MIGRATION AND RELATIONSHIP POWER AMONG MEXICAN WOMEN[*]

Emilio A. Parrado
Duke University
Department of Sociology

Chenoa A. Flippen
Duke University
Center for Demographic Studies

Chris McQuiston
University of North Carolina Chapel Hill
School of Nursing

Forthcoming in *Demography*

[*] This research was funded by a grant from NINR/NIH, #NR 08052-03. Direct all correspondence to Emilio A. Parrado, Department of Sociology, Duke University, Box 90088, Durham, NC 27708. The authors would like to thank El Centro Hispano and the members of our *Horizonte Latino* research team for their contributions to this work.

ABSTRACT

This paper draws on original data collected in Durham, NC and four sending communities in Mexico to examine differentials in women's relationship power associated with migration and residence in the U.S. We analyze the personal, relationship, and social resources that condition the association between migration and women's power. In addition, we evaluate the usefulness of the Relationship Control Scale (RCS) for capturing these effects. We find support for perspectives that emphasize that migration may simultaneously mitigate and reinforce gender inequities. Relative to their non-migrant peers, Mexican women in the U.S. average higher emotional consonance with their partners, but lower relationship control and sexual negotiation power. Methodologically, we find the RCS internally valid and useful for measuring the impact of resources on women's power. However, the scale appears to combine diverse dimensions of relationship power that in our case were differentially related to migration.

There is increasing recognition of the importance of gender disparities in relationship power for understanding a wide array of social and demographic processes, including fertility, child health outcomes, and women's reproductive health (Blanc 2001; Population Council 2001). Especially in the area of HIV/STD prevention, researchers have suggested that relationship power is a central dimension allowing women to negotiate safer sexual practices (Gupta and Weiss 1993; Harvey et al. 2002; Pulerwitz, Gortmaker, and DeJong 2000; Quina et al. 1997). This is particularly important for Latina women in the U.S., since their greater vulnerability to HIV infection has been at least partly attributed to a lack of gender-based power to negotiate safer sex (Amaro 1995; Gomez and Marin 1996; Miller, Burns, and Rothspan 1995). However, strategies to improve women's status and health cannot be adequately developed without a more systematic understanding of the varying sources of women's power, including individual and interpersonal resources and societal-level factors. In the case of Latina women this understanding also requires careful examination of the relationship between migration and gender inequality.

International migration, especially from less to more developed countries, generally implies a radical change in cultural environment that can act as a powerful agent of social change. While a considerable body of research examines the impact of migration on gender, its net effect on women's power remains elusive. On the one hand, studies have found that migration provides women with greater economic opportunities and a more egalitarian cultural environment, thereby heightening their power vis-à-vis men (Boserup 1970; Grasmuck and Pessar 1991; Guendelman and Perez Itriaga 1987; Lamphere 1987). Other studies, however, have questioned the equalizing effect of migration, arguing that issues of marginalization, family

separation, and social isolation might actually increase women's dependence on their partners (Baca Zinn 1995; Espin 1999; Fernandez-Kelly and Garcia 1990; Mahler 1995; Malkin 1999; Young and Willmott 1957; Zhou 1992). It is increasingly recognized that migration may simultaneously challenge and reinforce patriarchy, presenting women with opportunities in some domains and imposing constraints in others (Kibria 1990; Menjivar 2003). However, research that systematically examines the gender domains associated with gains and losses for migrant women and isolates and inter-relates the factors that condition power outcomes remains elusive (Pessar 2003).

A lack of consensus as to how to conceptualize and measure relationship power has impeded a deeper understanding of the relationship between migration and gender. The complex and multi-dimensional nature of relationship power renders it difficult to analyze, and divergent strategies have contributed to inconsistent findings across studies (Blanc 2001). More importantly, the paucity of comparable information from origin *and* destination communities makes it difficult to disentangle cultural and migration-related determinants of gender inequality, with some studies relying on women's recollection of experiences in their home countries and others deriving inferences from sources of information that are not always directly comparable (Mahler 2003). In addition, the selectivity of the migrant flow and the potential for unobserved characteristics to influence both migration decisions and women's power also needs to be taken into consideration.

Accordingly, this paper has two main objectives. The first is substantive: to contribute to the migration and gender literature by comparing relationship power among migrant Mexican women in the U.S. with their non-migrant counterparts in Mexico, and examining its socioeconomic correlates. The massive and continuous flow of Mexican migrants to the U.S.

increasingly involves women (Cerrutti and Massey 2001; Kanaiaupuni 2000). This, in tandem with the wide economic and cultural differences between the two countries, provides an excellent opportunity to examine the relationship between migration and gender inequality. The second objective is methodological: to advance the measurement of women's power by evaluating the Relationship Control Scale (RCS) proposed by Pulerwitz, Gortmaker, and DeJong (2000). The RCS is a theoretically grounded, culturally specific scale developed to measure relationship power among Latina women that offers a promising balance between methodological validity and administrative ease (Blanc 2001). However, before it can be widely applied a deeper understanding of its psychometric properties and measurement construct is in order.

To accomplish these ends, we draw on original data collected from Mexican migrant women in stable relationships in Durham, NC and four sending communities in Mexico. Using factor analysis we investigate underlying dimensions in the RCS and model these dimensions according to women's personal, relationship, and social resources, explicitly taking into consideration the potential effect of unobserved factors simultaneously affecting migration and women's power. In doing so, we shed light on how migration and U.S. residence affect the contours of women's power across various domains, and the social and resource-related factors that shape them.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

The determinants of women's power

Our theoretical framework, presented in Figure 1, integrates migration into the resource theory of relationship power. Social exchange theory has become a prominent framework for understanding decision-making processes within small groups, including couples (Blumberg and

Coleman 1989; Giles-Sims and Crosbie-Burnett 1989). Social exchange theory posits that power is an integral part of social relations since mutual dependencies between parties make it imperative for each party to control or influence the other party's behaviors (Emerson 1962). In the context of mutual dependencies, power is defined as the amount of resistance in one individual that can be potentially overcome by another (Emerson 1981). Thus, rather than residing in the individual actor, power is a property of the interaction between two actors. A corollary of social exchange theory is resource theory, which proposes that a person's relative power is determined by the structural resources or assets that one partner may make available to the other, helping the other satisfy his or her needs or attain his or her goals (Blood and Wolf 1960; Giles-Sims and Crosbie-Burnett 1989).

FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE

While power is not merely reducible to human capital endowments or earnings, personal resources, such as education, employment, and age are direct determinants of women's power (Blood and Wolfe 1960; Xu and Lai 2004). Schooling is one of the most important factors enhancing women's power within relationships. Education provides women with knowledge and verbal skills that directly facilitate participation in decision-making processes. In addition, education facilitates women's participation in activities outside the relationship, such as community involvement, which can also indirectly enhance women's power. Studies in Mexico have shown that educational attainment is one of the most important factors reducing domestic violence and increasing women's participation in household decision-making processes (Oropesa 1997).

Labor force participation provides women independent access to economic resources and has been regarded as a central factor undermining patriarchy (Blood and Wolfe 1960). In

addition to reducing women's financial dependence on men, work for pay involves outside contacts that increase women's social capital and interpersonal skills, enhancing their self-confidence and assertiveness, and thus their bargaining power (Hood 1983; Crandon and Shepard 1985). However, the evidence from Mexico is mixed, suggesting that even though wives' employment has become an important household risk diversification strategy (Parrado and Zenteno 2001), once other factors are taken into consideration it does not appear to exert an independent effect on women's power (Gonzalez de la Rocha 1994; Lomnitz 1977; Oropesa 1997).

Age can also act as an important resource in many contexts. Even in rigid patriarchal cultures age often conveys elements of social prestige, knowledge, and recognition that might allow women to achieve a more egalitarian position with respect to men (Xu and Lai 2004). However, in Mexico the benefits of age are often tempered by the fact that older Mexican women were socialized in a more patriarchal environment and thus tend to conform more closely to traditional sex roles than younger women (Hirsch 2003).

As illustrated in Figure 1, relationship specific resources are another important determinant of women's power. Longer and more formal relationship (i.e. legal as opposed to consensual unions), reflect higher levels of commitment and tend to increase women's control over relationships (Oropesa 1997). At the same time, high fertility or the presence of young children in the household tend to weaken women's power, as domestic demands undermine women's ability to challenge patriarchy (Mason 1987). Researchers have also pointed out that it is not merely absolute resources that determine relationship power, but rather the relative position of women with respect to men that structure gender relations. Age and educational differentials between partners reflect differential command over resources. Having a partner that

is a much older or better educated tends to reduce women's overall position in relationships and diminishes their bargaining power (Wolf, Blanc, and Gage 2000).

