

(Re) Constructing 'Subservient' Filipino Migrant Subjectivities

Fea Jerulen Gelvezon

University of Alberta
Corresponding author: gelvezon@ualberta.ca

ABSTRACT

Abstract: In the 1970s, the Philippine state implemented a labour-export policy to alleviate the country's economic crisis. This policy centers employers' needs at the expense of the rights and lives of Filipino migrants. As a consequence, many Filipino migrants find themselves in low-paying, precarious, and exploitative working conditions. However, as foreign employment of Filipino labour is tied to the state's economic agenda, the Philippine state is caught between protecting the rights of its citizens and its economic profits. In this essay, I argue that the Philippine state constructs 'docile' and 'subservient' migrant subjectivities to serve the state's neoliberal interests. As migrants learn to become acutely aware of their exploitation, they re-construct a subjectivity premised on challenging the Philippine state's neoliberal interests through the help of transnational migrant activist groups.

This essay employs a qualitative case study analysis of the Philippines' foremost institution serving migrants: the Philippine Overseas Employment Agency (POEA) and the largest transnational Filipino migrant activist group, Migrante International. I use a Critical Filipino Studies framework (FilCrit) to analyze these case studies. FilCrit recognizes that the institutionalization of migration under US colonization largely influences how Filipinos are incorporated into the global economy today. This essay finds that the goals of the Philippine state and migrant activist groups stems from their opposing values. The Philippine state is concerned about their neoliberal agenda, while migrant activist groups are concerned about Filipino migrants' everyday lives.

Introduction

In the 1970s, the Philippine state implemented a "labour-export policy." The state implemented this policy to alleviate the country's economic crisis (Rodriguez 2016). The remittances from migrant workers helped boost the country's economy. However, by adopting a neoliberal policy, the Philippine state centers the needs of foreign employers at the expense of the rights and lives of Filipino migrants. Since establishing the labour-export policy, millions of Filipinos have worked overseas. Many Filipino migrants

work in low-paying and precarious employment, exposing Filipinos to exploitative work conditions (Rodriguez 2016). As a consequence, Filipinos are overrepresented in service and domestic work (Asis 2017). Since such industries require work in client services and care, there is a gendered aspect to Filipino migration. Compared to Filipino men, more Filipino women have worked overseas almost every year since the 1970s (Guevarra 2006).

The topic of protecting 'migrant vulnerabilities' has been an issue that is being addressed by the

Philippine government and civil society. However, as foreign employment of Filipino labour is tied to the state's economic agenda, the Philippine state is caught between protecting the rights of its citizens and economic profits (Guevarra 2006). In this essay, I argue that the Philippine state constructs 'docile' and 'subservient' migrant subjectivities to serve the state's neoliberal interests. Although, as Filipino migrants learn to become acutely aware of their exploitation, they re-construct a subjectivity premised on challenging the Philippine state's neoliberal interests through the help of transnational migrant activist groups. For this paper, neoliberalism refers to governments favouring the liberalization of national economies, reducing government spending, and free-market capitalism (Griffin 2017).

This essay is divided into four sections to prove my argument. The first section contextualizes the history of migration in the Philippines and explores why the Philippines implemented a labour-export policy. The second section discusses how the Philippines employs multiple technologies – like narratives, contracts, and mandated programs – to construct 'docile' and 'subservient' migrant subjectivities. In this paper, subjectivity refers to how Filipino migrants experience, understand, and relate to their nation, the global economy, and others as Filipino subjects (Fajardo 2011). The third section of this paper describes the role of migrant activist groups in helping transform migrants' understanding of their foreign employment as a form of systematic oppression and exploitation for the benefit of the Philippine state. Lastly, the final section of this paper argues that the divergence between the goals of the Philippine state and migrant activist groups stems from their opposing values. The Philippine state is concerned about their neoliberal agenda, while migrant activist groups are concerned about Filipino migrants' everyday lives.

