Migration Research and Policy Landscape
Case Studies of Australia, the Phillipines and Thailand

Robyn Iredale
Tim Turpin
Charles Hawksley
Stella Go
Supaphan Kanchai
Yee May Kuang
Edited by Kerry Lyon
# Table of Contents

Acknowledgements i
Contributors ii
Executive Summary iii

## Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Background 1
1.2 Role of international networks 1
1.3 Rationale for this project 2
1.4 Aims and goals 3
1.5 Research method 4
1.6 Outline of this report 6

## Chapter 2: Overview

2.1 Australia 7
2.2 Philippines 15
2.3 Thailand 20

## Chapter 3: Links between researchers, NGOs and policy makers

3.1 Australia 25
3.2 The Philippines 26
3.3 Thailand 27
3.4 Implications for migration researchers, the APMRN and country networks 29

## Chapter 4: Detailed Case Study of Australia

34

## Chapter 5: Detailed Case Study of Philippines

61

## Chapter 6: Detailed Case Study of Thailand

90

## Appendix A: List of Interviews in Australia

108

## Appendix B: List of Interviews in the Philippines

109

## Appendix C: List of Interviews in Thailand

110
Acknowledgements

The project was proposed by the Management of Social Transformations (MOST) programme of the Social and Human Sciences Sector of UNESCO. However, the APMRN Secretariat is responsible for the choice of presentation of the facts contained in this publication and for the opinions expressed therein.

The APMRN Secretariat thanks all those who participated in the planning meetings and who were interviewed for this study. For ethical reasons names of respondents have not been given or recorded against particular comments.

The authors gratefully acknowledge the financial support of the University of Wollongong to this study. The original research for this project is a contribution to the APMRN’s work on informing the policy making process connected to aspects of migration.

The designations employed, and the presentation of material throughout this publication, do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the UNESCO Secretariat concerning the legal status of any county, territory, city, or area of its authorities, or the delimitations of its frontiers or boundaries.
Contributors

Robyn Iredale is Secretariat Director of the APMRN and Associate Professor, School of Geosciences, University of Wollongong.

Tim Turpin is Professor, Centre for Research Policy and Innovation Studies, University of Wollongong.

Charles Hawksley was Secretariat Coordinator of the APMRN from July 2000 to February 2002 and is now Lecturer in History and Politics, University of Wollongong.

Stella Go is Associate Professor at De La Salle University, Manila and is a coordinator of the Philippines Migration Research Network.

Supaphan Kanchai and Yee May Kaung are researchers at the The Asian Research Center for Migration, Institute of Asian Studies, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand.
Executive Summary

Background

This project was initiated by Dr Nadia Auriat of UNESCO-MOST at the 3rd International Conference of the APMRN in Tokyo, September 1999. The aim was to investigate the links between policy makers and social scientific researchers in the Asia Pacific region. These links have been receiving greater attention in recent years. The UNESCO-MOST Programme has funded the APMRN since 1995 to assist with understanding migration and settlement policy in the Asia Pacific region. It began as a regional project based on the collaboration South Korea, Hong Kong; South East Asia (Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, Vietnam, the Philippines, Thailand) and the Pacific (Australia, New Zealand, and the countries of the Pacific Islands). In 2001, the APMRN expanded into South Asia (Bangladesh, Sri Lanka and India) and now involves scholars in 17 networks or economies. Personnel from international organisations, national governments and NGOs participate in local network meetings and in international activities.

Aims and research method

The project is concerned with the ways that research networks, such as the APMRN, inform the policy process. It is not, however, an evaluation of the APMRN. It is more a study into the extent to which, and how, migration research has an impact on migration policy. The aim has been to investigate this relationship generally, and then to consider the particular role of the APMRN.

Major findings and implications for migration research networks

Major findings that emerge from the study include the following:

1. knowledge of the political and economic context of each country varies and needs to be understood as it provides the context for policy making;
2. the relationship between research and policy processes varies considerably across countries — in some countries the policy process is 'tightly' managed by a single department (such as in Australia) while in others there is a more diverse administrative approach to migration policy (such as in Thailand);
3. the impact of research is more direct and conclusive when research has been commissioned directly by government or involves close collaboration with government;
4. migration policy processes in all case study countries appear increasingly responsive to public opinion, rather than the findings of academic research, and thus indicate the important (but more amorphous) indirect policy impact from academic research;
5. given this situation, the need to disseminate results widely is evident;
6. migration researchers are inevitably ‘biased’ towards certain methodologies and theoretical perspectives and therefore a wide range of opinions is valuable.
General lessons for migration research networks follow from these observations

1. The most striking impact of migration research on policy is through indirect mechanisms. Therefore, it is important that networks such as APMRN seek to influence public opinion as well as policy makers. Neither is an easy task. However, involving well organised and articulate NGOs in research networks should help inform the debates to which such NGOs contribute.

2. Researchers in the network should recognise that their research outcomes are unlikely to influence policy makers simply through academic publications. They will need to adopt 'dissemination mechanisms' to inform public debate in areas where their respective governments are either leading or being led by their electorates.

3. Since the most direct route to policy impact is through research directly commissioned by government agencies, research networks should explore 'inclusive' options for drawing government agencies into network debates. This might be through invitation to specially targeted workshops or through on-going representation within networks.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION
Robyn Iredale, Charles Hawksley and Tim Turpin

1.1 Background

Building links between policy makers and social scientific researchers in the Asia Pacific region has been receiving greater attention in recent years as governments have been urged to adopt strategies such as the World Bank's Comprehensive Development Frameworks (CDFs) and Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs). These strategies, in alliance with UN development agencies, are calling for greater cooperation between governments, civil society, the private sector and external agencies to develop more inclusive policy making options and methods. Independent scholarly research and international knowledge transfer is an important aspect of this process. However, as the demand for independent policy-oriented research in the Asia Pacific region has increased, it has become clear that there is a need to ensure that the results of such research can effectively reach policy makers and advisors. Linking research and policy not only provides policy makers with a solid base of knowledge but also helps in countering some of the pitfalls of internal decision-making.

One of the effects of globalisation has been on governance in the Asia Pacific region. Local, national and regional policy makers have been put under increasing pressure to design and implement effective solutions for sustainable and equitable development. National governments have also become increasingly more aware of the interconnectedness of societies and economies. Nowhere was this more evident than after the Asian financial crisis of 1997-98, when governments were forced to re-assess their relationship with civil society and the private sector, as well as with regional and international agencies and economic fora. They were forced to adjust their social and economic policies as the crisis triggered civil unrest and social crises and highlighted the nexus between social policy and economic matters.

1.2 Role of international networks

Within this context, various international networks have been established to promote and co-ordinate independent research dealing with global issues, but focusing on specific countries. Recent examples of such networks are the Asia Pacific Migration Research Network (APMRN), the Science and Technology Policy Asian Network

(STEPAN) and the Science and Technology Management Arab Region Network (STEMARN). These networks all receive some support through UNESCO and serve as cross-cutting networks that work closely with national governments and other international agencies. Other examples of networks are the Coastal Resources Research Network, the Global Urban Research Initiative, the Learning for Environmental Action Program, the Canadian Aging Research Network and the Metropolis Network. While it is clear that these networks serve an important role in co-ordinating and disseminating research and training activities, it is not entirely clear how effective they are at informing national policies. For this reason, UNESCO encouraged an investigation of the impact of one network, the APMRN.

The APMRN was established in 1995 as a project of UNESCO-MOST’s (Management of Social Transformations) Programme to assist with understanding migration and settlement policy in the Asia Pacific region. It began as a regional project based on the collaboration of migration and ethnic relations scholars in the countries of East Asia (China, Japan, South Korea, Hong Kong); South East Asia (Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, Vietnam, the Philippines, Thailand) and the Pacific (Australia, New Zealand, and the countries of the Pacific Islands). In 2001, the APMRN expanded into South Asia (Bangladesh, Sri Lanka and India) and now involves scholars in seventeen networks or economies. Personnel from international organisations, national governments and NGOs participate in local network meetings and in international activities. The Chair and Deputy Chair are rotating positions. The APMRN Secretariat is based at the University of Wollongong, Australia.

The main concerns of the APMRN are twofold: to increase awareness of the long-term effects of migration and ethno-cultural diversity as factors of social transformation; and to contribute to strategies to develop effective policy responses to alleviate poverty affected by migration. One of the APMRN’s strengths is its academic independence from government. However, partnerships with policy-making bodies in government and other agencies are essential to ensure that scholarly research provides realistic solutions and recommendations that work within policy-making mechanisms and frameworks in the different countries of the region.

1.3 Rationale for this project

The process of making policy is not always sufficiently well informed. Further, the inherent imperatives for quick responses from policy makers usually allows only short time-frames that do not permit sufficient opportunity for consultation, and

---

2 See Stein, J. et al. (2001) for an evaluation of these networks, with the exception of Metropolis.
3 Taiwan is an informal member of the APMRN.
4 Professor Vijay Naidu (University of the South Pacific, Fiji) is the current APMRN Chair and is assisted by four Deputy Chairs, one each from North East Asia, South East Asia, the Pacific region, and South Asia.
gathering and assembling necessary information and knowledge. Government agencies seek to overcome these difficulties by generating information databases, developing networks of informants and carrying out research into areas that they believe will best inform their policy making and assessment.

Knowing what needs to be known is an important and obvious prerequisite for the task of effective policy making. It is not, however, always so clear-cut as to what it is that needs to be known. For short-term issues, such as the implementation and management of policy initiatives and responding to new issues once they emerge, the question is less problematic. But for longer term planning — policy evaluation and pre-empting new issues before they reach crisis point — the question is far more complex.

1.4 Aim and goals of the project

This project is concerned with the ways that research networks, such as the APMRN, inform the policy process. It is not, however, an evaluation of the APMRN. It is more a study into the extent to which, and how, migration research has an impact on migration policy. The aim has been to investigate this problem generally with a specific emphasis on the particular role of the APMRN. The project investigates the relationship between migration research and migration policy making by means of an analysis of the policy making nexus in three of the APMRN's 17 networks in the Asia Pacific region. It focuses on three countries with differing migration histories: Australia, as a traditional country of immigration and settlement; the Philippines, as a country of out-migration, particularly labour migration, and Thailand, which has both significant migration inflows and outflows.

The study examines the policy environments and receptiveness of these three governments toward migration research, particularly that produced by academics. However, Non-Government Organisations (NGOs) were also consulted on their research activities and strategies to influence policy and their perceptions of the policy making environment. Specifically we looked at:

- the receptiveness of governments to migration research
- the operations of the APMRN networks in Australia, the Philippines and Thailand;
- the possible role of the APMRN in providing migration policy makers with advice and recommendations; and
- the potential impact of the APMRN in broadening participation in government planning and policy.
The study will make some observations on the work and value of these three networks of the APMRN in particular but it is hoped that the findings will contribute to improved strategies for the development of similar research networks.

1.5 Research method

This study was initially conceived as a pilot project to inform UNESCO of the policy climate in three countries and to explore options for generating greater impact from migration research networks. The research was undertaken in the following five steps.

1. Selection of participating countries and identification of research teams (Jan-Feb 2001)

Three countries were selected to participate in the survey: a developing country of emigration (Philippines); a developing country of in-migration (Thailand); and a developed country with a settled migrant population (Australia). Comparative analysis of how developed societies mobilise research and policy resources is an important feature of the pilot survey, and as migration and settlement policy is affected by external and regional pressures, a sending country and a receiving country were also selected.

The APMRN co-ordinator in Thailand, Supang Chantavanich of the Asian Research Centre for Migration (AMRM), and the Executive of the Philippine Migration Research Network (PMRN) were approached to assist in assembling a research team and organising participants to come to national workshops. The APMRN Secretariat in University of Wollongong co-ordinated the Australian study.

2. National workshops to identify issues in each country (March-May 2001)

NGOs, international agencies and specific government departments using social science research in the area of migration and social transformations were listed for each country. A select number of participants were invited to attend national workshops to identify issues for stakeholders (NGOs, government & researchers) during 2001. These workshops were held in Manila on 23 March, Canberra on 11 May and Bangkok on 5 June. These workshops identified potential interviewees as well as the types of questions that needed to be asked.

3. Design questionnaires and select survey targets from government, NGOs and research institutions (May-July 2001)

The APMRN Secretariat designed a questionnaire for Australia that was adapted for use in the Philippines and Thailand. Three main groups were identified as being of importance in the policy making process: government policy makers; NGOs, and researchers/academics. Ten representatives from each group was the ideal survey sample size but this was not always possible. The major topics pursued with each group were as follows:
Government policy makers
- Quantity of migration research, and the basis on which it is commissioned;
- The development processes for migration policy;
- Relationship between government and civil sector (the community consultation processes);
- Knowledge of the existence of the APMRN and individual country networks or of individual APMRN members working in the area of migration; and
- Use of APMRN research outputs.

Relevant NGOs/other research users
- Quality and quantity of field research generated internally and its use value for government policy makers;
- Strategies and processes in place to inform government of grassroots issues;
- Links with wider academic community;
- Links with the APMRN and its members; and
- Value and uses of APMRN research.

Researchers/academics
- Impressions of how policy process worked;
- Availability of funding for migration research;
- Level of consultation by government on policy issues;
- Links with government and NGOs;
- Media strategies for getting research into wider community;
- Knowledge of APMRN; and
- Ways to facilitate better positioning of APMRN research product in networks.

4. Administration of the survey (August-November 2001)
Country-level investigators assembled research teams and conducted their own interviews from August to November 2001. Interviewees were in the main selected from the national issues workshops. Interviewees were guaranteed anonymity and most interviews were conducted over the phone or by email, although some were face-to-face.

5. Analysis of results and drafting of country reports and overview (October 2001-February 2002)
Once country reports were completed the analysis of data for the overview report was conducted at the University of Wollongong. This overview reviews the approach to research and knowledge-gathering taken by Australian, Thai and Filipino migration policy makers.
1.6 Outline of this report

Chapter 2 of this report consists of the overview that has been compiled by the chief investigators and research assistant. This may be read as a separate document as it summarises the main findings of the three case studies. Chapter 3 discusses the implications for the research-policy linkage and the role of networks, specifically the APMRN.

Chapters 4, 5 and 6 contain the three country studies: Australia, the Philippines and Thailand in the format in which they were prepared. Only minor editing has been undertaken on these reports as their value lies in the uniqueness of each detailed case study. The differences between these three case studies demonstrates that they can only be used as examples as there is wide variation between the policy-making context of each country. They are not ‘exemplars’ but examples of the way that political processes in different countries respond to migration research in the formulation of policy.
Research may contribute directly to policy formulation or it may do so in an indirect manner. In the direct way, a government agency may commission a report and then accept and implement some, or all of its recommendations. Indirectly, migration research may also come to influence government migration policy by affecting public debate through the media or by gaining acceptance within a government agency. In the latter case it is slowly absorbed into the bureaucratic agenda and eventually becomes policy. Likewise migration research may provide NGOs with findings that they can use to urge policy shifts. Alternatively, it may inform the policy of an opposition party that may then press for change, or later form government and implement changes.

The investigation of the effects of migration research on migration policy making in the three case studies indicates that it is easiest to show a direct effect from research to policy — where specific research is commissioned and then acted upon. The indirect effects are more common but much more difficult to quantify. Showing the indirect links is problematic but, nevertheless, essential as most policy making occurs through a combination of political and bureaucratic processes. From our analysis of the present study, it is through these more indirect processes that research networks take on an important role.

The main findings of each of the case studies are summarised below. Chapter 3 then examines the nature of links between researchers and policy makers and the implications of the findings for migration research, and the APMRN in particular.

### 2.1 Australia

**Overview of current migration trends**

Australia is largely a ‘nation of immigrants’ and migration continues to provide about half of the annual population increase. Permanent immigration is comprised of the ‘Migration Program’ (around 70,000) and the ‘Humanitarian Program’ (around 8,000). Temporary migration has increased by 73 per cent from 1992, to 8,164,549 in 2000. Most of these people come on short-term visas and return home eventually but some become permanent. Australia also experiences emigration and so, on balance, gains around 40,000 people per year from migration.

The key trends over the last five years are:
increased emphasis on skilled migration that is fully self-funded (travel, visa applications, assessment of qualifications, health and unemployment costs) under the Coalition Government of John Howard, since 1996;

- a significant down-sizing of migrant support services that is making it difficult for new arrivals (lack of English language programs, labour market programs, etc) and is placing a much greater burden on ethnic communities, especially women, to support new arrivals;

- family migration has diminished as a proportion of the intake;

- policy towards refugees has focused on taking only UNHCR-defined refugees and various measures to discourage asylum seekers from arriving — mandatory detention (introduced by Hawke Labor Government in the late 1980s), reduced access to lawyers, the courts and other related agencies.

- some extreme measures of turning boatloads of asylum seekers away and paying Pacific states to set up detention centres and process applications for refugee status came into play in 2001;

- the number of overseas students coming to Australia has escalated rapidly from 65,000 in 1991-92 to 95,607 in 2000;

- temporary migration increased by 73 per cent from 1992 to 2000 and temporary entrants can now switch to permanent fairly readily.

Profile of migration research
Research into immigration and its effects on society is carried out and funded by a small number of agencies. Universities are the major source of research since the demise of the Bureau of Immigration, Multicultural and Population Research (BIMPR) in 1996. There is little privately funded research in Australia, due to the absence of private foundations of the type that occur in the United States and Japan.

High-quality statistical data are readily available on most topics. The Australia Bureau of Statistics (ABS) conducts five-yearly censuses as well as labour market and other surveys. The figures are usually broken down by birthplace, allowing comparative work on first but not second-generation immigrants. The former BIMPR provided excellent data and the Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs (DIMIA) has continued with some of these data. The Longitudinal Survey of Immigrants to Australia (LSIA) data set may be purchased from DIMIA. Government departments have done some research in this area in the past and the major agency now conducting or contracting research is DIMIA.

University research centres with a focus on this area have diminished significantly over the last five years. Individual university academics and students continue to carry out research on immigration and ethnic relation issues. Their main source of funding is the Australian Research Council (ARC) which allocates grants on a competitive basis. Private consultants are no longer a significant component in this field as the level of government funding has diminished significantly in recent years.
Limitations of this research

A total of 33 interviews were conducted with key informants: 12 with policy makers in state and commonwealth government departments, 11 with representatives of Non-Government Organisations and 10 with academics/researchers. Interview were not-taped but the interviewers keyed information in when speaking over the telephone or wrote up face-to-face discussions immediately afterwards from notes.

Possible limitations on the survey are that people can only respond to the questions asked. Government bureaucrats, in particular, were loath to be recorded as saying anything and DIMIA provided only written answers. Academics tended to be less concerned about possible ramifications from comments made about the government but some NGOs were particularly guarded in what they had to say due to the fact they receive financial support from the government.

Policy context

The role of the state in determining migration (and settlement) policy is very pronounced in Australia. Freeman and Birrell (2001: 546) describe the role of the current minister, Philip Ruddock, as 'a strong and knowledgeable minister willing to use his departmental [DIMIA] advisers to reshape policy.' For a decade now, according to some analysts, the department has sought to insulate itself from political, ethnic and judicial interference through the creation of a 'rule-based decision-making regime' (Bruer and Power, 1993: 122) — the assumption being that popular support for the program depends on the widely held view that it is well managed or filled with 'integrity', as the Minister and Prime Minister often say. Given the current Prime Minister’s propensity for restricting immigration, especially from Asia, the Coalition 'has been prepared to defy the interest groups that were dominant clients in the 1980s because of its larger concern to quiet populist fears' (Freeman and Birrell, 2001: 546).

Migration legislation, especially of the restrictive type, is subject to great scrutiny and to many obstacles in the U.S. but this scrutiny is also absent in Australia (with the exception of the Democrats and the Greens). The immigration rights-based movement that is pronounced in the U.S. and Canada has barely raised its head in Australia and/or has been legislated out of being able to play a role. Popular opinion, according to Freeman and Birrell (2001: 548) is readily mobilised and volatile in Australia and 'more efficiently translated into pressures on governments.'

A quite extensive community consultation process is undertaken each year by DIMIA. State-based migration agencies and migrant resource centres generally provide the focus for such consultations and community groups, such as the Ethnic Communities Councils, provide consolidated input from their constituent agencies. DIMIA-commissioned research and statistics provide a major reference point for much of their input.
Understanding this context and the role of the electorate in the current climate is crucial for interpreting the approach to migration research and the responses from the three groups.

**Approaches to migration research**

**Policy makers’ responses**

Migration policy makers' approach to research operates at three different levels. First, there are those who are deeply involved in the policy formulation process, the Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs (DIMIA), which is responsible for what is described as a 'whole of government' approach to migration. DIMIA policy makers are essentially charged with formulating and implementing national migration policy. At a second level, there are policy makers in Commonwealth agencies that contribute to the whole of government process but, in addition, are required to provide services and formulate and implement their specific portfolio policies within the prevailing migration context. This includes Commonwealth agencies such as the Department of Education, Science and Technology (DEST) and the Department of Family and Community Services (FACS). At a third level, there are state agencies responsible for multicultural affairs. They too are consulted in the development of the national approach to immigration policy but their prime concern is with steering state-based services in managing the implications of the national migration policy.

DIMIA is the lead agency in this process, but there is considerable and regular input from other Commonwealth agencies. DIMIA’s approach to research is at first glance quite broad based: it has an internal process for collecting and monitoring data, and receives input from its program branches in order to 'identify research needs.' They also draw information from their representatives at overseas posts. Cross-departmental research input is provided through agencies such as the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS), DEST, FACS and the Department of Employment and Workplace Relations (DEWR). Joint research is sometimes commissioned with these departments.

Research is also commissioned directly by DIMIA to outside consultants, including academic researchers. This commissioned research includes short-term issue specific projects as well as some quite detailed longitudinal studies. However, the research problem, the research questions and, to a fairly considerable extent, the methodology are determined by DIMIA prior to the commissioning of research. Other Commonwealth agencies contribute some research outcomes that inform the ‘whole of government’ approach but these are generally from their own portfolio perspective. It is interesting to note that a major input to these ‘other agency’ research questions is derived from the research and data provided by the lead agency, DIMIA.

---

5 See footnote in the Australian report in chapter 4 for detail.
At the international level, DIMIA research draws on selected international bodies with similar responsibilities, overarching bodies such as International Organization for Migration (IOM), Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and UNESCO. DIMIA also uses its own staff in foreign embassies and the broader public domain of international research literature.

Non-Government Organisations' (NGOs')/International Agencies' (IAs') responses

Very little research is being done by NGOs in Australia at present. Some manage to collect basic statistics, monitor the media, conduct limited surveys and collect anecdotal information on issues of concern. One organisation stated that it 'only collects statistics that state 'facts' as no government will fund a body that criticises it.' In general, organisations funded by DIMIA are reluctant to criticise government policy for fear of political or funding retribution (although there is no evidence to suggest that this has happened).

NGOs mostly rely on the Federation of Ethnic Communities Councils of Australia (FECCA), academics and professional researchers to provide them with information. FECCA itself does little research and stressed the problem of little independent research being done these days. One group stated that there is limited research conducted on these topics in universities now due to the 'corporatisation' of universities and the demise of most 'pure' research. Other groups rely on bodies such as the Refugee Council of Australia (RCA), the National Council of Churches and the Catholic Bishops Conference, or on university students working as voluntary or part-time researchers. Few have the resources or desire to make input to government inquiries or consultations.