Social resources, somewhat neglected in resource theory, also play an important role in relationship power. Social contacts can provide information and assistance, and as such represent a valuable resource. Social networks are not necessarily shared between men and women within households (Hondagneu-Sotelo 1994), and thus are central to women's independence. Studies in Mexico, for instance, have found that the family, including in-laws, and other personal contacts can be an important constraint on patriarchal demands and a central source of support for women in their attempts to foster more egalitarian relations (Guttman 1996; Lewis 1949). Family and friends have been found to provide shelter for women when they are in danger of being mistreated by their partners, and parents and in-laws often represent an important source of help with domestic chores and economic needs (Gonzalez de la Rocha 1994).

Living arrangements are another form of social resources that impact women's position within the household, though the direction of the effect is unclear. Extended families are generally characterized by complex status hierarchies according to age and gender that might reinforce patriarchal arrangements and increase the household demands placed on women (Xu and Lai 2004). On the other hand, the presence of multiple earners and additional sources of support potentially available in extended households could reduce women's dependence on their husband's earnings and his control over resources (Oropesa 1997).

While sex differences in resources have been shown to contribute to gender inequality in relationship power, resource theory has been criticized for its lack of attention to the structural context affecting power relations (Connell 1987). Resource theory fails to account for the impact

of cultural variation in gender ideologies, which can inhibit women's ability to wield power in their interpersonal relationships at both the individual and societal level (Blumberg and Coleman 1989; Ferree 1990; Vogler 1998). Power relations between couples do not occur in a vacuum but are embedded within the social context in which they take place. Power is embodied within social groups as well as individuals, and the gender system of a society is central to individual women's ability to negotiate power within the household. For instance, work by Mason, Smith, and colleagues in five Asian countries showed that community aggregates of women's socio-economic and demographic characteristics predicted their reported power better than their own traits did (Mason 2003).

Migration and women's power

A long literature ties migration to women's power. Voluntary migration, both legal and illegal,[1] generally entails a dramatic change in structural context, which can affect gender based power both directly and via its impact on intervening resource characteristics. However, the effect of migration on women's power is not necessarily uniform and leads to contradictory expectations as to the net effect on women's position within interpersonal relationships. Depending on the larger context of reception, the degree of labor market segmentation and the extent to which migrants are isolated in the receiving society, migration may mitigate *or* reinforce patriarchal gender inequality (Hondagneu-Sotelo 2003; Kibria 1990; Zavella 1987; Zhou 1992).

Migration often has a positive effect on women's labor force participation. Heightened employment opportunities, and the greater financial independence they offer women, have been argued to be one of the central motors promoting migrant women's control over budgetary and

[1] The power consequences of forced or involuntary migration are likely to differ substantially from those of voluntary migration.

other realms of decision-making and providing greater leverage in involving men in household chores (Boserup 1970; Grasmuck and Pessar 1991; Lamphere 1987; Pessar 2003). Some scholars, however, have questioned the direct connection between employment and increases in women's power, noting that while work opportunities are more plentiful in the U.S., migrant women are concentrated in low skilled, poorly paid, and unstable occupations that do not constitute a career. Because women's work in the U.S. is frequently spurred by poverty and economic necessity, it is often more a reflection of the extreme marginality of migrant households than the liberation of migrant women (Fernandez-Kelly and Garcia 1990; Kibria 1990; Oropesa 1997).

The effect of migration on other resources is largely negative, particularly with respect to social resources. Migration is a highly disruptive event that often weakens or strains social bonds. One of the great challenges of settlement in a new environment is the reconstruction of social networks, which are a vital source of support and information. Until such networks can be forged, the immediate effect of migration is to increase husbands' and wives' dependence on one another (Yong and Wilmont 1976). Moreover, social networks are not necessarily shared by all members of a household, and often represent contested resources between husbands and wives (Hondagneu-Sotelo 1994). Because migrant women are less likely than their husbands to work, reconstituting social bonds is more difficult for them, and they may be especially prone to increased dependence following migration.

In addition to affecting women's level of resources, migration also holds the potential to alter the effect of particular resources on gender power. For instance, migration is often a stressful experience that entails prolonged ambiguity and uncertainty, the need to learn and assimilate vast amounts of new information, and numerous other challenges relating to operating

in a foreign language and culture (Espin 1999). Factors that facilitate coping and adaptation, such as education and social networks, are likely to be of heightened importance to migrant women's power relative to their peers in their communities of origin.

And finally, migration and the associated change in structural environment can alter gender relations over and above its effect on women's resources. The overarching social structure and women's position within it has been shown to be an important determinant of women's power irrespective of individual resources (Mason, 2003; Mason and Smith 2000). In the U.S. an ethos of egalitarianism, whether real or ideological, pervades notions of gender relations. This ethos contrasts sharply with the more familistic and patriarchal gender system prevalent in Mexico (Foner 2002). In addition, the more protective legal environment in the U.S. might provide women with additional resources in power relations (Hirsch 1999). Exposure to a more egalitarian gender environment could thus enhance Mexican women's power position in the U.S. relative to Mexico, over and above its impact on employment and other opportunities.

On the other hand, migration is often a marginalizing experience, and migrant women's position in the U.S. must be situated within the larger context of stratification by race, ethnicity, and immigration status as well as by gender. Rather than simply assimilating the culture and values of the U.S., migrant communities and households might reinforce "traditional" gender-role behaviors for migrant women as a way of preserving their cultural heritage and protecting themselves from the disintegrating forces arising from residence in a foreign environment (Espin 1999). Studies have shown that as minority members, Mexican women migrants sometimes emphasize and reinforce patriarchal family values as a strategy to set themselves apart from other minority groups and defend Mexican identity against negative perceptions prevalent in the host society (Malkin 1999). Comparable patterns have been reported for Colombian (Garcia Castro

1986) and other Latin American women in the U.S. (Mahler 1995), where the direct connection between a more egalitarian ideological environment and increased female autonomy is not clearly supported.

Rather than emphasizing an overall positive or negative effect of migration on women's relationship power, what is needed is a better understanding of which changes facilitate or impede greater gender parity within relationships (Pessar 2003). Such analysis entails not only deconstructing monolithic notions of women's power and identifying different domains that might be differentially affected by migration, but also elucidating the extent to which the effects are due to macro-contextual forces or to more immediate factors connected to women's resources in the U.S.

Special care must be taken, however, in modeling and interpreting differences across migrants and non-migrants because individuals are generally not randomly selected into voluntary migration. Unobservable characteristics affecting both migration and power, such as psychological predispositions or resources, might distort the observed association between migration and relationship control. This is particularly important in our case because previous research suggests that migrant women could be positively selected in terms of relationship power (ρ in Figure 1). Migrants in general have been described as risk takers and enterprising, and this characterization applies to both men and women (Boneva and Frieze 2001; Freeman 1999). The tremendous dangers involved in crossing the border, especially for women, and the precarious nature of life as an undocumented migrant could heighten the selectivity of the migrant flow. Moreover, it is often the case that women's migration occurs in spite of opposition by other family members, including husbands. Studies indicate that women who are more independent and resourceful and have more to say about family decisions are more likely to migrate than less

resourceful women, and as such, the act of migration itself has been described as a challenge to patriarchy (Hondagneu-Sotelo 1992; 1994).

DATA AND METHODS

We apply our theoretical framework to original data obtained in Durham, NC and four Mexican sending communities. Durham is a particularly interesting setting to examine the relationship between migration and gender. Like other cities in the Southeastern U.S., the Hispanic population in Durham experienced rapid growth in recent years, from a mere 2,054 in 1990 to 17,039 (or 8 percent of the total population) in 2000. Hispanic migration to Durham began in earnest in the mid-1990s, as the high-tech boom in the nearby research triangle created intense demand for low-skilled construction and service workers. The relatively recent arrival of the Hispanic community is reflected in data from the 2000 Census, which shows that nearly 75 percent of area Hispanics are foreign born, with upwards of 85 percent migrating to the U.S. after 1990 (Ruggles et al. 2004). As a result, the vast majority is undocumented, lacks legal authorization to work, and exhibits relatively low levels of English fluency.

In addition, while over half of migrant Hispanic women in Durham work, the majority is concentrated in low-skill employment with little occupational diversity. Over 60 percent of women work in just two fields: service occupations (overwhelmingly cleaners, cooks, and janitors) and manual operatives (primarily laundry and meat cutting and a large number of unspecified kindred operatives).

