

# Perception Gap in Migration Governance: A Comparative Analysis of Institutional and Migrant Assessments of R.A. 10022

**Emil Arca**

Graduate School, Manuel L. Quezon University, 790 EDSA, Diliman, Quezon City, Philippines  
Email: [emilarca2@gmail.com](mailto:emilarca2@gmail.com)

**Received : 01 June - 2026**

**Accepted : 28 June - 2026**

**Published online : 01 July - 2026**

## Abstract

Despite the enactment of Republic Act No. 10022 to strengthen the protection of overseas Filipino workers, limited empirical evidence has compared institutional assessments with migrant workers experiences of policy implementation. This study evaluates the implementation of Republic Act No. 10022 in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia by comparing the assessments of migrant workers and diplomatic personnel involved in migration governance. Using survey data from 200 respondents, consisting of 156 migrant workers and 44 diplomatic staff, the study examined four implementation domains: employment, recruitment, deployment, and services. Findings indicate that while both groups generally viewed the law's implementation positively, diplomatic personnel consistently reported higher ratings than migrant workers. Independent-samples t-tests were performed using the aggregated weighted mean scores of the five indicators within each implementation domain to compare the assessments of diplomatic personnel and migrant workers. Statistical analysis revealed significant differences ( $p < .05$ ) across all domains. The largest disparity was observed in deployment ( $t=18.76$ ), indicating a substantial divergence between institutional assessments and migrant experiences. Lower ratings in employment and services further indicate a concentration of concerns in administrative efficiency, accessibility, and service responsiveness. The results demonstrate that governance effectiveness requires more than institutional performance indicators, as positive administrative evaluations may not reflect beneficiary experiences. By providing empirical evidence on the gap between official assessments and migrant perceptions, the study contributes to migration governance literature and emphasizes the necessity of integrating user-centered evaluation into the implementation of migrant protection policies.

**Keywords:** Governance, Overseas Filipino Workers, Perception Gap, R.A. No. 10022, Saudi Arabia.

## 1. Introduction

Bilateral social security agreements play a critical role for the Philippines in ensuring that overseas Filipino workers (OFWs) have access to social protection benefits in host countries and retain their portability across national borders (Wijayanti, 2023). Within this framework, Republic Act No. 10022 (R.A. No. 10022), which amended Republic Act No. 8042, was enacted to strengthen the protection, welfare, and rights of migrant workers and distressed Filipinos abroad. Given the long-standing dependence of the Philippine economy on labor migration, migration has become deeply embedded in the country's social and economic structure (Ang & Tiongson, 2023). Consequently, the effectiveness of migrant governance has implications not only for worker welfare but also for national development.

In 2024, the estimated number of OFWs reached 2.19 million. Saudi Arabia was the primary destination, comprising 21.9 percent of the total OFWs (PSA, 2024). It is a major destination for OFWs, employed in healthcare, construction, engineering, domestic services,



hospitality, and various other service industries. The country thus serves as a pivotal context for assessing the implementation of Republic Act No. 10022. Despite persistent labor reforms, Filipino migrant workers still face governance issues related to labor mobility, contract enforcement, dispute resolution, and access to governmental services. The *kafala* (sponsorship) system has historically been linked to these difficulties (Malaeb, 2015). In this context, the Philippine Embassy and the Migrant Workers Office (formerly the Philippine Overseas Labor Office) are pivotal in implementing Republic Act No. 10022 by providing legal assistance, welfare services, labor protection, and repatriation support for overseas Filipino workers. Therefore, examining the perceptions of these institutional services among diplomatic staff and migrant workers is crucial for assessing the efficacy of migration governance in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

The Philippines has developed a comprehensive system for governing labor migration that aims to protect workers overseas (Nguyen, 2023). However, the existence of legal protections does not necessarily guarantee effective implementation. Fonte (2021) identified persistent challenges, including delays in government services, limited administrative capacity to manage migrant complaints, weak interagency coordination, labor policies that may conflict with constitutional principles, and unequal treaty provisions affecting low-skilled migrant workers. These findings suggest that migration governance should be evaluated not merely by the existence of protective legislation but also by the extent to which migrant workers experience these protections in practice.

Migrant workers contribute significantly to national development through remittances and international labor participation. However, migration's benefits and vulnerabilities do not uniformly affect all individuals. Experiences vary according to the destination country, employment conditions, legal status, and socio-economic circumstances. Although the competitiveness of Filipino migrant workers has contributed to economic resilience during periods of regional and global economic instability (Gasapo, 2019), economic contributions alone cannot serve as sufficient indicators of policy success. An overemphasis on economic outcomes risks obscuring persistent concerns regarding worker protection, the accessibility of services, and governance effectiveness.

