actual or understood distribution of opportunities. It is unlikely in the short run that any substantial improvement in opportunities can be effected in the thousands of communities from which rural-urban migration originates; but perhaps development of opportunities in regional urban centers, or the wider dissemination of knowledge about opportunities already existing

in those centers, would divert some part of the rural-urban migration away from the metropolitan centers such as Greater Manila, and thus mitigate the effects of overurbanization (Cf. Commission on Population Growth and the American Future, 1972, pp. 223-24). That potential rural-urban migrants would be responsive to such programs is suggested by the fact that the "best" outmigrants from Calasiao and Miagao already seem to be going not to Manila, but to smaller urban centers (Hendershot, 1969, pp. 21-22).

Acknowledgments

The data were collected, processed, and made available to the author by the University of the Philippines Population Institute, directed by Mercedes B. Concepcion. Nancy Saul provided computer and editorial assistance; Leo C. Rigsby, Omer R. Galle, and Paul Placek made useful suggestions at several points in the research. Part of the research was supported by a grant from the U. S. Public Health Service, PHS-NIH-1-ROI-HD05771-01. The author was on the faculty of Vanderbilt University at the time the research was completed.

TABLE 1
 DISTRIBUTION (PERCENTAGE) OF OUTMIGRANTS BY
 GEOGRAPHIC DESTINATION BY URBAN-
 RURAL DESTINATION: CALASIAO AND MIAGAO

Geographic Destination	Calasiao			Miagao		
	Total	Urban	Rural	Total	Urban	Rural
(Number)	(225)	(140)	(85)	(382)	(244)	(138)
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
Municipio ^a	17	2	41	8	3	17
Region ^b	35	26	51	24	9	51
Greater Manila ^c	36	59	0	47	73	0
Other ^d	12	13	8	21	15	32

^a Within Calasiao for Calasiao outmigrants; within Miagao for Miagao outmigrants.

^b Outside the municipio, but within the geographic region; the region for Calasiao includes the provinces of Bataan, Bulacan, Nueva Ecija, Pampanga, Pangasinan, Tarlac and Zambales; for Miagao the region includes Aklan, Antique, Capiz, Iloilo, Romblon, and Negros Occidental.

^c Includes the City of Manila and its suburbs--Caloocan, Pasay, Quezon, Makati, Mandaluyong, Paranaque, San Juan, Las Pinas, Malabon, Marikina, Navotas, Pasig, Pateros, and Taguig.

^d Includes all domestic and foreign destinations not elsewhere classified.

TABLE 2
 DISTRIBUTION (PERCENTAGE) OF OUTMIGRANTS BY
 AGE, SEX, AND MARITAL STATUS BY URBAN-
 RURAL DESTINATION: CALASIAO AND MIAGAO

Age, Sex, and Marital Status	Calasiao			Miagao		
	Total	Urban	Rural	Total	Urban	Rural
(Number)	(225)	(140)	(85)	(382)	(244)	(138)
Age						
Less than 20	13	16	8	23	25	20
20-29	65	70	67	56	55	59
30 or more	22	14	35	21	20	22
Sex						
Male	49	56	39	50	47	54
Female	51	44	61	50	53	46
Marital Status						
Single	31	44	11	67	80	45
Married	69	56	89	33	20	55

TABLE 3
 DISTRIBUTION (PERCENTAGE) OF OUTMIGRANTS BY
 REASON FOR LEAVING BY RURAL-URBAN
 DESTINATION: CALASIAO AND MIAGAO

Reason for Leaving	Calasiao			Miagao		
	Total	Urban	Rural	Total	Urban	Rural
(Number)	(225)	(140)	(85)	(381)	(244)	(137)
Total	100	100	100	100	99	99
Marriage	56	39	84	19	8	39
Work	39	53	15	61	74	39
Education	3	5	0	8	9	5
Family and health	1	1	0	1	1	*
Land	0	0	0	2	*	6
Others	2	2	1	9	9	10

Note: * = less than .5%

TABLE 4
 DISTRIBUTION (NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE) OF
 RESPONDENTS BY URBAN AND RURAL MIGRANTS
 PER 1000 CHILDREN: CALASIAO AND MIAGAO