Data

Data for the analysis are drawn from face-to-face interviews with 219 randomly selected Hispanic migrant women aged 18 to 49 in Durham and 400 surveys (100 in each) in four sending communities in Mexico: two in the state of Michoacán and one each in Guerrero and Veracruz.[2]

The relatively recent development of the Durham Hispanic community complicated applying simple survey techniques and required special considerations to approximate a representative sample. [3] Based on our knowledge of the community we identified 13 apartment complexes and blocks that house large numbers of migrant Hispanics. We then conducted a census of all the apartments in these areas and randomly selected individual units to be visited by interviewers. Comparison of our data with information from the 2000 Census reveals that the vast majority of Durham's Hispanics, close to 75 percent, live in areas similar to those in which the 13 apartment complexes are located, i.e. in blocks that are between 25 and 60 percent Hispanic. This figure would likely be even higher if block-level data identifying the foreign born population were available (Parrado, McQuiston, and Flippen 2005). Even though a small proportion of more established migrants may be less likely to be captured in our survey this method reduces the problems associated with non-random, convenience samples. Communities in Mexico were purposively selected to represent different areas of out-migration based on the

[2] Surveys were conducted between April, 2002 and July, 2003 in Durham and between December, 2002 and April, 2003 in Mexico.

[3] The study relied heavily on Community-Based Participatory Research (CBPR) to gain entrée into the migrant community and build the rapport and trust necessary to gather information on sensitive issues such as gender roles and immigration status. Specifically, we worked extensively with 14 members of the migrant Hispanic community, who have been directly involved in every stage of the research, including formulating and revising the questionnaire, identifying survey locales, and developing strategies to guarantee the collection of meaningful information (McQuiston et al. 2005; Parrado, McQuiston, and Flippen 2005). In addition, the CBPR group was trained as interviewers and collected all surveys in Durham. The group has been especially instrumental in allowing us to reach the fledgling Durham Hispanic community, facilitating the collection of sensitive information and helping us achieve a 7.6% refusal rate among women, a figure that compares favorably to those reported in other random surveys conducted with recent migrants (Stepick and Stepick 1990; DaVanzo et al. 1994). The group continues to provide culturally grounded commentary that guides the interpretation of our analyses.

place of origin of the first 100 interviewees in Durham. Respondents in each community were randomly selected using sampling frames from the 2000 Mexican Census (Parrado, Flippen and McQuiston 2005).

The bi-national survey design is ideal for assessing the relationship between migration/U.S. residence and gender power among the Mexican population. The survey collects identical retrospective information in Mexico and the U.S. on several life course domains, including labor, family and fertility behavior, and migration. In addition, the survey incorporates several measures of gender dimensions, including the Relationship Control Scale. Social resources, including perceived social support and contact with friends and family, are also captured. Because our focus includes power dynamics within relationships we restrict our analysis to women in stable relationships. This restriction results in a total sample of 271 and 146 women in Mexico and Durham, respectively.

The measurement of women's power

One factor undermining greater consensus and comparability across studies on migration and gender is the lack of a standard way to define and measure power. Relationship power is a multi-faceted phenomenon that is very difficult to operationalize and document (Bowleg, Belgrave, and Reisen 2000). Researchers have employed a variety of approaches, including using education and age differences between partners as proxies for power differentials (Wolf, Blanc, and Gage, 2000), devising indicators of decision-making authority (Hogan, Berhanu, and Hailemariam 1999; Govindasamy and Malhortra 1996; Mason and Smith 2000), and applying a complex combination of measures (Kishor 2000). In the area of reproductive health researchers have focused specifically on sexual power, or the ability to request condom use without fear of angering or provoking violence from one's partner (Gomez and Marin 1996).

Overall, the development of scales or indices has become an increasingly popular means for obtaining consistent and reliable measures of women's power (Blanc 2001). The Relationship Control Scale (RCS), a subscale of the Sexual Relationship Power Scale (SRPS) devised by Pulerwitz, Gortmaker, and DeJong (2000), represents an important step toward the construction of a theoretically grounded, culturally based, and measurable definition of relationship power applicable to Hispanic women. Its development was guided by Connell's structural theory of Gender and Power (Connell 1987) and Emerson's psychosocial Social Exchange Theory (1981) of relationship power, and is thus consistent with our integration of migration into the resource theory of relationship power. In addition, the 15 items included in the RCS (listed in Table 2) were specifically identified among Hispanic women in the U.S. and translated into Spanish.

We made one modification to the RCS scoring, reducing the 4-point Likert scale to a 2-point agree/disagree choice. In general, studies have found that dichotomous and rating scale formats yield very similar results (Clark and Watson, 1995). Moreover, research suggests that cultural variation in response styles (Hui and Triandis 1989; Warnecke et al. 1997) can lead to response bias with Likert-type formats among unacculturated Hispanics (Marin, Gamba, and Marin 1992), for whom the assumption of equal-interval scaling is often not justified. This modification was evaluated for validity using a test-retest procedure, and again in pilot surveys in the community. An advantage of this simplification is that the overall relationship control score is reduced to the simple sum of agreements to the 15 items in the scale with higher scores indicating lower levels of power. The scale can be further analyzed using multivariate regression techniques for count data, since the dependent variable is simply the number of times a woman agrees with the statements in the scale (Cameron and Trivendi 1991).

Descriptive statistics, presented for both samples in Table 1, show that Mexican women agree on average roughly 4 times with the items in the scale, with no significant differences overall between migrant and non-migrant women.

TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

Independent variables

Independent variables in the analysis derive from our conceptual framework. A dummy variable indicating whether a woman is residing in the U.S. captures the effect of structural context on relationship power.[4] In order to account for the potential effect of unobserved characteristics affecting both women's migration propensities and power, the likelihood of U.S. residence is allowed to be endogenous to power perceptions (see below).

To capture the importance of personal resources for women's power, we include measures of age, education, and employment status. Table 1 shows that relative to their counterparts in Mexico, Mexican women in Durham are slightly younger, average fewer years of education, and are nearly twice as likely to be employed. To capture the impact of relationship characteristics on women's power, we include marital status, number of young (i.e., less than 12 years of age) children in the household, relationship duration, and age and educational differentials between partners. Table 1 shows that consensual unions are twice as prevalent in the U.S. as in Mexico. Roughly 34 percent of Durham migrant women formed their union in the U.S. and 71 percent of those unions are consensual. As studies have found in other historical contexts (Tilly and Scott 1987), lack of familiarity with the legal system and, in our case, lack of documentation are among the main barriers to formal union formation among Mexican women

[4] Preliminary analyses considered years of migration experience as a predictor to assess whether relationship control changed with increased exposure to U.S. culture. However, the effect was not significant. Given that few women in Mexico have migration experience to the U.S. and the relatively recent arrival of our sample we do not include the variable in our analyses.

in Durham.[5] At the same time, migrant women average slightly fewer children under age 12, shorter time in their relationships, and smaller age differences with their partners than their counterparts in Mexico.

Differences in social resources show that while Mexican women in the U.S. visit friends at a rate similar to those in Mexico, their visits with family are significantly reduced. Perceived lack of social support, constructed as the number of times that women report not having anyone to listen to them, to make them feel secure, knowledgeable about the local environment, to whom they could turn for help, or who could give them a ride if needed, is higher among migrant than non-migrant women. Finally, women in the U.S. tend to live in larger households (i.e. with a greater number of extended family co-residents) than women in Mexico. All of these patterns hold the potential to affect relationship power, and to mediate the impact of migration and U.S. residence on women's power.

Methods

The empirical analysis is separated into two parts. First, we conduct measures of internal consistency and a factor analysis to deconstruct average scores and investigate underlying dimensions within the RCS that might be differentially affected by migration and U.S. residence. Second, we model the different dimensions of women's power using count data techniques.[6]

[5] Single women who formed unions in the U.S. tended to do so shortly after migrating, most of them during the same year. Fifteen percent of these unions occurred between couples from the same communities in Mexico, many of which likely represent relationships formed prior to migration. To investigate whether the timing of union formation relative to migration was important to women's power we restricted the sample to migrant women and included a variable for place of union formation. Results showed no significant differences, suggesting that the association between migration and women's power does not differ between women who formed their unions in the U.S. and those who migrated to join their husbands.

[6] An alternative approach would be to treat the sum of responses as ordered outcomes and model them using ordinal data techniques. Count data models are appropriate in cases where the size of the population is large and the event probability is small, as in our case. The two alternatives yield similar substantive results. Count models are advantageous in our case because they allow us to control for omitted and unobserved variables and treat U.S. residence as endogenous. For a comparison of different approaches, see Cameron and Trivendi (1986).

As discussed above, however, care should be taken when estimating the effect of migration/U.S. residence on women's relationship power because important determinants of migration may be unobserved, and these unobservable effects may be correlated with the random component in the model predicting relationship control, leading to biased results. For instance, if risk-taking and more independent women have a higher propensity to migrate to the U.S. and a simultaneously higher propensity to maintain more egalitarian gender relations, then failure to account for the positive correlation between migration and women's power would cause endogeneity bias and lead to inconsistent parameter estimates.