Although previous studies have contributed substantially to understanding migration governance and the protection of overseas Filipino workers, important empirical gaps remain. Fonte (2021) critically examined Philippine labor migration policies and highlighted implementation challenges related to governance and service delivery but did not evaluate whether institutional assessments reflected migrant workers' experiences. Saguin and Shivakoti (2022) investigated the role of Philippine embassies in the transnational administration of labor migration, emphasizing institutional coordination and administrative functions without examining how these were perceived by migrant beneficiaries. Likewise, Leonardo (2024) compared the regulatory frameworks governing migrant worker protection in Indonesia and the Philippines but focused on legal and policy provisions rather than differences between policy implementers and beneficiaries' evaluations.

## 2. Literature Review

### 2.1. Migration Governance

Contemporary migration scholarship increasingly emphasizes the structural inequalities embedded within migration governance systems. Cleton and Meier (2023) argue that migration governance is shaped by intersecting systems of inequality that influence how migrants are categorized and treated. This perspective raises important questions about the

equal experience of institutional protections among various groups of migrant workers. Similarly, Triandafyllidou (2020) highlights the complexity of migration governance and the uncertainties that arise in the interpretation and implementation of migration policies across different institutional contexts. Although Leonardo (2024) notes that Philippine migrant protection policies are comparatively systematic in areas such as legal assistance and support services, the continued reporting of service-delivery concerns suggests a potential disconnect between the formal policy design and actual migrant experiences. This contradiction underscores the need to assess governance outcomes beyond administrative compliance.

## 2.2. Crisis and Migration Governance

The challenges associated with migration governance become more pronounced during periods of crisis. Sahin-Mencutek et al. (2022) argue that crisis-driven migration governance represents a distinct form of governance characterized by specific institutional responses and regulatory mechanisms. In response to these challenges, the Philippine government reorganized migration governance through the establishment of the Department of Migrant Workers (DMW), reflecting an effort to consolidate services and strengthen institutional protection for OFWs. The creation of the One Repatriation Command Center further demonstrates attempts to centralize assistance and improve service coordination for distressed workers abroad (Abad, 2022). However, the COVID-19 pandemic exposed the continuing vulnerability of migrant workers, as economic disruptions disproportionately affected migrant populations and revealed limitations in existing support mechanisms (Hashmi, 2020). These developments suggest that institutional reforms alone may not fully address the complex realities faced by migrant workers.

## 2.3. Social Dimensions of Migration Governance

Migration governance also extends beyond administrative protection and includes social, cultural, and psychological dimensions. Falkheimer and Zhao (2020) emphasize the importance of culturally responsive approaches to crisis communication when addressing migrant-related concerns. In contrast to dominant narratives that portray migrants primarily as vulnerable populations, Gilodi et al. (2022) argue that vulnerability can also become a source of empowerment when supported by strong community networks and opportunities for participation. Nevertheless, structural barriers such as cultural stigma and financial constraints continue to limit access to essential services, including mental health support (Parashtheo et al., 2025; Zarsuelo, 2018). These challenges emphasize the necessity of migration governance systems that address not only immediate protection needs but also long-term social and psychological well-being.

## 2.4. Philippine Migration Context

In the Philippine context, limited domestic employment opportunities and wage disparities largely drive labor migration. While globalization and international labor mobility create economic opportunities, the distribution of these benefits remains uneven (Dix-Carneiro et al., 2023). At the same time, migrant workers play an essential role in post-crisis economic recovery in both sending and receiving countries (Kikkawa et al., 2021). The designation of OFWs as “*Mga Bagong Bayani*” reflects official recognition of their economic contributions. However, such recognition also creates a policy obligation to ensure that migrant workers receive adequate protection and support throughout the migration cycle.

## 2.5. Administrative Burden and Service Delivery

This study is guided by Administrative Burden Theory, which posits that administrative procedures and service delivery processes may create barriers that affect beneficiaries' access to public services (Herd et al., 2023). In the context of migration governance, the theory provides a framework for understanding how differences may arise between institutional assessments of policy implementation and migrant workers actual experiences.

Liao (2023) further characterizes repatriation as both a protective and regulatory mechanism, illustrating the complex role of migrant-sending states in managing labor mobility. While Montanez (2025) suggests that the Philippines has achieved notable success in protecting migrant workers from exploitative practices, the persistence of implementation concerns indicates that institutional effectiveness should be evaluated from the perspective of both service providers and service recipients.