Migrants per 1000 Children	Calasiao				Miagao			
	Urban		Rural		Urban		Rural	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Total	469	100	469	99	505	100	505	101
None	380	81	414	88	345	68	395	78
1-99	7	1	11	2	10	2	9	2
100-199	45	10	29	6	51	10	48	10
200-299	25	5	11	2	56	11	28	6
300-399	4	1	3	1	23	5	11	2
400-499	3	1	0	0	7	1	3	1
500-599	3	1	1	*	8	2	9	2
600 or more	2	*	0	0	5	1	2	*

Note: * = less than .5%

TABLE 5
 DISTRIBUTIONS (NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE) OF
 RESPONDENTS BY AGE, SOCIAL CLASS, AND
 CHILDREN EVER BORN: CALASIAO AND MIAGAO

Characteristic	Calasiao		Miagao	
	Number	Percent.	Number	Percent.
Age				
40-44	178	38	161	32
45-49	117	25	133	26
50-54	93	20	127	25
55-59	81	17	84	17
Social Class				
Non-farm	179	38	104	21
Small tenant	84	18	91	18
Medium tenant	19	4	79	16
Small owner	132	28	133	26
Medium owner	55	12	98	19
Children Ever Born				
0-4	128	27	136	27
5-7	143	31	177	35
8 or more	198	42	192	38

TABLE 6
 URBAN AND RURAL MIGRANTS PER 1000 CHILDREN
 (ADJUSTED FOR OTHER PREDICTORS) BY AGE, SOCIAL
 CLASS AND CHILDREN EVER BORN: CALASIAO AND MIAGAO

Predictor	Calasiao		Miagao	
	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural
Age				
40-44	18	8	60	28
45-49	49	20	53	34
50-54	49	17	124	70
55-59	51	40	85	87
Social Class				
Non-farm	45	17	90	65
Small tenant	25	20	91	37
Medium tenant	<u>12</u>	<u>6</u>	39	40
Small owner	36	19	100	43
Medium owner	44	21	57	63
Children Ever Born				
0-4	25	4	74	50
5-7	37	17	73	41
8 or more	46	28	86	57

Note: Underlined numbers based on fewer than 20 cases.

31

TABLE 7
 BETAS AND R-SQUARES FOR MULTIPLE CLASSIFICATION
 ANALYSES USING AGE, SOCIAL CLASS, AND
 CHILDREN EVER BORN AS PREDICTORS OF URBAN
 AND RURAL MIGRANTS PER 1000 CHILDREN:
 CALASIAO AND MIAGAO

Municipality and Dependent Variable	Predictors	Betas			R ²
		1.Age	2.Class	3.CEB	
Calasiao					
Urban migrants/CEB	1,2,3	.16	.10	.09	.02*
	1,2	.15	.09	--	.01
Rural migrants/CEB	1,2,3	.20	.05	.17	.05**
	1,2	.19	.05	--	.02*
Miagao					
Urban migrants/CEB	1,2,3	.19	.16	.04	.05**
	1,2	.20	.15	--	.05**
Rural migrants/CEB	1,2,3	.19	.10	.06	.03**
	1,2	.19	.10	--	.04**

Note: * = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$

TABLE 8
DISTRIBUTIONS (NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE) OF
RESPONDENTS BY SOCIAL CLASS BY
CHILDREN EVER BORN: CALASIAO AND MIAGAO

Social Class and Children Ever Born	Calasiao		Miagao	
	Number	Percent.	Number	Percent.
Non-farm				
0-4	53	11	27	5
5-7	55	12	32	6
8 or more	71	15	45	9
Small Tenant				
0-4	16	3	20	4
5-7	21	5	42	8
8 or more	47	10	29	6
Medium Tenant				
0-4	2	*	9	2
5-7	7	2	27	5
8 or more	10	2	43	9
Small Owner				
0-4	38	8	49	10
5-7	45	10	42	8
8 or more	49	10	42	8
Medium Owner				
0-4	19	4	31	6
5-7	15	3	34	7
8 or more	21	5	33	7

Note: * = less than .5%

TABLE 9
 URBAN AND RURAL MIGRANTS PER 1000 CHILDREN
 (ADJUSTED FOR AGE) BY SOCIAL CLASS BY
 CHILDREN EVER BORN: CALASIAO AND MIAGAO

Social Class and Children Ever Born	Calasiao		Miaqao	
	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural
Non-farm				
0-4	52	6	85	88
5-7	49	15	99	54
8 or more	37	26	88	62
Small Tenant				
0-4	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>	62	29
5-7	<u>1</u>	13	91	41
8 or more	47	33	110	31
Medium Tenant				
0-4	<u>-11</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>-6</u>	<u>-8</u>
5-7	<u>-4</u>	<u>17</u>	45	32
8 or more	<u>32</u>	<u>7</u>	48	58
Small Owner				
0-4	13	10	105	36
5-7	33	22	77	41
8 or more	53	21	115	52
Medium Owner				
0-4	<u>6</u>	<u>-7</u>	68	75
5-7	<u>73</u>	<u>15</u>	44	31
8 or more	52	47	59	82

Note: Underlined numbers based on fewer than 20 cases.