This essay employs a qualitative case study analysis of the Philippines' foremost institution serving migrants, the Philippine Overseas Employment Agency (POEA) and the largest transnational Filipino migrant activist group, Migrante International. I use a Critical Filipino Studies framework (FilCrit) to analyze these case studies. Robyn Magalit Rodriguez (2016, 33) describes

FilCrit as an approach that is "attentive to the legacies of US imperialism, especially neo-colonial state formation on processes of e/migration." FilCrit recognizes that the institutionalization of migration under US colonization largely influences how Filipinos are incorporated into the global economy today. It further argues that the economic crises produced by US colonialism in the country have forced Filipinos to find work overseas (Rodriguez 2016, 38). More importantly, a FilCrit lens locates the position of both Filipino migrants and the Philippine state as being subordinate in the global economy, requiring the need to 'discipline' Filipino subjects to be subservient to the dominant, Western actors in the economy.

The Philippine State, Migration, and the Global Economy

The Philippines' history of high unemployment stems from the country's culture of debt reliance to facilitate economic growth (Simbulan 2001). The end of the colonial rule of the United States of America (USA) in 1946 saw widespread unemployment and income inequality across the country. The government then adopted a borrowing policy - often borrowing money from the US, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank (WB) - to boost the country's economy. Most of the debt was primarily from the Structural Adjustment Programs (SAP) in the 1980s, which liberalized and deregulated the country's economy to facilitate economic growth. However, the programs had extensive negative effects on the country's economy, as borrowing conditions required the privatization of public provisions like health and education (Simbulan 2001). By 1998, the Philippines had a foreign debt burden of about \$46.4 billion and paid an annual amount of \$4.4 billion or 8.8% of the country's GDP towards this debt (Fajardo 2011, 58).

Due to high unemployment, the country was not collecting enough taxes to pay off its debt. The Philippines then institutionalized their labour brokerage status through the 1974 Labour Code to alleviate its high unemployment and debt concerns, allowing hordes of Filipinos to seek work worldwide (Aguilar 2012). The 1974 Labour Code institutionalized labour-export as a

national policy in the establishment of the Overseas Employment Development Board (OEDB) to promote “a systematic program for overseas employment of Filipino workers” (Ruiz 2008, 1). Since its inception, the policy became very popular amongst Filipinos, resulting in the continuation of the policy until the 21st century, where about 10% of the Filipino population worked overseas (Ruiz 2008).

The goal of the labour-export policy of the Philippines is to secure overseas employment for Filipinos. The more Filipinos work overseas, the more remittances the Philippines receive from migrants. The increased remittances incentivize the Philippine state to secure as many work placements as possible for Filipinos. To ensure Filipinos are foreign employers’ preferred choice for labour, the state engages in a ‘race to the bottom’ approach. This means the state undercuts the costs of Filipino labour to attract foreign employers (Fajardo 2011). This strategy brings negative consequences for Filipinos, resulting in the overrepresentation of Filipinos in low-waged and un-skilled industries. Filipinos often experience a de-skilling of their professional credentials to work in these industries and accept low wages. Still, many Filipinos continue to enter into these contracts despite their drawbacks because of the Philippines’ unemployment crisis (Rodriguez 2016). Thus, the Philippine state systematically devalues its citizens’ labour to accrue monies to service its foreign debt.

To encourage Filipinos to migrate, the Philippines valorizes the suffering and sacrifice of migrant workers. The state adopted a *Bagong Bayani* (new heroes of the nation) narrative to rationalize the overrepresentation of Filipinos in low-wage and unskilled labour industries (Fajardo 2011). This narrative recognizes the hardships and loneliness Filipino migrants endure to earn income for their families and, by extension, the Philippine state. The narrative of Bagong Bayani praises migrants for their remittances sent home to boost the country’s economy, helping the state achieve its tax profits goals to fund services and pay its foreign debt (Fajardo 2011; Rodriguez 2016). Therefore, the institutionalization of migration in the Philippines goes beyond the facilitation of emigration. It also produces narratives that rationalize suffering to benefit one’s family as the pinnacle of Filipino identity. In turn, these rationalities

give migrants a sense of agency despite their exploited conditions (McKay 2007).

