

## CHAPTER VI

### NATURE, EXTENT AND EFFECTS OF INFLOW OF IMMIGRANT LABOUR IN JORDAN

The earlier chapter dealt with the nature and effects of outmigration on Jordanian labour market and on the economy. One of the unique features of Jordanian labour market is that both emigration and immigration affect its functioning. In absolute terms, the inflow of labour has been smaller than that of the outflow. The later part of this chapter reveals that the ratio of inflow to outflow increased from 1978 onwards. This is linked to the state of the economies of the neighbouring countries and the prospects of getting employment in Jordan. Agriculture, construction and other activities in the urban informal sector which do not require skilled manpower provide ample job opportunities to the immigrant labour. Moreover, till recently, the government did not discourage their participation in the Jordanian labour market and hence in the absence of any restrictive policy, the flow of immigrants continued.

The analysis of the impact of the immigrants on the host country's labour market and economy is an important field of study in economics, with reference to the developed economies. Most of the developed countries face the problem of shrinking labour force due to the fall in the death and birth rates. Immigration helps them to solve the problem of labour shortage.

However several socio - economic factors led them to revise their immigration policy. The adverse economic effects which are often cited are displacement of domestic labour, lowering the overall wage rate, burden on the social security measures and benefits to the country of origin in the form of remittances.

In case of developed countries the pull factors are very strong in attracting labour from developing countries. Two recent articles on economics of immigration which need to be cited are by George J. Borjas. He has analysed the nature of research with respect to developed countries <sup>1</sup>. The article is based on the experience of the United States. It covers various aspects like performance of immigrants in the host country, aging and cohort effects, wage convergence between immigrants and ethnically similar natives, international differences in immigrant performance, immigrants impact on native earnings and employment, immigration and welfare and second generation.

In many developed countries immigration policy has become an integral part of social policy in the post second world war era. Through changes in the immigration policy, the developed countries have regulated the inflow of immigrants both in quantitative and qualitative terms.

"Every immigration policy must resolve two distinct issues : how many immigrants the country should admit, and what kinds of people they should be<sup>2</sup>.

Borjas discussing the consequences of immigration argues that immigration increases the supply of workers in an economy,

which leads to <sup>a</sup>fall in the wages of native workers. At the same time such phenomenon also leads to an increase in the supply of goods and services in the economy as firms can hire workers at a lower cost. Thus immigration increases the size of economic pie and also induces redistribution of income from native workers who compete with immigrant labour to those who use immigrants' services. If the objective of immigration policy is to increase per capita income of native population, the policy should encourage entry of skilled workers. However, the gains might remain concentrated to a particular sub group of population. Economic theory teaches that economic impact of immigration is essentially distributional in nature.

The above mentioned probable impact of immigration has roots in the experience of developed economies. Labour movement in the developing countries is the result of push factors. Further developing countries' experience of emigration, if the labour market is also characterized by immigration is different from that of developed countries' labour market experience. It is likely that movement of people both in and out might be the result of strong push factors operating in both sender and recipient countries. The experience of Jordan has shown that most of the immigrants are not highly educated or skilled labour and are engaged in agricultural, construction and other urban informal sector activities, whereas outmigration is of relatively more educated people. Immigrant labour in Jordan thus plays an important role in the labour market as they engage in the economic activities, which are not preferred by native workers. It is necessary to analyse the nature and effects of

this on the Jordanian labour market. Since the literature on <sup>the</sup> economics of immigration does not address itself to the issues of developing countries, the present study would attempt to make a modest contribution in this field. Before discussing the pattern of immigrants and their impact on Jordanian economy, the following two sections deal with international migration pattern and economic thinking on migration. This is necessary to understand the unique features of Jordanian labour market.

### 6.1 Pattern of International Migration

The major causes of migration are: ■ concentration and internationalization of productive forces, ■ booming condition in mining and commercial cash-crop-agriculture, ■ colonial and pseudo-colonial exploitation, ■ shortages in local population and labour force and ■ the need to use surplus and cheaper manpower from backward regions. Thus whenever a home country finds shortage of labour and that too of labour of specific skill, education, experience and competence, it is eager to import labour like any other resource or commodity. Normally labour is not as mobile as capital, consumer goods and the entrepreneur. Labour requires very attractive incentive to move from one country to the other. Studies of immigration/emigration reveal that employers affected by a shortage of labour naturally ask their government to import/or allow them to import foreign labour<sup>3</sup>. In case of cyclical booms when labour is required for arduous, monotonous, risky, hard, un-dignified and low-paid work,

employers avail of the option of bringing cheap and willing labour from the relatively backward and poor countries.

After the World War II, particularly during 1946-1957 there was a lot of international migration. The major destinations of people were; United States, Canada, Latin America, (Brazil and Argentina) and Australia. In this period, immigrants from Mediterranean basin and North Africa (Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia etc) went mainly to Western European countries. The largest part of the present American society, <sup>in the</sup> United States is composed of immigrants and so is that of Australia<sup>4</sup>.

Between 1962 and 1964, the number of migrant labour to the European countries, viz, Federal Republic of Germany, France, Switzerland, Belgium, Sweden, United Kingdom, Austria, Netherlands went up from 3.6 million to 7.8 million. The prominent immigrants were Turks, Yugoslaves, Portugees, Moroccans and Tunisians. Italian migrants went to Germany, France and Switzerland. Turks and Greeks went mainly to Germany. Algerians went to France and Moroccans to France and Belgium. The majority of immigrant labour in Europe is concentrated in Germany, France, United Kingdom and Switzerland. During the last twenty years, more than one million immigrant labour migrated to European countries in search of work. After the seventies, Europe has turned into the center towards which the Southern European and North African Labour migrate.

Migrations from Asia reveal that labour from large and thickly populous countries go to newly discovered/settled colonies and the islands under the control of British empire. Most of the labour of Malaysia consists of immigrants from China

and India. Indian labour was attracted to Myanmar, Srilanka, Malaysia, Thailand, Singapore, Fiji and Mauritius. (In sugarcane and rubber plantations and mines). Chinese labour has gone to Hongkong, Singapore and Vietnam. India and Pakistan had sent more than 3 lakh and 1.5 lakh immigrants respectively to United Kingdom during 1945 to 1971. Japan faces a serious problem of South Korean immigrant labour. In 1973, there were 6 lakh Koreans in Japan which was 0.6 percent of the country's population and 88 percent of the entire foreign population in Japan. The problem of brain drain of Asian countries arises due to sizable number of Asian students who graduate in the United State, find employment and settle there.