31.

TABLE 10
 BETAS AND R-SQUARES FOR MULTIPLE CLASSIFICATION
 ANALYSES USING AGE AND SOCIAL CLASS-
 CHILDREN EVER BORN AS PREDICTORS OF URBAN
 AND RURAL MIGRANTS PER 1000 CHILDREN:
 CALASIAO AND MIAGAO

Municipality and Dependent Variable	Predictors	Betas		R ²
		1.Age	2.Class-CEB	
Calasiao				
Urban migrants/CEB	1,2	.17	.19	.03*
	1	.15	--	.02*
Rural migrants/CEB	1,2	.20	.20	.04**
	1	.19	--	.03**
Miagao				
Urban migrants/CEB	1,2	.20	.18	.04**
	1	.20	--	.03**
Rural migrants/CEB	1,2	.20	.16	.03*
	1	.20	--	.03**

Note: * = p<.05; ** = p<.01

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, James N. 1962. Some Aspects of Land and Society in a Pangasinan Community. *Philippine Sociological Review* 10:41-58.
- Andrews, Frank, James Morgan and John Sonquist. 1969. Multiple Classification Analysis: A Report on a Computer Program for Multiple Regression using Categorical Predictors. Ann Arbor: Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research.
- Carroll, John J. 1970. The Family in a Time of Change. In John J. Carroll et al. (eds.), *Philippine Institutions*. Manila: Solidaridad Publishing House. Pp. 10-16.
- Commission on Population. 1969. Statement on Population Policy and Program. In Vitaliano R. Gorospe, S.J. (ed.), *Responsible Parenthood in the Philippines*. Manila: Ateneo Publications Office. Pp. 253-257.
- Commission on Population and the American Future. 1972. *Population and the American Future*. New York: The New American Library, Inc.
- Concepción, Mercedes B. and Wilhelm Fliieger, 1968. Studies of Fertility and Family Planning in the Philippines. *Demography* 5:714-31.
- Eggan, Fred. 1968. Philippine Social Structure. In George M. Guthrie (ed.), *Six Perspectives on the Philippines*. Manila: Bookmark. Pp. 1-48.
- Goldscheider, Calvin. 1971. *Population, Modernization and Social Structure*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
- Gugler, Josef. 1969. On the Theory of Rural-Urban Migration: The Case of Sub-Saharan Africa. In J.A. Jackson (ed.), *Migration*. Cambridge (Great Britain): University Press. Pp. 134-55.
- Hendershot, Gerry E. 1969. Characteristics of Migrants to Manila and Other Urban Places from Two Rural Communities. Paper presented to the Third Conference on Population in Manila.
- _____. 1970. Cityward Migration and Urban Fertility in the Philippines. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Chicago.
- _____. 1971. Cityward Migration and Urban Fertility in the Philippines. *Philippine Sociological Review* 19:183-91.

- Lee, Everett S. 1966. A Theory of Migration. *Demography* 3: 47-57.
- Mitchell, J. Clyde. 1959. The Causes of Labor Migration. *Bulletin of the Inter-African Labour Institute* 6:12-47.
- Morrison, Peter A. 1971. Chronic Movers and the Future of Population: A Longitudinal Analysis. *Demography* 8:171-84.
- Murphy, Edmund M. 1968. Four Fertility Surveys. Quezon City (Philippines): JMC Press.
- Myrdal, Gunnar. 1968. *Asian Drama: An Inquiry into the Poverty of Nations*. New York: Pantheon.
- Smith, Peter C. 1971. Philippine Regional and Provincial Differentials in Marriage and Family Building: 1960. *Philippine Sociological Review* 19:159-81.
- Takahashi, Akira. 1969. *Land and Peasants in Central Luzon: Socio-Economic Structure of a Philippine Village*. Honolulu: East-West Center Press.

37