Accordingly, the statistical analysis applies a recently proposed count data model with endogenous switching that includes controls for omitted and unobserved factors and allows for the treatment of migration/U.S. residence as an endogenous dummy variable to relationship control. The model involves jointly estimating a Poisson equation predicting the number of less egalitarian RCS responses and a Probit equation predicting the likelihood of U.S. residence. The model accounts for the potential endogeneity of U.S. residence to relationship power by allowing the random error terms to be correlated across equations.[7]

The formal presentation of the model follows the discussion in Terza (1998) and Miranda (2004). Consider the i^{th} individual from a random sample $I = \{1 \ldots n\}$. The model assumes that conditional on the list of our explanatory variables presented above, x_i, an endogenous dummy variable measuring U.S. residence, d_i, and a random term ξ_i, the sum of less egalitarian responses

[7] Terza (1998) illustrated the properties of the model in an analysis of household trip frequency considering vehicle ownership as an endogenous regressor. Miranda (2004) extended its application to the analysis of fertility among Mexican women controlling for the potential endogeneity of educational attainment. Similar count data models with endogenous switching have been applied in other situations of endogenous regressors, such as the effect of health insurance choice on the demand for health care (Schellhorn 2001; Weindmeijer and Silva 1997), the effect of physician advice on alcohol consumption (Kenkel and Terza 2001), the effect of past smoking habits on current cigarette smoking, and the effect of unobservable psychological traits on birth weight (Mullahy 1997).

to items in the RCS scale, y_i, follows a standard Poisson distribution with probability density function

$$f(y_i \mid \xi_i) = \frac{\exp\{-\exp(x_i'\beta + \gamma d_i + \xi_i)\}\{\exp(x_i'\beta + \gamma d_i + \xi_i)\}^{y_i}}{y_i!}$$

and conditional mean equal to

$$\mathrm{E}[y_i \mid x_i, d_i, \xi_i] = \exp\{x_i'\beta + \gamma d_i + \xi_i\}$$

The random term ξ_i summarizes omitted and unobserved variables. The endogenous dummy, d_i, i.e. U.S. residence, follows a dichotomous rule of the following form:

$$d_i = \begin{cases} 1 \text{ if } z_i'\alpha + \upsilon > 0 \\ 0 \text{ otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where z_i is a vector of independent variables expected to affect the likelihood of U.S. residence. In our case these include indicators of women's personal resources, such as age and years of education, which previous analyses of female migration from Mexico have found to predict U.S. residency (Cerrutti and Massey 2001; Kanaiaupuni 2000). In addition, the vector includes controls for relationship characteristics, such as age at union formation and age and educational differences between partners, since research suggests that U.S. residence is more likely among younger and more egalitarian relationships (Hondagneu-Sotelo 1992). Finally, even though the model is identified through functional form, we include two specific variables capturing women's experiences and orientations before first union that are expected to affect the likelihood of U.S. residency (Kanaiaupuni 2000): whether women's first employment and first

trip to the U.S. occurred before first union. These two variables are obtained from women's retrospective labor, migration, and union histories.[8]

In order to allow for the potential endogeneity of d_i, the random term ξ_i and ν_i are assumed to be jointly normal with mean zero and covariance matrix

$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma^2 & \sigma\rho \\ \sigma\rho & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

If $\rho = 0$ then ξ_i and ν_i are independent and d_i can be treated as exogenous. An estimate of $\rho > 0$ in our case indicates a positive association between migration/U.S. residence and lower women's power. An estimate of $\rho < 0$ indicates the opposite association, which in our case implies that migrant women show a higher degree of power than their non-migrant counterparts. The Wald statistic for the significance of ρ can be used to test the adequacy of the endogenous switching model.[9]

RELIABILITY AND FACTOR STRUCTURE OF THE RELATIONSHIP CONTROL SCALE

A preliminary evaluation of the measurement properties of the RCS, including its reliability and factor structure, is needed before we can investigate the socio-demographic correlates of women's power. Reliability refers to the extent to which an instrument accurately measures the underlying construct it is intended to measure, and in the case of single-administration

[8] For the Mexican sample, migration information was obtained from return migrants. Additional tabulations (not reported) showed that whether women's first employment and first trip to the U.S. occurred before first union did not significant predict relationship control. However, making a trip before first union is an important predictor of current U.S. residency. Results from the Probit model predicting U.S. residence are available upon request.

[9] The model was estimated using the espoisson command in Stata written by A. Miranda and available at http://www.stata-journal.com/software/sj4-1. For a detailed discussion of the procedure see Miranda (2004).

questionnaires can be assessed by the level of internal consistency (Nunnally and Bernstein, 1994). Taken together, the 15 items in the scale exhibit a relatively high degree of internal consistency. The standardized Kuder-Richardson Formula 20 (KR-20) estimate, which is a special form of coefficient alpha applicable when items are dichotomous, equals 0.80, which is above the generally accepted level of adequacy of 0.60 (Nunnally and Bernstein 1994).

However, internal consistency does not necessarily imply unidimensionality (Anderson et al. 1987; Gardner 1995; Green et al. 1977). Investigating the underlying factor structure of the RCS is particularly important in our case since the literature on migration and gender suggests that the effect varies across different power dimensions. Confirmatory factor analysis rejected the hypothesis that the scale measures a single construct (Goodness of Fit Index Adjusted for Degrees of Freedom (AGFI)=0.744; Chi-Square= 635.8; Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA)=0.12). We therefore conducted an exploratory common factor analysis to assess the RCS' underlying dimensions.[10]

Three factors obtained eigenvalues that were higher than the average prior communality estimates: relationship control, sexual negotiation, and emotional consonance. The three factors account for 89 percent of the initial variance in the RCS, and the items loading on each factor exhibit conceptual coherence with discernable differences across constructs.[11] While the specific items comprising each factor are detailed below, in general, the relationship control factor contains items that relate to who determines what the couple does and how they spend time; the

[10] Since items in the scale are dichotomous the analysis was performed on the matrix of tetrachoric rather than Pearson correlations. Factors were extracted using the principal axis method, with prior communalities for each variable estimated as the maximum absolute correlation with any other variable, and a varimax rotation of initial factors (Hatcher 1994).

[11] Two items in the scale (#14 and #15) do not weigh heavily in any one particular factor and could potentially be excluded from the analysis. However, analyses performed with or without these items do not show substantively different results. Results for the factor loadings are available upon request.

sexual negotiation factor contains items that pertain to condom use; and the emotional dissonance factor contains more affective items pertaining to women's feelings about their relationships. These three dimensions serve as dependent variables in subsequent analyses.

Table 2 reports the percentage of women who agree with each item in the scale together with the mean number of agreements and the KR-20 formula results according to the three power dimensions. Higher rates of agreement indicate lower interpersonal power. Results are reported for Mexican and U.S. samples, and two-tailed t-tests were computed to assess the significance of differences.

TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

Substantively, the descriptive results presented in Table 2 support the contention that migration and U.S. residence affect interpersonal power in opposing directions. Results show that U.S. residence is associated with lower levels of relationship control and sexual negotiation power and higher levels of emotional consonance. For instance, while 29 percent of migrant women agreed with the statement "When my partner and I disagree, he gets his way most of the time," only 20 percent did so in Mexico. The same applies to statements such as: "My partner does what he wants, even if I do not want him to" and "My partner tells me who I can spend time with." As a result, women in Mexico agree on average with the statements about relationship control 1.1 times compared to 1.4 times among migrant women.

Two items of sexual negotiation also show significantly lower interpersonal power among migrant women relative to their counterparts in Mexico. More migrant women agree with the statements "If I asked my partner to use a condom, he would get violent" and "If I asked my partner to use a condom, he would get angry" than do women in Mexico. Overall, in Mexico

women agree on average 0.4 times with statements about sexual negotiation relative to 0.6 times among migrant women in the U.S.

The lower average relationship and sexual control among migrant women does not translate into higher emotional dissonance, however. On the contrary, migration and U.S. residence are associated with reduced emotional dissonance, with fewer women agreeing with statements such as "I am more committed to our relationship than my partner is" in the U.S. than in Mexico. Overall, migrant women agree with statements about emotional dissonance 2.3 times, compared to 2.6 times among women in Mexico.

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS

Relationship Control Factor

In order to assess the social correlates of women's power we separately model the three dimensions identified above. Table 3 reports estimates from Poisson models predicting the relationship control factor within the RCS that controls for unobserved and omitted variables and treats migration and U.S. residence as endogenous. Coefficients can be interpreted as the effect of a given variable on the logged number of agreements with items in the scale. Substantively, positive coefficients indicate a higher number of agreements and hence lower reported relationship control power.

TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

Contrary to the relatively optimistic predictions in some of the prior literature on gender and migration, we find that even after accounting for the endogeneity of migration, Mexican women in the U.S. report a higher number of agreements with items in the scale, and thus lower relationship control, than their peers in Mexico. The lower control of migrant women remains

even after we take into consideration their lower average age and education, higher rates of labor force participation, and relationship characteristics in models 1 and 2. In fact, additional tabulations reveal that one item ("My partner does not let me wear certain things") is responsible for a considerable reduction in the positive effect of migration and U.S. residence on the scale score; models that exclude that item show a larger negative association between migration and women's relationship control. Thus, while differences in personal resources and relationship characteristics across contexts contribute to the lower relationship control of migrant women, they do not explain it in full. It is not until social resources are added in model 3 that migration and U.S. residence is reduced to non-significance.

Results also attest to the importance of women's resources to interpersonal power. Education stands out as a central predictor of gender power among migrants and non-migrants, decreasing the number of agreements with items in the scale. Similar results are found for the effect of regular social contacts. Model 3 shows that visiting friends and family at least once a week decreases the number of agreements with scale items by 72 (exp(-.328)=.72) and 74 percent (exp(-.307)=.74), respectively.

To test whether migration and U.S. residence modify the impact of resources on relationship control, models 4 and 5 estimate parameters separately for migrant and non-migrant women. Bolded coefficients indicate statistically significant differences in coefficients. In general, the forces shaping women's relationship control do not vary significantly between migrant and non-migrant women, except for the effect of regular visits to family. While in Mexico contacts with family are a significant resource positively associated with women's relationship control (coef.= -.621), the opposite is true among migrant women in the U.S. (coef.=.375). Previous research suggests that in the U.S. context, the family often emphasizes

traditional, Mexican values as a means of protecting against destabilizing aspects of migration (Espin, 1999), which can undermine women's attempts to challenge patriarchy.

Of substantive importance is the association between relationship control and U.S. residence as measured by ρ (rho). Results show a large significant and negative association that remains across models, indicating that migrants are positively selected with respect to relationship power. That is, migrant women show a stronger underlying power orientation than their non-migrant peers. Models that do not control for this association underestimate the negative association between migration and U.S. residence and women's relationship control.

Sexual Negotiation Factor

Table 4 reports estimates from Poisson models predicting the sexual negotiation factor within the RCS. Tests for endogeneity rejected the hypothesis that U.S. residence is endogenous to sexual negotiation and we therefore report models that treat U.S. residence as exogenous. As with the case of relationship control, results show that even after controlling for women's personal resources and relationship characteristics (models 1 and 2) migrant women average lower sexual decision-making power than their peers in Mexico. Social resources, however, capture most of this negative effect. Once we add social resources in model 3 the coefficient for U.S. residence is reduced to non-significance.

TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE

Personal resources are important correlates of sexual power. Age, rather than a resource, in this case reflects more traditional gender role socialization and as such is associated with less sexual negotiation power among women. Educational attainment, on the other hand, is positively associated with sexual negotiation power even after other factors are taken into account. Results also show the importance of legal unions to women's power, as being in a consensual union is

associated with decreased women's power in models 2 and 3. The higher prevalence of consensual unions among migrant women implies that this is an important factor under girding differences in sexual power across contexts.

And finally, social resources are also central to women's sexual negotiation power. Once these resources are taken into account in model 3, the negative effect of U.S. residence on sexual negotiation power is eliminated, apparently channeled through its association with perceived lack of social support. Results show that a unit increase in perceived lack of support increases the number of agreements with items in the scale by a factor of 1.26.

Once again, these effects, especially social support, differ significantly across contexts. Models 4 and 5, estimated separately for migrant and non-migrant women, show that regular visits with friends and perceived lack of social support are both central correlates of sexual power in the U.S. but not in Mexico. This finding pertains to the linguistic, cultural, and legal restrictions to information in the U.S. that heighten the importance of friends and social support to women's power.

Again, as in the case of relationship control, we see differences in the nature of the family across migrant and non-migrant women. While in Mexico visiting family once a week reduces women's dependence in sexual negotiation by a factor of .47, in the U.S. it increases it by a factor of 2.3. Thus, as in the case for relationship control, the family may act as a resource in Mexico but in the U.S. exerts pressures to conform to a more traditional distribution of power with respect to sexual negotiation.

Emotional Dissonance Factor

The final set of analyses estimate the factors associated with the emotional dissonance factor within the RCS. Contrary to the pattern evident for relationship control and sexual negotiation,

results reported in Table 5 show that migrant women average lower emotional dissonance than their peers in Mexico. Moreover, the positive association between U.S. residence and this dimension of power becomes larger and gains significance after accounting for personal, relationship, and social resources, suggesting that the experience of migration reinforces both parties' commitment to the relationship and reduces women's perceptions of lack of emotional support within the dyad. After accounting for all types of resources, Model 3 estimates that residence in the U.S. reduces the expected number of agreements with the items in the emotional dissonance scale by .79 times.

However, results also highlight the importance of accounting for endogeneity between migration and emotional dissonance in estimating these effects. Across all specifications, the association between migration and U.S. residence and emotional dissonance, as measured by ρ, remains negative and significant. Substantively this suggests that compared to their non-migrant peers, Mexican migrants are positively selected with respect to relationship commitment.[12] Models that do not account for this selectivity overestimate the positive association between migration and U.S. residence and emotional consonance.

TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE

As in previous dimensions of power, women's resources are important correlates of emotional dissonance. Educational attainment and relationship duration are the two main factors associated with a reduction in women's sense of emotional dissonance with their partners. As in the analysis of sexual negotiation, being in a consensual rather than legal union is clearly negatively related to this aspect of women's power. Model 2 shows that being in a consensual

[12] This finding is largely driven by women migrating to join their husbands. Models restricting the sample to migrant women who formed unions in the U.S. indicate that the association is in the same direction although smaller and not significant. While unobserved characteristics might also make these women more committed to their relationships, their small sample prevents us from reaching more definitive conclusions.

union increases the expected number of agreements with the emotional dissonance factor by 1.15 times. The fact that consensual unions are much more prevalent among women who form unions in the U.S. than in Mexico implies that if migration has a negative effect on emotional consonance it is through its effect on the type of unions being formed. At the same time, the burdens associated with having young children appear to increase women's perceptions of emotional dissonance, while social resources, particularly regular contacts with family and friends, lessen it.

As before, however, differences in the effect of social resources across contexts reflect the difficult situation faced by migrant Mexican women in reconstructing social networks. Among both migrants and non-migrants, regular contacts with friends reduce women's sense of dissonance. Contacts with family, on the other hand, once again show opposing effects. In Mexico family contacts are an important source of emotional support, while among migrants in the U.S. the association is not significant. At the same time, while perceived lack of social support and residence with extended family do not affect power perceptions in Mexico, they are significantly and positively associated with emotional dissonance among migrants. Lack of social support is a clear indicator of women's degree of social isolation and the presence of extended family in the U.S. in many cases imposes burdens on women that reinforce patriarchal demands. In both cases they appear to be important contributors to emotional dissonance among migrant women.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

One of the primary motivations of this paper was to contribute to the literature on gender and migration by comparing relationship power among migrant and non-migrant Mexican women.

Integrating migration as a structural context factor within the resource theory of interpersonal power, we assessed both the direct effect of migration and U.S. residence on women's power and its mediated effects through women's personal, relationship, and social resources. Although limited sample size and the exclusive focus on Durham migrants render our conclusions tentative, our results challenge the common assumption of a positive association between women's power and migration. Instead, we find support for perspectives that emphasize the marginal position of migrant women in the U.S. and view relationship power as a multidimensional construct that can be differentially affected by migration.

The second motivation of our analysis was to contribute to the literature on the measurement of power by providing an assessment of the Relationship Control Scale (Pulerwitz, Gortmaker, and DeJong 2000). The implications in this respect are two-fold. The scale exhibits a relatively good degree of internal consistency, is well suited for understanding the resources affecting Mexican women's power, and is perfectly applicable to women residing in both Mexico and the U.S.

At the same time, we found the scale does not reflect a single construct. As applied to our sample, factor analysis identified three underlying dimensions captured in the scale: relationship control, sexual negotiation, and emotional dissonance. Without distinguishing between these dimensions, the scale failed to capture significant differences in women's power between migrant and non-migrant women. Thus, even though the individual questions included in the scale are useful for understanding relationship power among Mexican women, before taking it as a whole further applications need to pay close attention to patterns among individual items and perform preliminary factor analyses to verify the uni-dimensionality of the construct in their sample.

After identifying the three dimensions of relationship power, we modeled them separately, taking into account the potential endogeneity between migration and women's power, and compared estimates across migrant and non-migrant samples. Our results show that the relationship between migration and U.S. residence varies across the three constructs. When compared to their non-migrant peers, Mexican migrant women appear to have lower relationship control and sexual negotiation power but higher emotional consonance. Most of the negative effects of migration on women's power are not directly captured by U.S. residency, but are mediated through the lower average education, relationship characteristics, and weaker social networks of migrant women.