The study by Adriana Marshall<sup>5</sup> on migrant workers movement between Europe and United States stresses the mobility of unskilled and manual labour. The study indicates that foreign inflows from Western Europe to the U.S. are composed of manual workers. In countries like the Netherlands, the Federal Republic of Germany, Switzerland and France an overwhelming majority of the Mediterranean immigrants have been employed in manual occupations. In Argentina, nearly 90 percent of the Bolivian, Chilean and Paraguayan immigrants and 66 percent of the Uruguayans were employed in manual work in 1970. In Buenos Aires in particular, about 80 percent of the recent immigrants from neighbouring countries were employed in manual works<sup>6</sup>.

One finds that immigration and emigration does not take place simultaneously. The international immigration pattern shows that immigrants move to "traditional" destinations, over half of them go to countries like the United States, Canada and

Australia<sup>7</sup>. The countries like the U.S.A and Western European countries which are the major recipients of immigrants have recently made their immigration rules tighter and stiffer in order to discourage immigration and to protect the socio-economic interests of the local labour and people.

"During some decades, especially the 1960s, demand pull migration was seen as beneficial to the economy. In the 1970s immigration policies became more restrictive. The unemployment crisis in Europe in the past fifteen years has stirred fears of a jobless society, with current and expected migration induced by conditions in sending countries adding to mass unemployment<sup>8</sup>."

The movement from developing countries of labour therefore now is towards countries like Canada, Australia, Newzealand etc. In case of Jordan one finds that the out flow is not towards developed economies, but towards oil rich neighbouring countries. Secondly the inflow of labour is from nearby countries. Such a pattern is not observed at global level.

The following section about the review of economic thinking on migration, would help us contextualise the pattern of international labour movement.

## **6.2 Review of Economic Thinking on Migration**

In the standard economic reasoning both optimistic and pessimistic views on migration are expressed. Inmigration is

considered to be good if it helps in easing labour shortage in a recipient country and bad if it lowers wage rate and creates unemployment among native born population. In some cases even if unemployment prevails in a recipient country, immigration may not be a bad thing if supply of skilled immigrant labour increases. Because this in turn can increase demand for unskilled labour due to an increase in economic activities. This helps to reduce unemployment among the unskilled, even if their wages do not increase due to institutional factors. Thus the relative strength of relationship of complementarity or substitutability between immigrant and native born labour determines the net impact on the recipient country.

In the second half of the 17th century, the prevailing view was that the nation's interests were best served by encouraging the growth of numbers. Mercantilists were in favour of a large number of immigrant labour for nation's trading activities. By the end of the 18th century, this thought was undermined by Malthus in his 'Essay on population' published in 1798. The classicists believed that migration should be regulated by the state as an ~~an~~ exception to the general rule of laissez-faire<sup>9</sup>. John Stuart Mill regarded emigration of labour and capital from the mother country to the colonies as beneficial, as long as they bring more profits/wages.

He states that, "The West Indies is the place where England finds it convenient to carry on the production of sugar and coffee. All the capital employed is English, almost all the industry is

carried on for English uses. The trade with West Indies is amenable to the principles of Home Trade<sup>10</sup>.

Edward Gibbon Wakefield<sup>11</sup>, urged that colonization would confer three advantages viz i) it would increase the market for its products, ii) give relief from over population and iii) promote foreign investment.

Marx exposed the exploitative policy of attracting, cheaper and more subservient labourers for a class to whom the capitalist might dictate terms instead of being dictated by them<sup>12</sup>.

Thomas Brinlay<sup>13</sup> discussed the Rosa Luxemburg idea in his book on Migration and Economic Growth and argued that as long as there are new territories to be opened up the older capitalist countries can succeed in avoiding the crisis of mass-unemployment by encouraging regional growth through migration.

The orthodox classical school saw nothing incongruous in Britania holding the Bible of free trade in one hand, and the sword of monopoly power in the other, and they were shocked when their Kinsmen overseas paid more attention to the sword than to the Bible<sup>14</sup>.

Britain had encouraged the free trade as well as the labour movement. The countries of the world have always justified immigration and emigration wherever they were advantageous to them.

The neoclassical approach has contributed to the understanding of the geographic mobility of people through developing human capital model of migration. As already mentioned earlier if the present value of expected increased earnings exceeds the present value of the investment cost, the person decides to move. The theoretical framework of analysing movement of people is based on the movement of people from developing to developed economies. It concerns itself with the impact of movement of skilled, unskilled, educated with or without capital, on the economy of the recipient country. Theoretical literature is also silent on the phenomenon of return migration, and countries where in and out migration take place simultaneously. This is mainly because the focus of most of the studies has been <sup>on</sup> developed economies.

The labour movement of Jordan is unique because both the in and the out migration take place simultaneously. A sizable number of in and out migrants do not migrate with a view to acquire permanent residentship of a country. The political factors also result in unexpected movement of people from time to time. Such a pattern of migration thus cannot be analysed in the theoretical framework of migration which is rooted in the context of developed economy, where the main concern is that of push immigration which might result in unemployment among its native workers. However, we discuss here a theoretical

framework, which tries to analyse the migration of people to the Western European countries. The work cited below is also relevant from the point of view of understanding pull and push factors of migration.

Zimmermann<sup>15</sup> developed a theoretical framework to analyse European migration which has experienced both push and pull migration. While pull migration is considered to be economically beneficial, the push migration can lead to an employment crisis. Zimmermann in his article theorises the implications of immigration with heterogeneous labour in the face of unemployment caused by institutions like trade unions. If migrants are complementary to natives, native unemployment may decline. According to him, the migration to Europe has not been harmful.

Zimmermann assumes a standard price output relationship with an upward sloping supply curve in a labour receiving economy. If aggregate demand increases, output and prices increase. Such a situation of rising wages makes immigration beneficial as it helps to contain inflation and also results in an increase in output. This is pull migration. Conversely, if inflow of migrants takes place without an increase in demand, it is push migration.

Thus Zimmermann differentiates between the two as follows: "In short, push supply migration affects the aggregate supply curve alone while pull-demand migration deals with migration (and hence a shift of the supply curve) that responds to a shift in the demand curve. All internal factors affecting aggregate demand that cause migration are

considered to be pull migration, while all internal or external factors that affect the aggregate supply and that are associated with migration are defined as push migration<sup>16</sup>.

According to Zimmerman, if the institutional pressure in the form of trade union fixes real wages above equilibrium level, immigration can lead to an increase in unemployment. Immigration (push factors) shifts the supply curve of labour resulting in deficit due to increases in the payment of unemployment compensation in recipient countries. The impact of this development on the economy is stagflation where output remaining constant, prices and demand rise.