One exception is the RCA which is able to fund research by two people on topics agreed to in collaboration with DIMIA. The RCA do not undertake research that is not in their interests. Topics include submissions on the annual intake, settlement services, guardianship models for unaccompanied minors, family unity, the notion of 'exclusion' in the refugee convention and humanitarianism. Ideas for research come from the RCA Board. The RCA produces reports that are written in a non-academic way so that they will inform both the political process and the public. They use, as a model, research conducted for the European Council on Refugees and Exiles — as it is research written with policy in mind.

NGOs noted considerable value in research but are not in a position to conduct it themselves — either because of resource limitations or political sensitivities. They sometimes look to academics who they can collaborate with but they are usually hampered in this by a lack of money to contribute to projects. Priority research areas that NGOs identified are: the UNHCR refugee convention and its appropriateness to current needs; asylum seekers and determination processes; alternative detention models; the impact of 'illegal' migration; the balance of Australia's immigration program; health and family issues with migrants; people smuggling, and Australia's
international obligations. This list opens up a wide range of pressing research questions and is indicative of the general level of dissatisfaction with current focus of government commissioned research.

**Academics' responses**

Perceptions of academics interviewed on current migration policy-making processes vary widely. More than half of those interviewed believe that government policy is devised by a small number of influential members of cabinet who pursue an agenda that is generally opposed to multiculturalism and immigration. Others argued that the situation is more complex.

Academic researchers generally noted that economic issues and the effects on the labour market are the main concern of the government with respect to migration and that this perspective largely drives government policy: skilled migration is one area of migration from which policy makers can see substantial benefit. Respondents were generally critical of this, noting that the emphasis on skills, which has mostly short-term benefits (ie maintaining the current migration intake) ignores the long-term impacts of migration. In contrast, research interests of those interviewed (in no particular order) are:

- skilled migration;
- international immigration trends (longitudinal surveys);
- economic and labour market effects of migration;
- urban dimensions;
- social and cultural consequences of immigration policy;
- cultural diversity in marketing;
- settlement and language services, including access and equity;
- migrant education and social justice;
- multicultural education;
- ethnic youth issues;
- emigration; and
- population and sustainable development.

The politics of migration is another concern identified as a driving force in migration policy making. The populist appeal to disenfranchised voters of the centre and right of the political spectrum is seen as dominating government thinking on migration. This is accompanied by an apparent disavowal of the multicultural ideal that had, until recently, been advocated in Australia by governments of both sides of politics in bipartisan agreement. A smaller number of academic researchers expressed the view that the desire among politicians to retain power conditioned the appeal to anti-immigration prejudice which is exemplified in the emphasis on exerting greater control over Australia's borders.
Pressure groups were seen by four academics as being important to the policy making process: including business groups (some of which have advocated an increased immigration policy); community groups (representing people of specific ethnic backgrounds, refugees and asylum seekers), and concerned members of the public. The open fora provided by DIMIA and attended by the Minister, that were described above are part of this process. Policy formulation was thus seen as a complex process of interacting groups, interests, advocacy and bureaucracy.

No academic mentioned research as a major factor in migration policy-making. Seven interviewees noted that government policy does not reflect independent research. Only two researchers could identify some effect of their independent research on government policy but even then, this occurred more by osmosis where ideas and findings worked their way upwards over months or years, until picked up by the government. Another academic noted that research provides a setting for policy debates and frames the parameters of that debate but maintained politics is still the dominant factor.

There was general agreement that since the government’s decision to abolish the Bureau of Immigration, Multicultural and Population Research (BIMPR) in 1996 the quantity of migration research has declined. There is an identified lack of support for migration research due to the end of the BIMPR and the cutting of DIMIA’s research budget. Funding for basic migration research has effectively dried up. Research consists mainly of the collection of statistics or applied research for solving a particular problem or answering a particular question. The general feeling expressed was that there are now fewer research consultancies being offered, and even those are being taken up by consultancy groups that focus on economic rather than social issues. Government policy interest in research appears limited to:

- settlement, through the LSIA;
- housing, although this is not direct government research; and
- economic effects, through using consultant economists and large consulting companies.

A common problem for those seeking to influence policy is getting their voices heard and research read, although six academics said that they do not attempt to influence policy. When seeking to devise policy, the Australian government from time to time holds inquiries and invites submissions. Half of those interviewed make regular submissions to government committees. One researcher has a very active program of information release that involves cultivating a relationship with the print media. Their press releases are picked up as news articles and this helps to shape the public debate. Another uses access to policy makers and all interested parties (government and opposition) and two contribute articles on their research to the media.
All ten felt that government funding is more difficult to obtain now than was the case five or ten years previously. Academic research is mostly supported by their own tertiary institutions but some attract financial assistance from consultancies, on non-immigration related matters, and this subsidises their immigration research. In the light of this 'funding drought' for research, most academics either do their own research or employ postgraduates and casual academics to collect materials. Australian migration researchers have little research support through their academic units and most are working alone on projects. Home institutions pay their basic salary and provide them with the freedom to pursue their research interest but little support for field-work or data analysis. They mainly rely on international and domestic journals to publicise their research, with book chapters and books, government reports and opinion pieces making up the remainder of locations where research is published.

In terms of implementation there are few occasions in which academics can claim some success in influencing government policy and all were before 1996. No interviewees could identify an area where their research recommendations had been fully implemented as policy. One researcher proposed that for academic research to influence government policy the academic debate had to first shape the public debate, as the public debate is the factor to which politicians respond. This fits in with the point made by Freeman and Birrell (2001) where they argue that in the present policy environment it is the electorate rather than research that is most influential in steering policy in Australia.

A project on 'serial sponsorship' (repeated sponsorship of spouses from abroad by one person) that was commissioned in 1992 by the Immigration Department did result in substantial policy shift (Iredale, Innes and Castles, 1992). The impetus for the research project emerged as result of the high level of public debate and media attention on the disappearance of, and domestic violence towards, women who had been sponsored as spouses from overseas. While the government officials at the time were skeptical of any likelihood of change, all recommendations were eventually implemented. Some recommendations related to human rights violations and were implemented while others (especially the control over number of sponsorships that one person could engage in) were implemented by the Coalition after 1996 as a means of curbing spouse migration.

**Summary**

Migration and migration research has a long history in Australia. Australia's White Australia Policy that prevailed until the late 1960s-early 1970s was a period of limited research and tight government control over policy. The 1970s saw the elimination of race as a factor in selection, the emergence of a consensus between the two major parties and the movement from an 'assimilationist' to a multicultural settlement policy. Research has mainly focused on permanent arrivals and their impact but in recent years temporary arrivals and emigration have become important. Research was at its peak in the early 1990s.
Unlike the situation of the 1980s and early 1990s, migration researchers are now faced with a climate that does not appear to welcome or encourage independent research. Academics can only pursue small projects using their own or their universities' resources. NGOs have been allocated a specific service-delivery role in the post-settlement services in Australia and are generally unable to undertake research on immigration 'policy issues', which is considered to be the exclusive province of DIMIA. Government researchers on immigration and related issues accept that the current government has limited and controlled research funding from DIMIA. What funding exists is directed toward Australian conditions and the impacts of migration on the Australian community and towards particular researchers.

2.2 The Philippines

**Overview of current migration trends**

After more than a quarter of a century of experience in the export of labour, fuelled largely by emigration pressures built up over long years of economic and political mismanagement, the Philippines today has become the largest exporter of human capital in Asia. Labor migration looms large in the national consciousness and the country continues to be challenged not only by its human consequences but also by other politically sensitive and socially complex issues that accompany it.

Today, Filipinos migrate to more than 100 countries in the world. Empirical evidence reveals the following patterns regarding international migration in the mid-1980s and 1990s:

- the increasing primacy of temporary labor migration over permanent migration;
- the increasing prominence of Asia as a work destination and the decline in importance of the Middle East as a job site;
- the increasing feminization of labor migration; and
- the continued importance of foreign remittances to the Philippine economy.

**Profile of migration research**

Since 1975, considerable research has been conducted on various aspects of international migration from the Philippines. This has resulted in a wealth of knowledge that has been compiled in two annotated bibliographies documenting 745 studies that have been undertaken between 1975 and 1997 (see country report for details).

A review of the international migration research literature in the Philippines between 1975 and 1998 reveals that most of the empirical studies undertaken on the various aspects of the migration phenomenon have been conducted by researchers based in universities or research institutions outside of government. The topics under investigation have been varied and wide-ranging reflective of the freedom that
academics generally have to explore and push the frontiers of knowledge.

Several factors have shaped migration research in the Philippines. In her review of migration research in the Philippines from 1975-1995, Yukawa (1996) succinctly summarizes four key factors:

1. the desire to describe or analyze a phenomenon and its context as it unfolds;
2. new developments in migration theory;
3. policy interests; and
4. availability of funding and resources.

Non-government organizations conduct their own studies that focus on topics of special interest to them and to the advocacy that they champion. They recognize the importance of presenting evidence to back up their policy or program advocacy. As with academic researchers, NGOs must seek funding support from outside the organization.

On the other hand, although the Philippine Migrants Rights Watch (PMRW), a network of ten NGOs, does not do research as an organization, some of its NGO members do. This is particularly true of the Scalabrini Migration Center (SMC) and the Institute on Church and Social Issues (ICSI) which have research as one of their primary functions.

International organizations in the Philippines, such as the International Organization for Migration (IOM) and the International Labor Organization (ILO) support migration-related researches undertaken by academic or research institutions and NGOs. However, in the case of IOM, it is interested, not so much in supporting researches in the Philippines that influence policy, but in studies that lead to programs, activities or services that benefit migrants.

Within the Department of Labor and Employment (DOLE), the government agency that makes policies affecting international labor migration, hardly any formal research on the various aspects of the phenomenon have been done through the years. Its attached agencies, the Philippine Overseas Employment Administration (POEA) and the Overseas Workers Welfare Administration (OWWA) have their own research units and a research budget. A positive development was the drawing up of a three-year research agenda by DOLE in October 2001 and the institutionalization of an annual research conference. The various units within DOLE will conduct in-house studies related to different aspects of labor and employment in the Philippines.

Investigations into the phenomenon of international migration from the Philippines by local and foreign researchers have been undertaken at the macro and micro-levels. These studies have looked into the following:
1. migration patterns and trends
2. relationship between migration, development and macro-economic factors
3. labour recruitment
4. effects of migration on individuals, families and communities
5. migration determinants and decision-making
6. women in migration
7. migration policy and management
8. welfare and the rights of migrant workers

Research on these topics have been country or region specific. Most of them have focused on migration to the Asian region and specific countries in it, followed by studies of Filipino migration to the United States.

Limitations of this research
Interviews were conducted with 13 people: six policy makers (three in the executive and three legislators), four representatives of NGOs and three researchers. One of the major difficulties of this study was getting appointments with key informants, particularly policy makers in Congress and the Department of Labor and Employment (DOLE). During the data-gathering period, Congress was busy with the budgetary hearings for the 2002 fiscal year and officials of various departments had to appear in Congress to defend their proposed budgets. Consequently, in cases where the busy schedules of policy makers made it impossible to set a date for an interview, the key informants had to be dropped and substitutes were found.

Among the NGOs, the head of the seafarers union refused the request for an interview outright. Two other NGOs that were selected as key informants were likewise dropped after three follow-ups for appointments yielded negative results. Because of their hectic schedules, appointments for an interview could not be obtained for seven policy makers from the Senate (2), the House of Representatives (2), the Department of Labor and Employment (2), and the Commission on Filipinos Overseas (1).

Because of the qualitative nature of this study, the impact of research on policy was largely perceptual rather than quantitatively measured using objective indicators. Moreover, the study could have benefited from the additional information available from the other identified key informants among the NGOs and the policy makers who could not be interviewed for reasons beyond the control of the researcher.

Policy context
In the Philippines, the formulation of government policy occurs within the legislative and executive branches of government. On the legislative front, Congress, through legislative action, enacts the laws and the appropriate department within the executive branch of government formulates the necessary implementing rules and regulations governing the laws. Policies emanating from the executive branch may come in the form of department orders or memorandum circulars. Public policy making at the
legislative level is often a long and tedious process that is influenced by an interplay of multiple factors from the personal to the social and the political. The passage of a bill into law is affected by the following:

1. the strength of the public clamor;
2. the endorsement of the President of the Philippines;
3. the legislative priorities of the chairman of the committee in the House of Representatives or the Senate to which the bill has been submitted; and
4. the interpersonal relations between the legislator sponsoring the bill and the chairman of the relevant committee of the House of Representatives or the Senate and/or the legislators' technical staff and secretary and technical staff of the said committee.

Generally, the initiative for the bills that are filed and sponsored by the senators and congressman, including migration-related bills, comes from either the legislator, an NGO or other interest groups. The technical staff of the legislator may assist in drafting the bill, or the legislator may approach the relevant government agency to request technical support in formulating the bill. On the other hand, the initiative for filing a bill may come from an NGO or an interest group that submits a draft of a bill to the legislator whose sponsorship it is seeking.

The law that governs various aspects of international migration, both temporary and permanent, is Republic Act 8042 (the Migrant Workers and Overseas Filipinos Act of 1995). This law is designed to establish a higher standard of protection for migrant workers, their families and other overseas Filipinos. The Department of Labor and Employment (DOLE) and the Department of Foreign Affairs (DFA) formulated the rules and regulations accompanying R.A. 8042. DOLE was responsible for the rules and regulations governing temporary labour migration while those that governed permanent migration (emigration) were drawn up by the DFA. The Philippine Overseas Employment Administration (POEA) and the Overseas Workers Welfare Administration (OWWA) are the implementing agencies within DOLE and the Commission on Filipinos Overseas (CFO) is the implementing arm of DFA. While the law is not easily amended, the implementing rules and regulations are periodically reviewed and amended as the need arises.

**Approaches to migration research**

**Policy makers' responses**

The prevailing policy environment in the Philippines leaves much to be desired. Policy-making in this country has been described as 'satisficing' rather than rational

---

*Satisficing is a social psychological concept where a decision-maker chooses a course of action that is not necessarily the best but 'good enough' the combination of satisfy and suffice produces a 'satisficing choice'.*
in its approach. Consequently, policy makers are willing to settle for what is 'good enough' rather than what is best (Gonzalez, 1998). Policy decisions are often arrived at based on incomplete information and without the benefit of systematic research.

While the importance of policy decisions based on systematic research was articulated by the policy makers interviewed in the study, they are also quick to admit that very little of the work that is done by academic and research institutions is directly utilised in the policy-making process. All other informants in the study support this observation unanimously. Moreover, even when consultative dialogues with experts are conducted 'these are often used to legitimise predetermined decisions made in the interest of particular groups' (Center for Integrative and Development Studies, 2000). It was precisely for this reason that one of the key informants in the study discontinued his participation in one such consultation meeting related to R.A. 8042.

Given the policy environment described above, policy advocates, including researchers and NGOs, spend a lot of time lobbying, negotiating and networking with politicians and other decision-makers in government.

**NGOs'/IAs' responses**

Of all the policy advocates, NGOs are generally the most driven and tenacious and this is also true of NGOs representing the interests of migrant workers. Many migrant NGOs include legislative advocacy as one of their major activities while others limit their policy advocacy to the departmental level where they try to influence policy decisions that have a direct impact on the groups and sectors they represent.

To influence policy, NGOs have used various strategies to exert pressure and to be heard. They lobby in Congress, dialogue and negotiate with decision-makers, do research and build formal and informal networks with policy makers and other NGOs. They also utilise the print and broadcast media to make their positions heard. Because there is strength in numbers, one strategy which some of the NGOs have adopted to increase their effectiveness in influencing policy is to organise formal networks or coalitions among themselves.

**Academics' responses**

Efforts of migration researchers to directly influence migration-related policies in Congress and in the executive branch of government over the last 25 years have been extremely limited, particularly those in universities. None of those interviewed reported helping to draft bills, lobbying in Congress, or sending policy briefs, executive summaries or copies of their research reports on a regular basis to legislators or policy makers in relevant government agencies. Two studies conducted in 1997 under the auspices of the Center of Integrative and Development Studies of the University of the Philippines (Samonte, 1997; Baviera, Asis, and Tigno, 1997) are exceptions. These researchers attempted to directly influence migration policy on domestic helpers in relation to the impending hand-over of Hong Kong to China.
Because of the lack of follow-through and the fact that the hand-over was overtaken by the Asian financial crisis, it is unclear whether or not these studies made any concrete impact on policy.

Academic researchers continuously maintain links with NGOs and policy makers in government agencies on an informal basis. In research dissemination seminars, conferences, and other migration fora organised by researchers and research institutions, policy makers, particularly in the relevant government agencies, are generally invited as speakers or as participants. Although decision-makers in government rarely attend, unless they have a specific part in the activity, representatives are almost always sent. How much gets fed back to the policy makers cannot be ascertained. Invitations are also extended to NGOs. However, senators and congressmen who constitute an important group of policy makers have rarely been invited to these activities. The attempt to maintain informal links is reciprocal and NGOs and government agencies invite researchers as speakers or resource persons in activities that they organise.

International groups such as the International Organization for Migration (IOM) and the International Labor Organization (ILO) indirectly try to influence migration policy by providing the opportunity for policy makers, NGOs and researchers to come together for dialogue and exchange on policy issues; by conducting or providing funds for migration research and research dissemination to policy makers, and through moral persuasion.

Summary
The Philippines is primarily concerned with the emigration of temporary workers and the loss of skilled human resources on a permanent basis. The rights, conditions and impacts of their population working overseas are of major concern to families, NGOs and the government. But almost all of the key informants in the study were of the opinion that research, particularly scholarly, academic research, has very little or no impact on migration policy in the Philippines. While this may be their perception, it is difficult to measure the actual effects because many factors come into play in the process of decision-making at the policy level.

2.3 Thailand

Overview of current migration trends
The nature of migratory flows in Thailand covers refugees, immigrant workers from neighbouring countries, Thai migrant workers, and international tourists. Key trends over the last ten years are:

- 1.63 million Thai workers migrated abroad for employment;
emigration flows for employment in 1990s shifted from the Middle East to Asia Pacific destinations. Taiwan, Korea, Japan, Hong Kong, Singapore, Brunei and Malaysia are new destinations;
most destination countries in the Asia Pacific have cut the number of unskilled migrant workers in their countries. This directly affects Thai workers who are predominantly unskilled, who then migrate through illegal recruiting agencies or networks of friends and relatives;
the number of immigrant workers increased steadily and the government started to be aware of the problem. By 1996, the estimated number of migrant workers in Thailand had increased to one million. The vast majority of these migrants were undocumented and the largest group came from Myanmar;
in 1999-2000 the government announced it would allow 106,684 workers to be employed in 18 jobs in 34 provinces but, due to the lack of a clear policy and poor legal enforcement, the control of migrant worker numbers has failed.

Profile of migration research
Migration research is a relatively new field of study in Thailand. Some key themes of migration research are labour migration; border controls and border economies; sex workers; domestic workers; and legal and illegal migration. In the 1990s, studies on emigration focussed on remittances from migrants and their developmental impact, and the causes and consequences of Asia’s new migrations. Protection for Thai migrant workers abroad was of great concern. Research on immigration included studies on HIV/AIDS and population movement, economic development linked with the Thai commercial sex sector, trafficking of Burmese women in Thailand and the health of Cambodians in Thai refugee camps.

The economic crisis of 1997 led to increased studies by academics, international organisations and NGOs. Research into the safety and protection of women workers, social impacts on households as a result of the women migrating and the reduction of service fees and costs borne by migrants was carried out. NGOs researched and published studies on protection of women migrants in the various destination countries and the health of migrants. Government departments, such as the Department of Labour and Department of Recruitment, published guidebooks and handbooks regarding overseas employment as they had become concerned about the safety and protection of Thai migrant workers. The emphasis in immigration research moved to the Thai-Myanmar (Burma) border as many displaced Burmese migrated in large numbers into Thai territory.

Research projects on migration are mainly funded by two sources. The first is through internal funding by the government, universities and Thailand Research Fund (TRF). The other source is from external funding, such as the Japan Foundation, Ford Foundation, IOM, ILO and the World Health Organization (WHO).
Most research is undertaken by academic researchers working alone or in centres (such as the Asian Research Center for Migration, Institute for Population and Social Research, Institute of Population Studies and Thailand Development Research Institute). Research centres tend to co-ordinate the research activities of academics working in various departments or universities. However, a number of individuals who carry out research on migration-related issues also act as consultants for government agencies. After 1997, NGOs became active in research. Government agencies (especially Development and Research Unit, Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare (MLSW), National Security Council, National Economic and Social Development Board and Office of the Prime Minister) conduct or contract out limited research. International organisations are also active (ILO, IOM, WHO).

In recent years, research projects have arisen as a result of co-operation between government agencies and academic institutes. For example, research on labour shortage (1998 and 2000); and a pilot study of the needs of migrant workers (2001) were conducted by the Institute of Asian Studies in co-operation with the Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare.

**Limitations of this research**

Interviews were conducted with 19 of the 30 original key informants selected — seven government officials, seven NGOs/UN agencies and five academics. This was mainly due to the fact that officers in governmental agencies were in transition to other positions during September to November and this limited the number available.

**Policy context**

Generally speaking, the objectives of the three parties, policy makers, NGOs and academics/researchers, differ considerably. Government policy makers tend to focus on national security and political objectives; NGOs are committed to protection and problem-solving for migrants; and academics conduct research that is of academic interest as well as research that is useful to the government and NGOs. Thus priorities are very different among these three groups.

There are many factors that inform the migration policy such as national economic interest; private sector; international agencies; and social matters. But government policy has not responded to the migration problems and migration related issues, particularly after the Asian financial crisis in 1997.

**Approaches to migration research**

**Policy makers' responses**

A number of government departments have an interest in migration and most of the policy making departments and divisions interviewed stated that they use Thai language migration research reports done by the Asian Research Center for Migration (ARCM) and governmental agencies (Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare and National Security Council) in formulating plans regarding population movement in
Thailand. They also consult previous research reports as the departments do not want to duplicate the research done by other organisations. Reports in English are also used, such as those of the International Labour Organization (ILO), the International Organization for Migration (IOM) and the Asia Pacific Migration Research Network (APMRN).

Many of the policy making departments and divisions interviewed do not have their own research budget or their own researchers. The Department of Employment does however have its own research section and research budget. The Department has in the past commissioned the ARCM to do research, for example on labour shortage. Most of the research of the Department of Employment is however in cooperation with other government departments and institutions, since they did not want the results to be biased.

Policy makers have to consider the economic and political feasibility of implementing research recommendations. For instance, the study of migrant workers policy recommended policy makers give basic rights (i.e. rights to work, rights to educate) to immigrant workers. However these considerations had to be weighted up against those of national security that would be compromised by such a move. Researchers also advised policy makers to give migrant workers and their families free access to health services but the costs are so high that the government could not accept the recommendation.

**NGOs' responses**

Migration is generally viewed by NGOs as beneficial. They also believe that migrants need to be recognised for the remittances that they send back to their home country and for the economic labour they provide. Recognising the contribution of migrants is an important step towards protecting them and their rights.

Most of the NGOs interviewed stated that they used previous research in order not to duplicate the research that has already been done. They also mainly use migration research reports from ARCM.

The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) has field officers to conduct its research and also commissions projects from outside academics/researchers and individual experts. The United Nations Economic, Social and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) as well as the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) do not have their own research staff but hire social science researchers. On the other hand, much research published in co-operation by both bodies has been used widely by government agencies, academics and some NGOs.