The main personal trait increasing women's relationship power is educational attainment. Better educated Mexican women show consistently higher levels of relationship control, control over sexual negotiation, and emotional consonance than their less educated counterparts. Moreover, the effect of education does not vary between migrant and non-migrant women, making it a central resource for achieving more egalitarian gender relations across contexts. Contrary to expectations prevalent in the gender and migration literature and in resource theories of interpersonal power, female employment had no effect on any of the three dimensions of relationship power considered. Thus the more plentiful employment opportunities in the U.S. do not automatically translate into greater power for migrant women, and previous emphasis on employment might be overstated.

Relationship-specific resources also show consistent results across power domains. The negative association between consensual unions and sexual negotiation and emotional consonance is particularly striking, especially given the fact that consensual unions are much more common among migrant women than among their counterparts in Mexico. Thus part of the

negative effect of migration and U.S. residence on women's power is related to its effect on union type. Future studies of women's status need to pay closer attention to the type of union formed by migrant Mexican women in the U.S. and how it is affected by legal status and acculturation.

While somewhat overlooked in resource theory, social resources, including contact with friends and family, social support, and living arrangements, are both central correlates of women's power and vary systematically in their effects across contexts. Among both migrant and non-migrant women, regular contacts with friends provide access to information that is associated with enhanced power positions. Visits with friends are particularly important among migrant women in the U.S. where they exert a stronger effect in promoting more egalitarian sexual control than in Mexico. The importance of social networks to migrant women's access to information and power is reinforced by the association between perceived lack of social support and sexual negotiation and emotional consonance. Lacking social support decreases women's bargaining position with respect to men on both factors, and the effect is only present in the U.S.

Regular visits with family, on the other hand, have opposing effects among migrants and non-migrants. In Mexico contacts with family are an important resource positively associated with women's relationship control, sexual negotiation power, and emotional consonance. Among migrant women, in contrast, contacts with family either do not significantly correlate with relationship power or become negative, as in the case of sexual negotiation. Similar results apply to the effect of residing with extended family on emotional consonance. Thus, while families are a valuable resource easing the difficulties associated with migration, they may nevertheless impose important constraints on women's ability to negotiate more egalitarian gender relations.

While beyond the scope of the current analysis, prior literature suggests at least two sources of such constraints. First, as the effect of extended living arrangements suggests, the family frequently adds to women's workload in the U.S., where families often double-up to reduce costs and help newly arrived migrants (Hondagneu-Sotelo 1994). This is particularly so in contexts such as Durham, where the migration stream is relatively new and still disproportionately male.

A second source of constraint emerges from the psychology of migrant adaptation. The low social position and feelings of powerless common among Mexican migrants to the U.S. can encourage them to emphasize certain cultural traits in order to defend their self-esteem against negative stereotypes from the native population and to set themselves apart from other minority groups (Garcia Castro 1986; Malkin 1999; Mahler 1995). The Mexican emphasis on the family could thus become a cherished cultural ideal to be defended, and women's roles become the site for struggles against disorienting cultural differences (Espin 1999). In this context, women's attempts to exert control over their lives and bodies, which in Mexico might have been viewed by the family as benign, can be seen as an unacceptable challenge to threatened values in the U.S.

Our analysis also highlights the importance of taking into consideration migrant selectivity and unobserved characteristics affecting both migration and relationship power. Failure to control for unobserved characteristics underestimates the negative association between migration and women's relationship control and overstates the significance of migration to women's emotional consonance.

In sum, migration has a profound impact on the social environment in which women operate. While the U.S. might offer a more egalitarian gender regime than Mexico, it is unclear

whether or to what extent recently migrated women participate in the wider society, or the extent to which they remain enclosed within migrant communities. Social isolation, family separation, and disrupted social bonds often characterize migration. Limited fluency in the host language and lack of familiarity with the new environment restrict migrants' access to information. This tends to increase husband's and wife's dependence on each other, and may significantly undermine women's position overall. These patterns may attenuate with greater time in the U.S., depending on changes in legal status and the overall political climate. Our findings likewise warn against equating women's power with economic changes associated with female employment. Instead, they suggest that researchers must continue to pay close attention to the structural context affecting personal relations.

These findings also have important implications for the health correlates of women's power. A long literature documents the link between migration and men's health risks, particularly for HIV, through the increased use of commercial sex workers and other casual partners (Herdt 1997; Mishra, Conner, and Magana 1996; Parrado, Flippen, and McQuiston 2004; Viadro and Earp 2000). Our results indicate that migration is a source of increased risk for women as well, not only through the heightened risk of their partners but also because of their lower ability to negotiate condom use in the U.S. relative to the Mexican context.

More importantly, our results suggest that Hispanic women's elevated HIV risk is not merely reducible to cultural traits that dictate low interpersonal power. Rather, the experience of migration, which is associated with scarce social resources and informal marriage, and the precarious position of migrant women in the U.S. are integral contributing factors. Considerable variation in power among Mexican women in both Mexico and the U.S. according to education

and other resources also challenges the idea that culture, rather than poverty or limited opportunities, is the root source of powerlessness for these women.

REFERENCES

Amaro, H. 1995. "Love, Sex, and Power: Considering Women's Realities in HIV Prevention." *American Psychologist* 50: 437-447.

Anderson, J. C., D. W. Gerbing and J. E. Hunter. 1987. "On the Assessment of Unidimensional Measurement: Internal and External Consistency, and Overall Consistency Criteria," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 24: 432-437.

Baca Zinn, M. 1995. "Political Familism: Toward Sex Role Equality in Chicano Families." Pp. 237-251 in *Latinos in the United States. Volume 2: Latina Issues*, edited by A.S. Lopez. New York: Garland Publishing Inc.

Blanc, A. 2001. "The Effect of Power in Sexual Relationship on Sexual and Reproductive Health." *Studies in Family Planning* 32: 189-213.

Blood, R. and D. Wolfe. 1960. *Husbands and Wives: The Dynamics of Married Living*. New York: The Free Press.

Blumberg, R. and M. Coleman. 1989. "A Rheoretical Look at the Gender Balance of Power in the American Couple." *Journal of Family Issues* 10: 225-250.

Boneva, B. S. and I.H. Frieze. 2001. "Toward a Concept of a Migrant Personality." *Journal of Social Issues.* 57(3): 477-491.

Boserup, E. 1970. *Women's Role in Economic Development*. London: George Allen and Unwin.

Bowleg, L., F. Belgrave, and C. Reisen. 2000. "Gender Roles, Power Strategies, and Precautionary Self-Efficacy: Implications for Black and Latina Women's HIV/AIDS Protective Behaviors." *Sex Roles* 42: 613-636.

Cameron, A.C. and P. Trivendi. 1986. “Econometric Models Based on Count Data: Comparisons and Applications of Some Estimators.” *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 1: 29-53.

Cameron, A.C. and P. Trivendi. 1999. *Regression Analysis of Count Data.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cerrutti, M. and D. S. Massey. 2001. "On the Auspices of Female Migration from Mexico to the United States." *Demography* 38(2):187-200.

Clark, L. and D. Watson. 1995. “Constructing Validity: Basic Issues in Objective Scale Development.” *Psychological Assessment* 7: 309-319.

Connell, R. 1987. *Gender and Power: Society, the Person, and Sexual Politics.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Crandon, L. and B. Shepard. 1985. *Women, Enterprise, and Development*. Chestnut Hill, MA: Pathfinder Fund.

DaVanzo, J., J. Hawes-Dawson, R. Valdez, and G. Vernez. 1994. *Surveying Immigrant Communities: Policy Imperatives and Technical Challenges*. Center for Research on Immigration Policy. RAND Press.

Emerson, R. 1962. “Power-Dependence Relations.” *American Sociological Review* 27: 31-41.

-----. 1981. “Social Exchange Theory.” Pp. 30-65 in *Social Psychology: Sociological Perspectives*, edited by M. Rosenberg and R. H. Turner. New York: Basic Books.

Espin, O. 1999. *Women Crossing Boundaries: A Psychology of Immigration and Transformations of Sexuality*. New York: Routledge.

Fernandez Kelly, P. and A. Garcia. 1990. “Power Surrendered, Power Restored: The politics of Home and Work among Hispanic Women in Southern California and Southern Florida.”

Pp. 130-149 in *Women, Politics, and Change*, edited by L. Tilly and P. Guerin. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Ferree, M. 1990. "Beyond Separate Spheres: Feminism and Family Research." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 52: 866-884.

Foner, N. 2002. "Immigrant Women and Work in New York City, Then and Now." Pp. 231-252 in *Mass Migration to the United States: Classical and Contemporary Trends*, edited by P. G. Min. Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press.