The other factors which result in push migration are: better economic and working conditions abroad, social security benefits, structure of the economy and the wishes of the families of the migrants to reunite. Thus both push and pull factors attract the international migration pattern. Zimmermann classifies international migration pattern after 1945 till date, as: (i) war adjustment and decolonization (1945 - early 1960s), labour migration (1955-73), restrained migration (1974-88), and the dissolution of socialism and its aftermath (from 1988 onwards). According to him excepting the period of labour migration, all the other periods are due to push migration. In future demographics will be the major driving force in push migration, reinforcing underdevelopment, political instability and the increasing number of asylum seekers and refugees. Thus if push

factors become unavoidable, the pattern of labour movement to a great extent would get determined by ethnic networks and the relative strength of the economic political factors. Pull migration, on the other hand, would be effective depending upon the immigration policy of the country. In case of Jordan the forces of push migration are stronger than pull factors affecting them to migrate to Jordan. The following section discusses in detail the immigration in Jordan which will help us in analysing the nature of the impact of inflow of labour on Jordanian economy.

### **6.3 Immigration in Jordan**

During the last 45 years since 1950, migration has played an extremely important role in the demography and labour market of Jordan. Due to many military conflicts in the area adjacent to the West Bank, Gaza strip, and Jerusalem a large number of both Jordanians and Palestinians have been displaced and have taken shelter in cities in Jordan. In 1948, about 3.5 lakh refugees from Palestine moved to Jordan. As a result of further in-migration as well as natural increase, the refugee population grew to about 6 lakhs in 1961<sup>17</sup> i.e., about one-third of the total population. Nowhere in the world, such a huge influx of refugees has caused so much of stress and strain on a host country. Jordan does not have progressive agriculture and suitable environment and land for cultivation. It has neither petro-mining nor any modern large scale industry. Jordan cannot afford to provide job-opportunities to its own employable labour. Due to the in-migration of refugees, its employment market has been facing chaotic and critical conditions. There is a very delicate and sensitive dimension to the problem of the refugees,

Jordan cannot disown them because most of the Palestinians in Jordan are Jordanian citizens.

Apart from this, the interaction of factors such as the outflow of Jordanian labour force abroad and various local and external socio-economic factors resulted in the inflow of people in Jordan. Outflow of huge number from domestic labour force created vacancies in some economic sectors such as construction and agriculture. Jordan imported labour force from abroad to implement its development plans and to overcome the shortage in the labour market especially in agriculture, construction and services sector<sup>18</sup>.

The immigrant labour force which was 39 thousand workers in 1979 increased to 153 thousand by the end of 1984. Their ratio to the total labour force increased from 9.6 percent in 1979 to about 26 percent in 1984<sup>19</sup>. The ratio decreased to 20.5 percent by 1992.

Table 6.1 shows the ratio of Jordanian labour outflow to inflow of immigrant workers between 1973-1989. It is clear from the table that the inflow of people in Jordan started on a big scale only after 1978. All along the period the outflow of Jordanians was much more than the inflow. However there is a significant increase in the number of immigrants as the ratio consistently went up during the said period from 0.2 percent in 1973 to 14.64 in 1979, reaching 58.8 percent in 1989. This marks a very significant increase in the number of immigrants, whose characteristics should be analysed. The following sections therefore deal with various characteristics of immigrants in Jordan.

Table 6.1 : Outflow and Inflow of  
Labour in Jordan, 1973-1989

Year	Outflow	Inflow	Inflow/ Outflow (in % )
1973	152900	376	0.25
1974	174200	519	0.30
1975	198400	2228	1.12
1976	216300	4790	2.21
1977	235800	9733	4.13
1978	257000	18785	7.31
1979	280200	41042	14.64
1980	305400	79566	26.04
1981	312300	93402	29.90
1982	317800	120000	37.70
1983	326400	130000	39.80
1984	334300	153519	45.90
1985	339300	143000	42.14
1986	343300	130000	37.87
1987	339000	120000	35.40
1988	330000	148000	44.85
1989	340000	200000	58.82
Anul.Avg. Growth Rate	4.65	36.75	

- Sources:1. Royal Scientific Society,  
Current Status and Future  
of Labour Market, Vol.3,(Arabic  
Origin) 1989, Jordan.  
2. Dr. Kamel Abu Jaber, Jordanian  
Labour Market, D, Albasher  
(Arabic Origin), 1991, Jordan.

#### 6.4 Nationality of Immigrant Labour Force

Tables 6-2 and 6-3 convey information on distribution of immigrant labour force by nationality in absolute and percentage terms during 1973-1993. They show that the Arab labour force (Egyptians, Syrians and other Arabians) in 1973 formed 83.5 percent of the total immigrants. Other non-Arab Immigrant labour were from Asia (most of them from India, Pakistan, Korea and Thailand), Europe, America and other countries, forming 15 percent share in the total.

The Egyptian immigrant workers in Jordan were in majority after 1975 in comparison to other nationalities. Their annual growth rate was 37.06 percent during 1973-1989. The influx of Egyptian workers into Jordan is attributed to the economic factors. Due to geographical proximity, the transport cost to Jordan is less than the cost of travel within Egypt at times. Jordanian Immigration authorities facilitate the inflow of Egyptian workers, especially for the jobs demanded in the Jordanian labour market like in agriculture and construction sectors. Egypt is a developing country. Its Gross Domestic Product at market prices decreased from 26296 million U.S.dollars in 1985 to 25699 million U.S.dollars in 1989. The country faced depression which led to<sup>a</sup> fall in job opportunities. Hence the investment in Egypt decreased sharply from 12781.7 million U.S. dollars in 1985 to 4309.0 million dollars in 1989. Such an economic recession in the country forces the labour force to leave in search of employment opportunities. Jordan being in geographical proximity thus becomes the most convenient destination for such immigrants.

Table 6.2 : Distribution of Immigrant Labour in Jordan by Nationality, 1973 - 1993

Years	Egyptians	Syrians	Other Arab Countries	Asians	Europeans	Americans & Other Countries
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1973	47	33	234	21	28	13
1974	65	46	323	29	38	18
1975	280	196	1386	124	166	76
1976	1726	217	1599	793	344	111
1977	4701	240	1845	2070	714	163
1978	10480	267	2129	4191	1480	238
1979	25768	296	2457	9103	3069	349
1980	55544	3639	2784	13954	3430	215
1981	67796	3092	3951	15560	2637	366
1982	63042	3834	6176	41757	4296	893
1983	62922	2663	6213	52839	4295	1068
1984	122120	3048	2855	22865	1966	665
1985	100608	3100	5522	29911	2916	943
1986	94114	3659	3832	26900	1582	713
1987	81840	5312	4223	26303	1639	683
1988	105000	15000	6000	20600	1000	400
1989	100000	71900	8000	19000	800	300
1992*	76794	7685	1735	9812	298	92
1993*	37960	1855	1862	10810	423	111
Anul. Avg. Growth Rate (1973-89)	37.06	31.35	10.83	32.19	10.87	11.85

Sources: 1. RSS, Current Status & Future Prospect of Jordanian Labour Market, Vol 3, 1990.