As more Filipinos worked overseas, the Philippine state reconfigured the tenets of Filipino citizenship to accommodate Overseas Filipino Workers (OFWs) as members of the nation. In the early 2000s, the Arroyo Administration implemented two policies encouraging the participation of overseas Filipinos, including permanent emigrants, into Filipino politics and the economy (Chavez and Piper 2015). First, the Republic Act (RA) 9225 of 2003 grants Filipino citizens the opportunity to retain or reacquire their Filipino citizenship when they become naturalized citizens of a foreign country (“Dual Citizenship,” n.d.). Second, RA 9174 of 2002, otherwise known as the Balikbayan Program, exempts former Filipino citizens from needing a visa to stay in the Philippines for a maximum of one year (“Balikbayan Program,” n.d.). Both legislations were intended for former citizens to invest in the country. However, OFWs and emigrants have argued that these legislations create space for claims-making. In other words, both legislations grant Filipinos abroad the legitimacy to demand change from the Philippine government (Rodriguez 2002). Essentially, existing formal and legal structures bind Filipinos in foreign countries to the Filipino state and nation. It is then through this formal connection that migrant activist groups form their agendas to demand change from the government.

Filipino Migration Institutions and Creating ‘Docile’ and ‘Subservient’ Subjects

Before moving on to a discussion about migrant activism, it is important to contextualize the role of the Philippine government in constructing Filipino migrant subjectivities. In tandem with its labour-export policy, the Philippines established institutions to facilitate the migration of Filipinos. The Philippine Overseas Employment Agency (POEA) serves as the country’s top agency for managing and protecting overseas employment. POEA is responsible for industry regulation by issuing certificates to licensed recruiters and workers protection, such as facilitating OFWs to file complaints against their employers for violations of POEA rules, etc. (Tang and

Zhang 2021, 31-32). In theory, POEA's presence balances the power disparity between employers and OFWs. POEA acts as an intermediary between the two parties throughout the entirety of the negotiated employment contracts (Debonville 2021). However, the Philippine government's 'race to the bottom' agenda limits POEA's capacity to promote the well-being of OFWs. In many cases, POEA's programs that supposedly protect Filipino migrants limit migrants' capacity to sue their employers for wrongdoings (Debonville 2021).

As noted in the earlier section, the Philippine state aims to ensure Filipinos are employers' preferred choice for labour. During the neoliberal period, becoming the employers' preference means becoming the cheapest source of labour (McKay 2007). There are two ways the state ensures Filipino labour is cheap. First, the state racializes Filipino labour. Instead of promoting Filipinos' skills, the state "racially brands" migrants by promoting their "heart" and "cleanliness" (McKay 2007). This promotion constructs the value of Filipino labour to be not for their skill, but for their personal quality. In the economy, this does not translate to high wages (McKay 2007). Rather, the Philippine state de-skills their citizens in their promotions to devalue the costs of Filipino labour for employers.

Second, the state constructs Filipino migrants as docile and subservient to reduce costs for employers. When individuals enter into a work contract, they have the right to sue their employers for wrongdoings such as exploitation, assault, or a breach of contract (Rodriguez 2017). The more rights workers have, the more expensive they become for the employer. The Philippine state circumvents this issue by facilitating the employment of Filipinos on temporary contracts. This precariousness minimizes the responsibilities of employers (Rodriguez 2017). Since OFWs do not have job security, they are less likely to complain or demand monetary compensation from their employers. This two-pronged approach ensures that Filipino labour remains inexpensive and therefore preferred by foreign employers.

Additionally, the pre-departure migrant programs curriculum further promotes migrants to become subservient. This teaching comes at the expense of

empowering migrants because they are not taught how to respond to crises, like reporting abuse (Rodriguez 2005). Instead, these programs promote a paternalistic message to OFWs: a good and protected worker is an obedient worker. For example, POEA's Pre-Departure Orientation Seminar (PDOS) underscores the importance of being obedient, docile, and subservient. The PDOS is a mandated program all OFWs and overseas Filipinos must attend prior to emigration. The goal is to inform Filipinos what to expect and the rules and regulations for working overseas. During these seminars, the presenters emphasize the punitive measures Filipinos may face in their destinations (e.g., deportation, imprisonment, or termination of contracts) and how being caught up in these measures would result in a loss of income and bring shame to the country. Alternatively, compliance with values ensures the well-being of migrants and economic security (Tungohan 2021; Rodriguez 2002). Thus, the conflation of economic security and migrant welfare reinforces the need for migrants to be subservient, meaning keeping one's head down low prevents exploitation and violence.