Freeman, G. P. 1999. "The Quest for Skill." Pp. 86-103 in *Migration and Refugee Policies: an overview*, edited by A. Bernstein and M. Weiner. New York, NY: Pinter

Garcia Castro, M. 1986. "Work Versus Life: Colombian Women in New York." Pp. 231-255 in *Women and change in Latin America*, edited by J. Nash and H. Safa. South Hadley, MA: Bergin and Garvey.

Gardner, Paul L. 1995. "Measuring Attitudes to Science: Unidimensionality and Internal Consistency Revisited." *Research in Science Education* 25(3); 283-289.

Giles-Sims, J. and M. Crosbie-Burnett. 1989. "Adolescent Power in Stepfather Families: A Test of Normative-Resource Theory." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 51: 1065-1078.

Gomez, C. and B. Marin. 1996. "Gender, Culture and Power: Barriers to HIV Prevention Strategies for Women." *Journal of Sex Research* 33: 355-362.

Gonzalez de La Rocha, M. 1988. "Economic Crisis, Domestic Reorganization and Women's Work in Guadalajara, Mexico." *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 7: 207-23.

Govindasamy, P. and A. Malhortra. 1996. "Women's Position and Family Planning in Egypt." *Studies in Family Planning 27*: 328-340.

Grasmuck, S. and P. Pessar. 1991. *Between Two Islands: Dominican International Migration*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Green, S. B., R.W. Lissitz and S.A. Mulaik. 1977. "Limitations of Coefficient Alpha as an Index of Test Unidimensionality," *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 37: 827-38

Guendelman, S. and B. Perez Itriaga. 1987. "Double Lives: The Changing Role of Women in Seasonal Migration." *Women's Studies* 13: 249-271.

Gupta, G. and E. Weiss. 1993. "Women's Lives and Sex: Implications for AIDS Prevention." *Culture, Medicine, and Psychiatry 17*: 399-412.

Gutmann, M. 1996. *The Meanings of Macho. Being a Man in Mexico City.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Harvey, S., S. Bird, C. Galavotti, E. Duncan, and D. Greenberg. 2002. "Relationship Power, Sexual Decision Making and Condom Use among Women at Risk for HIV/STDs." *Women and Health* 36(4): 69-84.

Hatcher, L. 1994. *A Step-by Step Approach to Using the SAS System for Factor Analysis and Structural Equation Modeling.* Cary, NC: SAS Institute Inc.

Herdt, G. (Ed). 1997. *Sexual Cultures and Migration in the Era of AIDS: Anthropological and Demographic Perspectives*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hirsch, J. 1999. "En el Norte la Mujer Manda: Gender, Generation, and Geography in a Mexican Transnational Community." *American Behavioral Scientist* 42: 1332-1349.

------. 2003. *A Courtship after Marriage: Sexuality and Love in Mexican Transnational Families*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hogan, D., B. Berhanu, and A. Hailemariam. 1999. "Household Organization, Women's Autonomy, and Contraceptive Behavior in Southern Ethiopia." *Studies in Family Planning 30*: 302-314.

Hondagneu-Sotelo, P. 1992. "Overcoming Patriarchal Constraints: The Reconstruction of Gender Relations among Mexican Immigrant Women and Men." *Gender and Society* 6(3): 393-415.

Hondagneu-Sotelo, P. 1994. *Gendered Transitions. Mexican Experiences with Immigration.* Berkeley: University of California Press

Hondagneu-Sotelo, P. 2003. "Gender and Immigration: A Retrospective and Introduction." Pp. 3-19 in *Gender and U.S. immigration: Contemporary Trends*, edited by P. Hondagneu-Sotelo. Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

Hood, J. 1983. *Becoming a Two-Job Family*. New York: Praeger.

Hui, C. and H. Triandis. 1989. "Effects of Culture and Response Format on Extreme Response Style." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology 17:* 225-248.

Kanaiaupuni, Shawn. 2000. "Reframing the Migration Question: An Analysis of Men, Women, and Gender in Mexico." *Social Forces* 78(4): 1311-1347.

Kibria, N. 1990. "Power, Patriarchy, and Gender Conflict in the Vietnamese Community." *Gender and Society* 4: 9-24.

Kishor, S. 2000. "Empowerment of Women in Egypt and Links to the Survival and Health of their Infants." Pp. 119-156 in *Women's Empowerment and Demographic Processes: Moving Beyond Cairo,* edited by H.B. Presser and G. Sen. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lamphere, L. 1987. *From Working Daughters to Working Mothers: Immigrant Women in a New England Community*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Lewis, O. 1949. "Husbands and Wives in a Mexican Village." *American Anthropologist* 51: 602-610.

Lomnitz, L. 1977. *Networks and Marginality: Life in a Mexican Shantytown*. Academic Press.

Mahler, S. 1995. *American Dreaming. Immigrant Life on the Margins.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Mahler, S. 2003. "Engendering Transnational Migration: A Case Study of Salvadorans." Pp. 287-316 in *Gender and U.S. immigration: Contemporary Trends*, edited by P. Hondagneu-Sotelo. Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

Malkin, V. 1999. "La Reproducción de las Relaciones de Género en la Comunidad de Migrantes Mexicanos en New Rochelle, Nueva York." Pp. 475-498 in *Fronteras Fragmentadas*, edited by G. Mummert. Michoacán, Mexico: El Colegio de Michoacán.

Marín, G., R. Gamba, and B. Marín. 1992. "Extreme Response Style and Acquiescence among Hispanics: The Role of Acculturation and Education." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 23: 498-509

Mason, K. 1987. "The Impact of Women's Social Position on Fertility in Developing Countries." *Sociological Forum* 2:718-745.

Mason, K. 2003. "Measuring Empowerment: A Social Demographer's View." Paper prepared for the workshop on "Measuring Empowerment: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives." World Bank, Washington D.C., Feb. 4-5.

Mason, K. and H. Smith. 2000. "Husbands' Versus Wives' Fertility Goals and Use of Contraception: The Influence of Gender Context in Five Asian Countries." *Demography, 37*(3): 299-311.

McQuiston, C., E. A. Parrado, J. Olmos, and A. Bustillo. Forthcoming. "Community-Based Participatory Research and Ethnography: The Perfect Union." In *Methods for Conducting Community-Based Participatory Research for Health*, edited by Israel, Eng, Schulz, and Parker. Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Menjivar, C. 2003. "The Intersection of Work and Gender: Central American Immigrant Women and Employment in California." Pp. 101-126 in *Gender and U.S. immigration: Contemporary Trends*, edited by P. Hondagneu-Sotelo. Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

Miller, L., D. Burns, and S. Rothspan. 1995. "Negotiating Safer Sex: They Dynamics of African-American Relationships." Pp. 163-188 in *Gender, power, and communication in human relationships*, edited by P. J. Kalbfleisch and M. J. Cody. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Miranda, A. 2004. "FIML Estimation of an Endogenous Switching Model for Count Data." *The Stata Journal* 4(1): 40-49.

Mishra, S., R. Conner, and J. Magana (Eds). 1996. *AIDS Crossing Borders: The Spread of HIV among Migrant Latinos*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Mullahy, J. 1997. "Instrumental Variable Estimation of Count Data Models: Applications to Models of Cigarette Smoking Behavior." *Review of Economics and Statistics* 79(4): 586-593.

Nunnally, J. and I. Bernstein. 1994. *Psychometric Theory.* New York, MacGraw Hill.

Oropesa, R. 1997. "Development and Marital Power in Mexico." *Social Forces* 75: 1291-1317.

Parrado, E.A., C.A. Flippen, and C. McQuiston. 2004. "Use of Commercial Sex Workers among Hispanic Migrants in North Carolina: Implications for the Spread of HIV." *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health* 36(4): 325-347.

Parrado, E.A., C. McQuiston, and C.A. Flippen. 2005. "Participatory Survey Research: Integrating Community Collaboration and Quantitative Methods for the Study of Gender and HIV Risks among Hispanic Migrants." Unpublished manuscript, Duke University, Department of Sociology.

Parrado, E.A. and R. Zenteno. 2001. "Economic Restructuring, Financial Crises, and Women's Work in Mexico." *Social Problems* 48(4): 456-477.

Pessar, P. 2003. "Engendering Migration Studies: The Case of New Immigrants in the United States." Pp. 20-42 in *Gender and U.S. immigration: Contemporary Trends*, edited by P. Hondagneu-Sotelo. Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

Population Council. 2001. *Power in Sexual Relationships. An Opening Dialogue among Reproductive Health Professionals.* New York, NY: Population Council.

Pulerwitz, J. S. Gortmaker, and W. DeJong. 2000. "Measuring Sexual Relationship Power in HIV/STD Research." *Sex Roles* 42: 637-659.