2. Ministry of Labour, Annual Report- 1987, 1988, 1989, 1992 and 1993.

3. \* The registered immigrant labour with Ministry of Labour only.

**Table 6.3 :Percentage Distribution of Immigrant Labour  
in Jordan by Nationality, 1973 -1993**

Years	Egyptians	Syrians	Other Arab Countries	Asians	Europeans	Americ-ans & Other Countries
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1973	12.5	8.8	62.2	5.6	7.4	3.5
1974	12.5	8.9	62.2	5.6	7.3	3.5
1975	12.6	8.8	62.2	5.6	7.5	3.4
1976	36.0	4.5	33.4	16.6	7.2	2.3
1977	48.3	2.5	19.0	21.3	7.3	1.7
1978	55.8	1.4	11.3	22.3	7.9	1.3
1979	62.8	0.7	6.0	22.2	7.5	0.9
1980	69.8	4.6	3.5	17.5	4.3	0.3
1981	72.6	3.3	4.2	16.7	2.8	0.4
1982	52.5	3.2	5.1	34.8	3.6	0.7
1983	48.4	2.0	4.8	40.6	3.3	0.8
1984	79.5	2.0	1.9	14.9	1.3	0.4
1985	70.4	2.2	3.9	20.9	2.0	0.7
1986	72.4	2.8	2.9	20.7	1.2	0.5
1987	68.2	4.4	3.5	21.9	1.4	0.6
1988	70.9	10.1	4.1	13.9	0.7	0.3
1989	50.0	36.0	4.0	9.5	0.4	0.2
1992*	79.6	8.0	1.8	10.2	0.3	0.1
1993*	71.6	3.5	3.5	20.4	0.8	0.2

Source : Based on Tables 6.1 and 6.2.

## 6.5 Distribution of Immigrants by Governorates

Though the immigrant labour force is distributed everywhere in the kingdom, it is however concentrated in Amman and Zarqa. Tables 6.4 and 6.5 show immigrant distribution by governorates in absolute and percentage terms during 1973-1993.

Such concentration has occurred because Amman and Zarqa are the economic centres of the country. It is easier for the immigrants to get work in Amman than in other districts. The construction jobs as well as unskilled and semiskilled ones are easily available in Amman, than in other districts. In the outskirts of Amman and Zarqa it is also possible for immigrants to be employed in agriculture.

The total immigrant labour force in Jordan increased at the rate of 28.78 percent during 1973-1993. Due to the expansion in economic activities throughout Jordan, and industrial decentralization policy, the concentration of immigrant labour force slightly decreased in Amman by the late eighties. However, by 1993 Amman became the largest employment centre for immigrant labour as 62.3 percent immigrant labour concentrated there. Because of the lack of industrialisation and economic activity in the southern region of Jordan, Karak and Ma'an governorates are the smallest employers of immigrants, which formed 4.9 and 7.2 percent to the total registered immigrants in the Ministry of Labour in 1993. Irbid and Balqa, formed 16.1 percent and 9.4 percent of the total labour force.

**Table 6.4 : Distribution of Immigrant Labour in Jordan  
by Governorates, 1973 - 1993**

Years	Amman	Irbid	Balqa	Karak	Ma'an
1	2	3	4	5	6
1973	269	51	18	17	21
1974	372	70	24	23	30
1975	1597	299	104	98	130
1976	3393	645	298	202	252
1977	6580	1393	854	416	490
1978	11477	3005	2449	856	951
1979	23928	6485	7018	1764	1847
1980	45735	12762	14200	3396	3473
1981	52910	15198	17385	3956	3953
1982	66960	19800	23280	5040	4920
1983	75236	20187	24509	5079	4989
1984	96947	20592	25803	5119	5058
1985	84534	21012	27166	5159	5129
1986	69550	21450	28600	5200	5200
1987	52485	21897	30110	6036	9472
1988	64732	27006	37136	7444	11682
1989	87476	36495	50184	10059	15786
1992*	58658	14565	11859	5227	6107
1993*	33015	8542	5001	2623	3840
Anul.Avg. Growth Rate (1973-89)	26.79	31.04	36.09	29.42	30.09

Note:\* The immigrants in Zarqa district has been added to Amman, Ma'raq to Irbid and Tafilah to Karak.  
\* The registered immigrant labour in Ministry of Labour only.

Sources : Same as in Table 6.2.

**Table 6.5 : Percentage Distribution of Immigrant Labour  
in Jordan by Governorates, 1973 -1993**

Years	Amman	Irbid	Balqa	Karak	Ma'an
1	2	3	4	5	6
1973	71.5	13.6	4.8	4.5	5.6
1974	71.7	13.5	4.6	4.4	5.8
1975	71.7	13.4	4.7	4.4	5.8
1976	70.8	13.5	6.2	4.2	5.3
1977	67.6	14.3	8.8	4.3	5.0
1978	61.2	16.0	13.1	4.6	5.1
1979	58.3	15.8	17.1	4.3	4.5
1980	57.5	16.0	17.8	4.3	4.4
1981	56.6	16.3	18.6	4.2	4.2
1982	55.8	16.5	19.4	4.2	4.1
1983	57.9	15.5	18.9	3.9	3.8
1984	63.1	13.4	16.8	3.3	3.3
1985	59.1	14.7	19.0	3.6	3.6
1986	53.5	16.5	22.0	4.0	4.0
1987	43.7	18.2	25.1	5.0	7.9
1988	43.7	18.2	25.1	5.0	7.9
1989	43.7	18.2	25.1	5.0	7.9
1992*	60.8	15.1	12.3	5.4	6.3
1993*	62.3	16.1	9.4	4.9	7.2

Source : Based on tables 6.1 and 6.4.

## 6.6 Distribution of Immigrant Labour by Level of Education

Tables 6.6 and 6.7 provide information about the level of education of immigrant labour force in absolute and percentage terms for the period 1973-1993. The tables indicate that the majority have education below the general secondary level, forming 60.9 percent of the total in 1973. The general secondary level was 15.7 percent while lower diploma and B.A., B.Sc. level was 13.8 percent and 8.2 percent respectively. The share of post graduates was only 1.3 percent of total during the same year.

The immigrant labour force having below general secondary level of education fill the shortages of labour market in particular types of jobs, as the voluntary unemployed Jordanians like better jobs. This category of immigrant labour continued to form 66.5 percent of total immigrants in 1993. The share of lower Diploma holders improved from 13.8 percent in 1973 to 25.9 percent in 1993.