In tandem, POEA's mandated contracts also promote subservience. All OFWs enter POEA with an issued Standard Employment Contract (POEA-SEC) before going overseas. In theory, the POEA-SEC ensures the protection and safety of Filipinos as the contract aligns with international and the Philippines' minimum standards for employment. However, the state's economic agenda to secure employment for Filipinos results in the POEA-SEC favouring the interests of employers at the expense of Filipinos (Rodriguez 2002). The language of the current version of the POEA-SEC is employer-centred. Despite the termination regulations stated by the POEA-SEC, other aspects like change of job responsibilities or location, working hours, and wages need to be mutually agreed upon by both parties (Rodriguez 2002). Since Filipinos are disciplined to be subservient, OFWs are less likely to disagree with the demands of employers. They also will avoid disagreeing with employers to prevent bringing 'shame' to the nation.

Altogether, the Philippine state constructs docile and subservient migrant subjectivities through the institutionalization of migration in the country. Through

POEA, the state employs multiple technologies, from mandated programs, contracts, and narratives, to reinforce the necessity of hardships for economic security and personal well-being and the Philippine state. This rationality negatively disadvantages migrants by disempowering them and denying their agency to challenge their exploitation. The next section discusses how migrants develop an acute awareness of their exploitation through participation in migrant activism and how this participation resists state-constructed migrant subjectivity.

Migrant Activism and Challenging State-Imposed Subjectivities

The boom of migrant domestic workers starting in the 1970s placed migrants' vulnerabilities into the spotlight. By the 1990s, mistreatments against OFWs overseas were widely recognized within the country due to the media exposés and high-profile deaths of Filipina OFWs (Oh 2016; Chavez and Piper 2015). In 1994, the Singaporean government's order of the death penalty against a Filipino domestic worker, Flor Contemplacion, provoked outrage amongst Filipino citizens both in the Philippines and globally (Oh 2016; Chavez and Piper 2015). Contemplacion's death represented the "economic plight" OFWs experience in the Philippines, which forces them to seek precarious and dangerous work overseas (Guevarra 2006, 524). The momentum from Contemplacion's trial pressured the Philippine government to create legislation to protect OFWs, including the Republic Act (RA) 8042 or the OFW's Magna Carta. RA 8042 aims to reduce migrant vulnerabilities by legislating the state to take an active role in vetting foreign employers for legitimacy (Oh 2016; Chavez and Piper 2015). The success of civil society pressures in the 1990s initiated the emergence of grassroots resistance to actualizing change for the benefit of Filipinos.

Filipinos' collective outrage against these vulnerabilities strengthened the role of civil society in protecting migrant rights both in the Philippines and abroad. For example, protests for Contemplacion's death helped establish Migrante International as a transnational migrant activist network (Guevarra 2006). According

to Valerie Francisco and Robyn Rodriguez (2014), Migrante International is a cross-border solidarity network consisting of hundreds of local migrant groups across the globe. These local groups send representatives to meet every three years at a Congress to discuss Migrante's policies, mandates, etc., which are then implemented into their host countries' local groups. The existence of Migrante International stems from the notion that solidarity is formed through migrants' collective struggle against the apathy of the Philippine state in protecting and supporting Filipino migrants (Francisco and Rodriguez 2014). A primary goal of Migrante International is to call for the end of the Philippines' labour-export policy. They argue that the policy systematically places migrants in vulnerable positions to benefit the Philippine and global economies (Francisco and Rodriguez 2014).

The recruitment of members for Migrante International and local activist groups occurs organically. Membership in groups is driven by word of mouth amongst Filipino social networks. Some ways to network with other Filipinos are through meetings in public spaces, community leagues, churches, workplaces, etc. As many OFWs often do not have family in the host country, they make an effort to connect with fellow Filipinos to create a community (Francisco and Rodriguez 2014; Chavez and Piper 2015). Although the primary goal of these migrant groups is activism, they also offer educational sessions for their members, like information on pathways for residency or family reunification in the host country. Since the Philippine state does not provide this education to OFWs, membership in migrant activist groups appeals to OFWs. Once migrants continually participate and engage with the group's programs, the more likely they are to develop an acute awareness of their exploitation (Tungohan 2021). Sometimes topics of exploitation would arise organically in discussions with other group members, creating solidarity amongst OFWs. Another way is for OFWs to contact migrant activist groups whenever they find themselves in trouble with their employers (Francisco and Rodriguez 2014). Thus, there are many pathways to membership in migrant activist groups. Prospective members do not need to be passionate about change or activism before joining. Moreover, migrant activist groups deliver educational