## 2.6. Empirical Studies

Tabuga (2018) emphasizes the importance of evidence-based policymaking in addressing migration-related challenges. Despite extensive legal frameworks and institutional reforms, migrant workers remain vulnerable to exploitation, economic shocks, and rights violations. Reintegration initiatives frequently emerge in response to crises affecting migrant populations rather than as components of a comprehensive long-term migration strategy (Yap & Opiniano, 2024). Furthermore, Encinas-Franco (2016) argues that the Philippine migration experience provides valuable lessons for other migrant-sending countries.

The transferability of these lessons depends on the availability of reliable empirical evidence regarding policy effectiveness. Consistent with this position, Orbeta Jr (2014) advocates for more systematic and comprehensive data collection to support policy evaluation. Likewise, Saguin and Shivakoti (2022) emphasize the important role of embassies and consular offices in extending migration governance beyond national borders through coordination with both state and non-state actors. Their findings suggest that migration governance increasingly operates through transnational administrative networks, further emphasizing the necessity of evaluating how governance is experienced by migrant workers themselves.

## 2.7. Research Gap

Although previous studies have contributed substantially to understanding migration governance and the protection of overseas Filipino workers, important empirical gaps remain. Fonte (2021) critically examined Philippine labor migration policies and highlighted implementation challenges related to governance and service delivery but did not evaluate whether institutional assessments reflected migrant workers experiences.

Saguin and Shivakoti (2022) investigated the role of Philippine embassies in the transnational administration of labor migration, emphasizing institutional coordination and administrative functions without examining how these were perceived by migrant beneficiaries. Likewise, Leonardo (2024) compared the regulatory frameworks governing migrant worker protection in Indonesia and the Philippines, but focused on legal and policy provisions rather than differences between policy implementers and beneficiaries' evaluations.

Addressing this gap, the present study compares the assessments of diplomatic personnel and overseas Filipino workers regarding the implementation of Republic Act No. 10022 in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia across four implementation domains: employment, recruitment, deployment, and services. By examining both institutional and beneficiary perspectives, the study provides empirical evidence on the extent to which official evaluations

correspond with migrant workers lived experiences and identifies governance gaps that may inform future policy implementation and service delivery.

## 2.8. Hypothesis Development

Previous studies have indicated that differences may exist between institutional assessments of migration governance and the actual experiences of migrant workers (Herd et al., 2023; Saguin & Shivakoti, 2022; Triandafyllidou, 2020). Based on these findings, this study proposes the following hypotheses:

**H<sub>0</sub>:** There is no significant difference between the assessments of diplomatic staff and migrant workers regarding the implementation of Republic Act No. 10022.

**H<sub>1</sub>:** There is a significant difference between the assessments of diplomatic staff and migrant workers regarding the implementation of Republic Act No. 10022.

## 3. Methods

### 3.1. Research Design

This study employed a quantitative survey analysis to examine the implementation of R.A. No. 10022 and the divergence between institutional and migrant perspectives.

### 3.2. Study Setting and Participants

The study focused on Filipino migrant workers in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and relevant institutional actors involved in service delivery, including personnel from the Philippine Embassy/Consulate and the DMW and Migrant Workers Office (MWO). The migrant worker respondents consisted of currently employed overseas Filipino workers residing and working in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia during the data collection period. The data collection was conducted from June 2023 to March 2024. A total of 200 respondents participated in the quantitative phase, comprising 156 migrant workers as beneficiaries and 44 diplomatic staff as service providers. This dual-sample design enables a comparative analysis between policy implementers and recipients, an approach that is central to identifying governance gaps in service delivery.

### 3.3. Sampling Strategy

A purposive sampling method was utilized to ensure the participation of respondents with direct experience or engagement in policy implementation. Migrant worker participants were chosen based on their engagement with DMW services, whereas institutional participants were selected according to their functions in program implementation. The sample size was established to ensure enough representation for comparative statistical analysis while being practical within the study's field limitations.

### 3.4. Data Collection

Data were collected using a structured survey questionnaire, which was administered both electronically through Google Forms and through direct personal distribution by the researcher. The survey was designed to assess respondents' perceptions across four key domains, namely employment, recruitment, deployment, and services. The questionnaire consisted of 20 indicators distributed across employment, recruitment, deployment, and services. The instrument used a four-point Likert scale, allowing for the measurement of employment, recruitment, deployment, and services.

### 3.5. Instrument Reliability

To establish the internal consistency of the research instrument, a Cronbach's alpha reliability analysis was conducted. The overall 20-item questionnaire produced a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.985, indicating excellent internal consistency. The reliability coefficients for each implementation domain were also impressive: Employment ( $\alpha = 0.953$ ), Recruitment ( $\alpha = 0.962$ ), Deployment ( $\alpha = 0.960$ ), and Services ( $\alpha = 0.956$ ). These findings demonstrate that the questionnaire is highly reliable for assessing respondents' perceptions of the implementation of Republic Act No. 10022.