The increase of lower diploma holders in 1993 reflects requirement of Jordanian labour market for some special skilled labour force to fulfill the shortage which is caused by the outflow of Jordanian labour force. The general secondary <sup>certificate</sup> holders increased from 15.7 percent to 20.5 percent during 1973-1988. If one compares this to emigrant Jordanians education level (Table 5.10), one finds that in 1989, the Jordanians with general

secondary (49.70 percent) and below secondary (26.0 percent) education level had 76 percent share. Those with higher education had a share of 24 percent, whereas immigrants had the percentage share of 20.5, 61.3, 18 for the secondary, below secondary and higher education categories respectively. Thus in relative terms the outflow of Jordanians with more human capital component is higher than that of immigrants, as a higher percentage of Jordanians with general secondary and higher level of education are working abroad. The share of immigrant labour force with general secondary education was 3.1 percent in 1993 to <sup>the</sup> total registered immigrants in Ministry of Labour. Graduates and post graduates were only 3.8 and 0.7 percent respectively in the same year. However the data are not comparable as they are only of the registered Immigrant Labour with Ministry of Labour. The actual number is much larger.

Table 6.6 : Distribution of Immigrant Labour in Jordan  
by Level of Education, 1973 - 1993

Year	Below General Secondary	General Secondary	Lower Diploma	B.A./ B.Sc.	Post Graduate
1	2	3	4	5	6
1973	229	59	52	31	5
1974	317	82	70	43	7
1975	1359	352	303	186	28
1976	3080	737	537	376	60
1977	6555	1450	894	714	120
1978	13144	2691	1400	1277	226
1979	29838	5647	2487	2586	484
1980	56333	11847	5593	4838	955
1981	64354	14963	7463	5473	1149
1982	80412	20568	10752	6768	1500
1983	84643	23751	12896	7046	1664
1984*	97084	29797	16726	7987	1997
1985	87688	29358	16946	7121	1887
1986	79716	26689	15406	6473	1716
1987	73584	24636	14221	5975	1584
1988	90754	30384	17539	7369	1954
1989	122640	41060	23702	9958	2640
1992**	68978	2361	22531	2272	274
1993**	35278	1645	13719	2014	365
Anul. Avg. Growth Rate (1973-1989)	28.79	25.09	31.53	23.93	25.9

Note :\* The registered immigrant labour with Ministry  
of Labour.

\*\* Official total of Immigrant Labour in 1984  
is 153519

Sources : Same as in Table 6.2

**Table 6.7 : Percentage Distribution of Immigrant Labour  
in Jordan by Level of Education, 1973-1993**

Year	Below General Secondary	General Secondary	Lower Diploma	B.A./ B.Sc.	Post Graduate
1	2	3	4	5	6
1973	60.9	15.7	13.8	8.2	1.3
1974	61.1	15.8	13.5	8.3	1.3
1975	61.0	15.8	13.6	8.3	1.3
1976	64.3	15.4	11.2	7.8	1.3
1977	67.3	14.9	9.2	7.3	1.2
1978	70.1	14.4	7.5	6.8	1.2
1979	72.7	13.8	6.1	6.3	1.2
1980	70.8	14.9	7.0	6.1	1.2
1981	68.9	16.0	8.0	5.9	1.2
1982	67.0	17.1	9.0	5.6	1.3
1983	65.1	18.3	9.9	5.4	1.3
1984	63.2	19.4	10.9	5.2	1.3
1985	61.3	20.5	11.9	5.0	1.3
1986	61.3	20.5	11.9	5.0	1.3
1987	61.3	20.5	11.9	5.0	1.3
1988	61.3	20.5	11.9	5.0	1.3
1989	61.3	20.5	11.9	5.0	1.3
1992*	71.5	2.4	23.4	2.4	0.3
1993*	66.5	3.1	25.9	3.8	0.7

Source : Based on tables 6.1 and 6.6.

## 6.7 Distribution of Immigrant Labour According to Economic Activities

Tables 6.8 and 6.9 show the distribution of immigrant labour force in Jordan by economic activity in absolute and percentage terms during the period 1973-1993. In 1973, the immigrant labour force was occupied mostly in construction. Their share was 42.0 percent of the total. In Social and Administrative Services the share was 29.8 percent, in Trade it was 9.6 percent, in Agriculture it was 8.8 percent and in Mining and Manufacturing it was 6.6 percent. The shares of other sectors were relatively low, such as 1.6 percent in Transport and Communication, 1.1 percent in Financial Services and 0.5 percent in Electricity and Water. There was a steady increase in immigrant labour force in all the sectors during the period 1973-1989. The number of immigrant labour force in agriculture was 34.4 percent of the total in 1989. The annual average growth rate was 39.02 percent. The data for 1992 and 1993 as mentioned earlier also are not comparable with the earlier years as they refer to only those workers who are registered with The Ministry of Labour. According to the data of 1992 and 1993, immigrant workers in agriculture were 29.6 percent of the total. The share of immigrants in Construction was 4.9 and in Social Services it was 31.1 percent in 1993. Mining and Manufacturing and Trade had around 15 percent share. This explains a probable shift in the inflow of immigrant labour force from construction and agriculture to social sectors, yet all these three sectors

continue to attract immigrant labourers. As against this the emigrated Jordanians (see Table 5.10) are employed mostly in Social and Public Administration sectors (39 percent). Industry, Construction and Trade taken together employed 44 percent Jordanians.

It is rather unwarranted that even in a traditional sector like Agriculture Jordan has to depend on immigrant labour. By realising this weakness, Jordan will have to prepare its own labour force to replace foreign labour engaged in various economic activities<sup>20</sup>. In a sector like Construction where immigrants are working, Jordan can replace them with Jordanians as many Jordanians are working abroad in this sector (16 percent of total as per table 5.10). Even in Agriculture sector the percentage of Jordanians working abroad is increasing. Thus it is possible to restrict the flow of immigrants in these sectors with proper immigration policy.