sessions highlighting the forms of oppression and exploitation experienced by OFWs. The education provided by Migrante International disproves the state's curriculum of 'managing vulnerability' to ensure migrants' well-being. As noted in the earlier section, the versions of the Philippine state's and POEA's migrant 'empowerment' education requires migrants to be docile and subservient. This paradox aligns with the state's neoliberal agenda of "economic competitiveness and entrepreneurship" (Guevarra 2006, 528). The state's education teaches migrants to have the sole responsibility for their economic success and well-being, rendering the consequences of Filipinos' placement in the global hierarchy invisible. Essentially, systems of oppression, including gender, race, nation, neocolonialism, etc., are left out of the discussion as factors influencing Filipinos' exploitation.

Meanwhile, Migrante International's education emphasizes the direct influence of these systems on the treatment of Filipinos overseas (Francisco and Rodriguez 2014). In contrast to the state's education, Migrante International contextualizes the experiences of Filipino migrants to socio-political histories that drive Filipinos to low-wage, unskilled, and precarious jobs overseas (Francisco and Rodriguez 2014). Also, possessing this understanding allows migrants to situate their personal struggles to a larger collective struggle of Filipinos across space and time (Francisco and Rodriguez 2014). This acute awareness then results in migrants establishing solidarity networks, like local activist groups, to educate other migrants (Francisco and Rodriguez 2014; Tungohan 2021).

In addition to teaching about systems of oppression, their education curriculum also teaches OFWs about the hypocrisy of the Philippine state's neoliberal rationalities (Tungohan 2021). Specifically, they emphasize and spell out how the Philippines' focus on migrants' personal responsibility and economic profits absolves the state from establishing robust protections for migrants. Migrant education also directly links the lack of investment in the Philippine economy and the increasing outflows of Filipino labour (Rodriguez 2016; Tungohan 2021). Instead of focusing on narratives of nation and family building, which are abstract concepts, education

provided by migrant activist groups creates tangible links between migrants' everyday experiences and the hypocrisy of neoliberal rationalities. For example, migrant groups refer to Filipinos' de-skilling and low wages abroad as a product of the Philippine state underselling Filipino labour when entering contracts with foreign employers (Francisco and Rodriguez 2014). In this way, migrant activist groups help migrants re-orient the causes of their exploitation away from themselves and directed towards the Philippine state, creating a subjectivity premised on agency and empowerment.

Discussion

The previous three sections of this paper expose how multiple technologies of subordination influence the disempowerment OFWs face in the global economy. Firstly, the Philippines' 'race to the bottom' approach diminishes OFWs' rights to actualize their workers' rights. The Philippines' subordinate position in the global economy then animates through the state, compromising its citizens' workers' rights to maintain the Philippines' preferred source of labour status (Fajardo 2011). Secondly, OFWs see themselves and their needs as second to the nation's interests. In many cases, they will endure exploitation to avoid bringing 'shame' to the nation (Fajardo 2011). Consequently, OFWs internalize these subordinate narratives, creating a labour performance aligned with the state's expectations. Most migrants then endure suffering and are likely to have a high threshold for abuse, therefore tolerating non-physical abuses in many cases before they report to their employers (Debonville 2021).

The overrepresentation of OFWs in precarious work overseas means many Filipinos will likely face abuse or exploitation overseas. To reconcile this concern while encouraging more Filipino migration, the Philippines adopts a mode of 'liberal governmentality' premised on narratives of victimhood to legitimize 'paternalistic' ways of protecting migrants (Debonville 2021, 4-5). Liberal governmentality refers to the production and normalization of migrant protecting institutions that control migrants as subjects (Debonville 2021, 4-5). For the Philippines, liberal governmentality refers to POEA's requirements and mandated programs meant to reduce

migrants' vulnerabilities (Debonville 2021, 5-10). Despite its goal to empower migrants, these programs instead "materially and discursively" subordinate Filipino subjects by perpetuating rationalities that migrant welfare is tied to one's labour performance (Debonville 2021; Fajardo 2011). In this way, the Philippine government fulfills its role of protecting its citizens without compromising its neoliberal interests. Ultimately, the 'docile' and 'subservient' subjectivity is a product of the Philippine state prioritizing the interests of foreign employers and economic profits.