### 3.6. Data Analysis

The data were analyzed using IBM SPSS (version 23) and Microsoft Excel. Independent-samples t-tests were performed using the aggregated weighted mean scores derived from the five indicators within each implementation domain rather than individual respondent-level scores. This approach enabled a comparison of domain-level assessments between diplomatic personnel and migrant workers. However, because the analysis was based on aggregated indicator means, the statistical power was lower than analyses conducted using individual respondent-level data. This limitation is acknowledged when interpreting the findings.

The hypotheses developed in the literature review were tested using independent-samples t-tests at a 0.05 level of significance. For interpreting the responses, a four-point Likert scale was employed, with the following weight ranges and corresponding verbal interpretations: a mean score from 3.26 to 4.00 was interpreted as Strongly Agree, 2.51 to 3.25 as Agree, 1.76 to 2.50 as Disagree, and 1.00 to 1.75 as Strongly Disagree. Prior to distribution, the questionnaire underwent expert validation by specialists in public administration to ensure content validity and clarity.

### 3.7. Limitations

The statistical comparisons were based on aggregated weighted mean scores for each implementation domain rather than individual respondent-level observations. Consequently, the statistical power of the analysis was lower than it would have been achieved using individual respondent-level data. Future studies are encouraged to conduct independent-samples t-tests using respondent-level observations to provide more robust statistical inferences.

### 3.8. Ethical Considerations

Ethical standards were rigorously maintained during the investigation. Participation was optional, and respondents were guaranteed secrecy and anonymity. Informed consent was secured before data collection, and all identifying information was substituted with coded labels to safeguard participant identification.

## 4. Results and Discussion

### 4.1. Research Results

#### 4.1.1. Respondents' Demography

**Table 1. Demographic Profile of Respondents**

Variable	Category	Diplomatic Staff (n=44)	%	Migrant Workers (n=156)	%
Age	21-40	19	43.18	38	24.35
	41-60	23	52.28	109	69.88
	60+	2	4.54	9	5.77
Total		44	100%	156	100%
Gender	Male	21	47.73	73	46.79
	Female	23	52.27	83	53.21
Total		44	100%	156	100%
Civil Status	Single	11	25.00	32	20.51
	Married	28	63.64	109	69.87
	Separated	5	11.36	10	6.41
	Annulled	0	0.00	5	3.21
Total		44	100%	156	100%
Education	High School	0	0.00	9	5.77
	College	30	68.19	97	62.18
	Technical/Vocational	5	11.36	17	10.90
	Graduate Studies	9	20.45	33	21.15
Total		44	100%	156	100%
Length of Service	1-5	3	6.81	17	10.90
	6-10	15	34.10	26	16.67
	11-15	16	36.36	40	25.64
	16-20	6	13.63	34	21.79
	21+	4	9.10	39	25.00
Total		44	100%	156	100%

The table 1 delineates the demographic characteristics of the 200 respondents. The predominant age group among respondents in both categories is 41-60, with migrant workers exhibiting a greater prevalence (69.88%) in this mature population. The gender distribution is almost equal, with females representing a slight majority in both the diplomatic staff (52.27%) and migrant worker (53.21%) categories.

The majority of respondents are married, comprising 63.64% of staff and 69.87% of workers. Concerning education, both categories are primarily composed of individuals with college degrees (>60%). A considerable segment of both cohorts (about 20-21%) has engaged in graduate studies, indicating a highly qualified respondent pool. Diplomatic staff predominantly fall within the 6-15 year category (70.46%), while migrant workers demonstrate a higher prevalence of long-term service, with 50% of the cohort having served for 16 to over 21 years.

### 4.1.2. Respondents' Assessment on the Implementation of R.A. No. 10022

**Table 2. Assessment of the Implementation of R.A. No. 10022 in Terms of Employment**

Employment	Diplomatic Staff		Migrant Workers		Total	
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI
Equal employment opportunity for all	3.36	SA	2.73	A	3.05	A
Job offers are attractive	3.26	SA	2.77	A	3.02	A
Employment opportunities are posted	3.33	SA	2.95	A	3.14	A
Application process is fast and easy	3.21	A	2.72	A	2.97	A
Employment contract is clear and fair	3.29	SA	2.81	A	3.05	A
Average Mean	3.29	SA	2.80	A	3.04	A

Legend: 4:00-3.26 Strongly Agree, 2.51-3.25 Agree, 1.76-2.50 Disagree, 1.00-1.75 Strongly Disagree  
 Abbreviations: WM = Weighted Mean; VI = Verbal Interpretation

An assessment of R.A. No. 10022 implementation indicates general agreement (total average mean of 3.04) that the employment provisions are effective, with diplomatic staff (3.29) holding a more positive view than migrant workers (2.80). While transparency in posting opportunities is viewed positively, the application process is identified as the area requiring the most improvement.