Table 6.8 : Distribution of Immigrant Labour in Jordan by  
Economic Activities, 1973 - 1993

Years	Agricul- ture	Mining and Manufa- ture	Electr- icity & Water	Constr- uction	Trade	Transp- ort and Communi- cation	Finan- cial Services	Social Defence & Adminis- trative
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1973	33	25	2	158	36	6	4	112
1974	46	35	2	219	50	8	5	154
1975	196	148	9	941	215	34	23	662
1976	422	319	20	2023	463	72	48	1423
1977	857	649	41	4111	940	146	98	2891
1978	1651	1299	78	7914	1810	231	189	5566
1979	3615	2735	168	17336	3965	616	415	12192
1980	11480	4109	319	22371	5563	1553	712	33459
1981	19043	5691	513	29378	7289	2656	1076	27756
1982	26653	7507	762	38578	9153	3946	1519	31882
1983	43478	9552	1078	40661	11161	5451	2057	16562
1984*	46280	11949	1475	48449	13331	7198	2705	22204
1985	49083	11530	1430	44330	11985	7865	2860	13917
1986	44621	10482	1300	40300	10895	7150	2600	12652
1987	41189	9676	1200	37200	10057	6600	2400	11678
1988	50800	11934	1480	45880	12403	8140	2960	14403
1989	68648	16127	2000	62000	16762	11000	4000	19463
1992*	35684	13315	240	8019	10282	2256	1880	24740
1993**	15678	8133	—	2600	7865	1656	619	16470
Anul.Avg. Growth Rate (1973-89)	39.02	32.1	37.44	21.8	29.09	36.62	33.2	23.23

Note :\* Official total of Immigrants labour in 1984 is 153519

\*\* The registered immigrant labour with Ministry of Labour.

Source : Same as in table 6.2.

Table 6.9 : Percentage Distribution of Immigrant Labour in Jordan by Economic Activities, 1973 - 1993

Years	Agric- lture	Mining and Manufa- cture	Electr- icity and Water	Constr- uction	Trade	Transport & Commu- nication	Finan- cial Services	Social Defence & Adminis- trative
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1973	8.8	6.6	0.5	42.0	9.6	1.6	1.1	29.8
1974	8.9	6.7	0.4	42.2	9.6	1.5	1.0	29.7
1975	8.8	6.6	0.4	42.2	9.6	1.5	1.0	29.7
1976	8.8	6.7	0.4	42.2	9.7	1.5	1.0	29.7
1977	8.8	6.7	0.4	42.2	9.7	1.5	1.0	29.7
1978	8.8	6.9	0.4	42.2	9.7	1.2	1.0	29.7
1979	8.8	6.7	0.4	42.2	9.7	1.5	1.0	29.7
1980	14.4	5.2	0.4	28.1	7.0	2.0	0.9	42.1
1981	20.4	6.1	0.5	31.5	7.8	2.8	1.2	29.7
1982	22.2	6.3	0.6	32.1	7.6	3.3	1.3	26.6
1983	33.4	7.3	0.8	31.3	8.6	4.2	1.6	12.7
1984	30.1	7.8	1.0	31.5	8.7	4.7	1.8	14.5
1985	34.3	8.1	1.0	31.0	8.4	5.5	2.0	9.7
1986	34.3	8.1	1.0	31.0	8.4	5.5	2.0	9.7
1987	34.3	8.1	1.0	31.0	8.4	5.5	2.0	9.7
1988	34.3	8.1	1.0	31.0	8.4	5.5	2.0	9.7
1989	34.3	8.1	1.0	31.0	8.4	5.5	2.0	9.7
1992*	37.0	13.8	0.2	8.3	10.7	2.3	1.9	25.7
1993*	29.6	15.3	0.0	4.9	14.8	3.1	1.2	31.1

Source : Based on tables 6.1 and 6.8.

## 6.8 Occupational Classification of Immigrant Labour Force

Tables 6.10 and 6.11 provide information on distribution of immigrant labour force by occupational group during the period 1973-1993 in absolute and percentage terms. Table 6.10 shows that the major portion of immigrant labour force is engaged in the unclassified job category. Their percentage to the total was 33.0 percent in 1973. Next were the specialists and technicians, which formed 21.0 percent, services- 15.4 percent, agriculture - 13.8 and sales - 10.6 percent, while clerks and administrative <sup>staff</sup> consisted only 3.5 and 2.7 percent (Table 6.11).

The relative importance of immigrant workers in services increased and was 35.1 percent of the total immigrants in 1993. In the same year more than half of the immigrants happened to concentrate in productive unclassified category (30.8 percent) and agriculture - (30.1 percent). The number of immigrants engaged in other occupations formed a negligible proportion.

The immigrant labour force continued to concentrate in jobs which are not liked by Jordanians and are in jobs not requiring much skill. Thus, they do not seem to displace Jordanian labour. If one compares the occupational distribution of immigrants with emigrants (see table 5.10) one finds that most of the emigrants (25.7 percent) are employed as specialists or technicians and 52.4 percent work in production and unclassified occupations. These occupations are mainly in the urban informal sector requiring some skill. In relative terms, however, the Jordanians with higher human capital components are mostly in white collar jobs as compared to immigrants working in Jordan.



Table 6.10 : Occupationwise Distribution of Immigrant Labour  
in Jordan, 1973-1993

Year	Specialist & Technicians	Administrative	Clerks	Salesmen	Services	Agriculture	Productive Work & Unclassified
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1973	79	10	13	40	58	52	124
1974	109	15	18	56	79	71	171
1975	468	62	79	239	341	305	734
1976	793	114	166	421	702	627	1967
1977	1229	197	316	678	1319	1176	4818
1978	1746	309	555	1001	2276	2026	10825
1979	2742	534	1075	1633	4338	3854	26866
1980	5028	955	1973	3437	9277	12253	46643
1981	5557	1028	2195	4343	11909	19997	48373
1982	6708	1200	2652	5988	16596	32916	53940
1983	6799	1170	2691	6929	19396	43478	49537
1984*	7465	1229	2980	8693	24590	51361	57273
1985	6435	1000	2574	8580	24453	47819	52139
1986	5850	909	2340	7800	22230	43472	47399
1987	5400	839	2160	7200	20520	40128	43753
1988	6660	1035	2664	8880	25308	49491	53962
1989	9000	1398	3600	12000	34200	66880	72922
1992**	967	436	84	841	19902	36224	37962
1993**	1130	495	78	429	18588	15976	16325
Anul. Avg. Growth Rate (1973-89)	16.31	19.51	15.94	20.36	31.65	36.22	27.82

Note : \* Official total of Immigrants labour in 1984 is 153519

\*\* The registered immigrant labour with Ministry of Labour.

Source : Same as in table 6.2.