**Academics/researchers' responses**

An interview with Director of ARCM, Institute of Asian Studies, revealed that research by the ARCM is usually conducted with regard to current migration issues
and that this research is usually conducted where problems and issues are raised. It is felt, however, that there is still inadequate usage of the findings of their research, although in recent years government usage of research studies concerning immigration has increased. It is also felt that there is an inadequate development of government policy to keep up with the migration issues and that policy responses could be faster.

Summary
Thailand is concerned about the rights, conditions and impacts of its own workers offshore as well as the rights, conditions and impacts of immigrant workers in its own society. For a country that has experienced little migration until the 1980s this poses major strains on both policy makers and researchers.

The culture of policy makers is a significant barrier to effectively influencing migration policy through research. Most Thai policy makers do not have a research background or culture. They appear to make decisions on migration policy without considering or reading any research. This culture may change with time but education and short policy briefs would assist them to come to terms with the issues. Comparative studies from elsewhere are an invaluable way of filling the gap in research that currently exists.
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CHAPTER 3

LINKS BETWEEN RESEARCHERS, NGOs AND POLICY MAKERS

Tim Turpin, Robyn Iredale and Charles Hawksley

3.1 Australia

In Australia, the direct effect of migration research on migration policy making is limited to finding solutions to short-term problems that the government perceives. The analysis of interviews with Australian policy makers reinforces the observation that migration policy in Australia is driven primarily by short-term problems or issues rather than longer term planning questions.

There is a bifurcation in the Australian migration policy environment that emphasises, on the one hand, articulation and implementation of a 'whole of government' (Commonwealth) migration strategy and, on the other, the provision of services and management of social issues in the context of that broader migration strategy. This bifurcation leads to rather different migration policy concerns depending on the agency and its overall mandate and, consequently, rather differently focussed research interests.

DIMIA's approach to migration research is rather narrowly framed within a paradigm that assumes policy makers know what they need to know. Even for short-term policy responses this paradigm is problematic. For longer term planning, a more comprehensive and lateral approach that asks what else might need to be known is essential. As in other scientific disciplines, academic research performs a useful role in identifying what it is that needs to be known in migration policy-making so as to adequately inform short-term and long-term policy formulation and assessment. Basic research plays a vital role in steering the more applied activities of industry towards new and creative directions. The role of basic research in the social sciences is no different. In this case the links between academic research (the location of basic research in Australia) and applied socio-economic objectives (in this case policy making) appear to be extremely weak.

The result is a policy process that tends to reinforce the status quo rather than opens up new possibilities, new options and questions that can inform long-term policy issues. Australian immigration policy making is currently being driven by the government's political agenda, considerations and costs. Decisions are often made to fit in with the prevailing political philosophy or presumed effects on public opinion, regardless of international obligations, human rights perspectives or pressure from interest groups.
The following diagram serves to illustrate what appear to be the current Australian research and policy links. The major features are a growing emphasis on the indirect impact links, illustrated by the dotted lines. The direct links that exist between government policy making and academic researchers, often do so outside of the context of the broader social debate.

Figure 3.1: Australian Research and Policy Links

3.2 The Philippines

The effects of research on policy in the Philippines as in other cases, can be direct or indirect, however, the latter tends to dominate. Research agendas and the impact of research on policy are mediated by specific interest groups. Consequently the indirect, or less visible effects of research on migration policy are more difficult to document. The Philippines case suggests that the influence of academic research is more involved with the post-policy processes (e.g. implementation, program development and policy evaluation) than on policy formulation.

Because the Philippines' policy interests are concerned primarily with the issues of Philippines nationals abroad, there are specific issues that focus the attention of the relevant agencies. Migration policy in the Philippines is more broadly spread across
various responsible agencies. Each agency is the target of NGOs for specific issues. The role of NGOs in the dissemination of research findings and their influence on policy is critical in transferring the results of academic research into migration policy.

Figure 3.2: The Philippines Policy and Research Links

Figure 3.2 emphasises the fact that academic researchers are outside of the mainstream of policy making and most influence on legislators and government departments is exerted by NGOs and international agencies.

3.3 Thailand

Migration research seems to influence migration policy only if it has been commissioned by governmental agencies. In such cases, research questions and methods are set by the government; the focus may be narrowly concerned with policy matters; academic standards of theory and methodology may not be maintained; and findings may not be published, especially if government officials do not like them. Recommendations may be adopted by the government, as in the case of the study of migrant labour quotas recommended in 1998 by the ARCM or they may be ignored. Other factors may make the recommendations politically or economically unworkable. Governmental bodies do not appear to commission research from NGOs although NGOs may submit their independent research to the government.

Academics also do independent research and submit findings to relevant government organizations. NGOs often hire researchers to conduct research on specified topics. In
the case of non-commissioned research, there are no systematic links between researchers and policy makers and researchers have no idea whether their research will be considered or have any influence on migration policy.

The lack of workshops, seminars and other forms of interactive presentations of research findings is one of many barriers which prevent research findings from reaching and influencing policy makers. This absence also restricts the number of academic groups that can participate in providing the government with advice and opinions, apart from those writing commissioned research reports or directly consulted by government. Timing is also a problem as good quality research reports are sometimes too late to influence policy. In addition to these problems, some policy makers question the validity of research methodologies and some are concerned about possible bias among researchers.

Informal links among policy makers, NGOs and academics occur on a personal basis. The role of NGOs is mainly as an informal player. Neither government nor academics usually sign contracts with NGOs but ask them to provide local information and field officers working for NGOs may provide linkages to local key informants. NGOs are more involved when the research team makes a field trip to collect data since they are familiar with the area and have in-depth information.

Figure 3.3: Thai Research and Policy Links
Policy and research links as defined in the Thai case study are illustrated in Figure 3.3. The major features are a tension between government agencies around specific policy issues, the direct commissioning of research tasks to academic research consultants and little coordination between agencies and research into different topics.

3.4 Implications for migration researchers, the APMRN and country networks

This project has produced very interesting results on the policy making process. The comparative study has shown very different contexts in which migration researchers work. This carries implications for optimising the impact from international research networks such as APMRN. Not only are the migration trends and patterns very different but the mechanisms for formulating policy vary significantly. For migration researchers and the APMRN the following lessons have emerged from this project.

A knowledge of the political and economic context of each society is essential for understanding the nature of migration research conducted and its potential impact on policy makers. Migration researchers operate in a heavily value-laden environment. Peoples’ perceptions about immigration and emigration are tied up with concepts of national and ethnic identity, rights to citizenship, national economic well-being, access to employment, the ‘right’ to jobs, access to education, health and other services and many other aspects of their daily life. It is a highly charged political environment in which to conduct research. Moreover, researchers have their own political positions, value systems and ideologies and it is unrealistic to expect them to be without some ‘bias’.

Even more importantly, theory suggests that migration policy making is contingent on many elements but especially on three sets of factors: (i) attitudes to the rights of citizens, immigrants, migrant workers and ‘irregular’ migrants; (ii) the ability of interest or lobby groups to influence politicians, and (iii) the role of the state. The relative role of these three sets of factors varies from country to country but is it important to analyse the policy making context if one wants to strengthen the research-policy nexus. Migration researchers need to understand their environment and try to find the most productive way of working.

In Australia, this may mean persuading DIMIA to commission research and using the research findings to influence the public debate. In the Philippines it may mean getting closer to legislators and influential people and informing them of research findings. Migration researchers can learn a lot from NGOs in this regard. Research could have a more potent collective impact on migration policy in the policy formulation and post-policy stages if the potential synergy among major research institutions and researchers can be harnessed. This can be done through cooperation and
complementation in the research and related activities that they undertake. In Thailand it may mean using the backing of a reputable research centre to get the government to commission research or listen to recommendations arising from other research.

Research that involves the collaboration of researchers and policy makers is an ideal way to proceed. It may also be achieved by involving policy makers in a steering committee of some other forum. It sometimes occurs on commissioned research. Bedford (2000: 7) stresses that ‘building problem-oriented collaboration between social scientists and policy makers requires excellent communication between universities and research institutes on the one hand, and policy agencies on the other. This requires a significant investment of time in relationship building by both groups. It is not just an issue of doing policy-relevant research.’ In-country networks of the APMRN need to build ‘durable, dynamic networks that allow for effective and regular communication between the actors, both at the national and international levels’ (Bedford, 2000: 7).

The three country studies have all shown the value of formal and informal links with policy makers. In the Philippines, strengthening linkages with committed government officials (including legislators), civil society groups, and the media can enhance the impact of research further.

The need to be proactive in terms of both basic and applied research is also apparent. Migration researchers need to conduct in-depth research into topics of current and future interest and significance so that when an issue becomes policy relevant they have data and knowledge already to hand. Much migration policy is made quickly and with a sense of urgency and there is often not time to commission or conduct detailed investigation.

The dissemination of results to policy makers may occur informally through conferences, workshops, seminars, submissions to inquiries and through the media. Researchers need to use all of these avenues to disseminate the results of their research to both the public and to policy makers. The preparation of short policy briefs, a proposal initiated by UNESCO-MOST in 2001, is a move in the right direction.

The question of ‘bias’ is difficult as different governments adopt different approaches to migration and these are not necessarily consistent with the approaches of migration researchers. These researchers see governments as commissioning research only from people who will support their existing position. The aim should be to conduct sound, convincing research that is not politically charged or jargon laden. Statistical research is more amenable to this type of approach but qualitative research should be as scientific in its approach as possible.

The ‘perception’ of the APMRN and in-country research networks and researchers is therefore very important. Governments that see the APMRN or country networks as
taking a particular stance will shy away from any communication with them. In-country networks should allow a wide range of opinions and should be open to discussion and debate without any one particular view predominating.

The APMRN, as with other similar networks, presents an opportunity for a 'conceptual convergence between North and South' (Stein et al. 2001: 138). This has clearly been happening in the development and conduct of comparative research projects across a number of countries/regions, in the exchanging of information at the international meetings of coordinators, international agencies and NGOs that are held every eighteen months and in the publication of working papers. Thus the networking function of the APMRN has functioned very effectively and the 17 countries/regions that are now incorporated in the network has benefited greatly from this participation.

The scope, however, now needs to be widened so as to incorporate a much greater and more strategic impact on research generation and policy making. The Philippines study has suggested that the APMRN should draw up a regional research agenda based on the priority migration issues within the region and organize a regional research agenda workshop. They also suggest that the APMRN should engage in collaborative research with a policy thrust, bilaterally or multi-laterally, in which policy makers and/or civil society groups and other stakeholders within each participating country are involved from the project planning stage of the study onward.

These are valuable suggestions but they are contingent on the active participation of member networks. Country coordinators take on this function on top of an already busy schedule and with no financial support, and thus have little time or resources to devote to new projects. Experience from APMRN international meetings has shown that there is a reluctance on the part of participants to initiate or develop regional projects and this role has been left to the Secretariat.

The Philippines study also suggests the organisation of regional workshops that bring together policy makers, researchers and/or civil society to disseminate research findings. This is again contingent on additional funding. Such regional meetings already take place among migration officials and international organisations on particular topics (eg trafficking) and it more realistic for the APMRN to try to get a voice at these meetings or at APEC meetings, as an observer.

The mode of operation of the APMRN has not been the focus of this research project but the capacity of the Secretariat to provide greater leadership on all of these issues is a subject that requires further attention. Stein et al. (2001: 146-47) call for more research into how interdisciplinary networks operate in the generation and

---

7 The budget for the APMRN has always been small (US$30,000-60,000), relative to other networks, and has not provided any in-country administrative assistance (see Stein et al. 2001).
dissemination of knowledge. They also highlight the important role played by the institutional support structures, especially for the Secretariat and country coordinators.

If these networks do not recognise the indispensable role of universities, both in the North and in the South, in the training of future researchers, and in the dissemination of knowledge in their own countries – a recognition that can take place through support of administrative and indirect costs in the institutions through project funding – the contribution of networks will be short-term. Universities, agencies, NGOs, and the private sector can work together profitably, but we need to establish protocols such that individual partners – whether these are the agencies themselves, or the universities, or the NGOs – are adequately supported and can carry out appropriate roles within complex partnerships. ... For networks to function effectively, the partners ought to contribute from strength, and to receive according to their institutional needs. (Stein et al. 2001: 147)

Finally, Stein et al. (2001: 147-48) stress the need for networks to be funded on a long term basis so that they can get on with their innovative activities. The findings of the present study are consistent with this view. They need to be flexible and creative and not constrained by the need to ‘be constantly preoccupied’ with continuity in funding.

Conclusion

The uniqueness of each country situation in terms of the links between migration policy and research highlight the need for studies of all countries/economies in the APMRN. Only then can researchers tailor their strategy for research and for the dissemination of their findings so that there is a reasonable chance of being incorporated into the public debate.

This indicates that networks need the input of political scientists and communication experts. Future funding should include these aspects if networks funded by international bodies are to be truly effective in the policy arena.

The general lessons for migration research networks are:

2 the most striking impact of migration research on policy is through indirect mechanisms. Therefore, it is important that networks such as APMRN seek to influence public opinion as well as policy makers. Neither is an easy task. However, involving well organised and articulate NGOs in research networks should help inform the debates to which such NGOs contribute.
researchers in the network should recognise that their research outcomes are unlikely to influence policy makers simply through academic publications. They will need to adopt 'dissemination mechanisms' to inform public debate in areas where their respective governments are either leading or being led by their electorates.

since the most direct route to policy impact is through research directly commissioned by government agencies, research networks should explore 'inclusive' options for drawing government agencies into network debates. This might be through invitation to specially targeted workshops or through on-going representation within networks.

References
CHAPTER 4

AUSTRALIA
Charles Hawksley, Robyn Iredale and Tim Turpin

4.1 Introduction

Overview of migration trends
Australia is largely a ‘nation of immigrants’ with Indigenous people making up less than 2% of the total population of 18.5 million. Altogether over 5 million immigrants have come to Australia since 1945 and immigrants and second generation immigrants (one or both parents born overseas) currently account for approximately 45% of the population. Until 1947 most immigrants came from Britain and from 1947 to 1972 most came the UK, Europe and North America. But in the last 30 years, increasing numbers have come from Asia and elsewhere after Australia undertook a radical transformation of its immigration policy. The 1973 points system increased the principle of selection in migration and ‘the change was in part a response to rising unemployment. Selection on the basis of race, ethnicity or regional background, however, was removed’ (Burnley 2001: 34).

Permanent intake
Migration policies have mostly been based on people who were expected to become permanent settlers and eventually citizens. The permanent intake has two broad programs: Migration Program (70,200 in 1999-2000) and Humanitarian Program (7,810 in 1999-2000) (DIMIA 2000).

The Migration Program has two major categories:

1. Family Migration which allows for the immigration of spouses, fiancés, dependent children and a few parents (32,000 or 45.6%);
2. Skilled Migration which includes the Employer Nomination Scheme, Business Skills, Distinguished Talents, Independents, Skilled-Australian Sponsored (35,330 or 50.3%)
3. Special Eligibility (2,850 or 4.1%).

The Humanitarian Program is meant to be around 12,000 per year and in 1999-2000 included:

1. Refugees—UNHCR defined (3,800);
2. Special Humanitarian Program—not UNHCR defined but people who have suffered gross violation of their human rights (3,050);
3. Special Assistance Category (650)
4. Onshore grant of refugee status—former asylum seekers (2,460)
5. Safe Haven temporary visas where people returned home after a period (East Timorese and Kosovars) (1,980).

As a consequence there were 3,130 unfilled positions which the Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs (DIMIA) calls 'Rollover'. This is the number of places unfilled in the program year plus a number to compensate for 'leakage' of visas granted but not used for travel to Australia.

**Net permanent gain**
The permanent intake must be balanced against permanent departures in order to calculate the level of net permanent gain (51,200 in 1999-2000). Permanent departures were normally in the order of around 30,000 until 1998 but the figure for 1999-2000 was over 41,100.

**Temporary entrants**
In recent years there has been an increasing level of temporary immigration—both long-term (more than one year) and short-term (less than one year). In 1999-2000, there were 7,951,700 short-term visas granted, mainly to tourists but also to business and skilled employment visitors. In that year there were 3,299,900 long-term temporary arrivals, including high level executives, specialists, entertainers, sports persons, academics and working holiday makers.

**Table 4.1 Movement into and out of Australia, 1982-93 to 1999-00**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arrivals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>83,010</td>
<td>107,391</td>
<td>92,272</td>
<td>+11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitors</td>
<td>48,990</td>
<td>62,920</td>
<td>79,651</td>
<td>+65.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79,730</td>
<td>126,311</td>
<td>171,923</td>
<td>+167.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>1,240,800</td>
<td>2,072,400</td>
<td>3,299,900</td>
<td>+165.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitors</td>
<td>930,400</td>
<td>2,519,700</td>
<td>4,651,800</td>
<td>+400.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,171,200</td>
<td>4,592,100</td>
<td>7,951,700</td>
<td>+266.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>24,830</td>
<td>29,122</td>
<td>41,978</td>
<td>+65.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitors</td>
<td>47,020</td>
<td>67,191</td>
<td>84,918</td>
<td>+80.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71,850</td>
<td>96,313</td>
<td>126,890</td>
<td>+75.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Departures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>47,020</td>
<td>67,191</td>
<td>84,918</td>
<td>+80.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitors</td>
<td>25,440</td>
<td>47,971</td>
<td>71,850</td>
<td>+182.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72,460</td>
<td>115,162</td>
<td>156,768</td>
<td>+116.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>1,259,100</td>
<td>2,173,500</td>
<td>3,332,300</td>
<td>+164.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitors</td>
<td>907,500</td>
<td>2,473,700</td>
<td>4,635,200</td>
<td>+410.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,166,600</td>
<td>4,647,100</td>
<td>7,967,500</td>
<td>+267.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Hugo (2000: 5).*
The internationalisation of businesses, education and professions, shortages in skilled occupations, the growth of transnational communities and business networks and social/environmental factors all account for this growth in short-term movement. There has been an increasing tendency for the government to allow temporary migrants to become permanent if they meet the points score required for permanent migration—especially in the case of students and business/employment visitors.

**Key trends in 2001**

- There has been increased emphasis on skilled migration that is fully self-funded (travel, visa applications, assessment of qualifications, health and unemployment costs) under the Coalition Government of John Howard, since 1996.

- There has been a significant down-sizing of migrant support services that is making it difficult for new arrivals (lack of English language programs, labour market programs, etc) and is placing a much greater burden on ethnic communities, especially women, to support new arrivals. This impacts on different ethnic communities in different ways.

- Family migration has diminished as a proportion of the intake.

- The policy towards refugees has focused on taking only UNHCR-defined refugees and various measures to discourage asylum seekers from arriving. Detention centres were first introduced by the Hawke Labor Government in the early 1990s and have been expanded in number, distance from towns and cities and degree of isolation (in terms of access to lawyers, education facilities, social workers, etc). Extreme measures of turning boatloads of asylum seekers away and paying Pacific states to set up detention centres and process applications for refugee status have come into play in 2001.

- The number of overseas students coming to Australia has escalated rapidly from 65,000 in 1991-92 to 95,607 in 2000.

- Temporary migration increased by 73 per cent from 1992 to 2000 and temporary entrants can now switch to permanent fairly readily. Half of Australia’s skilled permanent intake now holds Australian qualifications.

**Profile of migration research**

Research into immigration and its effects on society is carried out and funded by a small number of agencies. Universities are the major source of research since the demise of the Bureau of Immigration, Multicultural and Population Research (BIMPR) in 1996. BIMPR was established by the Labour Government in 1989 and was a semi-independent body with an annual budget of around A$6 million. It was responsible for both commissioning and conducting research and its output marked it as being the foremost migration research unit over this time period. The BIMPR
commenced the Longitudinal Survey of Immigrants to Australia (LSIA) in 1993 and this has continued under the auspices of the then Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs (DIMA).

There is little privately-funded research in Australia, due to the absence of private foundations of the type that occur in the United States and Japan. Some researchers are successful, however, in getting grants from private Australian firms and from international agencies, such as the Ford Foundation, Japan Foundation, etc. The latter projects tend to be regionally focussed.

High-quality statistical data are readily available on most topics. The Australia Bureau of Statistics (ABS) conducts five-yearly censuses as well as labour market and other surveys. The figures are usually broken down by birthplace, allowing comparative work on first but not second-generation immigrants. The former BIMPR provided excellent data and the DIMIA has continued with some of these data. The LSIA data set may be purchased from DIMIA.

Government Departments have done some research in this area in the past and the major agency now conducting or contracting research is the Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs (DIMIA). The projects listed in DIMIA's Research Digest March 2001 that relate to migration policy are:

1999
‘Category Jumping - Causes and Demographic Impact’ (McDonald and Khoo, 1999);
‘Twenty Community profiles from 1996 census’ (McDonald and Khoo, 1999);
‘Longitudinal Survey of Immigrants to Australia 1 (LSIA) – Overview of Waves 1, 2 and 3’ (Vanden Heuvel and Wooden, 1999);
‘Review of the Independent and Skilled-Australian Linked (SAL) Categories’ (DIMIA, 1999);
‘The Impact of Immigration on the Ageing of Australia’s Population’ (McDonald and Kippen, 1999);

2000
‘Welfare Recipient Patterns Among Migrants’ (Jupp and Birrell, 2000);
‘Independence in Ageing: the social and financial circumstances of older overseas-born Australians’ (Benham and Gibson, 2000);
‘Theoretical and Practical Issues in Diversity management’ (Clarence Pinto, 2000);
‘Development of a Diversity Management Feedback and Assessment Instrument’ (Bean, 2000);
‘Business Benefits from Diversity - Case Studies’ (Bertone, 2000);
‘Diversity Leadership’ (Sinclair, 2000);
‘Implementing and Teaching Diversity - Tools for Australia’ (Australian Diversity Consultants, 2000);
'Diversity in Action - Evaluating the Personal Effectiveness in the Diversity Program' (Caroline Pinto, 2000);
'The Intersection of Health and Culture - a proposed multicultural health program at UNSW' (Dowton and Eisenbruch, 2000)

2001
'Economic Impact of 2000-2001 Immigration Program Changes' (Econtech, 2001);
'Fiscal Impact of Migrants to Australia (Access Economics' 2001);
'Future Options to 2050' (Foran and Poldy, 2001);
'Impact of Immigration on State and territory Budgets' (Access Economics, 2001);
'Indicators and Benchmarks of Successful Settlement' (Khoo and McDonald, 2001);
'Labour Force Analysis of Data from LSIA2 and a comparison with data from LSIA1' (Richardson, 2001);
'Skilled Labour: Gains and Losses' (Birrell et al., 2001);
'The Australian People' (Jupp, 2001);
'Corporate Awareness of Diversity in the Australian Workplace' (Nicholas, 2001).

The Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission also does some research into racism, detention policy and discrimination. Few state governments are research active in these areas. Governments often contract work to university academics, private research companies and individuals.

_University Research Centres_ with a focus on this area have diminished significantly over the last five years. The Centre for Multicultural Studies at the University of Wollongong was absorbed within the Key Centre for Asia Pacific Social Transformation Studies (CAPSTRANS) in 1999. Migration and Multicultural Societies was one program within CAPSTRANS but this program has been renamed the Mobility Strand. There were five other university centres in 1995 but they have all declined since then and only a couple remain. Curtin University in Perth is currently attempting to upgrade a centre that focuses on these issues. Other more general centres, such as the Centre for Population and Urban Research at Monash University, Melbourne, and the Population Centre at the Australian National University, Canberra, conduct most of the commissioned government research.