**Table 3. Assessment of the Implementation of R.A. No. 10022 in Terms of Recruitment**

Recruitment	Diplomatic Staff		Migrant Workers		Total	
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI
DMW has coordinated with the other migration agencies	3.31	SA	2.91	A	3.11	A
List of placement agencies is well provided	3.56	SA	2.97	A	3.27	SA
Constant advertisements for illegal recruitment are posted on social media	3.26	SA	2.86	A	3.06	A
Safety net measures are provided for the victims of illegal recruitment	3.26	SA	2.86	A	3.06	A
Guidance for the first-time migrant worker applicant was properly implemented	3.26	SA	2.93	A	3.10	A
Average Mean	3.33	SA	2.91	A	3.12	A

Legend: 4:00-3.26 Strongly Agree, 2.51-3.25 Agree, 1.76-2.50 Disagree, 1.00-1.75 Strongly Disagree

According to Table 3, the implementation of R.A. No. 10022 regarding recruitment is considered generally effective, with an overall average mean of 3.12 (Agree). While diplomatic staff “Strongly Agree” (3.33) with the implementation, migrant workers only “Agree” (2.91), indicating a gap in perception, particularly regarding the visibility of safety nets for victims of illegal recruitment.

**Table 4. Assessment of the Implementation of R.A. No. 10022 in Terms of Deployment**

Deployment	Diplomatic Staff		Migrant Workers		Total	
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI
Standardized deployment procedures are made available	3.29	SA	2.97	A	3.13	A
Pre-departure order seminars are conducted and well presented to the prospective migrant workers	3.29	SA	3.02	A	3.16	A
The Philippine government through DMW created a protection mechanism that will safeguard migrant workers	3.31	SA	2.97	A	3.14	A
The Philippine government, through DMW, provided the list of countries safe to work with	3.33	SA	3	A	3.17	A
The deployment procedures are systematic.	3.29	SA	2.93	A	3.11	A
Average Mean	3.30	SA	2.98	A	3.14	A

Legend: 4:00-3.26 Strongly Agree, 2.51-3.25 Agree, 1.76-2.50 Disagree, 1.00-1.75 Strongly Disagree

Table 4 shows that the implementation of R.A. No. 10022 regarding deployment is generally effective, earning a Total Average Mean of 3.14 (Agree). Providing a list of safe countries received the highest total rating (3.17), indicating strong transparency regarding worker safety. Diplomatic staff are more confident in the system (3.30, Strongly Agree) than the migrant workers themselves (2.98, Agree). Both groups agree that pre-departure orientation seminars (PDOS) are well conducted, helping prepare workers for their roles abroad. Across all indicators, diplomatic staff consistently rated the implementation higher than migrant workers, indicating a persistent perception gap between providers and beneficiaries.

**Table 5. Assessment of the Implementation of R.A. No. 10022 in Terms of Services**

Services	Diplomatic Staff		Migrant Workers		Total	
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI
Services are well defined	3.28	SA	2.96	A	3.12	A
It is properly implemented	3.28	SA	2.85	A	3.07	A
It is very essential for migrant workers	3.4	SA	3.05	A	3.23	A
Services are given on time	3.24	A	2.81	A	3.03	A
Availment is easy and fast	3.24	A	2.81	A	3.03	A
Average Mean	3.29	SA	2.90	A	3.09	A

Legend: 4:00-3.26 Strongly Agree, 2.51-3.25 Agree, 1.76-2.50 Disagree, 1.00-1.75 Strongly Disagree

Table 5 assesses the implementation of services under R.A. No. 10022. With a total average mean of 3.09 (Agree), the provision of services is considered effective but shows room for improvement in speed. The essential nature of services for migrant workers received the highest total score (3.23), reflecting its critical importance to the stakeholders.

Services delivered on time received the lowest scores (3.03). This suggests that while services exist, the speed of delivery is the primary bottleneck. Diplomatic staff strongly agree (3.29) that services are well delivered, whereas migrant workers only agree (2.90), indicating

a need to streamline the actual user experience. Services are recognized as vital and well defined, but the government should focus on making them faster and easier to access.

The results show consistent differences between institutional and migrant assessments across all domains. While both groups generally agree on the effectiveness of implementation, migrant workers report lower levels of satisfaction, suggesting that implementation challenges are more pronounced at the level of service delivery.