Table 6.11 : Occupationwise Percentage Distribution of Immigrant Labour in Jordan, 1973 - 1993

Years	Specialist & Technicians	Administrative	Clerks	Salesmen	Services	Agriculture	Productive Work & Unclassified
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1973	21.0	2.7	3.5	10.6	15.4	13.8	33.0
1974	21.0	2.9	3.5	10.8	15.2	13.7	32.9
1975	21.0	2.8	3.5	10.7	15.3	13.7	32.9
1976	16.6	2.4	3.5	8.8	14.7	13.1	41.1
1977	12.6	2.0	3.2	7.0	13.6	12.1	49.5
1978	9.3	1.6	3.0	5.3	12.1	10.8	57.8
1979	6.7	1.3	2.6	4.0	10.6	9.4	65.5
1980	6.3	1.2	2.5	4.3	11.7	15.4	58.6
1981	5.9	1.1	2.4	4.6	12.8	21.4	51.8
1982	5.6	1.0	2.2	5.0	13.8	27.4	45.0
1983	5.2	0.9	2.1	5.3	14.9	33.4	38.1
1984	4.9	0.8	1.9	5.7	16.0	33.4	37.3
1985	4.5	0.7	1.8	6.0	17.1	33.4	36.5
1986	4.5	0.7	1.8	6.0	17.1	33.4	36.5
1987	4.5	0.7	1.8	6.0	17.1	33.4	36.5
1988	4.5	0.7	1.8	6.0	17.1	33.4	36.5
1989	4.5	0.7	1.8	6.0	17.1	33.4	36.5
1992	1.0	0.5	0.1	0.9	20.6	37.6	39.4
1993	2.1	0.9	0.1	0.8	35.1	30.1	30.8

Source : Based on tables 6.1 and 6.10.

## 6.9 Distribution of Immigrant Labour by Sex

Table 6.12 shows the distribution of immigrant labour force in Jordan by sex during the period 1973-1993. It shows that males played a predominant role in all the years. In 1973 out of total 376 workers, 364 were male workers. Their percentage share was 96.8 percent, while the females formed only 3.19 percent of the total.

Between 1979 and 1989, the share of the male workers remained around 95 percent, while that of the females it was 5 percent. According to the official figures the share of males was 85 and that of females was 15 percent in 1993. The higher growth rate for females was because of a low base.

**Table 6.12 : Distribution of Immigrant Labour  
by Sex, 1973 - 1993**

Year	Male	Female	% To Total Inflow	
			Male	Female
1	2	3	4	5
1973	364	12	96.81	3.19
1974	503	16	96.92	3.08
1975	2161	67	96.99	3.01
1976	4646	144	96.99	3.01
1977	9441	292	96.99	3.01
1978	18176	562	97.01	2.99
1979	38741	2301	94.39	5.61
1980	76573	2993	96.24	3.76
1981	91468	1934	97.93	2.07
1982	110640	9360	92.21	7.19
1983	115420	14580	88.78	11.22
1984	143819	9772	93.64	6.36
1985	132950	10050	92.97	7.03
1986	119000	11000	91.54	8.46
1987	108000	12000	90.01	9.99
1988	137090	10910	92.63	7.37
1989	191500	8500	95.75	4.25
1992*	88707	7709	92.01	7.99
1993*	44800	8221	84.49	15.51
Anul. Avg. Growth Rate (1973-89)	28.3	36.38		

Note :\* The registered immigrant labour with Ministry of Labour.

Source: Same as in Table 6.2.

#### 6.10 Immigration/Emigration Policy of Ministry of Labour

During the Seventies the government of Jordan followed an "open door" policy which aimed to support both labour outflows and inflows. The outflow was not selective as labour with different skills and education emigrated. The main emigrants were from agriculture and construction sectors. The Government encouraged emigration as they were the source of remittances and also the source of easing unemployment problem. The immigration policy was linked to this policy. Workers were needed for agricultural and construction work. During the Eighties the government followed a restrictive policy. On the one hand, it required skilled and educated manpower for implementing five year plans and on the other, it had to tackle the problem of unemployment among Jordanians. Because of these considerations it restricted the immigrants from obtaining the jobs where Jordanians could be employed and to implement the plans so that educated Jordanians could be absorbed in the domestic labour market. During the early Eighties the Ministry of Interiors decided to abolish residence permit requirements from Egyptians working in Jordan. After 1982, due to economic slump in the region and employment problem, immigrants continued to come to Jordan. Therefore, the government passed the legislation that the employers would have to give opportunities to Jordanians rather than to immigrants. The Government also banned the employment of immigrants in white collar jobs.

In 1993 the government of Jordan used restrictive policy in order to reduce the burden of immigrants on the labour market and

to reduce the unemployment among the native Jordanians. The government abolished all the exemptions from existing laws and regulations and tightened the control over the inflow of immigrant workers.

The Jordanian Ministry of labour followed different policies and legislation in order to organize the labour market. At present the policy aims to regulate the inflow of immigrants into Jordan. The policy aims at protecting the local labour and the immigrants are allowed only if the Jordanians are not displaced. This policy also aims at terminating the outlaw of workers and sending them back<sup>21</sup> to their native countries.

#### **6.11 Impact of Immigrant Workers on the Labour Market of Jordan**

The immigrant workers in Jordan are a part of the total labour force, and they participate in the development process. Due to the technical difficulty of measuring immigrant workers actual contribution in the overall production level, their aggregate sectoral income may be taken as a proxy. One basic assumption underlying this analysis would be the non discrimination of immigrants at work and in employment.

The immigrant workers contributed 8.5 percent and 12.2 percent to Jordan's Gross National Product and Gross Domestic Product respectively in 1984. The actual productivity of the immigrant workers is difficult to estimate. The immigrant workers in Jordan have influenced the country's Balance of Payment. The Immigrant workers' remittances to their native countries from Jordan reflect an upward trend. This phenomenon is partly

explained by the rising number of the immigrant workers. Obviously, the growth of remittances would increase the debit side of the current account and that in turn would affect the overall balance of payments of Jordan. The estimated immigrant workers marginal propensity to remit was 0.3935 in 1984<sup>22</sup>. But in the beginning of 1990s the number of immigrants started diminishing. Thus the outflow of immigrants remittances was reduced. It will come down further in near future.

Table 6.13 indicates that average monthly per capita income of immigrant workers was JD 87.0 in comparison with JD 89.8 of total labour force in 1984. This happened inspite of the fact that in certain sectors, viz agriculture, electricity, trade, transport and finance, average per capita income of the immigrant workers was higher than that of total labour force. The reason for this is that Jordanians did not prefer such jobs and hence in order to attract immigrants higher wages were offered. However, the overall wage level of the immigrant workers was lower than that of total labour force in Jordan in 1984. It is possible that the immigrant workers in Jordan may have lowered the general wage level in the country, and consequently may have contributed in reducing the price level. At the same time the immigrants may also have caused price rise if the producers failed to expand the production capacity and/or imports had to be increased to bridge the gap between supply and demand. It is not easy to measure the impact of immigrants on inflationary situation in Jordan as there is no relevant data.