_Individual University academics and students_ continue to carry out research on immigration and ethnic relation issues. Their main source of funding is the Australian Research Council (ARC) which allocates grants on a competitive basis.

_Private consultants_ are no longer a significant component in this field as the level of government funding has diminished significantly in recent years.
Recent Research
The level of research has dropped off markedly, especially since the demise of the BIMPR in 1996. In 1996, the Australian Migration Research Network (AMRN) suggested that the priority areas for migration research in Australia were:

- social effects of immigration;
- participation of ethnic community groups in settlement process;
- educational experience of ethnic groups;
- relations between groups in Australia's population;
- racism and discrimination;
- participation and representation of migrants and Indigenous people in economic and political decision-making;
- cultural and linguistic diversity, development of multiple and transnational identities, and consequences for citizenship and identity.

At the regional and international level, the AMRN suggested the following key areas for research:

- patterns of labour migration and refugee movements in the Asia Pacific region;
- impact of international conflict and crises on migration;
- legal and social status of migrants in various countries;
- ways of improving international cooperation in monitoring migratory movements, bilateral or multilateral regulation of movements and social measures for welfare of migrants and their families;
- links between attitudes towards immigrants and the process of economic and societal development;
- relationships between emigration and immigration and the process of socio-economic development;
- the 'migration transition'—how it occurs and the causes and effects

The major publications since 1996 will be described, under a number of headings, as an indication of the direction of 1996-2001 research.

Australia in General
Immigration and Australia: Myths and realities (Castles et al. 1998) was commissioned in 1996 by a private body, the Housing Industry of Australia, to draw together research findings on the demographic, economic, social and environmental impacts of immigration. The authors reviewed all recent research results and used these results to answer key questions that have been raised within Australia in recent years in relation to immigration. The book concluded with a section on the role of research in requiring a 'position to be put clearly, explicitly and with such supporting evidence as can be gathered'. Moreover, no research study stands alone but is a contribution to 'a wider marketplace of ideas where, in competition with others,
findings are reviewed, tested and criticised, including by many whose own private views may diverge widely' (Castles et al., 1998: 129).

The Longitudinal Survey of Immigrants to Australia (LSIA) is being used by some academics to conduct research into various topics of interest to them. Khoo and Mak (2000) have looked at return migration rates and Cobb-Clarke and Chapman (1998) have analysed employment outcomes.

Fincher (1997) did some innovative work on immigration and gender equity, along with other topics, just before the BIMPR was closed.

Viviani (1996) and her associates (Coughlan et al., 1997) have mainly worked on migrants from Southeast Asia since the 1980s and their recent books represent a culmination of many years of research.

**Australia Family Migration**
This is no longer an area of significance in terms of research outputs. The last major report was on Hong Kong Immigrants (Pe-Pua et al., 1996).

**Australia Skilled Migration**
This topic has become one of considerable interest in the last few years as the economic benefits of skilled migration have become more obvious. In the area of skilled migration, DIMIA recently commissioned a study on *Skilled Labour: Gains and Losses* (Birrell et al. 2001: 5) which found that overall Australia experienced a net 'brain gain' over the period from 1997-98 to 1999-2000. While there was a net loss of skilled Australian residents (Australia-born and former settlers) but this 'was more than offset for almost every occupation by gains from settler movement and a net inflow of visitors' (ie. long term arrivals). This followed an earlier study by Birrell and Hawthorne (1997) into immigrant professionals in Australia.

A few studies have been conducted into specific migrant communities (Schak 1999) or professions (NSW Committee of Inquiry into the Employment of Medical Practitioners 1998).

**Australian Refugee Migration Research**
A number of individual researchers (Julian and others) have continued to work on refugee communities and their settlement experiences in Australia but there is little to no research being conducted into asylum seekers, the impact of the new Temporary Protection Visa (TPV) scheme, detention policy (except for a PhD thesis) or long term policy options and regional strategies for dealing with these issues. The most recent comprehensive piece of work is Iredale *et al.* (1996) on humanitarian settlement experiences.
**Australian Settlement Processes and Outcomes**

The major work in this area is being done by Ian Burnley, his associates and students (Roberts and others). His recent book *The Impact of Immigration on Australia: A Demographic Approach* (2001) addresses the key issue of whether immigrants of various cultural backgrounds have formed segregated communities or if they have merged with the wider society. This question raises further subsidiary questions: If there is segregation, does it result in disadvantage or a lack of social cohesion? Does segregation or concentration matter? How have local communities responded to the immigrant presence? What has been the impact of immigration on local communities? The book answers these questions and finally provides a brief critique of settlement policy and multiculturalism under the Coalition Government.

Fincher (1998) has shifted her focus to this area in recent years. Birrell, Betts, Khoo, Jones (1996) and others have also done some work on intermarriage, social welfare, education and other outcomes for first and/or second generation migrants.

**Australian Multiculturalism**

This has also diminished with the exception of work into productive diversity — the economic benefits of a multilingual/multicultural population. Cope and Kalantzis (1997) have drawn on their training experience while Thompson *et al.* (1998) have shown how diversity can benefit local governments. The 'highly masculinised, Anglocentric constructions of multiculturalism at the local government level' are highlighted (Bedford 1999: 8). Jupp's (2001) *Encyclopaedia of Australian People* is a landmark volume that updates his earlier work (1988) of the same name.

**International**

Various academics tend to work individually or in groups on topics that have a comparative element or are particularly relevant to the region. Some examples are provided:

Stephen Castles—migration and citizenship, migration policy, identity;

Graeme Hugo—migration and HIV/AIDS in Indonesia, international migration data collection systems, comparative study of migration policies;

Christine Inglis—skilled migration in a global context, comparative project with Canada;

Robyn Iredale—skilled migration in the Asia Pacific region, internationalisation of education and the professions;

John Connell—migration in PNG and the Pacific generally, skilled outflows from Pacific Island states;
Charles Stahl—labour migration, skills shortages in Asian firms in the APEC group.

4.2 Research Method

The investigation of Policy Impacts in Australia fell into three broad planning and activity stages. Preliminary meetings among University of Wollongong researchers were held in March which devised an agenda for a planning workshop in May. By June the selection of respondents had been settled, as had the questions for each groups. Interviews were conducted from July to September with some stretching into October.

At meetings of the University of Wollongong researchers in October, the analysis of collected data was distributed before coming together with a completed report for Australia.

The planning workshop

An informal workshop to discuss the relationship between migration research and migration policy making was held in Canberra on Friday 11th May 2001. The objective of this workshop was to canvass issues and ideas that would need to be included in a survey of (1) policy makers; (2) academics; (3) non-government organisations/international organisations, on the role of research networks in migration policy.

Those attending the Canberra meeting were:

1. Cathryn McKenzie, Executive Director, Federation of Ethnic Communities Council (FECCA)
2. Charles Hawksley, APMRN Coordinator, University of Wollongong
3. Jim Jupp, Centre for Immigration and Multicultural Studies (CIMS), Australian National University
4. Judith Therkelsen, Multicultural Affairs, ACT Government
5. Killion Banda, Migrant Resource Centre, ACT
6. Ondrae Campbell, Director of Research, Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs (DIMIA)
7. Robyn Iredale, APMRN, University of Wollongong
8. Siew Ean Khoo, Demography Program, ANU
9. Tim Turpin, APMRN, University of Wollongong

After discussion of issues those attending the workshop came up with a list of possible respondents to approach, (see Appendix A) as well as three separate draft questionnaires. It was decided to interview the following people and agencies by face-to-face and telephone interviews. A total of 33 interviews were conducted: 12 government officials, 11 NGOs/international agencies and 10 academics.
Where possible, policy makers and academics were interviewed face to face but when this was not possible telephone interviews were conducted.

The limitations of research

Possible limitations on the surveys were that people can only respond to the questions asked. Government bureaucrats in particular were loath to be recorded as saying anything and DIMIA were especially sensitive, providing only written answers. While academics tend to be less concerned about possible ramifications from comments made about the government, certain NGOs were particularly guarded in what they had to say due to the fact they received financial support from the government.

No interview was taped but the interviewers keyed information in when speaking over the telephone or wrote up face-to-face discussions immediately afterwards from notes.

On occasion a particular person was unwilling to be interviewed or did not return calls or email messages. A suitable replacement was then attempted, in most cases successfully.

In attempting to condense all viewpoints from the different groups interviewed it has been necessary to synthesise differing viewpoints to extract common beliefs and information.

4.3 Approaches to migration research

Policy Makers

The analysis of interviews with Australian policy makers offers some interesting (but not unexpected) insights into the Australian migration policy process. First, our analysis reinforces observations elsewhere that migration policy in Australia is driven primarily by short-term problems or issues rather than longer term planning questions. Secondly, there is a bifurcation in migration policy concerns that emphasises, on the one hand, articulation and implementation of a whole of government (Commonwealth) migration strategy and, on the other hand, the provision of services and management of social issues in the context of that broader migration strategy. This bifurcation leads to rather different migration policy concerns depending on the agency and its overall mandate and consequently rather differently focussed research interests. Thirdly, our analysis suggests that the policy makers approach to migration research is rather narrowly framed within a paradigm that assumes it knows what it needs to know. Even for short-term policy responses this paradigm is problematic. For longer term planning a more comprehensive and lateral approach that asks what else might need to be known is essential.
Academic research can carry out a useful role in identifying what it is that needs to be known to adequately inform short-term and long-term policy formulation and assessment. This is what occurs in other scientific disciplines. Basic research plays a vital role in steering the more applied activities of industry toward new and creative directions. The role of basic research in the social sciences is no different. In the case we are exploring through the present study, however, the links between academic research (the location of basic research in Australia) and applied socio-economic objectives (in this case policy making) appear to be extremely weak. The result is a policy process that simply reinforces the status quo rather than opening up new possibilities, new options and questions that can inform long-term policy issues.

The following analysis examines approaches to migration research by three major groups: policy makers, NGOs and academics.

The Australian migration policy makers' approach to research operates at three different levels. Firstly, there are those who are deeply involved in the policy formulation process, ie. DIMIA, that is responsible for what is described as a 'whole of government' approach to migration. Policy makers in this department, together with the minister, are essentially charged with formulating and implementing national migration policy. At a second level, there are Commonwealth policy makers in agencies that contribute to the whole of government process but in addition are required to provide services and formulate and implement their specific portfolio policies within the prevailing migration context. This includes Commonwealth agencies such as DEST or FACS. At a third level there are state agencies responsible for multicultural affairs. They too are consulted in the development of the national approach to immigration policy but their prime concern is with steering state based services in managing the implications of the national policy.

The approach to research at these three levels differs but there are some common features. These differences and commonalities are summarised below.

**Lead agencies in developing national migration policies**

DIMIA is of course the lead agency in this process, but there appears considerable and regular input from other Commonwealth agencies. DIMIA's approach to research is at first glance quite broad based. They have internal process for collecting and monitoring data, and they receive input from their program branches in order to 'identify research needs'. They also draw information from their representatives at overseas posts. Cross departmental research input is provided through agencies such as the Australian Bureau of Statistics, DEST, Department of Family and community Services (FACS) and the Department of Employment and Workplace Relations (DEWR). Joint research is sometimes commissioned with these departments.

Research is also commissioned directly by DIMIA to outside consultants. This group of consultants includes academic researchers and the research commissioned includes
short term issue specific projects as well as some quite detailed longitudinal studies. However, the research problem, the research questions and, to a fairly considerable extent, the methodology is determined by DIMIA prior to the commissioning of research. (For example, see the projects funded by DIMIA between 1999-2001 above.)

At the international level, DIMIA research draws on selected international bodies with similar responsibilities, overarching bodies such as IOM, OECD and UNESCO, DIMIA’s own staff in foreign embassies and the broader public domain of international research literature. At the more local level they carry out a community consultation process that seeks input from community organisations and other state agencies.

Other Commonwealth agencies contribute some research outcomes that inform the ‘whole of nation’ but these are generally from their own portfolio perspective. It is interesting to note that a major input to these ‘other agency’ research questions is derived from the research and data provided by the lead agency, DIMIA.

A quite extensive community consultation process can also be considered to be part of DIMIA’s approach to research. State-based migration agencies and migrant resource centres generally provide the focus for such consultations and community groups such as the Ethnic Communities Councils provide consolidated input from their constituent agencies. DIMIA commissioned research and statistics provide a major reference point for much of their input.

Commonwealth agencies research approach to their specific portfolio concerns
The other Commonwealth agencies referred to immediately above have their agency specific approach to research. DEST for example, is concerned with migration related issues associated with the provision of education, science and training. Their internal data bases provide the capacity to monitor trends, identify potential problems and assess the impact of migration policies on their specific areas of interest. DEST draws on DIMIA’s internal data and research outputs to inform their own research. DEST, like DIMIA, also draws extensively on their state based offices for monitoring their program outputs and providing input to policy options and proposals. The agency seeks to support a broader research agenda by commissioning research ‘on specific areas of interest’ through their Evaluation and Investigation Program (EIP). The agency also draws information from international agencies working in areas of interest to their portfolio such as OECD and UNESCO.

The Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission (HREOC) provides an insight into the research approach of different arm of government. HREOC does not report directly to a Minister but to Parliament. The Attorney General, however, has financial and political responsibility for the Commission and usually introduces reports to parliament. In this sense, HREOC, is more independent of the political
process than other agencies. The agency's research interests are driven partly by international debates, partly by national human rights debates and partly by prevailing government policies and questions about their impact on various segments of society.

HREOC does not undertake a comprehensive research program but does carry out national inquiries that are informed by research. Research inputs emerge from the broader public domain literature and are also collected through commissioned research. Community consultations form an important part of their information gathering and can be considered to be an integral part of their approach to research.

State agencies responsible for multicultural affairs
These agencies represent a third level of input to the Australian migration policy process. They contribute to the 'whole of nation' approach to migration policy through the formal mechanism of joint Commonwealth state and territories ministers' conferences and through joint Commonwealth, state and territories officers' conferences. Their main policy concern, however, is with the migration settlement process at the state level and the effective management of socio-economic issues that emerge as a consequence of national migration policies.

The approach to research among these agencies is to monitor data collected across state agencies and to assess trends in these data according to national level research carried out or supported by DIMIA. These data include crime statistics, interpreter services, and specific settlement issues such as access to education and health services. Some state agencies commission research to outside consultants. These are usually on quite specialised topics, such as demands for language services (Victoria) or criminality (NSW).

NGOs/international agencies
Virtually no research is being done by these organisations at present. Some manage to collect basic statistics, monitor the media and conduct limited surveys and collect anecdotal information on issues of concern. One organisation stated that it 'only collects statistics that state 'facts'' as 'no government will fund a body that criticises it'.

They mostly rely on the Federation of Ethnic Communities Councils of Australia (FECCA), academics and professional researchers to provide them with information. FECCA does little research and stressed the problem of little independent research being done these days. 'Governments need to take note of the research being done rather than use research to justify existing policy or ideological position.'

One group stated that there is limited research conducted on these topics in universities now due to the 'corporatisation' of universities and demise of most 'pure' research. Others rely on bodies such as the Refugee Council of Australia, National
Council of Churches and Catholic Bishops Conference, and on student interns from universities. Few have the resources or desire to make input to government inquiries or consultations.

One exception is the Refugee Council of Australia (RCA) which obtains funding from DIMIA. This includes some funding for research by two people 'on topics agreed to with DIMIA.' They do not undertake research that is not in DIMIA's interests. Topics include submissions on the annual intake, settlement services, guardianship models for unaccompanied minors, family unity, notion of 'exclusion' in the refugee convention and humanitarianism. Ideas for research come from the RCA Board. They produce reports that are written in a non-academic way so that they will inform both the political process and the public. They use as a model research conducted for the European Council on Refugees and Exiles—as it is research written with policy in mind.

Priority research areas, according to the NGOs, are: the UNHCR refugee convention and its appropriateness to current needs; asylum seekers and determination process; the balance of the immigration program; health and family issues with migrants; alternative detention models; the impact of 'illegal' migration; people smuggling, and Australia's international obligations. The government is 'doing research on people smuggling but focuses on finding solutions rather than the victims.'

Academics

Australian academic perceptions of migration policy making varied widely with more than half of those interviewed feeling government policy was devised by a small number of influential members of cabinet who pursued an ideological agenda generally opposed to multiculturalism and immigration. Four felt the situation was more complex. The summary below attempts to integrate all perspectives by concentrating on some key areas of commonality.

Nine academics felt economics and its effects on the labour market were the current main concern of the government with respect to migration. Skilled migration was one area of the migration from which the policy makers could see substantial benefit. Academics were generally critical of this as this concentration created only short-term benefit while there was no long term plan evident for migration, other than maintaining the current migration intake. One claimed the interest in population is really in expanding the skills base of Australia.

The politics of migration was a concern identified by eight academics as a driving force of migration policy making. The populist appeal to disenfranchised voters of the centre and right of the political spectrum dominates government thinking on migration. This is accompanied by a disavowal of the multicultural ideal that had been advocated for two decades in Australia by governments of both sides of politics in bipartisan agreement. The current Liberal National coalition was thought to have jettisoned any
commitment to the multicultural ideal except for when migrant groups were used for political purpose, ie as party fund raisers. A smaller number of academics felt that the desire to retain power conditioned the appeal to anti-immigration prejudice which was exemplified in the emphasis of exerting greater control over Australia’s borders.

Pressure groups were identified by three academics as being important to the policy making process. This included business groups (some of which have advocated an increased immigration policy) as well as community groups representing people of specific ethnic backgrounds, refugees, asylum seekers and concerned members of the public.

One academic offered a rather more organisational view of the policy making process identifying a range of concerns from a variety of stakeholders (business, private, public and NGO groups) all of which were channelled through open forums provided by the Department of Immigration and attended by the Minister. Policy formulation was thus thought to be a complex process of interacting groups, interests, advocacy and bureaucracy accompanied by opportunities for those with no direct government interest to put their case. No academic mentioned research as a major factor of policy making.

Seven felt that government policy did not reflect independent research. There was general agreement that since the government’s decision to abolish the Bureau of Immigration Research in 1996 the quantity of migration research had declined. There was an identified lack of support for migration research through the axing of BIMPR and the slashing of the Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs (DIMIA) research budget. Funding for migration research has effectively dried up reflecting the lack of interest within government for academic projects. What passed for research was effectively the collection of statistics.

Two felt there was some effect of independent research on government policy but that it occurred more by osmosis where ideas and findings worked their way upwards over months or years until picked up by the government. Another felt that research provided a setting for policy debates and framed the parameters of that debate but maintained politics was still the dominant factor.

With respect to whether research for government policy came from specific sectors of the community, responses again varied. One felt that since around 1980 the government, through BIMPR, had given a direction to commissioned research, as a result, most of the research commissioned by that organisation had reflected the views held by the government while research done outside of government had been largely pro-migration.

Others felt the government took notice of research conducted by industry groups such as the Business Council of Australia, and in some cases the work of individuals. The
general feeling was that there were now fewer research consultancies being offered and even those were taken up by consulting groups which focus on economics rather than social issues. Both of these trends were due to the demise of BIMPR and the government's ideological position of competitive tendering.

The academics interviewed were researching migration issues from a variety of perspectives. The priority interests of those interviewed were (in no particular order): skilled migration; international immigration trends (longitudinal surveys); economic and labour market effects of migration; urban dimensions; social and cultural consequences of immigration policy; cultural diversity in marketing; settlement and language services, including access and equity; migrant education and social justice; multicultural education; ethnic youth issues; emigration; population and sustainable development.

Government policy interest into the above areas — if funding levels or governmental research are any indicators — appears limited to: settlement, through the Longitudinal Survey of Immigrants to Australia (LSIA); housing, although this is not direct government research; and economic effects, through using consultant economists and large consulting companies. This however depends on the state of affairs and the attitudes of government. One academic noted that when a problem emerges it can be dealt with as evidenced by the realisation that the immigration program of the 1980s had been poorly structured and that migrants were having settlement problems which led to toughening of English tests and the selection system.

Academics were cognisant of current political debates over immigration, multiculturalism and migrant assimilation but none felt that it determined their research agenda. One contributed regular articles to newspapers defending immigration and multiculturalism against the zero-population intake lobby. Others aimed to provide non-partisan academic examination of issues through publications and to present positive aspects of migration through demonstrating the economic importance. Another felt that all research was influenced to a small degree by political issues as social problems and social inquiry drive research which then has a political dimension. Still others had given up on the political debates which were seen as simplistic and out of date, and in the anti-intellectual climate in which research was not wanted or valued.

In terms of funding for migration related research, all felt that it was more difficult now than five or ten years previously to attract government funding for research. Academic research was mostly supported by their own tertiary institutions, while some attracted financial assistance from consultancies on non-immigration related matters which then subsidised their immigration research. Community groups, industry groups, international organisations and foreign governments were all potential sources of funding, as was the Australian Research Council (ARC). The ARC remains a possible source of funding for academics interested in migration but only two had claimed success with their proposals. In light of this funding drought for research most
academics either did their own research or employed postgraduates and casual academics to collect materials.

In terms of the effect of their research on government policy, few could identify instances where their research had had an obvious effect. One claimed success during the 1960s in the areas of support facilities and housing for migrants. Another pointed out that the effects of research adopted by the government may not be those intended by the researcher, citing the exclusion of ethnic Chinese from citizenship in Papua New Guinea in the 1970s. Another felt that his research showed outcomes for migrants were not good in the labour market of the 1980s, which prompted a reform of the selection process. Most tended to think that, if at all effective, academic research was picked up by osmosis and its translation into policy was a slow process. This could mean that briefings to opposition figures some years previously had been implemented after securing government or that Ministers would later take up an idea contained in research data but claim it as their initiative. None felt that their research recommendations had ever been fully implemented as policy. One felt that for academic research to influence government policy the academic debate had to shape the public debate, a factor to which politicians would respond.

Except for when conducting commissioned research academics generally did not target research toward particular government departments. Only three claimed to attempt to directly influence policy. Two aimed to convince both DIMIA and Treasury of the merits of their research while another aimed to influence DIMIA exclusively. One of these also targeted the then Department of Employment Training and Youth Affairs (now DEST).

On maximising policy impacts of their research through media releases etc. six academics did not in any way attempt to do so. One had a very active program of information release that involved cultivating a relationship with the print media. Press releases were then picked up as news articles that helped to shape the public debate. Another used his access to policy makers and all interested parties (both government and opposition) and two contributed articles on their research to the media.

Academics mainly relied on international and domestic journals to publicise their research, with book chapters and books, government reports and opinion pieces making up the remainder of locations where research was published. Journals noted included *International Migration, Population Studies, Dissent, Australian Society, People and Place, Australian Economic Review, Journal of Population Research, New Zealand Population Review, Asia Pacific Migration Journal, Urban Studies, Housing Studies, Progress and Planning, Overland*, and the newspapers the *Sydney Morning Herald, The Age* and *The Australian*. Most academics attended conferences related to their specific interest and gave papers there, as well as writing commissioned reports. One adopted a conscious strategy of first using refereed academic journals to provide an authoritative voice, later disseminating this research into the public sphere.
Australian migration researchers had little research capacity provided by their units and were mostly working alone on their projects. They supported their research by their home institution paying their basic salary and providing them with the freedom to pursue their research interest. Where money was available it came from conference funds or from contracted projects. Within Faculties of up to 40 people there may be 3-4, at the most, with a migration interest but attracting funding also has its problems as employing assistants creates a need for space that most universities are unable to accommodate. One was able to attract funding to support three staff working more than part-time while his own salary was paid by his institution. This situation appears to have been rare in the sample interviewed.