Meanwhile, migrant activist groups, like Migrante International, educate OFWs by relating to their everyday experiences. Instead of advising them on what they should do, these groups empower migrants by providing them with the knowledge to identify systems of oppression and assuage their personal guilt when they fail to meet the state's neoliberal expectations (Francisco and Rodriguez 2014; Tungohan 2021). These groups then help migrants develop an acute awareness of their exploitation. By doing so, OFWs better understand their subordination in the global economy and how this shared struggle with other OFWs signals their exploitation, not as an individual experience, but as a collective experience. Therefore, these groups empower OFWs to resist and challenge the Philippine state's neoliberal agenda by providing tools that allow them to demand the state to rectify domestic conditions, like the labour-export policy, which forces Filipinos to find work overseas. As a result, migrant activist groups help OFWs reconfigure their migrant subjectivities to one premised on an acute awareness of exploitation and resistance.

However, possessing an acute awareness of Filipino migrant's exploitation does not always result in solidarity and activism. Ethel Tungohan's (2021) analysis of the Facebook posts of female migrants in Canada shows how OFWs internalized the 'docile' and 'subservient' state narratives. In her article, Tungohan analyzes the online shaming of a Filipina worker who called for more social support from the Federal Government for temporary foreign workers in Canada during the Covid-19 pandemic. Tungohan notes this was not accepted well within the Filipino online community, as

OFWs police each other and call out those who transgress narratives of subservience by shaming them online. Tungohan (2021, 47-48) states these acts perpetuate the notion that Filipino migrants need to be "grateful" and "uncomplaining." She argues OFWs should be 'grateful' to be living in Canada during the pandemic instead of the Philippines, where healthcare is expensive. This conflict demonstrates the conflation of economic security with migrants' well-being, a tenet of the Philippines' migrant empowerment education. This example also shows the limitations of solidarity and activism, especially when OFWs internalize narratives that reinforce their subordination.

Conclusion

In conclusion, regarding Filipino migration, the Philippine state is caught between a rock and a hard place. On one hand, the Philippine state requires profits from migrants' remittances to service the foreign debt it accrued immediately post-American independence and from implementing neoliberal policies starting in the 1980s (Rodriguez 2016). The Philippines' history within the global economy then requires remittances. On the other hand, the government is responsible for protecting its citizens from exploitation and abuse when working overseas. The Philippines implements 'paternalistic' institutions that advise Filipinos to be 'docile' and 'subservient' (Debonville 2021) to reconcile these two concerns. This logic assumes that those 'educated' with Filipino and neoliberal values will be less likely to find themselves exploited (Debonville 2021). These teachings disempower migrants of their workers' rights and agency despite their intentions. However, migrant activist groups, like Migrante International, challenge this education by producing their own to provide migrants with the tools to develop an acute awareness of their exploitation. Overall, Filipino migrant subjectivities are dynamic and change over time, depending on their education.