**Table 6.13 : Wage Levels of Immigrant Workers and Jordanian Labour in Jordan in 1984. (in JD)**

Economic Activity	Average Per capita Income of Guest Workers		Average Per capita Income of Labour Force in Jordan	
	Monthly	Annually	Monthly	Annually
1	2	3	4	5
Commodity Producing Sectors	86.7	1040.8	91.5	1098.4
Agriculture	70.8	849.8	51	612
Mining and Quarrying	80.2	962.4	102	1224.6
Manufacturing	91.8	1101.6	103	1240.4
Electricity	118.5	1421.5	88.2	1058.6
Construction	97.3	1167.9	109.3	1312.3
Services Sector	87.2	1046.3	89.1	1068.9
Trade	90.3	1084.1	72.2	866.6
Transport	146.9	1763.6	143	1716.5
Finance	144.2	1730.8	97	1164.6
Other Services	80.2	962.9	84.6	1015.6
Total	87	1044.5	89.8	1078.1

Source : Department of Statistics, Unpublished Data, Jordan, 1987.

Table 6.14 : Distribution of Immigrant Labour by Economic Activities and Category of Wage Level, 1993

Wage Category (Per Month)	Agriculture	Mining and Quarrying	Manufacturing Industries	Construction	Hotels and Restaurants	Trade, Transport & Communication	Real Estate and Finance	Personal & Social Services	Total
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
JD \$ 50 and Below	339	10	299	24	209	4	16	5260	6161
50-100	15118	286	6079	1869	6849	981	483	9095	40760
100-150	204	36	860	526	488	524	52	721	3411
150-200	7	10	220	85	114	40	12	644	1132
200-250	5	6	120	27	59	13	10	150	390
250-300	1	-	68	16	40	5	3	69	202
300-350	1	2	34	16	25	43	11	75	207
350-400	-	3	21	5	15	1	4	26	75
400-450	-	8	5	5	13	6	4	48	89
450-500	-	-	11	5	3	8	2	18	47
500 and Above	3	17	38	22	50	31	22	364	547
<b>Total</b>	<b>15678</b>	<b>378</b>	<b>7755</b>	<b>2600</b>	<b>7865</b>	<b>1656</b>	<b>619</b>	<b>16470</b>	<b>53021*</b>

Note : \* The total of Registered immigrants with Ministry of Labour, while the actual total exceeds the figures in this table.

Source : Ministry of Labour - Annual Report, 1993.

In 1993 the payment to immigrant labour did not improve much, as almost three quarters of the total registered immigrants in the Ministry of Labour, earn Jordanian Dinar JD 50-100 per month. The labour force of this category are absorbed in Agriculture and Social Service, sectors, e.g., 37.1 percent and 22.3 percent. The immigrants who get JD 50 and below form 11.6 percent share. 11.5 percent of immigrants employed in Jordan get JD 100 and above. 9.7 percent get JD 100-250 in social services, manufacturing, trade and construction. A small group, i.e., 0.8 percent receive between JD 250 to 450 and are distributed in various economic sectors. The immigrants who receive JD 450 to 500 and above are 1.1 percent, and most of them are highly skilled labourers (see table 6.14).

The monthly average wage level of immigrant labour is lower than that of Jordanian labour. Table 3.17 shows that during the period 1980-1989 the monthly average wage level for labour in Jordan ranged between JD 91 and JD 124, which was more than the same for Immigrant labour in 1993 (table 6.14). Though one cannot strictly compare the figures, it is likely that the wages of native workers are higher than those of the immigrants. This may cause a problem of replacement in some occupations where employers tend to employ cheaper immigrant workers rather than expensive native ones.

The above analysis reveals that immigrant workers have helped the Jordanian labour market by providing labour for agriculture and other sectors. However, they might have also displaced native Jordanians in some occupations. The recent policy to give preference to Jordanian native labour force actually discourages the inflow of immigrant labour.

The following chapter on internal migration would help in analysing the impact of another category of labour movement influencing the labour market of Jordan. This will also in a way complete the macro view of labour market of Jordan where outmigration of educated labour working in white collar jobs, inmigration of relatively less educated mostly working in agriculture and construction sectors and internal migration of people from rural agriculture sector to urban areas of Jordan takes place. Unless and until a proper planning is done such movements will continue to affect Jordanian labour market without much of structural transformation of the economy.

#### REFERENCES

1. Borjas, George J., (1994), "The Economics of Immigration", Journal of Economic Literature, New Books And Articles, December, Volume XXXII, Number 4.
2. ----- (1996), The New Economics of Immigration obtained from American Centre Library, USIS, Mumbai, (Article appeared in The Atlantic Monthly, Nov., 1996).
3. Wychno, Stanke, (1976), Migrant Workers and Their Problems, Economic and Social Department of the WETU Headquarters Nam, Curieovych I prague 11688, Czechoslovakia March, p.10.
4. ----- p.12.
5. Stahl, Chrles, (1988), International Migration Today, vol.2, Emerging Issues, The United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organisation, Paris, (Notes on Adriana Marshall Study).
6. I bid
7. Borjas, George J., (1994), "The Economics of Immigration", Journal of Economic Literature, New Books and Articles, December, Volume XXXII, P.1667
8. Zimmermann, Klaus F. (1994), "European Migration: Push and Pull", Proceedings of The World Bank Annual Conference on Development Economics, World Bank, p.313.
9. Thomos, Brinlay, (1973), Migration and Economic Growth, Cambridge University Press, Second Edition, p.2.
10. Mills, J.S., (1909), Principles of Political Economy, 16 the E.d. Longmans, p.414.
11. Colonel, Torens, Speech in the Ho. U. S. of Commons on the Motion of Emigration Feb 18. 1877 quoted by B. Thomas- Migration and Economic Growth, Cambridge University Press, Second edition, 1973, pp.3-6.
12. Marx, Karl, (1928), Capital, Allen and UNWIN, p. 854.
13. Thomas, Brinlay, Op cit p.14.
14. ----- p. 14,15
15. Zimmermann, (1994), Op cit.
16. ----- p.314-315.

17. United Nations, (1990), Population Situation in the ESCWA Region 1990, Social Development and Population Division, ESCWA, p.97.
18. Samah, Musa, Immigration of Substitute Labour Force in Jordan, Jordan University, Unpublished Research, Amman 7.9/8/1982, p. 5,6.
19. Smadi, M.A. and others, (1986), Socio-Economic Impact of Guest Workers in Jordan, Royal Scientific Society Jordan, p.p. 318-323.
20. Ministry of Labour, Annual Report 1992, Department of Research and Studies (Arabic Origin), pp. 18-24.
21. Ministry of Labour, Annual Report 1993, Department of Research and Studies (Arabic Origin), p.17,18.
22. Smadi, M.A. and Others; Op cit pp. 315-321.