Governmental Responses to academics’ priority research areas

With respect of the attention given by government and policy makers to academic research the government from time to time holds an inquiry on a specific matter. Such inquiries are open and any person may make a submission to the committee.

Five of the academics made regular submissions to government committees and one sometimes. (One made submissions to local government as her area of expertise was more directly in the interest of local councils.) Three were invited to speak to committees and one was invited as part of a group. One was asked to provide a written statement. Three were put on mailing information lists.

In terms of implementation there were few occasions, all before 1996, on which academics could claim some success in influencing government policy. Where academics claimed some effect on policy it was often more a matter of particular suggestions being implemented by the government of the day rather than a direct effect. Areas of partial success had been the development of the third multicultural agenda (late 1980s), dual citizenship for Australian born parliamentarians (1980s); an expansion in migration intake (1970s); points system to reward speakers of second languages (1970s); housing services for Greek/British migrants (1960s); end of white Australia policy (late 1960s); reform of migration categories (early 1990s).

Summary

Government researchers on immigration and related issues accept that the current Federal Government has limited and controlled research funding by DIMIA. NGOs have been allocated a specific service delivery role in the post-settlement services in Australia and are generally unable to undertake research on immigration ‘policy issues’ which are considered to be the exclusive province of DIMIA except by direct encouragement. Thus NGOs, especially those funded by DIMIA, feel a lack of openness in publicly criticising or providing information which may identify new or different knowledge on the impact of immigration or settlement issues.
Academic researchers, unlike those in the 1980s and 1990s, are now limited to the University research programs, Australian Research Council, international bodies such as the Ford Foundation, UNESCO or other similar organisations to fund research in Australia, of Australian conditions and impact on the Australian community. International funding organisations prefer researchers to study immigration and refugee issues with global significance and implications and not narrow national interest. Settlement issues are not high on their priority. Postgraduate students are also another source of research but these tend to be naturally academically oriented and may or may not address the impact of Australian Government immigration policies.

Currently the government, especially the Minister for Immigration, together with political considerations and costs, largely drive Australian immigration policy making. Decisions are often made to fit in with the prevailing political philosophy or marginal seats or issues related to the popular vote nationally. The Minister often takes advice from the department on policy issues, providing background, data and advice but ultimately the Minister’s Office and his or her staff collectively or individually make the decision on specific issues, depending on their nature and political sensitivity. Rationally and empirically based and argued policy-making is the exception rather than the rule but this does not mean that all policies are irrationally based. Politicians are not guided by ‘facts’ (whatever that maybe) but by what they are expected to announce in public and how it reflects on the Government of the day.

4.4 Links between researchers and policy makers

Policy makers’ perspectives
The policy makers’ approach to research, described above, is generally based on the assumption that they know what it is that they need to know. The impact of migration policy and the input to migration policy is monitored through agency managed data systems. These systems have been set up to monitor existing programs and to report on issues anticipated to emerge at the time such policies were put into practice. Other more specific issues that generate a research interest are addressed through commissioned research. Some of this commissioned work is carried out by researchers based in universities. The majority of this research is commissioned by the central agency, DIMIA, sometimes specific issues research is commissioned by agencies such as FACS, DEST, or again DIMIA. In fewer cases it is commissioned by state agencies. This work is generally commissioned to individuals or groups of individuals drawing from a fairly narrow ‘slice’ of academic expertise in migration research. For almost all commissioned research the specific questions and methodologies are very clearly defined by the commissioning agencies. This is, of course, not surprising and probably appropriate given that the research funding is being financed by agency specific public funds. However, it is worth noting that there appear to be few formalised links between migration policy makers and academic researchers.
In other fields of public policy, such as education, health, law or the environment there are structures in place that draw together academic and policy practitioners to engage with more basic and open ended research questions. While there are research centres such as ARC funded Key Research Centres as well as less formalised (or funded) academic based research centres their links with policy makers appear to be driven solely by quite specific research tasks. There is little evidence of on-going engagement with migration issues and a collective exploration of issues and consequences. Such links in other fields of research serve to generate debate and discover new and important research issues and problems that give further direction as to what it is that we need to know.

Rather, the Australian migration policy making process seems to be driven far more by what the central agency defines as the research issues and the research problem. The centrality of this agency reinforces the exclusivity of the questions. As the prime source of Australian migration data DIMIA is also the provider of research data to other Commonwealth agencies as well as state policy making agencies. Community groups also rely largely on the data collected by DIMIA. This arrangement provides the opportunity for centralising data collections and disseminating raw data for other agencies with a stake in the migration policy process. However, it has the potential to reinforce standard perceptions about migration policy. Academic research, unless it is problem specific to a question already defined by the policy making agencies appears somewhat peripheral to the migration policy process. In short, there appears to be no structure in place to support a comprehensive dialogue between academic research and Australian migration policy makers.

These observations suggest an important role for research networks such as AMRN and the APMRN. Firstly, both agencies could focus their efforts on developing and articulating emerging new issues. Second, they could focus on critically assessing and refining methodologies for migration research. Third, they could have greater constructive impact on policy processes by engaging in international studies that inform not just one national government but several. Such studies should ideally focus on common topics but deal with specific local dimensions. Finally, in the Australian context, there is a clear need for a group such as AMRN to interact more directly with Australian migration policy makers to establish a forum to more regularly review and debate what it is that Australian migration policy makers need to know. This is not simply a matter of holding national conferences or colloquia. It is more a matter of establishing institutional structures that more formally link academic researchers to policy planning and evaluation.

While the policy making process is quite strongly institutionalised the links with academic research are only weakly linked to the policy process. The information, knowledge and research process is therefore dominated by what the leading agencies
assume they need to know rather than exploring the question of what else they might need to know.

**NGOs/international agencies**
Few organisations interviewed had close links with policy makers. The Refugee council of Australia (RCA) is an exception and are consistently involved in discussions with the government about issues of concern to refugees and asylum seekers. FECCA had close links in the past but in the current climate is not consulted by the Government.

**Academics**
The Australian academics interviewed were involved in a variety of migration research types which involved links to policy makers, formal contract work and informal (ie private interest) research projects. The priority interests of those interviewed are listed on page 49.

**Formal Research: Links to policy makers**
Direct links to policy makers were few but some academics knew the Minister for Immigration or several key cabinet ministers from past experience whether in the bureaucracy or from their past activities acting as consultant. They did not, on the whole, claim to be able to influence the government in any way on matters relating to migration. Two academics had previously held positions in the Australian public service, one a former director of the Bureau of Immigration Research, the other an adviser to the government on economic policy.

Some academic research was related to formal government initiated or contracted work including analysis of census data (Atlas of the Australian People) and specific commissions. Most academics found the research climate unconducive to supporting research since 1996 although a small amount of work was commissioned on populations studies. In comparison with the situation of five years ago, little research now appears to be driven or commissioned by a government agency or a government Minister. There were a few projects driven by academics who sought government funding through the Australian Research Council however the rate of acceptance and granting of funds for such projects was small. There were also very few migration related projects driven by civil society.

**Informal Research**
The vast majority of academic research on migration was linked only informally to policy making, that is to say academics overwhelmingly pursued their own interests and projects cooperating with chosen individuals in Australia and overseas. This work was mostly supported by their own institutions in terms of office space, salary allowance and occasionally research assistance, but most academics tended to work on their own and their interests encompassed a diverse range of projects. While some had moved away from research into core migration issues they retained an interest in
genera
debates surrounding migration and the nature of Australia’s multicultural society.

Alternative Methods of influencing government Policy
Most academics do not try to influence policy or have given up trying to do so. Of those that did try, strategies for influencing the government included forming partnerships with or acting as advisers to minor players in the pro-migration lobby; staying visible in the public forum, being politically active in minor parties in an effort to sway policy of main parties through preferences allocation at elections, linkages with community groups, and letters to politicians, both government and opposition. Many academic had informal linkages with a number of groups or individuals.

Academics cooperated with a variety of groups and organisations from business, migrant and local communities, local groups, the APMRN, Metropolis, State offices for multicultural affairs and international organisations such as the IOM. Nine of the ten claimed that they have in the past, or currently act, as consultants on migration related issues for policy research while one stated that he acted more as a researcher without being a consultant. Most noted that consultancies are however rarely available.

4.5 The Operation of the AMRN and how to better influence policy making

Of the ten academic researchers interviewed only one had not heard of the APMRN which is not surprising given the relatively small number of people working on migration issues at Australian Universities and the fact that five of the ten were already members. Of the nine who were aware of the APMRN, only one did not know of its Australian Migration Research Network (AMRN). Four requested that they be placed on the AMRN’s email and mailing list for future events.

The number of migration researchers known to the respondents ranged markedly. This was primarily related to the amount of time a particular researcher had spent in migration related topics. High estimates were from a former director of the now disbanded BIMPR who knew about 100 people working on migration. An academic with 30 years experience also claimed to know between 50-100 migration researchers. Another researcher who had edited an extensive volume on the history of Australian migration, with entries from over 140 ethnic groups knows all of the contributors (230 writers) as well as between 20-30 academics and the same number of government bureaucrats. A more common response however, was that academics knew of between ten and twenty migration researchers and that this number had decreased from the situation ten years ago when there were perhaps up to 50 people writing on migration and contributing to these debates.
Seven of the ten academics worked with other Australian migration researchers and co-operated in a range of projects. These included such activities as joint publication (co-authoring, co-editing), as well as workshops and seminars. One academic edited a journal devoted to population and environment issues and worked with up to 40 contributors.

Of the three who did not work with other Australian migration researchers this was principally because the direction of their work had shifted away from what they perceived as the core migration-related issues affecting Australia. Their work now took them in the direction of multiculturalism, language and settlement policy, and migrant education and, increasingly, to comparative studies and international cooperation.

While not all researchers collaborated with other writers within Australia, all ten had co-operated internationally at both institutional and personal levels, with some developing governmental linkages. Countries mentioned as examples of where collaboration took place with other researchers were the USA, Canada, Sweden, Finland and England. One academic had been involved in an International Organization for Migration project setting up migration research teams in South Asia, the Caribbean, Central America and Sub-Saharan Africa.

**The AMRN**

From 1991 to 2000, the AMRN was administered by the APMRN Secretariat at the University of Wollongong. However, from 2001, the coordinator was located at the University of Sydney with a second coordinator from the University of Adelaide appointed in June 2001.

With respect to influencing policy, academics generally felt that the current governmental climate was not conducive to research, in that the government had little interest in research influencing policy although they were prepared to support research that would endorse the beliefs they already had. In late 2001 migration was a thorny issue in Australian politics with both major political parties taking a hard line on asylum seekers. In such a climate any debate about immigration levels was lost, as was the willingness of either major party to be exposed to research which did not fit their political agenda. Apart from a change of government suggested by three academics, various strategies were offered for the AMRN to exert greater influence over policy making.

UNESCO-MOST’s desire to see more of a policy impact from its funding of migration research was addressed by academics in a variety of responses and suggested strategies for achieving this aim. Most were careful to make a distinction between research and advocacy and drew attention to the possibility of the AMRN becoming too closely associated with a specific cause which would lead to the organisation being stigmatised as a ‘pro-issue’ lobby group. One academic pointed out
that the AMRN could have most impact by becoming a lobby group but this is not the general perception of the majority of those interviewed.

Another felt it was imperative to stick to the brief of the organisation. If this is to be 'pure' research then a number of strategies arise for achieving changes to policy. However, about half of the academics interviewed felt that the current political climate was not conducive to any migration research being accepted. One went so far as to say many who claim to be interested in migration research issues are actually more interested in opposing it.

Some academics felt there were possible strategies for achieving greater prominence and affecting policy without resorting to advocacy. One suggested the AMRN link with a government research organisation that has program funding and that it act as a clearing house to support funding applications. In this way the AMRN can become a feeder group for migration researchers, become better known within policy circles and any applications it puts forward would carry the organisation's imprimatur. However the abolition of most of the government research budget relating to migration makes this difficult.

Another felt the APMRN should actively court migration researchers and establish better contacts with those making policy. As Bedford (2000: 7) has noted:

Building problem-oriented collaboration between social scientists and policy makers requires excellent communication between universities and research institutes on the one hand, and policy agencies on the other. This requires a significant investment of time in relationship building by both groups. It is not just an issue of doing policy-relevant research. It is essential to build durable, dynamic networks that allow for effective and regular communication between the actors, both at the national and international levels.

Given that there are a limited number of people doing migration work, and the government is apparently always interested in serious research, the AMRN should make information more available to the government. Courtesy copies of all AMRN and APMRN publications should go, for example to DIMIA.

Another stressed that as DIMIA is the central government agency that controls migration flow, it is imperative for the APMRN to have good relations with DIMIA. As DIMIA had few channels through which policy can be decided it is important to also contact state governments and the Federal opposition so that APMRN research is available to all levels of government in Australia. Use of the media was also noted with the academic stating that the APMRN needed to become known for providing comment on migration related issues which would mean taking something of a more political role. The key problem remained the unwillingness of the Federal government to be influenced by any research on migration and the lack of interest within DIMIA.
for any research other than that that supports current policy. The current sensitivities surrounding migration in Australia makes University managers nervous about supporting what might be seen as pro-migration groups as this may put them out of favour with the next federal government. Another academic felt that the AMRN/APMRN needed to involve more key policy makers in our meetings, have them present papers and explore their ideas on research needs.

One felt that the AMRN had developed an attitude of 'learned helplessness' which required time and resources to break. One solution is that the coordinators make more time to cultivate relations with the federal opposition and the federal government. The honorary nature of the position of AMRN co-ordinator, the full-time workloads of university academics and the basic lack of support resources (the AMRN is currently administered by the APMRN when time permits) makes such increased activity difficult.

Another suggested forging direct linkages with community groups, trades unions and key industry groups so that our research could be more targeted. This would put the wares and capacities of the AMRN in the minds of those who are interested in the debate. Again the problem is the AMRN has no funding and no officers.

Another academic felt that government understanding of migration was linked to globalisation but that government was slow to see that mobility of people was as important as mobility of capital. The APMRN needs to convince government that migration is changing and it is in the government's interest to facilitate greater mobility.

Professional advice was suggested by another academic which involved engaging in migrant representative groups and their political organisation and discuss what they do, as well as using the media to influence public opinion, the only thing to which politicians appear to respond. Selling migration research was a matter of educating politicians, of telling 'good news' stories of migration and of having the media publish such stories. A parallel was the research on economic systems that used cultural diversity to demonstrate obvious benefits of a multicultural society. The migration debate needed to be framed around issues that people understand. It was also a matter of building networks and cultivating journalists.

As Australian academics saw it, the horns of the AMRN's dilemma appear to be whether to move towards a position of migration advocacy in order to influence policy development or whether to concentrate on producing 'pure' research. Both strategies require funding but the voluntary nature of the organisation which has no paid office holders and no secretarial support make it difficult for the AMRN to achieve anything other than the occasional meeting of researchers.
The APMRN Secretariat has examined means of funding for the AMRN, including charging fees for members, but most AMRN members felt that fees would be a disincentive for membership. The attraction of organisations such as the APMRN and the AMRN is the fact that it costs nothing to belong. The difficulty is that without an organisational heart that is supported financially, an organisation such as the AMRN can achieve little.
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CHAPTER 5
THE PHILIPPINES
Stella P. Go

5.1 Introduction

The history of the Philippines chronicles a history of migration. It reveals various phases of the country's international migration experience and documents the peripatetic nature of its people. Over the years millions of Filipinos have left the country either to work temporarily overseas or to reside permanently abroad.

With more than a quarter of a century of experience in the export of labour, fuelled largely by emigration pressures built up over long years of economic and political mismanagement, the Philippines today has become the largest exporter of human capital in Asia. Labour migration looms large in the national consciousness and the country continues to be challenged, not only by the human consequences, but also by other politically sensitive and socially complex issues that migration continues to raise.

Globalization, increasing trade liberalization, and a continuing clamor for the protection of the rights and welfare of its citizenry abroad, particularly its workers, have forced the Philippine government to take policy measures designed to respond to the needs of overseas Filipinos. The role that research has played in migration policy formulation in the Philippines is unclear; consequently, this study attempts to shed light into this aspect of policy-making.

The key questions that this research seeks to answer are the following: To what extent has research made an impact on migration policy-making in the Philippines? How can Filipino researchers, and research networks, such as the Philippine Migration Research Network (PMRN) and the Asia-Pacific Migration Research Network (APMRN), maximize their potential for influencing migration policy?

International Migration Patterns and Trends
That Filipinos are highly mobile is clearly evident in the international migration experience of the Philippines over the years.

Early Beginnings to the 1950s
Historical record dating back to the pre-Spanish occupation of the Philippines prior to the 16th century attests to the geographic mobility of Filipinos. During the Spanish colonial period (16th-19th century), the overseas Filipino migrants consisted of young men who were either students or refugees escaping persecution, or revolutionaries exiled to the
Marianas. Mostly based in Spain, these migrants formed the core of a movement for reforms in the Philippines during the Spanish times known as the Propaganda Movement.

During the American colonial period (1898-1944), two distinct waves of migration emerged with the United States or its strongholds as the countries of destination. The first wave started in 1903 consisted of pensionados or Filipino scholars to the United States on a subsidy or pension while studying there.

The second wave that occurred in the 1920s to 1930s marked the historical roots of international labour migration from the Philippines. Large-scale recruitment of Filipino workers for the pineapple plantations of Hawaii and the apple, orange, and grape farms of California began and continued with the recruitment of Filipino workers for job contracts in the rehabilitation and reconstruction of American strongholds in the Pacific after World War II.

The 1960s
In the 1960s, permanent migration or immigrant migration became distinct from temporary migration or contract labour migration. Professionals and technical workers, mostly medical personnel, moved to the United States as immigrants while skilled workers and craftsmen found temporary contractual employment with American construction companies in Guam and Indo-China.

Other skilled workers found contractual jobs in logging companies operated by Filipino and American companies in Borneo, Indonesia and Malaysia during the same period. Jazz performers and other Filipino artists, on the other hand, obtained employment contracts in Japan and Hong Kong and their artistic talent earned them the distinction of being the 'Entertainers of Asia.'

The 1970s and early 1980s
The seventies, however, marked the beginning of the most dramatic period of international contract labour migration from the Philippines. The construction boom in the Middle East, spurred on by the sharp increase in oil prices and the deteriorating economic conditions in the Philippines gave impetus to this phenomenon and the 'Middle East fever' may rightly describe international labour migration at this time.

Labour migration streams from the country consisted largely of married, able-bodied young men in the prime of their working lives, with fairly high levels of education compared to the rest of the population in the Philippines.

The Middle East, particularly Saudi Arabia, was the number one work destination for Filipino workers. It took a lion's share of the total worker outflow from the country between 1975-1979 (67.4 percent). At the height of the construction boom in the Middle East in the early eighties, the proportion of Filipino workers in the Middle East was at its peak at 84.7 percent.
The mid-1980s and 1990s

Today, Filipinos go to more than 100 countries in the world. Empirical evidence reveals the following patterns regarding international migration in the mid-eighties and nineties:

1. the increasing primacy of temporary labour migration over permanent migration;
2. the increasing prominence of Asia as a work destination and the decline in importance of the Middle East as a job site;
3. the increasing feminization of labour migration; and
4. the continued importance of foreign remittances to the Philippine economy.

The increasing primacy of temporary labour migration vis-à-vis permanent migration

Undoubtedly, the volume of people leaving the Philippines to work temporarily overseas since the mid-seventies has been decidedly greater in comparison to the volume of Filipinos leaving the country to reside permanently abroad (Table 5.1). However, the proportion of migrant workers in the total outflow dramatically increased in the eighties and has been steadily climbing since then.

The proportion of emigrants has steadily declined since the onset of the overseas employment program of the Philippine government in 1974 (5.1). In the first five years (1975-1979) after the program was instituted, 31 out of every 100 Filipinos who left the country was an emigrant. in period 1995-1999, only 6 out of every 100 Filipinos left to live permanently elsewhere.

The increasing prominence of Asia as a work destination

Although the Middle East remains the primary destination of Filipino workers, its importance has waned markedly since the mid-eighties. On the other hand, Asia’s prominence has increased significantly since then (5.2). The mid 1980s saw the emergence of Asia as an increasingly important destination for Filipino workers, particularly women.

It is significant to note, however, that as the construction boom in the Middle East slackened in the mid-eighties, Asia’s percentage share in the outflow steadily increased from 11.4 percent in the early eighties to 42.1 percent in the second half of the nineties. However, the proportion of workers going to the Middle East steadily fell from a peak of 84.7 percent in the first half of the eighties to a low of 44.2 percent at the end of the nineties.

In the second half of the 20th century, the Asian region has become just as important as the Middle East as a work destination for Filipinos. Out of every 100 workers that left the country to work abroad in the period 1995-1999, 40 went to other Asian countries while another 40 went to the Middle East, particularly Saudi Arabia. In Asia, the bulk of the Filipino workers have found employment in Hong Kong, Taiwan, Japan, and Singapore.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ALL OVERSEAS FILIPINO WORKERS</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>87.2</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>89.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(550,251)</td>
<td>(1,812,658)</td>
<td>(2,394,651)</td>
<td>(3,484,804)</td>
<td>(3,981,284)</td>
<td>(12,223,648)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. LAND-BASED</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>70.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(211,878)</td>
<td>(1,299,086)</td>
<td>(1,766,703)</td>
<td>(2,489,892)</td>
<td>(2,811,175)</td>
<td>(8,578,734)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFRICA</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMERICAS</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASIA</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUROPE</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDDLE EAST</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCEANIA</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUST TERRITORIES</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT REPORTED</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. SEABASED WORKERS</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(167,845)</td>
<td>(281,220)</td>
<td>(363,222)</td>
<td>(673,911)</td>
<td>(919,328)</td>
<td>(2,405,626)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. EMIGRANTS</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(170,428)</td>
<td>(232,352)</td>
<td>(264,726)</td>
<td>(321,001)</td>
<td>(250,781)</td>
<td>(1,239,288)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITED STATES</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANADA</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUSTRALIA</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAPAN</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHERS</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL MIGRATION OUTFLOWS</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Data from 1975-1983 refer to processed overseas Filipino workers (OFWs). Data from 1984-1997 refer to deployed overseas Filipino workers based on statistics on departing workers from the Balik-Manggagawa ( Returning/Visiting Workers) processing unit of POEA.

Data for 1998-2000 refer to deployed overseas Filipino workers based on statistics on departing workers from the Labor Assistance Center (LAC) of POEA on actual departures of OFWs at the international airports.

Source of raw data: Philippine Overseas Employment Administration

2 Source of raw data: Commission on Filipinos Overseas

3 Refers to permanent migrants

4 The 'Others' category for the period 1975-1984 includes emigrants to Japan.
### TABLE 5.2
DEPLOYED LAND-BASED OVERSEAS FILIPINO WORKERS BY REGION AND COUNTRY - 1975-1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL LAND-BASED (Percent)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Number)</td>
<td>(211,878)</td>
<td>(1,299,086)</td>
<td>(1,766,703)</td>
<td>(2,489,892)</td>
<td>(2,811,175)</td>
<td>(8,578,734)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFRICA</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMERICAS</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASIA</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunei</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUROPE</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDDLE EAST</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.A.E.</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCEANIA</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUST TERRITORIES</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT REPORTED</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Data from 1975-1983 refer to processed overseas Filipino workers (OFWs). Data from 1984-1997 refer to deployed overseas Filipino workers based on statistics on departing workers from the Balik-Manggagawa (Returning/Visiting Workers) processing unit of POEA.