References

- "Balikbayan Program." n.d. *Embassy of the Philippines – Ottawa, Canada*. Accessed April 9, 2022. <https://ottawape.dfa.gov.ph/index.php/2016-04-12-08-36-34/2016-04-13-03-22-51/balikbayan-program>.
- "Dual Citizenship." n.d. *Embassy of the Philippines – Ottawa, Canada*. Accessed April 9, 2022. <https://ottawape.dfa.gov.ph/index.php/2016-04-12-08-36-34/2016-04-13-03-10-46/dual-citizenship>.
- Aguilar, Filomeno V. 2012. *Migration Revolution: Philippine Nationhood and Class Relations in a Globalized Age*. NUS Press in association with Kyoto University Press.
- Asis, Maruja MB. 2017. "The Philippines: Beyond labor migration, toward development and (possibly) return." *Migration Information Source* 12. <https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/philippines-beyond-labor-migration-toward-development-and-possibly-return>.
- Chavez, Jenina Joy, and Nicola Piper. 2015. "The reluctant leader: The Philippine journey from labor export to championing a rights-based approach to overseas employment." In *Asian Leadership in Policy and Governance*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited. <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/S2053-769720150000024013>.
- Debonneville, Julien. 2021. "An organizational approach to the Philippine migration industry: recruiting, matching and tailoring migrant domestic workers." *Comparative Migration Studies* 9, no. 1: 1-20. <https://comparativemigrationstudies.springeropen.com/track/pdf/10.1186/s40878-020-00220-2.pdf>.
- Fajardo, Kale Bantigue. 2011. *Filipino Crosscurrents: Oceanographies of Seafaring, Masculinities, and Globalization*. University of Minnesota Press. <https://search-ebscohost-com.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat03710a&AN=alb.5427936&site=eds-live&scope=site>.
- Francisco, Valerie, and Robyn Magalit Rodriguez. 2014. "Countertopographies of migrant women: Transnational families, space, and labor as solidarity." *WorkingUSA* 17, no. 3: 357-372. https://brill.com/view/journals/wusa/17/3/article-p357_4.xml.
- Griffin, G. 2017. Neoliberalism. In G. Griffin (ed), *A Dictionary of Gender Studies: Oxford University Press*. Oxford University Press. <https://www-oxfordreference-com.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/view/10.1093/acref/9780191834837.001.0001/acref-9780191834837-e-272>.
- Guevarra, Anna Romina. 2006. "Managing 'vulnerabilities' and 'empowering' migrant Filipina workers: the Philippines' Overseas Employment Program." *Social Identities* 12, no. 5: 523-541. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/13504630600920118?casa_token=dMGViMGWSg0AAAAA:qMe eha5ZPkogpU1Lj7eawmp9At_7zdTs-P8oNOSMJonI5ASDen0Y3fzDnIYy9fkIbQDJR9NdUp1_g.
- McKay, Steven C. 2007. "Filipino Sea Men: Constructing Masculinities in an Ethnic Labour Niche." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 33 (4): 617-33. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13691830701265461>.
- Oh, Yoon Ah. 2016. "Oligarchic rule and best practice migration management: the political economy origins of labour migration regime of the Philippines." *Contemporary Politics* 22, no. 2: 197-214. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/13569775.2016.1153286?casa_token=JmSCuJLWefgAAAA:swVkpGtaFXPdtYWh1t2Y3f5EKzy-zJzNMxt_ww-26BTFUvgWCDjjcVajyvM1LW9YNSS0dB-oeJOLyA.
- Rodriguez, Robyn M. 2017. "Domestic insecurities: Female migration from the Philippines, development and national subject-status." <https://escholarship.org/content/qt7q75k44h/qt7q75k44h.pdf>.
- Rodriguez, Robyn M. 2002. "Migrant heroes: Nationalism, citizenship and the politics of Filipino migrant labor." *Citizenship studies* 6, no. 3: 341-356. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/1362102022000011658?casa_token=_v_SmapPC0wAAAAA:ncfZv9Rm_jpZUgql5MS4vrAZywp-orfilaPyATRwZyYbJ8XQUdruwpVig0cpcBpvoAUJzM5X6yA_hQ.

- Rodriguez, Robyn Magalit. 2016. "Toward a Critical Filipino Studies Approach to Philippine Migration" In *Filipino Studies* edited by Martin F. Manalansan and Augusto Espiritu, 33-55. New York, USA: New York University Press. <https://doi.org/10.18574/nyu/9781479829415.003.0006>
- Simbulan, Nymia Pimentel. 2001. "The Impact of Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs) on Health in the Philippines." *Public Policy V (2)*: 43–74. <https://cids.up.edu.ph/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/The-Impact-of-Structural-Adjustment-Programs-on-Health-in-the-Philippines-vol.5-no.2-July-Dec-2001-3.pdf>
- Tungohan, Ethel. 2021. "The 'Ideal' Female Migrant as Grateful and Uncomplaining: Gendered Colonial Ideologies, Pre-Departure Orientation Sessions, and the #ungrateful Filipina." *Alon: Journal for Filipinx American and Diasporic Studies* 1 (1): 35–50. <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1qq9115p>.