### 4.1.3. Summary of the Findings

The summary of findings across the four assessment areas for R.A. No. 10022 indicates a consistently positive implementation, with all categories earning a descriptive rating of “Agree.”

**Table 6. Overall Comparative Performance**

Assessment Area	DS WM	DS VI	MWWM	MWVI	Total Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
Deployment	3.30	SA	2.98	A	3.14	Agree
Recruitment	3.33	SA	2.91	A	3.12	Agree
Employment	3.21	A	2.72	A	3.04	Agree
Services	3.29	SA	2.90	A	3.09	Agree

Abbreviations: DS = Diplomatic Staff; MW = Migrant Workers; WM = Weighted Mean; VI = Verbal Interpretation.

Deployment (3.14) is viewed as the most successful area, particularly regarding the provision of safe-country lists and systematic procedures. In every category, diplomatic staff (DS) provided higher ratings (averaging 3.30, “Strongly Agree”) compared to migrant workers (MW) (averaging 2.90, “Agree”). This suggests that while officials believe the systems are robust, the actual beneficiaries experience minor inefficiencies in practice.

Primary area for growth is employment (3.04) and services (3.09) received the lowest relative scores. Specific feedback indicates that while services are “essential,” the speed of processing and ease of access are the main areas needing improvement. The implementation of R.A. No. 10022 is effective and well-structured. To move from “Agree” to “Strongly Agree” among migrant workers, the government should focus on streamlining service delivery and increasing the speed of application processes.

**Table 7. Test of Significant Difference on the Assessment of the Respondents in the Implementation of R.A. No. 10022**

Variables	Computed t-Value	df	Critical t-Value ( $\alpha = 0.05$ )	Decision on Ho	Remarks
Employment	10.02	7	2.36	Rejected	Significant
Recruitment	6.83	5	2.57	Rejected	Significant
Deployment	18.76	6	2.44	Rejected	Significant
Services	7.04	7	2.36	Rejected	Significant

**Table 8. Reliability Analysis of the Research Instrument**

Domain	No. of Items	Cronbach’s Alpha
Employment	5	0.953
Recruitment	5	0.962
Deployment	5	0.960
Services	5	0.956
Overall Instrument	20	0.985

Table 8 presents the reliability analysis of the research instrument, using Cronbach's alpha. The overall instrument exhibited excellent internal consistency ( $\alpha = 0.985$ ), while the four implementation domains produced alpha coefficients ranging from 0.953 to 0.962, all indicative of excellent reliability. These findings indicate that the questionnaire effectively measured the constructs of interest and provided a solid foundation for the subsequent statistical analyses.

#### 4.1.4. Statistical Analysis

The null hypothesis was rejected for all variables, indicating statistically significant differences ( $p < .05$ ) between the groups. In all categories, the computed t-value exceeds the critical t-value at the 0.05 level of significance. This indicates that the difference in ratings between the two groups is statistically significant and not due to chance. Although aggregated scores were used, the results consistently demonstrate significant differences ( $p < .05$ ) between the groups across all domains. There is a persistent perception gap in the implementation of the law. The diplomatic staff assess the implementation significantly more favorably than the migrant workers. The highest disparity occurs in deployment (18.76), suggesting this is the area where institutional providers and workers disagree most on the effectiveness of current procedures.

#### 4.1.5. Key Findings

The findings revealed a statistically significant difference in how the two groups view the implementation of Republic Act No. 10022, indicating that the higher scores from diplomatic staff and the lower scores from migrant workers are not a matter of coincidence. Among the four domains, the deployment category yielded the highest t-value at 18.76, marking this as the area where the two groups disagree most strongly regarding how well the law is functioning. Because the difference is significant, it suggests that the official version of implementation as reported by staff in institutional assessments diverges considerably from the experiences reported by migrant workers. Overall, the findings confirm that governance effectiveness is viewed differently by those who manage it versus those who experience it, thereby highlighting a persistent disconnect in the practical execution of the law.

#### 4.2. Discussion

The findings demonstrate that Republic Act No. 10022 is generally perceived to be effectively implemented across the domains of employment, recruitment, deployment, and services. However, diplomatic personnel consistently reported significantly higher assessments than migrant workers, indicating a persistent perception gap between institutional evaluations and beneficiary experiences. This finding supports Triandafyllidou (2020), who argues that migration governance is interpreted differently by institutional actors and migrants because implementation occurs across complex administrative and social contexts. The results suggest that governance effectiveness should be evaluated not only through institutional performance but also through the experiences of policy beneficiaries.