Data for 1998-2000 refer to deployed overseas Filipino workers based on statistics on departing workers from the Labor Assistance Center (LAC) of POEA on actual departures of OFWs at the international airports.

Source of raw data: Philippine Overseas Employment Administration
The increasing feminization of international labour migration

The shift in the international demand for labour in the eighties resulted in the increasing feminization of international contract labour migration from the Philippines. Since then, there has been a decline in the relative share of production workers in the labour out-migration stream.

There has been an increase in the international demand for service workers, particularly domestic helpers, and to a lesser extent, entertainers. Although the service sector covers a wide range of occupations, the largest proportion of workers within this category are domestic helpers, who are mostly female. Entertainers are also overwhelmingly female and a substantial proportion of other professionals, particularly nurses, are women.

The most dramatic indication of the feminization of international labour migration from the Philippines is shown by the proportion of women among the first-time migrant workers. In 1992, half of the newly hired Filipino workers in the world that year were women (5.3). The percentage share of women among the neophyte workers rose to 58 percent in 1995 and to 61 percent in 1998.

### TABLE 5.3
PERCENT FEMALE AMONG DEPLOYED OVERSEAS FILIPINOS IN TOP 10 HOST COUNTRIES: NEW HIRES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL COUNTRIES**</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(129,869)</td>
<td>(153,504)</td>
<td>(111,487)</td>
<td>(133,458)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAUDI ARABIA</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HONG KONG</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>92.8</td>
<td>99.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAPAN</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>98.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITED ARAB EMIRATES</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAIWAN</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>69.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUWAIT</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>78.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALAYSIA</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>84.9</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SINGAPORE</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>60.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNEI</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>62.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QATAR</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Refers to all countries of destination, not only to the top ten countries listed above.

Source: Philippine Overseas Employment Administration
The predominance of Filipino women in such vulnerable occupations as domestic helpers in Hong Kong, Italy and Saudi Arabia and as entertainers in Japan has been cause for much concern. Because of the nature of their employment, these women are easy prey to exploitation and abuse. While this is so, Filipinas opt to work abroad for the good of the family, aware that they may gain very little personally from the experience.

The migration of Filipinos as overseas contract workers is significant because it has implications for family dynamics. Because they migrate on their own and their stay is considered only ‘temporary’ in nature, they must leave their families behind. For married women, this often means leaving young children in the care of relatives and making arrangements for someone else to perform their normal household duties while they are away.

The continued importance of remittances to the Philippine economy.
The remittances of overseas Filipino workers continue to play a significant role in propping up the Philippine economy as they have done over the last twenty-five years. Their contribution to the economy has been documented in the research literature (Lamberte and Llanto, 1996; Alburo, 1995 and 1993; Go, 1994; Abella, 1993; Vasquez, 1992). The percentage share of remittances to the GNP has risen steadily from 2.38 percent in 1986 to 6.44 percent in 1995, except for a slight drop in 1988 and 1989 (Lamberte and Llanto, 1996). Its percentage share of exports has also increased from 4.5 percent in 1975 to 19.6 percent in 1994 (Alburo, 1995). Had there been no remittances from overseas workers, (Alburo 1993) cited that the aggregate performance of the economy would have been worse by at least 14 percent or a high 85 percent between 1980 and 1989.

The contribution of remittances to the foreign exchange earnings of the country has been considerable. From 1991 to 2000, the workers remitted a total of US$40.19 million or an average of US$4.02 million every year. Of the total amount, the land-based workers contributed 89 percent. It should be noted, however, that these figures do not include earnings sent through the ‘door-to-door’ and other forms of remittance delivery as well as the remittances of undocumented workers.

International Migration Research in the Philippines
Since 1975, considerable research has been conducted on various aspects of international migration from the Philippines. This has resulted in a wealth of knowledge that has been compiled in two annotated bibliographies documenting 745 studies that have been undertaken between 1975 and 1997 (Yukawa, 1996; Perez and Patacsil, 1998). Since then other researches have been published and completed.

Scientific investigations into the phenomenon of international migration from the Philippines by local and foreign researchers have been undertaken at the macro- and
micro-levels. These studies have looked into the following (Yukawa, 1996; Perez and Patacsil, 1998):

- Migration patterns and trends
- The relationship between migration, development and macro-economic factors
- Labour recruitment
- The effects of migration on individuals, families and communities
- Migration determinants and decision-making
- Women in migration
- Migration policy and management
- Welfare and the rights of migrant workers, and

Researches on the above topics have also been country or region specific. Most of them have focused on migration to the Asian region and specific countries in it, followed by studies of Filipino migration to the United States. Understandably, the migration of Filipinos to Europe and to Africa has been given considerably less attention by researchers because the volume of people working and living in these regions is fewer.

**Migration patterns and trends**
Several studies have analyzed the changing patterns and trends of international migration from the Philippines. The sheer volume and magnitude of the migration outflows led to an interest in documenting them and describing their characteristics over time (Battistella, 1992a; Asian Migrant, 1993; Collado, 2001; Go, 1998). The effects of the 1997 Asian financial crisis on the deployment of Filipino workers was also analyzed (Go, 1999).

**Migration and development**
Since labour migration has been viewed as an important avenue for improving the economic conditions, not only of individuals and families, but also of the country, numerous studies focused on the development aspects of Philippine labour migration. Research on the relationship between migration and development engaged in a cost-benefit analysis of migration and its relationship with other structural factors in the national economy (Abella, 1992). Among the important areas of investigation have been the economic gains vis-à-vis the costs (Vasquez, 1992, Abella 1979), remittances, savings and investment and skill acquisition or loss (Smart et al., 1986; Stahl, 1986, 1988; Vasquez, 1992); and the brain drain (King, 1987). In addition, several studies have looked into the relationship between trade and international labour migration from the Philippines (Alburo, 1993, 1994; Abella, 1993).

**Labour recruitment**
The labour recruitment industry has also been a focus of some attention by researchers. Studies have looked into its costs for the workers and its effects on the momentum of labour migration (Abcera-Mangahas, 1988, 1989; Abella, 1986, 1989).
Effects on individuals, households and communities

The unprecedented volume and speed at which the Philippine labour migration phenomenon developed led to the concern over its non-economic consequences at the micro-level, particularly its effects on the workers and their families. De La Salle University (Go, Postrado, and Jimenez, 1983) undertook the pioneering study into this area of research in the early eighties. It investigated the economic, psycho-social, and demographic consequences of international labour migration from the Philippines on the families and communities left behind. Using both quantitative (household survey) and qualitative (key informant interview) research methods, the study analyzed the use and allocation of remittances by migrant households, their economic behavior, and the effects of labour migration on family relationships. At the community level, physical, economic, social, political and demographic changes were investigated. This study laid the foundation for future research in this area of inquiry.

Subsequent community studies at the community level have looked at:

- the psychological, social, and economic aspects of return migration (Go, 1986);
- the use of skills and remittances by return migrants (Vasquez, 1987);
- the social transformation at the household and community levels (Asis, 1995);
- the operation of social networks in initiating and sustaining labour flows (Caces et al., 1985; Sycip and Fawcett, 1988; Root and De Jong, 1991; Go, 1995; Nagasaka, 1998); and
- the role of the village or the local community in managing the labour migration process (Go, 1995).

The effects of international labour migration on family relationships have also been investigated (Tacoli, 1996; Asis, 1994), including the consequences of parental absence on children (Battistella and Conaco, 1996; Cruz, 1987), whereas health issues related to migration have received little attention in the research literature. A very limited number of studies have looked into the problem of HIV/AIDS among migrant workers (e.g. Remmelts et al., 1997).

Migration decision-making

One area of research that received considerable attention in the eighties was the process of decision-making in migration. Several studies were generated using the value-expectancy model, a social psychological framework which predicted migration behavior based on an individual's assessment of micro-level and macro-level factors (Abad and Carino, 1981; Arnold, 1987; Arnold and Abad, 1985; Caces et al., 1985; De Jong and Fawcet, 1981; De Jong et al., 1983; 1985-1986; Findley, 1987; Lee et al., 1985).

Other studies, on the other hand, focused on the family as a decision-making unit (Lauby and Stark, 1988; Findley, 1987).
Women in migration

A most dramatic social and economic development in the late 20th century, not only in the Philippines but also in the Asian region as a whole, is the feminization of international labour migration. Consequently, women migrant workers have been the focus of considerable attention in the research literature. The violence experienced by women migrant workers who work in highly vulnerable occupations (i.e. domestic helpers and entertainers), its causes and consequences and responses designed to deal with the problem have been investigated (Abrera-Mangahas, 1998).

Domestic helpers, in particular, have been the subject of sustained research because they constitute a majority of the women migrant workers from the Philippines. Studies on domestic helpers have been largely descriptive, policy-oriented, and site specific. They have focused on domestic helpers in Hong Kong (Alcid, 1989; Asian Migrant Workers Centre, 1991; Beltran and De Dios, 1992; Medel-Anonuevo et al., 1989; Vasquez et al., 1995):

- Singapore (Alcid, 1989; Amarles, 1990; Amba, 1995; Beltran and De Dios, 1992; Hing, 1996; Medel-Anonuevo et al., 1989; Tan and Devasahayam, 1987)
- Malaysia (Dorall, 1989; Tharan, 1989)
- Middle East (Francisco, 1989; Humphrey, 1991)
- Italy (Barsotti and Lecchini, 1995; Battistella, 1992b; Tacoli, 1996)
- Brunei (Mani, 1996)

Another category of women workers that has also been studied because they constitute another highly vulnerable group is Filipino entertainers to Japan. Research on these women workers have described their background characteristics, recruitment methods, work conditions, economic and social effects, welfare and human rights issues (Angeles, 1993; Ballescas, 1992, 1993, 1996; De Dios, 1989; Go, 1994; Matsuda, 1993; Nuqui, 1996; Osteria, 1993; Samonte, 1994).

Filipino women also go abroad to work as skilled professionals in the medical field. These women work as nurses deployed mainly to the Middle East and to a much lesser extent, the United States. Because of their longer migration history, Filipino nurses to the United States have been the subject of study. However, there is a dearth of research on the large number of nurses who have gone to work in the Middle East.

The studies that have been conducted on Filipino nurses in the United States have looked into different aspects of this migration flow, such as the context, characteristics, and situation of these workers (Ong and Azores, 1994). Various aspects of the nurses' experience have also been investigated, such as licensure (Beyers, 1979), acculturation to nursing practice (Lopez, 1990), and professional advancement (Venzke, 1990). A macrostructural approach has also been used in a number of studies (Ishi, 1987; Ball, 1990).

Apart from nurses, the labour force participation of Filipino immigrant women to the
United States have also been studied vis-à-vis other Asian immigrant women (Gardner and Wright, 1984; Woo, 1985).

Another highly controversial and socially sensitive issue is the intermarriage of Filipino women to foreign nationals. A number of studies have been undertaken that sought to describe the situation of Filipino women married to:

- Australians (Cabigon, 1995; Chuah et al., 1987; Cooke, 1984; Holt, 1996; Iredale, 1994; Tapales, 1990; King, 1992; Scaramella, 1988; Tan and Davidson, 1994); and
- Japanese (Kariura, 1992; Miki, 1995; Samonte, 1986).

5.2 Research Method

This is a qualitative study that used the key informants' interviews to obtain the data.

Selection of Key Informants

The key informants used in the study were policy makers (16), researchers (3), and heads of non-government and international organizations involved in migration (4). Policy makers included those in Congress (Senate and House of Representatives) and the executive branch of government (Department of Labour and Employment and relevant attached agencies). A total of 13 key informants were interviewed out of a total of 20 initially identified.

Key informants were chosen on the basis of their knowledge of the topic under study. For policy makers in the executive branch of government, their positions, knowledge, and involvement in policy making related to international migration were primary considerations.

For those in the legislative branch, key informants were either the legislators themselves or their technical staff. The legislators had to be members, currently or in previous congress, of either the Committees on Foreign Affairs or Labour and Employment in the House of Representatives or of the Committees on Foreign Relations or Labour, Employment and Human Resources Development in the Senate. Moreover, they should have sponsored a migration-related bill either currently or in the previous congress.

For the non-government organizations, key informants were initially chosen in order to have some representation from organizations that catered to land-based and sea-based workers and organizations with a primary focus on women migrants. However, refusal to be interviewed by the head of the largest organization representing seafarers resulted in the absence of a key informant for sea-based workers.

Two of the researcher key informants were selected on the basis of their continued and sustained research on international migration from the Philippines. Although not a
migration researcher, the third key informant was chosen because she heads the research
center of the University of the Philippines that conducts policy research on various
development issues including international migration.

One of the major difficulties of this study was getting appointments with key informants,
particularly the policy makers in Congress and the Department of Labour and
Employment. During the data-gathering period, Congress was busy with the budgetary
hearings for the 2002 fiscal year and officials of various departments had to appear in
Congress to defend their proposed budgets. Consequently, in cases where the busy
schedules of policy makers made it impossible to set a date for an interview, the key
informants had to be dropped and where possible, substituted.

Among the NGOs, the head of the seafarers union refused our request for an interview
outright. Two other NGOs that were selected as key informants were likewise dropped
after 3 follow-ups for appointments yielded negative results. Because of their hectic
schedules, appointments for an interview could not be obtained for seven policy makers
from the Senate (2), the House of Representatives (2), the Department of Labour and
Employment (2), and the Commission on Filipinos Overseas (1)

Limitations of the Study

Because of the qualitative nature of this study, the impact of research on policy was
largely perceptual rather than quantitatively measured using objective indicators.
Moreover, the study could have benefited from the additional information available from
the other identified key informants among the NGOs and the policy makers who could
not be interviewed for reasons beyond the control of the researcher.

5.3 Migration policy and management

The state plays a pivotal role in fostering and sustaining labour migration. It helps to
shape the nature of international labour migration and to chart its direction by developing
policies and setting up institutional structures and mechanisms. Through government
regulation and supervision, sending and receiving countries protect their national interest
and make possible the protection or neglect of the migrants’ rights and welfare.

Various aspects related to international migration policy and management have been
studied over the years. Several studies have periodically described and assessed the
overall government policies related to labour migration at various points in time (Lazo et

Asis (1992), however, did the initial longitudinal study that reviewed, compared, and
assessed the policies and the policy changes that governed international labour migration
study, extending the analysis to cover the period between 1915 and 1995, and including international policies affecting Filipino migrant labour.

Carino (1991, 1994, 1995) looked into policies governing not only temporary labour migration but also permanent migration in his analysis of migration policies.

Specific migration policy areas have also been investigated. These include remittances (Abella, 1989; Endriga, 1995), illegal recruitment (Battistella, 1995), return migration (International Labour Organization, 1985); the protection of workers (Battistella, 1995; Endriga, 1995; International Labour Organization, 1989); and migration policy-making processes (Tigno, 1997).

**Factors Affecting Migration Research**

A review of the international migration research literature in the Philippines between 1975 and 1998 reveals that most of the empirical studies undertaken on the various aspects of the migration phenomenon have been conducted by researchers, mostly based in universities or research institutions outside of government. The topics under investigation have been varied and wide-ranging reflective of the freedom that academics generally have to explore and push the frontiers of knowledge.

As gleaned from the key informants, their own personal interests and the availability of funding largely influence the research that they do. For those in the academe, funding for research can be sourced internally through small research grants which universities make available to the faculty. Within this context, academic researchers have greater freedom to investigate the topics that are of particular interest to them. However, because of funding limitations, the studies may be limited in scope. Support for larger research projects can also be obtained externally from funding agencies, however, the proposed research must fall within the priority areas of these agencies. In some instances academics conduct studies that are commissioned by external agencies.

Although personal interest in a topic generally motivates researchers, a desire to more directly influence policy can result in a research undertaking. An example of this was the policy study conducted in 1996 under the auspices of the Center for Integrative and Development Studies (CIDS) of the University of the Philippines. The study sought to determine the implications of the impending hand-over of Hong Kong to China in 1997 for the Philippine government and the Filipino migrant workers.

Recognizing the importance of presenting evidence to back up their policy or program advocacy, non-government organizations conduct their own studies. These are generally focused on topics of special interest to them and to the advocacy that they champion. For instance, Action for Health Initiatives (ACHIEVE), Inc. only conducts reproductive health-related studies while the Coalition Against Trafficking in Women-Asia Pacific (CATW-AP) concentrates on research issues related to women in trafficking and in prostitution. In the Philippines, CATW-AP continuously documents human rights
violations with a gender focus and taps the participation of ten other non-government organizations in the coalition to assist in gathering the data. As with academic researchers, NGOs must also seek funding support from outside the organization.

Although the Philippine Migrants Rights Watch (PMRW), a network of ten (10) NGOs, does not do research as an organization, some of its NGO members do. This is particularly true of the Scalabrini Migration Center (SMC) and the Institute on Church and Social Issues (ICSI) which have research as one of their primary functions.

Some international organizations in the Philippines, such as the International Organization for Migration (IOM) and the International Labour Organization have supported migration-related researches that are undertaken by academic or research institutions and NGOs. However, in the case of IOM, it is interested not so much in supporting researches in the Philippines that influence policy, but in studies that lead to programs, activities or services that benefit migrants. IOM feels that enough is being done in the Philippines by way of policy interventions that its resources can be put to better use elsewhere.

Several factors have shaped the work that migration researchers have done. In her review of migration research in the Philippines from 1975-1995, Yukawa (1996) succinctly summarizes the four factors that have influenced the work that researchers have done:

1. the desire to describe or analyze a phenomenon and its context as it unfolds;
2. new developments in migration theory;
3. policy interests; and
4. availability of funding and resources

Within the Department of Labour and Employment (DOLE), the government agency that makes policies affecting international labour migration, hardly any formal research on the various aspects of the phenomenon has been done through the years. Interestingly, DOLE has the Institute of Labour Studies which is the policy research arm of the department. Moreover, its attached agencies, the Philippine Overseas Employment Administration (POEA) and the Overseas Workers Welfare Administration (OWWA) have their own research units and a research budget.

A positive development, however, was the drawing up of a three-year research agenda by DOLE in October 2001 and the introduction of an annual research conference. The various units within DOLE will conduct in-house studies related to different aspects of labour and employment in the Philippines. Studies related to international labour migration will be undertaken by POEA, OWWA, and ILS.
5.4 Approaches to migration research

Influencing policy in the Philippines is an arduous task. Given the policy environment described above, policy advocates, including researchers and NGOs, spend a lot of time lobbying, negotiating and networking with politicians and other decision-makers in government.

Policy makers

In the Philippines, the formulation of government policy occurs within the legislative and executive branches of government. In the legislative front, Congress, through legislative action, enacts the laws and the appropriate department within the executive branch of government formulates the necessary rules and regulations governing the law. Policies emanating from the executive branch may come in the form of department orders or memorandum circulars.

Public policy making at the legislative level is often a long and tedious process that is influenced by an interplay of multiple factors from the personal to the social and the political. The passage of a bill into law is affected by the following:

- the strength of the public clamor;
- the endorsement of the President of the Philippines;
- the legislative priorities of the chairman of the committee in the House of Representatives or the Senate to which the bill has been submitted; and
- the interpersonal relations between the legislator sponsoring the bill and the chairman of the committee at the House of Representatives or the Senate to which the bill has been submitted as well as that of the legislator's technical staff and the secretary and technical staff of the said committee.

Generally, the initiative for the bills that are filed and sponsored by the senators and congressmen, including migration-related bills, comes from either the legislator himself, an NGO or other interest groups. The technical staff of the legislator assists in drafting the bill that he/she initiates. However, in other instances, the legislator approaches the relevant government agency to request for technical support in formulating the bill. On the other hand, the initiative for filing a bill may come from an NGO or an interest group that submits a draft of a bill to the legislator whose sponsorship it is seeking.

The law that governs various aspects of international migration, both temporary and permanent, is Republic Act 8042 or the Migrant Workers and Overseas Filipinos Act of 1995. It is a law designed to establish a higher standard of protection for the migrant workers, their families and other overseas Filipinos. Because of the highly charged social and political context surrounding the bill at the time that it was filed, R.A. 8042 has gone
on record as probably the fastest bill of major importance to be passed into law.\(^1\) It took a total of 11 days from the time Congress closed a special session that conducted marathon public hearings on the bill from May 22-27, 1995 until it was eventually signed into law by President Fidel V. Ramos on June 7, 1995.

The Department of Labour and Employment (DOLE) and the Department of Foreign Affairs (DFA) formulated the rules and regulations accompanying the R.A. 8042. DOLE was responsible for the rules and regulations governing temporary labour migration while those that governed permanent migration (emigration) were drawn by the DFA. The Philippine Overseas Employment Administration (POEA) and the Overseas Workers Welfare Administration (OWWA) are the implementing agencies within DOLE, while the Commission on Filipinos Overseas (CFO) is the implementing arm of DFA. While the law is not as easily amended, the implementation rules and regulations are periodically reviewed and amended as the need arises.

Within DOLE, the POEA is mainly responsible for recommending policies and policy changes related to international labour migration to the Secretary of Labour and Employment for approval. Through the Governing Board of POEA, policies related to labour employment are formulated. The board is a multi-sectoral body chaired by the Secretary of DOLE with the POEA Administrator as the vice-chairperson. According to R.A. 8042, its members should include representatives of the women migrants, the land-based workers, the seafarers, and the private sector. Policy recommendations come in the form of Governing Board resolutions (GBRs) that have to be approved and signed by the Secretary of Labour and Employment. The implementing guidelines of the GBRs are then spelled out in department orders or memorandum circulars.

Currently sitting on the board are four members. These include one representative from the migrant women’s sector; two representatives from the sea-based sector — one representing the seafarers themselves and the other representing the manning agencies; and one representative from the land-based sector representing the private recruitment agencies. There is no one on the board representing the interests of the land-based workers.

Before the policy recommendations are discussed at the governing board level, initial spadework is undertaken by POEA itself. Less formal consultative bodies are formed on an ad hoc basis to assist in formulating policy guidelines and recommendations. These are sometimes tripartite in nature designed to get feedback from the relevant government

\(^1\)The celebrated case of Flor Contemplacion, the Filipino domestic helper who was accused of the murder of another Filipino and her Singaporean ward, sentenced, and subsequently hanged in Singapore raised the collective outrage of the Filipino people. The case almost resulted in the cutting off of diplomatic ties between the Philippines and Singapore. It also resulted in the resignation from office of the Secretary of Labour and Employment and the dismissal of the former Philippine ambassador to Singapore who was then in a new posting in South Korea. The ambassador who was then posted in Singapore was recalled and placed under administrative suspension pending the results of an investigation into the incident.
agencies, the representatives from the land-based and sea-based workers and the private recruitment and manning agencies. On other occasions consultations are done on an industry-based level, if the issue is industry-specific.

The final recommendations from the consultation meetings are first presented for comment and discussion to the POEA directorate before they are finally presented to the governing board. The directorate consists of the POEA administrator who chairs it with all deputy administrators and directors as members.

The prevailing policy environment in the Philippines leaves much to be desired. Policy making in this country has been described as 'satisficing' rather than rational in its approach; consequently, policy makers are willing to settle for what is 'good enough' rather than what is best (Gonzalez, 1998). ('Satisficing' is a social psychological concept where a decision-maker chooses a course of action that is not necessarily the best but 'good enough'; the combination of satisfy and suffice produces a 'satisficing choice'.) Policy decisions are often arrived at based on incomplete information and without the benefit of systematic research. Moreover, competing demands from competing interests often lead to politically expedient policy decisions that are good enough but not the best.