The relatively lower assessment of the employment domain suggests that legislative protection alone does not ensure effective implementation. Despite the existence of comprehensive legal safeguards, migrant workers continue to perceive limitations in employment accessibility and administrative efficiency. This finding is consistent with Fonte (2021), who identified administrative delays, institutional capacity constraints, and coordination challenges as persistent barriers to effective migration governance.

Both respondent groups positively evaluated recruitment, but migrant workers consistently reported lower satisfaction than diplomatic personnel. This pattern aligns with

Administrative Burden Theory (Herd et al., 2023), which proposes that administrative procedures may unintentionally reduce service accessibility despite institutional compliance. The findings therefore suggest that the effectiveness of implementation relies not only on regulatory adherence but also on the experiences of migrant workers with the services.

Deployment received the highest overall assessment while producing the largest statistically significant difference between respondent groups. This apparent paradox suggests that diplomatic personnel evaluate deployment primarily through procedural compliance, whereas migrant workers evaluate the same processes through their actual service experiences. Consistent with Saguin and Shivakoti (2022), migration governance increasingly relies on transnational administrative coordination; however, effective institutional coordination does not necessarily translate into equivalent levels of beneficiary satisfaction.

The services domain likewise received lower ratings from migrant workers, particularly regarding timeliness and accessibility. This finding reinforces the argument that governance effectiveness extends beyond the availability of services to include responsiveness and user experience (Herd et al., 2023; Liao, 2023). Overall, the significant differences between institutional and migrant assessments emphasize the necessity to evaluate policy implementation from both institutional and beneficiary perspectives. By integrating these perspectives, migration governance can be assessed more comprehensively, enabling policymakers to identify implementation gaps that may not be evident through administrative performance indicators alone.

## 5. Conclusion

The findings indicate that the implementation of R.A. No. 10022 was generally assessed positively across employment, recruitment, deployment, and services. Significant differences ( $p < .05$ ) between the assessments of diplomatic staff and migrant workers reveal a gap between institutional evaluations and beneficiary experiences. Lower ratings in employment and services suggest continuing challenges in accessibility and service delivery. Overall, the study highlights the importance of incorporating beneficiary perspectives into the evaluation of migration policies. Assessing governance effectiveness through both institutional and migrant experiences may provide a more comprehensive understanding of policy implementation and outcomes.

The study found that the implementation of R.A. No. 10022 was generally viewed positively across employment, recruitment, deployment, and services. Significant differences ( $p < .05$ ) between the assessments of diplomatic staff and migrant workers reveal a persistent gap between institutional evaluations and beneficiary experiences. While diplomatic personnel consistently rated the implementation more favorably, migrant workers reported more moderate assessments.

The largest disparity was observed in deployment, suggesting that formal protection mechanisms may be perceived differently by implementers and beneficiaries. Lower ratings in employment and services further indicate that challenges are concentrated in accessibility, timeliness, and service responsiveness rather than in the policy framework itself. These findings suggest that governance effectiveness should be assessed not only through administrative compliance but also through beneficiary outcomes. Strengthening service efficiency, transparency, digital access, and migrant feedback mechanisms may help align policy implementation with the needs and experiences of overseas Filipino workers.