While the importance of policy decisions based on systematic research has been articulated by the policy makers interviewed in the study, they were also quick to admit that very little of the work that is done by academic and research institutions has been directly utilized in the policy-making process. All the other key informants in the study from the NGOs and the academe were unanimous in reinforcing this observation.

Moreover, even when consultative dialogues with experts are conducted, 'these are often used to legitimize predetermined decisions made in the interest of particular groups' (Center for Integrative and Development Studies, 2000). It was precisely for this reason that one of the key informants in the study discontinued his participation in one such consultation meeting related to R.A. 8042.

Non-Government Organizations
Of all the policy advocates, the NGOs are generally the most driven and tenacious. This is true of NGOs representing the interests of migrant workers as well. Many migrant NGOs include legislative advocacy as one of their major activities. while others limit their policy advocacy to the department level where they try to influence policy decisions that have a direct impact on the groups and sectors that they represent. Action for Health Initiatives (ACHIEVE), Inc., for instance, does not do legislative advocacy; however, it focuses its efforts on influencing government policies and programs in the Department of Labour and Employment, through POEA and OWWA, and the Department of Health that affect the health needs of migrants.

On the other hand, the Coalition Against Trafficking in Women-Asia Pacific (CATW-AP) and the Philippine Migrants Rights Watch (PMRW) engage in legislative advocacy.
Both have gone to the extent of actively participating in discussions and legislative work for specific bills in Congress so that they can have direct inputs.

The CATW-AP was part of the technical working group in the House of Representatives that drafted the Anti-trafficking bill. It feels that it has made an impact in the formulation of the bill because its suggestions have found their way in the definitions and provisions of the bill. The research that they have been doing to document cases of trafficking and gender violence, not just in the Philippines but also in the Asia-Pacific region, have added weight to their legislative advocacy. Unfortunately, as in the case with many bills, this proposed legislation has been sitting in Congress for six years now. PMRW, on the other hand, was actively involved in the discussions and legislative work for the proposed Absentee Voting bill which seeks to give voting rights to overseas Filipinos.

To influence policy, NGOs have used various strategies to exert pressure and to be heard. They lobby in Congress, dialogue and negotiate with decision-makers, do research, and build formal and informal networks with policy makers and other NGOs. They also utilize the print and broadcast media to make their positions heard.

Because there is strength in numbers, one strategy which some of the NGOs have adopted to increase their effectiveness in influencing policy is to organise formal networks or coalitions among themselves. PMRW and CATW-AP exemplify this. Not only are their numbers increased, so are the resources available to them.

On the other hand, International organizations such as the International Organization for Migration (IOM) and the International Labour Organization (ILO) have indirectly tried to influence migration policy in the following ways:

- Providing the opportunity for policy makers, NGOs and researchers to come together for dialogue and exchange on policy issues;
- Conducting or providing funds for migration research and research dissemination to policy makers; and
- Moral suasion.

Migration Researchers
Efforts of migration researchers, particularly those in the academe, to directly influence migration-related policies in Congress and in the executive branch of government over the last 25 years have been extremely limited. None of the key informants reported helping to draft bills, lobbying in Congress, or sending policy briefs, executive summaries or copies of their research reports on a regular basis to legislators or policy makers in relevant government agencies. It should be noted, however, that migration scholars in the Philippines who do research on international migration on a sustained basis are limited in number.
Among the rare exceptions were two studies conducted in 1997 under the auspices of the Center of Integrative and Development Studies of the University of the Philippines (Samonte, 1997; Asis, Baviera, and Tigno, 1997). These researches attempted to directly influence migration policy related to the impending hand-over of Hong Kong to China.

The study of Samonte (1997) was an inventory of skills and long term plans of Filipino domestic helpers in Hong Kong. This research was partially funded by the Philippine Overseas Employment Administration (POEA) and was conducted in close coordination with it. The study of Asis et al. (1997) looked into implications of the hand-over of Hong Kong to China for the Philippine government and the migrant workers. This was a study that involved the collaborative efforts of CIDS and the Foreign Service Institute (FSI) of the Department of Foreign Affairs.

A roundtable discussion was organised for each of these studies to disseminate the research findings to representatives of key government agencies, NGOs, and academe, and to draw out their policy implications in light of the impending turnover. Because of the lack of follow-through and the fact that the hand-over was overtaken by the Asian financial crisis, it is unclear whether or not these studies have made any concrete impact on policy.

Researchers in the academe, however, have continuously maintained their linkages with NGOs and policy makers in government agencies on an informal basis. In research dissemination seminars, conferences, and other migration forums organised by researchers and research institutions, policy makers, particularly in the relevant government agencies are generally invited as speakers or as participants. Although the decision-makers in government rarely attend unless they have a specific part in the activity, representatives are almost always sent. How much gets fed back to the policy makers cannot be ascertained. The invitation is also extended to NGOs. However, senators and congressmen who constitute an important group of policy makers have rarely been invited to these activities.

The attempt to maintain the informal links is reciprocal. NGOs and government agencies also invite researchers as speakers or resource persons in activities that they organise.

5.5 Links between researchers and policy makers

Almost all of the key informants in the study were of the opinion that research, particularly scholarly, academic research, has had very little or no impact at all on migration policy in the Philippines. While this is so, it is difficult to measure its actual effects because many factors come into play in the process of decision making at the policy level.
Moreover, the effects of research on policy cannot be readily assessed because the impact could be direct or indirect, visible or invisible. Its influence could also be on the post-policy processes (e.g. implementation, program development and policy evaluation) and not necessarily on policy formulation. It is safe to say, however, that the direct, visible influence of migration research on policy formulation and its post-policy processes is minimal at best. Several factors have hindered the ability of research to influence policy. (Refer to the next section). On the other hand, the indirect, invisible effects of research on migration policy is much more difficult to ascertain. There is no way of determining the extent to which the dissemination efforts of researchers and the networking that they do with NGOs and policy makers have influenced migration policy in some way.

There is no argument, however, among all the key informants in the study (including policy-makers) about the value and importance of systematic research in the formulation of sound migration policies. It is unfortunate that academic researchers whose strength lies in scientific rigor have not been able to make a more visible and direct impact on policy. The potential of scholarly research undertaken by academic and research institutions for more directly influencing policy has been greatly limited by a number of factors. Among those cited by the key informants are the following:

- **Lack of information about and access to the available research by policy makers.** According to policy-makers, research results are not disseminated widely enough to come to their knowledge and attention. Researchers however, point out that policy-makers do not exert effort to actively seek out the research that is available.

- **Absence of direct policy relevance in the researches undertaken.** Not all of the studies which migration researchers do have obvious, direct, or immediate policy relevance. One policy-maker commented that academic research is not attuned to the policy needs of government. As a result, these tend to be ignored by policy-makers.

- **Lengthy gestation period of research projects.** Policy-makers also pointed out that the researches which academics undertake often take time and are not available when they are needed.

- **Packaging of the research results.** Since they do not have the luxury of time, policy-makers do not like to read lengthy research reports full of academic jargon. Consequently, research results and policy recommendations must be packaged in a form that is succinct and straight-to-the-point, like a two-page policy brief or an executive summary.

Another important factor that also greatly limits the power of migration researchers, as opposed to NGOs to influence policy, is the fact that the research which scholars do represent the voice of only one or a few individuals. Scholars also tend to be generally passive, believing that their work is done once the research is completed.
The position that NGOs take represents the voice of a large group or sector. They are highly visible and they actively lobby and push for their own policy agenda. To their credit, NGOs understand the value of research to provide empirical support to their legislative advocacy. Consequently, a number of them do some form of research even if, in certain cases, the soundness and the rigor of the studies may not stand up to scientific scrutiny.

The NGOs have also recognised and capitalized on the power inherent in numbers in their legislative advocacy and quest for policy reforms on all fronts. As a result, NGOs have organised formal networks and coalitions to consolidate their resources and to reinforce their strength. In this study, the two networks of NGOs have been able to make direct inputs into proposed migration-related legislation. Whether or not their substantive inputs will eventually be carried in the final version of the bill or if the bill will ever be passed into law is subject to the influence of a combination of factors.

5.6 Enhancing the Ability to Influence Policy: Implications for PMRN and APMRN

How then can researchers harness their potential to more actively influence policy? Migration researchers can learn a lot from NGOs in this regard. As one key informant in government put it, researchers should learn 'to think like NGOs' and utilise all the resources available to them if they want to make an impact on policy.

Research could have a more potent collective impact on migration policy in the policy formulation and post-policy stages if the potential synergy among major research institutions and researchers can be harnessed. This could be done through cooperation and complementation in the research and related activities that they do. Strengthening their linkages with committed government officials (including legislators), civil society groups, and the media can enhance it even further.

Philippine Migration Research Network (PMRN)
The Philippine Migration Research Network (PMRN) is in a strategic position strengthen the links between government, NGOs and researchers. Its membership includes not only researchers but also members of various NGOs and the government agencies involved in migration. However, being a fairly young organization, PMRN is not yet widely known. Although all of the key informants among the researchers, NGOs, and government officials in DOLE and POEA knew of PMRN and most were members of the network, none of the key informants from the Senate and the House of Representatives had ever heard of it.
PMRN can therefore adopt the following strategies to enhance the ability of research to make an impact on policy-making as well as improve its visibility in the community at large:

Research planning and implementation

• Draw up a research agenda for migration that incorporates the research priorities as well as the policy issues and concerns of policy-makers, civil society groups, researchers, and other stakeholders in migration.
• Engage in participatory research with a policy thrust in which policy-makers and/or civil society groups and other stakeholders are involved from the project planning stage of the study onward. PMRN members can undertake the research collaboratively or individually.

Research dissemination and utilization

• More actively disseminate research findings directly to policy-makers, civil society groups, and the media.
• PMRN can write policy briefs and executive summaries of completed researches that can be posted on its web site or disseminated directly to policy-makers, civil society groups and the media via e-mail, fax, or snail mail.
• Roundtable discussions, symposiums, seminars and policy workshops can be organised.
• Popularize research results by writing articles for newspapers and the PMRN web site.

Legislative advocacy

• Assist NGOs and legislators in drafting migration-related bills.
• Roundtable discussions and work-shops can be organised.
• Participate in consultation meetings and committee hearings for migration-related bills filed in Congress.
• Do policy analysis of migration-related laws and forward recommendations to the concerned policy-makers.

Publications

• Establish a track record in publications.

Networking

• Provide the venue for the continuing exchange of information among researchers, policy-makers, civil society groups and the media through roundtable discussions or seminars on current issues and concerns in migration.
• Provide training in research to build up the research capability of NGOs and government agencies involved in migration.
• Get accreditation in the Philippine APEC Study Center Network (PASCN) to expand PMRN’s ability to influence migration policy, not only at the local level, but also at the regional level.
• Be part of the National Labour Information Network (NATLINE) maintained by the Institute of Labour Studies of the Department of Labour and Employment.

Membership
• Expand membership to allow for institutional members in addition to its individual members.
• However, to be able to undertake all of the activities outlined above PMRN needs to find sources of additional funds.

Asia Pacific Migration Research Network (APMRN)
APMRN can play a significant role in influencing policy at the regional level. To do this, however, it has to increase its visibility in the Asia-Pacific region. In the Philippines, for instance, APMRN is even less known than PMRN. Moreover, it also has to strengthen the ties among its members by engaging in more collaborative activities. There are several ways by which APMRN can increase its potential in influencing migration policy in the Asia-Pacific:

Research planning and implementation
• Draw up a regional research agenda based on the priority migration issues within the region.
• Organise a regional research agenda workshop
• Engage in collaborative research with a policy thrust which is bilateral or multi-lateral in which policy-makers and/or civil society groups and other stakeholders within each participating country are involved from the project planning stage of the study onward.

Research dissemination and utilization
• Organise regional policy workshops bringing together policy-makers, researchers and/or civil society groups to disseminate research findings
• Publish research reports as books, monographs or journal articles
• Write policy briefs and executive summaries of completed researches that can be posted on its web site or disseminated directly to policy-makers, civil society groups and the media via e-mail, fax, or snail mail.

Legislative advocacy
• Be part of the APEC structure by getting accreditation as an observer. (Before APEC ministerial meetings, policy papers and the like can be distributed to policy-makers representing the APEC member countries via e-mail, snail mail, etc.).

Networking
• Provide the venue for the continuing exchange of information among researchers, policy-makers, and civil society groups in the region on current issues and concerns in migration through regional seminars, conferences, or workshops on specific issues and concerns in migration.
• It should be noted, however, that it is primarily through its members that APMRN can more directly influence migration policy in the Asia-Pacific. Consequently, the stronger and the more active all its member networks are within their own countries, the greater the overall impact of APMRN will be within the region.
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6.1 Introduction and Method

Rationale
Migration has become an important political and social issue in the Asia Pacific. Its significance as a regional issue is evidenced in the changing emphasis from migration to countries outside the region, to intra-regional migrations and the formations of communities.

Transnational movements are a phenomenon which has occurred in Thailand for many decades. The nature of migratory flows in Thailand covers refugees, immigrant workers from neighbouring countries, Thai migrant workers, and international tourists. There are many factors that inform Government migration policy such as national economic interest; private sector; international agencies; and social matters. Government policy has not responded to the migration problems and migration related issues, particularly with regard to the aftermath of the Asian financial crisis in 1997.

Migration research is a relatively new field of study to the region. Some of the key themes of this research are labour migration; border controls and border economies; sex workers; domestic workers and legal and illegal migration. The Asia Pacific Migration Research Network (APMRN) was initiated by a number of scholars throughout the Asia Pacific to develop institutional links and undertake research projects on migration in the Asia Pacific Region. The research projects, coordinated by the Centre for Asia Pacific Social Transformation Studies (CAPTRANS), University of Wollongong, were approved by UNESCO’s Management of Social Transformations (MOST) program for seed funding and project support in 1995. A part of APMRN’s mission is to research and publish trends and developments in the population movements of the Asia Pacific region, including Thailand.

APMRN research capabilities have informed, not only to APMRN members, but also Network colleagues, other interested scholars as well as policy makers. As for policy making, there is a need to ensure the results of such research can effectively reach policy makers and advisors. The objectives of this study are to investigate the role of the APMRN in bridging the gap between research and policy.
6.2 Migration trends from 1990s to 2001

Emigration from Thailand

The Thai labour force began to work abroad in the mid 1970s as there was a huge labour shortage in Middle East countries due to the oil boom (Pongsapich, 1995). Hundreds of thousand of workers were employed in the Gulf on the construction of oil rigs and pipelines. From 1990 to mid-2000, almost 200,000 Thai workers went to Saudi Arabia, Israel, Qatar, Bahrain, the United Arab Emirates, Kuwait, Libya and other Middle East countries, but many migrants (160,000–180,000) also went to Asia Pacific destinations. During the past decade (1990-2000), 1.63 million Thai workers migrated abroad for employment.

In the 1990s, the new trends of emigration flows for employment shifted from the Middle East to Asia Pacific destinations. With the rise of newly industrialized countries (NICS) in the region, the labour market became open for Thai workers. Taiwan, Korea, Japan, Hong Kong, Singapore, Brunei and Malaysia are the new destinations. The ratio of Thai workers to the Asia-Pacific compared with those to all other destinations is approximately 90:10 (Chantavanich, 1999). This trend is called the Asianization of migration flows.

At present, most Thai workers are employed in the construction and manufacturing industries. Some are engaged in the services sector as domestic helpers, cleaners, caretakers and the like. The new categories of employment attracted more female workers both in the manufacturing and the services sectors. It should be noted that a remarkable number of Thai women are engaged in the entertainment business, especially in Japan. Almost all female workers in Japan are undocumented migrants. Some of these workers were recruited by crime syndicates. Human trafficking is a major issue for female migration for work especially in the entertainment and sex business.

In 2000 Taiwan, Singapore, Malaysia and Brunei were the major receiving countries. Thai workers are employed mostly in construction work in Taiwan, Singapore and Brunei. Manufacturing work is also a major sector of employment in Taiwan. In Malaysia, workers are hired in services, manufacturing as well as agricultural sectors.

Most destination countries in the Asia Pacific tend to curb the number of unskilled migrant workers in their countries. This directly affects Thai workers who are predominantly unskilled, and migrate through the facilitations of illegal recruiting agencies and networks of friends and relatives. In order to escape from such constraints, many workers left Thailand as tourists, then went to work as undocumented workers in those destinations, making the number of irregular migrants more significant.

Immigration into Thailand

The rapid two-digit economic growth in Thailand at the end of the 1980s has changed the status of Thailand from a sending country of migrant labourers into a receiving country of migrant workers from neighbouring countries. There are certain kinds of employment which
are shunned by local workers. The labour shortage was caused by better job opportunities for young people and the expansion of the number of years for basic education to 9 years. The first industry to employ migrant workers was fishery and fishing related industries (seafood processing, frozen seafood, dry seafood, etc.). Migrant workers from Myanmar, Cambodia and Laos started to work in the 3D jobs (difficult, dirty and dangerous) in the early 1990s.

From the beginning of 1990s, the number of migrant workers increased steadily and the government began to be aware of the problem. In 1992, the government announced the first policy to allow migrant workers to be employed only in four border provinces which are all Myanmar border provinces. The biggest number of migrant workers were from Myanmar, followed by Chinese, South Indians, Cambodians and Laos. When the government announced an amnesty for migrant workers in 1996, the number of foreign workers who came for registration were highest in the construction industry, followed by agriculture, domestic work, fishing and production. By 1996, the estimated number of migrant workers in Thailand had increased to one million persons. The vast majority of these migrants were undocumented and it was clear from the existing data that the largest group of migrants came from Myanmar. There were approximately 300,000 migrant workers who came to register in seven kinds of jobs in 43 provinces in Thailand. These registered workers were estimated as 50 percent of the overall number of migrant workers at that time. In 1998, the third policy to allow workers to be employed in 47 kinds of jobs in 54 provinces was announced. Many employers thought that they could employ migrant workers without proper registration as long as they could bribe officials in charge of registering and monitoring the employment (Chantavanich et al. 1999).

The most recent short term policy for migrant workers was the 1999-2000 announcement to allow 106,684 workers to be employed in 18 kinds of jobs in 34 provinces. It is estimated that at present there are one million migrant workers in Thailand, employed in all provinces. Due to the lack of a clear policy and poor legal enforcement, the control of the number of migrant workers failed.

6.3 Migration research in Thailand since the 1980s

The early 1980s (1980-85)
In this period the emigration phenomenon was beginning to be acknowledged (although emigration had been going on since the 1960s and 70s) and the research titles of this period were mostly focused on reasons for migrating, sources of Thai labour, social and cultural impacts on communities as consequences of emigration. The emigration in this period was toward the Middle East and thus research studies focused on migration to the Middle East and its impacts, on the returnees from this area, as well as on reasons for migrants returning to the Middle East after coming back to Thailand (Sawangdee, 1983; Arnold and Shah, 1984; Bunnark and Saowapha, 1985; Rungcheewin, 1985). The involvement of Thai women in prostitution in Europe was also studied (Sereewat, 1983).
There were only a few studies on immigration in this period and these were on illegal immigrants into Thailand and their protection by international law. As the remittances from migrants increased, Kasetsart University made a study of the inflows as a source of foreign exchange earnings (Kerdpibul, 1984).

**The late 1980s (1986-89)**

During this time, there was a study on the role of the Department of Labour and Social Welfare's role in the administration of overseas workers, while the Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare itself also studied the impact of labour export on the internal labour market (Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare, 1989). Protection of Thai fishermen and crew who fish in foreign territories was also researched. A comparative study of economic and social differences between families with and without members working abroad showed that there was significant difference in terms of income, debt payments, savings, consumption and career changing expectations in favour of the former group (Social Science Researcher Association, 1989).

Some studies on immigration included a study of the interface of tourism and AIDS (Cohen, 1988). There was also research on Khmer refugees as well as on the Hmong in Thailand. Illegal immigrants and displaced persons were also researched by the Ministry of the Interior's Operations Center for Displaced Persons. In the 1990s the migration phenomenon really took off and there have been numerous studies in this period that cover various aspects of emigration and immigration.

**The early 1990s (1990-95)**

During these years the emigration was toward the South-East Asian and East Asian countries such as Malaysia, Singapore, Brunei, Taiwan, Hong Kong, Japan and Korea and there were many studies concerning migrants to each of these countries. In the studies on emigration in this period, there was still a focus on remittances from migrants and their developmental impact. The causes and consequences of Asia's new migrations were studied from theoretical viewpoints and migration was found to be linked to trends toward global economic, political and cultural integration (Athukorala, 1993; Pongsapich, 1950; Tingsabadh, 1994). Protection for Thai migrant workers abroad was of greater concern.

Research on immigration in the early 1990s included studies on HIV/AIDS and population movement, economic development linked with Thai commercial sex sector, trafficking of Burmese women in Thailand, health of Cambodians in refugee camps among other studies (Gray, 1991; Tanapornphan, 1993; Archavanitkul and Philip, 1994; Foundation for Women, 1995).

There were also studies on the Thai labour market in relation to development strategies, and the impact of economic development on labour markets and migration. HIV/AIDS and prostitution/commercial sex as a part of migration was researched extensively, as can be seen in studies on trafficking of women, child prostitution, and cross border migrations (Pyne, 1992; Skrobanek, 1994; Gray and Sompop, 1995).
**The late 1990s to present (1996-2001)**

The economic crisis of 1997 in Thailand had its effect on migration and led to studies such as the Thai crisis and migration, the impacts of the crisis and responses during economic growth and downturn (Chalamwong, 1998; Batistella and Maruja, 1999; Chantavanich et al, 2000). Other aspects of the crisis such as the social impact were studied by the ILO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (ILO, 1998).

In this period, government departments such as the Department of Labour and Department of Recruitment published guidebooks and handbooks regarding overseas employment as it had become concerned about safety and protection of the Thai migrant workers. At the same time, Thai labour was promoted as an export. Safety and protection of women workers also became important as more women workers migrated (although in the early days it had been mostly Thai male workers who emigrated). Urban women were also part of the migrating phenomenon, not just rural women. The social impacts on households as a result of the women migrating were studied (Skrobanek, 1996). Research into the reduction of service fees and costs borne by migrants was also carried out with a view to lessening the burden placed on migrants.

NGOs researched and published studies on protection of women migrants in the various destination countries, and the health of migrants. HELP Asian Women’s Shelter for example produced a guidebook for Thais working in Japan (HELP Asian Women’s Shelter, 1998).

In the late 1990s the emphasis of the immigration research studies moved to the Thai-Myanmar (Burma) border as many displaced Burmese migrated in large numbers into Thai territory as the Burmese economy became more chaotic, causing social, economic and political problems for Thailand (Chinnawaso, 1996; Chalamwong et al, 1996; Chantavanich, 1998). There were not as many studies on Cambodian (Khmer) or Laotian migrants as these migrants were not as numerous as the Burmese migrants.

As there was already a considerable amount of data amassed over the years, a list of the data collecting organizations was compiled, maps of migration patterns were made, and the types of migration information available were noted. Development strategies and migration patterns were studied as well as the impact of globalization. Health problems especially HIV/AIDS continue to be researched. HIV/AIDS continues to draw interest as the HIV/AIDS problem is widespread and has reached epidemic proportions throughout the South-East Asian region (Limanonda, 1997; Oppenheimer et al. 1998; UNICEF, 1998). Critiques of government policy in relation to migration were presented and recommendations put forward. As the 21st century approached, there were studies on prospective and alternative directions and policy implications as well as projections regarding migration in the 21st century.
6.4 Methodology

Sampling
The core research involved primary data collection. The first importance was to design questionnaire and then to select survey targets from government, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and research institutions. Nineteen in-depth interviews were conducted between July and October 2001. Officials from government offices, representatives each of international organizations and non-governmental organizations were interviewed. Appendix C contains a list of those who were interviewed in each.