## 6. References

- Abad, M. (2022). *Migrant Workers Department Opens One-Stop Center for OFW Repatriation*. Rappler.
- Ang, A., & Tiongson, E. R. (2023). Philippine Migration Journey: Processes and Programs in the Migration Life Cycle. *World Development Report 2023: Migrants, Refugees, and Societies*.
- Cleton, L., & Meier, P. (2023). Contesting Policy Categories Using Intersectionality: Reflections for Studying Migration Governance. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 46(14), 3014–3036. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2023.2171737>
- Dix-Carneiro, R., Pessoa, J. P., Reyes-Heróles, R., & Traiberman, S. (2023). Globalization, Trade Imbalances, and Labor Market Adjustment. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 138(2), 1109–1171. <https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjac043>
- Encinas-Franco, J. (2016). Filipino Women Migrant Workers and Overseas Employment Policy: An Analysis From Women's Rights Perspective. *Asian Politics & Policy*, 8(3), 494–501. <https://doi.org/10.1111/aspp.12269>
- Falkheimer, J., & Zhao, H. (2020). 26. Intercultural and multicultural approaches to crisis communication. In *Crisis Communication* (pp. 523–540). De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110554236-026>
- Fonte, A. (2021). 50 Years A Slave: A Review on Philippine Labour Migration. *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal*, 8(11), 70–100. <https://doi.org/10.14738/assrj.811.10992>
- Gasapo, Z. L. A. (2019). *Critical Analysis of Laws Affecting Migrant Workers and Overseas Filipino Workers*. Central Philippine University.
- Gilodi, A., Albert, I., & Nienaber, B. (2022). Vulnerability in the Context of Migration: a Critical Overview and a New Conceptual Model. *Human Arenas*, 7(3), 620–640. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42087-022-00288-5>
- Hashmi, S. (2020). *Coronavirus Leaves Gulf Migrant Workers Stranded*. BBC.
- Herd, P., Hoynes, H., Michener, J., & Moynihan, D. (2023). Introduction: Administrative Burden as a Mechanism of Inequality in Policy Implementation. *RSF: The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences*, 9(5), 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.7758/rsf.2023.9.5.01>
- Kikkawa, A., Sugiyarto, G., Villafuerte, J., Narayanan, B., Gaspar, R., & Kim, K. (2021). Labor Mobility and Remittances in Asia and the Pacific During and After the COVID-19 Pandemic. In *ADB Briefs*. Asian Development Bank. <https://doi.org/10.22617/brf210493-2>
- Leonardo, D. (2024). Comparison of Regulations Concerning Protection of Migrant Workers Between Indonesia and the Philippines. *Journal of Law, Politic and Humanities*, 5(1), 209–217. <https://doi.org/10.38035/jlph.v5i1.904>
- Liao, K. A. S. (2023). Infrastructuring Repatriation: The Philippine Sending State and the Return of Migrant Workers Caught in Disruptions. *International Migration*, 63(1), e13155. <https://doi.org/10.1111/imig.13155>
- Malaeb, H. N. (2015). The “Kafala” System and Human Rights: Time for a Decision. *Arab Law Quarterly*, 29(4), 307–342. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15730255-12341307>
- Montanez, C. (2025). The Gold Standard: Government Protections for Overseas Filipino Workers (OFWs). *Locus: The Seton Hall Journal of Undergraduate Research*, 8(1), 5. <https://doi.org/10.70531/2573-2749.1080>
- Nguyen, R. Le. (2023). *Protecting the Rights of Filipina Migrant Workers: An Analysis of Bilateral Labour Agreements Between the Philippines and Canada*. Public and International Affairs.
- Orbeta Jr, A. C. (2014). *Migrant Workers and Social Protection: The Philippine Experience*. In

- Towards a More Resilient Society: Lessons from Economic Crises* (pp. 19–44). Japan National Committee for Pacific Economic Cooperation.
- Parashtheo, B., Sakti, S. W. K., Suntoro, A., & Wulan, T. R. (2025). Indonesian Migrant Workers in Malaysia and Their Social Environment: Analysis from a Socio-Legal Perspective. *Policy, Law, Notary and Regulatory Issues*, 4(2), 244–255. <https://doi.org/10.55047/polri.v4i2.1700>
- PSA. (2024). *Results of the 2024 Overseas Filipino Workers: Number of Overseas Filipino Workers Grew*. Philippine Statistic Authority.
- Saguin, K., & Shivakoti, R. (2022). Keeping Up with the Migrant Workers: The Role of Embassies in Transnational Administration of Labor Migration Policy. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, 45(2), 63–80. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10841806.2022.2086754>
- Sahin-Mencutek, Z., Barthoma, S., Gökalp-Aras, N. E., & Triandafyllidou, A. (2022). A Crisis Mode in Migration Governance: Comparative and Analytical Insights. *Comparative Migration Studies*, 10(1), 12. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-022-00284-2>
- Tabuga, A. (2018). *A Probe into the Filipino Migration Culture: What Is There to Learn for Policy Intervention?* Philippine Institute for Development Studies. <https://doi.org/10.62986/dp2018.02>
- Triandafyllidou, A. (2020). Decentering the Study of Migration Governance: A Radical View. *Geopolitics*, 27(3), 811–825. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14650045.2020.1839052>
- Wijayanti, A. (2023). Social Security Provision for International Migrant Workers: Comparing Indonesia and the Philippines. *Jurnal Jamsostek*, 1(2), 105–126. <https://doi.org/10.61626/jamsostek.v1i2.66>
- Yap, C. A. D., & Opiniano, J. M. (2024). A Generation of Crisis-Responsive Reintegration in Migration Management: Reflections from the Philippines. In *Mobility & Politics* (pp. 15–43). Springer International Publishing. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-53562-8\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-53562-8_2)
- Zarsuelo, M.-A. M. (2018). A Review of the Philippine Policies on Mental Health of Overseas Filipino Workers (OFWs). *Acta Medica Philippina*, 52(5), 480–485. <https://doi.org/10.47895/amp.v52i5.337>