Interview method
An interview questionnaire was used to do the research. A questionnaire on the following themes was formulated for each of three groups of interviewees.

Government representatives
1. Knowledge of the existence of the APMRN and country networks or of individual APMRN members working in the area of migration;
2. Use of APMRN research outputs;
3. The development processes for migration policy;
4. Relationship between government and civil sector (the community consultation processes); and
5. Quantity of migration research, and on what basis is it commissioned?

NGOs/UN Agencies
1. Links with the APMRN and its members;
2. Links with wider academic community;
3. Value and uses of APMRN research;
4. Strategies and processes in place to inform government of grassroots issues; and
5. Quality and quantity of field research generated internally and its use value for government policy makers.

Academics/researchers
1. Links with government and NGOs;
2. Level of consultation by government on policy issues;
3. Media activity; and
4. Public advocacy.

6.5 Project Objectives
The aims of project are as follows:
1. To examine the possible role of the APMRN in providing migration policy makers with advice and recommendations;
2. To examine the potential impact of the APMRN in broadening participation in
government planning and policy.

We were successful in making appointments for only nineteen of the thirty original targets selected, mainly due to the fact that officers in governmental agencies were in transition to important positions during September through the beginning of November. Despite this data limitation, we hope our results will provide baseline data for future research in migration issues.

6.6 Approach to Migration Research

Generally speaking, the objectives of the three parties, namely policy makers, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and academics/researchers, differ considerably. Government policy makers tend to focus on national security and political objectives while NGOs are committed to protection and problem solving for migrants, and academics conduct research that is of academic interest as well as research that is useful to the government and NGOs. Thus priorities are also very different among these three groups.

Migration has been divided into, and studied under, various themes by policy makers, NGOs and academics. Themes such as regular and irregular migration, emigration and immigration, urban-rural migration, forced migrations, legal and illegal migrations, female migrants, economic migrants, and so on. The aspects studied cover economic, social, political, legal, environmental and health aspects of migration.

Research institutes or units which conduct studies on migration can be categorized as those within the universities, those in the ministerial offices and those in the international organization/network. Each category comprises of the following:

University/research Institute
- The Asian Research Center for Migration (ARCM), Chulalongkorn University
- Institute for Population and Social Research (IPSR), Mahidol University
- Institute of Population Studies (IPS), Chulalongkorn University
- Thailand Development Research Institute (TDRI)

Ministerial offices
- Development and Research Unit, Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare (MLSW)
- National Security Council
- National Economic and Social Development Board, Office of the Prime Minister

International organization/network
- International Labour Organization (ILO)
- International Organization for Migration (IOM)
- Asia Pacific Migration Research Network (APMRN)
- World Health Organization (WHO)
Policy makers

Most of the officials in the policy making departments and divisions interviewed, stated that they used Thai language migration research reports done by the Asian Research Center for Migration (ARCM) and governmental agencies (Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare – MLSW and National Security Council) in formulating plans regarding population movement, both emigration and immigration, in Thailand. Also, previous research reports were consulted since the departments did not want to duplicate the research done by other organizations. Reports (in English language) of international organizations such as International Labour Organization (ILO) and International Organization for Migration (IOM) and the Asia Pacific Migration Research Network (APMRN) were also referenced.

Some of the policy making departments and divisions interviewed did not have their own budget or their own researchers. The Department of Employment, however, has its own research section, with a budget from the government. The ARCM would also be commissioned to do research that the department required, for example research on labour shortage. Most of the research of this department would be in cooperation with other organizations since they did not want the results to be biased.

The Human Resources Planning Division under the Office of the Prime Minister uses mostly ARCM, IOM and other governmental agencies’ migration research. Its important responsibility is to provide information about human resource development in the country. Population movement, both emigration and immigration, for Thailand is also studied. This division provides the main part of the national economic development and social plan for the whole country. The department does not have research budget and does not hire researchers but uses research from other organizations.

The Rural Health Division under the Ministry of Public Health always uses migration research findings in Thai and English language from government agencies, Ministry of Labour, National Security Council, Ministry of Interior, Institute for Population and Social Research (IPSR), ARCM, IOM, and APMRN. Recently, the research findings used were mostly related to immigration, especially illegal migration.

The Department of Local Administration, Ministry of Interior, is responsible for providing registration and identification cards for Thai citizens and for minority groups (i.e. Vietnamese refugees, Yunnanese refugees, Burmese displaced persons and some tribes of ethnic groups in Northern Thailand) and has to examine how and why to issue such cards. Refugee data determination and identity cards for hill tribe population are some of the important tasks of this department. This department does not use a great deal of migration research findings and has no research section.

The Operations Center for Displaced Persons works in cooperation with the UNHCR and uses the UNHCR research reports on topics such as refugees, displaced persons and illegal migrants. Research done by ARCM and IOM were used for literature review occasionally.
The Standing Committee of the Senate on Labour Affairs does not have its own research section but has academic advisers. The committee conduct some case studies rather than research, for example, a case study on expenditure incurred by Thai labourers who go abroad. The Committee uses the migration (both emigration and immigration) research of ARCM, TDRI, ILO and IOM.

The Office of the Permanent Secretary for Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare and the Department of Employment are main bodies under MLSW, and study and provide data on the migration situation to the government. The Office of the Permanent Secretary has its own research budget but does not do research itself. It requests the academic institute to conduct research. The latter has both its own budget and research and development unit. It aims to do research which could increase the department’s efficiency, and researches at least one or two topics per year. Actually, migration research done by ARCM, IPSR, TDRI, IOM, ILO and UNAID were used for background information for further planning relating to these issues.

NGOs/UN agencies
Generally, migration is viewed by NGOs as beneficial and they also believe that migrants need to be recognized for the remittances they send back to their countries (emigrants) and the economic labour they provide (immigrants). Recognizing them is an important step toward protecting them and their rights.

Most of the NGOs interviewed stated that they used previous research in order not to duplicate the research that has already been done. They also use migration research reports from ARCM frequently. Some NGOs believed that the government does not use migration research results much because of the varied topics covered. There was some difficulty experienced in accessing research reports in the Thai language in some international NGOs.

NGOs such as World Vision and CARE are focused on HIV/AIDS, trafficking, child migrants and illegal migrants research but do not have their own researchers nor do they have budgets to do their own research. Instead, research project proposals are submitted to potential sponsors. They then seek co-operation from academics and government bodies. Mostly HIV/AIDS and illegal migrants research was considered for sponsorship. Both organizations often use the finding results done by ARCM, Institute of Population Studies (IPS) at Chulalongkorn University, IPSR and IOM.

The Center for the Protection of Children’s Rights Foundation focuses on only the rights of the child, and is concerned with trafficking, forced labour, and other human rights issues that are raised. The research topics on international trafficking, labour recruitment and gender abuses are the Center’s main concerns. It does not have its own research budget and researchers since its primary tasks are to help the children who face problems such as sexual harassment and forced labour. Frequently, the Centre uses migration research or studies to obtain additional information that has been researched by other agencies i.e. ARCM and ILO. Documents on related topics, issued by governmental offices, are also most useful for
them.

In an interview with responsible personnel from the International Organization for Migration we found that IOM does not conduct its own research but is oriented towards providing services, for example training courses and technical cooperation.

The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) has field officers to conduct its own research and it also commissions projects to outside academics/researchers and individual experts. (Note: The Thai government is not a signatory to the 1951 Geneva Convention and thus does not recognize refugees as such but considers them to be displaced persons. Nevertheless much has been done for these persons by the government.)

The United Nations Economic, Social and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) as well as the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) do not have their own staff to do research but hire social science researchers. However, many research articles published in cooperation by both bodies were widely used by government agencies, academics and among the NGOs.

Academics/researchers
An interview with Director of Asian Research Center for Migration (ARCM), Institute of Asian Studies, revealed that research by the ARCM is usually conducted with regard to current migration issues which can be divided into immigration and emigration issues; usually migration research is conducted where problems and issues are raised. For example, because of the lack of Thai labourers in the whole country especially in the industrial zones, the study of labour shortage in Thailand was conducted in 1998 by ARCM at the MLSW’s request.

It was felt that there was still inadequate usage of the findings of research that is conducted by the ARCM, although in recent year there has been more use by the government agencies of the research studies regarding immigration. It was also felt that there was an inadequate development of government policy to keep up with the migration issues and that policy responses could be faster.

A high official of the University of Siam explained that the university does its own research and has its own funding for migration research. Sometimes external funding is also received. Other organizations, government agencies and academic institutes are requested to provide research findings to support some projects.

Institute of Population Studies (IPS) in Chulalongkorn University is an organization which studies and conducts many research projects relating to migration. Just as for the University of Siam, Chulalongkorn’s IPS’ senior researcher also indicated that IPS does its own research but does not have its own funding. The financial support is both internal and external, i.e. university, Thailand Research Fund, IOM and World Health Organization (WHO). With regard to migration, research has been done by other bodies such as ARCM, Ministry of
Public Health, IOM and UNDP. The IPS research team has recognized their usefulness in order to obtain background information before carrying out its own research.

An assistant professor of the Graduate Program in Human Resource Development, National Institute of Development Administration (NIDA) uses research findings from the ARCM, NGOs and government agencies in her research. Although she has done only a few research studies, she is personally very interested in immigration and refugees.

In an interview with a senior researcher from Thailand Development Research Institute (TDRI), he emphasised the importance of migration research. Working with TDRI, which is well known as a 'think tank' in Thailand, his academic research focuses on migration-related issues, particularly those concerning Thai migrant workers and illegal migrants in Thailand. Actually, TDRI's main tasks are to research and to provide information which the government or public needs to know. It has its own research budget and research team.

As far as we know, TDRI's researcher team is of high quality and very experienced. However, by nature most academic researchers need to read the previous research that has been done in order to review and examine the results. They have recognized that it is useless to duplicate research; the best way is to provide new organ of knowledge for other interested parties and government. As a result, the migration research which has been conducted previously before they carry out any new projects. It is not surprising that migration research done by ARCM, IPSR, IOM, ILO, UN agencies and other academic institutes will be used by TDRI research team.

Links between Researchers, NGOs and Policy makers

In Thailand research projects on migration are mainly funded by two sources. The first is through internal funding by the government, universities and Thailand Research Fund (TRF). Most funding is awarded through competitive grants. Also, collaborative projects are being encouraged by the TRF; the main research grants council in Thailand, since it has recognized the need for links between different organizations i.e. governmental agencies, non-governmental organizations and academic institutes, including private researchers. The other source of funding is from external resources such as the Japan Foundation, Ford Foundation, IOM, ILO and WHO etc.

In recent years many research projects in Thailand were a result of co-operation between government agencies and academic institutes, for example the research on labour shortage 1998, 1999 and 2000; and the pilot study of the need of migrant workers for the year 2001 which were conducted by the Institute of Asian Studies in co-operation with the Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare (MLSW) (as shown in Figure 6.1)
Figure 6.1 Co-operation between ARCM with MLSW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal links</th>
<th>Informal links</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- MLSW</td>
<td>- NGOs: World Vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provincial employment office</td>
<td>- Governmental agencies: Provincial health office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ARCM</td>
<td>- Rajabhat Institutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Academics from the provincial universities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6.2 Formal and informal linkages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal links</th>
<th>Informal links</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governmental agencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal contract to conduct research</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic / research institutes</td>
<td><strong>Contacting NGOs at the target area</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collecting data</td>
<td><strong>Asking local NGOs officers provide some information and linkages to the key informants, sometimes collecting data together</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td><strong>Checking up and examine the analyzed data with local officers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenting the draft research report</td>
<td><strong>Involved NGOs are invited to attend and express their opinion or advice.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participants: Gov. officers, academics, NGOs, International agencies and general interested people</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editing the report, submitting to the funding source and publishing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using outputs by the gov. agencies, International bodies, NGOs and other interested academics and general people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.2 shows the linkages between the governmental agencies, academic research institutes and NGOs.

**Formal links**

There are formal links between academics and government bodies when the latter commission research projects by the academics. Academics also do independent research and submit findings to the relevant government organizations. Recommendations may be adopted by the government, as in the case of the migrant labour quotas recommended in
1998 by the ARCM. The government bodies may contract university research centers or individuals to undertake research or evaluation projects. Such work is often problematic: research questions and methods are set by the government; the focus may be narrowly concerned with policy matters; academic standards of theory and methodology may not be maintained; and findings are often not published especially if government officials do not like them.

Recently, most of the research centers tend to co-ordinate the research activities of academics who teach in various departments or universities. However, a number of individuals who carry out research on migration related issues also work as consultants for government agencies. Sometimes their research results from personal interest. Most of the work of the latter is published in academic journals or books.

Governmental bodies commissioning NGOs does not seem to occur. But NGOs may submit their independent research to the government. NGOs will hire researchers to conduct research on specified topics. International NGOs are sometimes not able to access research findings and reports if/where findings are presented in the Thai language.

**Informal links**

Informal links among policy makers, NGOs and academics occur on a personal basis. As said above, government (policy makers) and academics often collaborate with each other to formally undertake the research. In the meantime, NGOs' role is more as an informal player. Sometimes neither government nor academics signed contract with NGOs but actually asked them to provide some local information which field officers may provide including some linkages to the local key informants. NGOs are more needed when the research team makes a field trip to collect data, since they are very close and familiar with the area and may have in-depth information. Thus, they are most useful in the field.

6.7 Analysis of Links

**The influence of migration research**

In Thailand, migration research influences migration policy only if it has been commissioned by governmental agencies. If research is so commissioned, then it may directly influence national migration policy. However, the commissioning of work does not guarantee that the research will influence policy makers. This occurs when the agency that has commissioned the work does not agree with the findings of the research. An example of this is the research on labour shortage in 2001 that MLSW commissioned the ARCM to conduct. After the research was completed its findings and recommendations where not implemented by the government.

In the case of non-commissioned research, there are not systematic links between researchers and policy makers. Researchers have no idea whether or not their research will be considered or have any influence on migration policy.
The lack of workshops, seminars and other forms of interactive presentations of the research findings is one of many barriers which prevent the findings from reaching and influencing policy makers. The lack of seminar and workshops also restricts the number of academic groups that can participate in providing the government with advice and opinions to those who participated in writing the research report. Organizing the seminar or workshop and inviting the policy makers together with the researchers to comment or review research findings, will bring the research findings closer to policy makers.

In Thailand, the culture of policy makers is a very significant barrier to effectively influencing migration policy through research. Most Thai policy makers do not have a research consumption culture. They often make decisions on migration policy without considering or even reading any research. The Ministry of Interior is an obvious example.

Furthermore, timing is another barrier that obstructs migration research from reaching policy makers. Frequently, good quality research reports are out of date because the research report was submitted to the donors quite late. Such reports are often no longer applicable to the current situation as circumstances have changed since the data used in the report was collected. In addition to these problems, some users have questioned the validity of the research methodology and some are concerned about possible bias of the researchers. Naturally, these concerns will influence them not to use the research findings.

Other issues that policy makers have to consider
Besides the barriers mentioned above, there are also other issues that policy makers consider when formulating policy. First of all, they have to consider the feasibility of implementing the research recommendations. For instance, the study of migrant workers policy recommended policy makers to give basic rights (i.e. rights to work, rights to educate) to migrant workers. However these considerations had to be weighted up with national security interests that would be compromised by such a move.

Secondly, policy makers have to pay attention to political considerations that are not included in academic research. When it comes to migration policy there are many different political interests involved. When making policy decisions they not only have to pay attention to security interests, but also to business concerns because if their policies were to adversely effect the business interests of politically powerful business men then the policy makers them delves could suffer politically.

The third issue that policy makers should consider is costs of implementing the recommended migration policy. In the past some recommendations have not been implemented because the government deemed the costs to be too high. The recommendation on the rights of migrant workers was an example of this. Researchers advised policy makers to give migrant workers and their families free access to health service, however, the costs were so expensive that the government could not accept the recommendation.
An example of migration research having an influence on migration policy

ARCM's study on migrant worker policy is a good example of research having an influence on migration policy. In 1999, 2000 and 2001 the Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare commissioned ARCM to conduct research on labour shortage. One of many objectives was to identify the need for migrant workers in the Thai economy. In the past, the policies were heavily criticized for being short term with no longer-term strategies and little in the way of appropriate policies for particular target groups. In addition, there was no effective follow-up to monitor the provision of services or protection, and the system was rife with corruption. While policies and practices have made some attempt to provide reasonable conditions for workers there has been no accompanying policy that looks at families of workers. New arrivals who have not yet found employment have not been seriously considered either. The total number of those not gainfully employed may be twice the number of those currently working.

The recommendations raised by the research team were almost all accepted by the Cabinet and put into action in 1999. Although the Office of Immigration Bureau and the Ministry of Labour thanked the ARCM for this work, some NGOs criticized the number of migrant workers permitted to be hired as being too low and causing over 100,000 migrants to continue to work illegally. Recommendations submitted in 2000 were return to the research team to adjust some of the figures in the report's recommendations to suit the government's requirement. None of the recommendations proposed in 2001 were implemented as there were other overriding policy concerns, particularly political factors. The research team proposed that the government allow for the registration of 200,240 migrant workers in 39 provinces and in 21 industry sectors, but the government implemented a policy allowing the unlimited registration of migrant workers in all sectors simultaneously granting amnesty to all those who registered.

6.8 Implications for the APMRN

The Asia Pacific Migration Research Network in Thailand

The Thailand Migration Research Network does not currently exist in any official form in Thailand, but there is informal network, which indirectly link to APMRN to ARCM. In the past migration research conducted by academic institutes has often influenced policy makers through informal linkages between researchers and government agencies. A recent example of these linkages is the ILO and IOM providing financial support for the MLSW to commission research on migrant workers in Thailand. The MLSW has in turn commissioned ARCM, TDRI, and IPSR to conduct research on migrant workers in several different sectors. An active e-mail network is another indirectly connection between researchers and policy makers. In a more public sense, international research teams have been found to initiate the exchange of information which is found on these networks. The female migration project done by an international research team from ARCM and APMRN was very successful and the researchers concerned had a very productive time working together.
For APMRN to have a greater impact on Thai migration policy, it would need to support other activities beside simply conducting research. APMRN would have to create activities that link migration research to policy makers such as organizing workshops on migration issues. More policy makers should be invited to join in conferences and to express their opinions and other comments. NGOs also should be encouraged to participate since they have hands-on experience and possibly a greater depth understanding of some migration issues than some policy makers and researchers.

The migrant worker research done by ARCM that was implemented by the government is an example of successful indirect participation of APMRN. Thus, APMRN should be continuously supported in order to maintain the linkages between research institutions and policy makers at the national level. At the regional level, APMRN’s role in organizing international conferences and workshops will help researchers and policy makers to more effectively exchange information between each other on migration issues.

Lastly, the presence of APMRN will assist researchers and policy makers in addressing regional migration issue since many migration issues, by the nature of migration itself are transnational and must be addressed at a regional level.
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Appendix A: List of Interviews in Australia

Policy Makers

Commonwealth
Department of Education Training and Youth Affairs (DETYA) – from November 2001 this became the Department of Employment, Science and Training (DEST)
Department of Family and Community Services (FACS)
Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT)
Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs (DIMIA) – from November 2001 the Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs (DIMIA)
Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet (PM&C)

State
South Australian Government
Australian Capital Territory Government, Office of Multicultural Affairs, Chief Minister’s Department
New South Wales Government, Community Relations Council
Queensland Government, Multicultural Affairs Queensland, Department of the Premier and Cabinet
Tasmanian Government, Multicultural Tasmania
Victorian Government, Victorian Office of Multicultural Affairs

Statutory Bodies
Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission (HREOC)

NGOs
Albanians Community Association
Australian Catholic Migrant And Refugee Office
Australian Chinese Association
Australian Council of Social Service (ACOSS)
Australian Council of Trades Unions
Business Council Of Australia
Ecumenical Migration Centre
Ethnic Communities Council (NSW)
Federation of Ethnic Communities Councils (FECCA)
Housing Industry Of Australia
International Organization for Migration (IOM)
Migrant Resource Centre
Refugee Council Of Australia (RCOA)

Academics/Researchers
Associate Professor Christine Inglis, Faculty of Education, University of Sydney
Dr. Bill Cope, Centre for Workplace Communication and Culture, Melbourne
Dr. James Jupp, Centre for Immigration and Multicultural Studies (CIMS)
Australian National University
Dr. Rogelia Pe-Pua, School of Social Science and Policy, UNSW
Dr. Bob Birrell, Centre for Population and Urban Research, Monash University
Dr. Les Terry, Victoria University of Technology
Professor Glen Withers, Head, Graduate Program in Public Policy, Australian National University
Professor Graeme Hugo, Department of Geography, The University of Adelaide
Professor Peter Murphy, Faculty of the Built Environment, University of NSW
Professor Reg Appleyard, Graduate School of Management, University of Western Australia
Appendix B: List of Interviews in the Philippines

Policy Makers
Executive Branch of Government
Employment and Welfare, Philippine Overseas Employment Administration (POEA)
Policy and Program Support, Department of Labour and Employment
Institute of Labour Studies, Department of Labour and Employment

Legislative Branch of Government
House Committee on Labour and Employment, House Committee on Foreign Relations
Senate

NGOs
Philippine Migrants Rights Watch
Scalabrini Migration Center
Coalition Against Trafficking in Women – Asia Pacific (CATW–AP)
Action for Health Initiatives
International Organization for Migration (IOM)

Academics/Researchers
Dr Manija M. B. Asis, Scalabrini Migration Center
Dr Carmen Jimenez, Center for Integrative and Development Studies (CIDS), University of the Philippines
Mr Jorge V. Tigno, University of the Philippines
Appendix C: List of Interviews in Thailand

**Policy Makers**

*Governmental bodies*
- The Human Resources Planning Division, National Economic and Social Development Board
- The Rural Health Division, Ministry of Public Health
- The Department of Local Administration, Ministry of Interior
- The Operations Center for Displaced Person, Ministry of Interior
- Labour Committee of the Senate
- The Office of the Permanent Secretary for Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare (MLSW)
- Department of Employment, MLSW

*NGOs/UN agencies*
- World Vision Foundation of Thailand
- CARE International in Thailand
- The Center for the Protection of Children’s Rights Foundation
- International Organization for Migration (IOM)
- The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)
- The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)
- The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

**Academics/researchers**
- The Asian Research Center for Migration (ARCM), Institute of Asian Studies
- A high official of the University of Siam
- Institute of Population Studies
- National Institute of Development Administration (NIDA)
- Senior researcher of Thailand Development Research Institute (TDRI)
Asia Pacific Migration Research Network
Secretariat Director: Associate Professor Robyn Iredale

APMRN Secretariat
Centre for Asia Pacific Social Transformation Studies
University of Wollongong, 2522, Australia
Phone: +61 2 4221 3780
Facsimile: +61 2 4228 6313
Email: apmrn@uow.edu.au
URL: www.capstrans.edu.au/apmrn

ISSN 1328-2530

UNESCO – Management of Social Transformations (MOST) Programme

Address:
UNESCO-MOST
1, rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15, France

URL:
www.unesco.org

Dr. Malama Maleisea
Email: m.maleisea@unesco-proap.org

Supported by the MOST Programme of UNESCO