Quina, K., L. Harlow, P. Morokoff, G. Burkholder, and P. Deiter. 1997. "Interpersonal Power and Women's HIV Risk." Pp. 188-206 in *Gender and the politics of HIV*, edited by J. Manlowe and N. Goldstein. New York: New York University Press.

Ruggles, S., M. Sobek, T. Alexander, C.A. Fitch, R. Goeken, P.K Hall, M. King, and C. Ronnander. 2004. "Integrated Public Use Microdata Series: Version 3.0 [2000 5% census sample]." Minneapolis, MN: Minnesota Population Center.

Schellhorn, M. 2001. " A Comparison of Alternative Methods to Model Endogeneity in Count Models: An Application to the Demand for Health Care and Health Insurance Choice." The Program for Research on Social and Economic Dimensions of an Aging Population (SEDAP) Research Paper: 40.

Stepick, A. and C. Stepick. 1990. "People in the Shadows: Survey Research among Haitians in Miami." *Human Organization* 49: 64-77.

Terza, J. 1998. "Estimating Count Data Models with Endogenous Switching: Sample Selection and Endogenous Treatment Effects." *Journal of Econometrics* 84: 129-154.

Tilly, L. and J. Scott. 1987. *Women, Work, and Family*. New York: Routledge.

Viadro, C., and J. Earp. 2000. "The Sexual Behavior of Married Mexican Immigrant Men in North Carolina." *Social Science and Medicine* 50: 723-735.

Volger, C. 1998. "Money in the Household: Some Underlying Issues of Power." *The Sociological Review* 46: 687-713.

Warnecke, R., T. Johnson, N. Chavez, S. Sudman, D. O'Rourke, and L. Lacey. 1997. "Improving Question Wording in Surveys of Culturally Diverse Population." *Annals of Epidemiology* 7:334-342.

Weindmeijer, F.A.G. and J.M.C. Santos-Silva. 1997. "Endogeneity in Count Data Models: An Application to Demand for Health Care." *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 12(3): 281-294.

Wolf, B., A. Blanc, and A. Gage. 2000. "Who Decides: Women's Status and Negotiation of Sex in Uganda." *Culture, Health, and Sexuality* 3: 1-19.

Xu, X. and S. Lai. 2004. "Resources, Gender Ideologies, and Marital Power: The Case of Taiwan." *Journal of Family Issues* 25: 318-356.

Young, M. and P. Willmott. 1957. *Family and Kinship in East London*. London: Routledgeand Kegan Paul.

Zavella, P. 1987. *Women's Work and Chicano Families.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press

Zhou, M. 1992. *Chinatown*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of dependent and independent variables

	Mexico		U.S.		
	Mean	(Std. Dev.)	Mean	(Std. Dev.)	
Dependent variable					
Relationship Control Scale (mean # of agreements)	4.1	(2.8)	4.3	(3.2)	
Migration					
U.S. residence (%)	0.0		1.0		
Personal charactersitics					
Age (mean)	32.2	(6.4)	29.8	(7.2)	**
Years of education (mean)	8.2	(3.4)	7.6	(3.3)	*
Currently working (%)	28.4		52.1		**
Relationship charactersitics					
Marital status					
Legally married	75.3		51.3		**
Consensual union (%)	17.7		41.7		**
Single/Divorced (%)	7.0		7.0		
Number of children under 12 (mean)	1.6	(1.2)	1.4	(1.1)	*
Years in relationship (mean)	10.5	(6.6)	6.8	(5.5)	**
Differences between partners (man-woman)					
Age difference (mean)	1.5	(2.8)	0.8	(3.3)	**
Educational differences (mean)	0.0	(3.2)	0.3	(3.3)	
Social support					
Visits a friend once a week (%)	40.2		34.9		
Visits family once a week (%)	59.8		40.4		**
Perceived lack of social support (mean score)	0.4	(0.8)	1.0	(1.3)	**
Number of extended family co-residents (mean)	3.1	(1.7)	3.4	(1.5)	**
N	271		146		

* p<.1
** p,.05

Table 2: Relationship Control Scale items in Mexico and U.S.

	Percent agree	Mexico	U.S.		Standardized KR-20
Relationship control					
12	When my partner and I disagree, he gets his way most of the time	19.9	28.8	**	
10	My partner does what he wants, even if I do not want him to	16.2	21.9	*	
7	My partner tells me who I can spend time with	9.6	19.2	**	
3	Most of the time, we do what my partner wants	29.2	34.2		
4	My partner won't let me wear certain things	32.5	30.8		0.65
	Mean number of agreements	1.1	1.4	**	
		(1.3)	(1.5)		
Sexual negotiation					
1	If I asked my partner to use a condom, he would get violent	9.2	17.8	**	
2	If I asked my partner to use a condom, he would get angry	14.0	20.5	*	
8	If I asked my partner to use a condom, he would think I'm having sex with other people	18.5	23.3		0.84
	Mean number of agreements	0.4	0.6	**	
		(0.9)	(1.1)		
Emotional dissonance					
13	My partner gets more out of our relationship than I do	17.3	20.5		
9	I feel trapped or stuck in our relationship	12.5	11.6		
11	I am more committed to our relationship than my partner is	32.5	22.6	**	
5	When my partner and I are together, I'm pretty quiet	31.0	30.8		
6	My partner has more to say than I do about important decisions that affect us	85.6	82.1		
14	My partner always want to know where I am	62.4	48.6	**	
15	My partner might be having sex with someone else	19.6	13.6		0.66
	Mean number of agreements	2.6	2.3	**	
		(1.5)	(1.5)		
N		271	146		

* p<.10
** p<.05

Table 3: Estimates from Poisson Models Predicting Relationship Control Factor

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		In Mexico		In U.S.	
Constant	0.296	(0.389)	0.392	(0.491)	0.999 **	(0.502)	1.825 **	(0.619)	0.546	(0.654)
Migration										
U.S. residence	0.880 **	(0.247)	0.698 *	(0.419)	0.533	(0.369)				
Personal resources										
Age	-0.008	(0.009)	-0.008	(0.012)	-0.016	(0.011)	-0.028	(0.021)	-0.012	(0.014)
Years of education	-0.049 **	(0.018)	-0.054 **	(0.022)	-0.050 **	(0.022)	-0.047 *	(0.026)	-0.060 *	(0.036)
Currently working	-0.123	(0.127)	-0.071	(0.131)	-0.039	(0.129)	-0.274	(0.184)	0.235	(0.190)
Relationship resources										
Marital status (ref: legally married)										
Single			-0.291	(0.262)	-0.352	(0.264)	-0.460	(0.363)	-0.235	(0.383)
Consensual union			0.100	(0.134)	0.058	(0.134)	0.153	(0.175)	0.116	(0.198)
Number of children under 12			0.048	(0.051)	0.051	(0.051)	0.076	(0.060)	0.010	(0.091)
Years in relationship			-0.007	(0.015)	-0.011	(0.015)	-0.021	(0.021)	-0.011	(0.018)
Differences between partners (man-woman)										
Age difference			-0.011	(0.020)	-0.019	(0.020)	-0.011	(0.024)	-0.047	(0.030)
Educational differences			-0.008	(0.021)	-0.009	(0.021)	-0.037	(0.024)	0.028	(0.034)
Social resources										
Visits a friend once a week					-0.328 **	(0.124)	-0.389 **	(0.152)	-0.547 **	(0.217)
Visits family once a week					-0.307 **	(0.119)	**-0.621** **	(0.142)	**0.355** *	(0.209)
Perceived lack of social support					-0.013	(0.056)	-0.036	(0.084)	0.035	(0.072)
Number of extended family co-residents					0.009	(0.034)	0.015	(0.039)	0.084	(0.062)
Sigma	0.704 **	(0.097)	0.662 **	(0.116)	0.617 **	(0.099)	0.469 **	(0.112)	0.511 **	(0.128)
Rho	-0.670 **	(0.154)	-0.582 **	(0.297)	-0.561 **	(0.288)				
Wald Chi-Squared	30.3 **		29.9 **		46.6 **		46.3 **		22.5 **	
N	417						271		146	

* p<.10
** p<.05

Table 4: Estimates from Poisson Models Predicting Sexual Negotiation Factor

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		In Mexico		In U.S.	
Constant	-3.168 **	(0.632)	-3.789 **	(0.805)	-3.667 **	(0.878)	-3.625 **	(1.404)	-4.979 **	(2.007)
Migration										
U.S. residence	0.644 **	(0.213)	0.508 **	(0.248)	0.188	(0.263)				
Personal resources										
Age	0.069 **	(0.015)	0.081 **	(0.019)	0.074 **	(0.021)	0.096 **	(0.044)	0.103 **	(0.036)
Years of education	-0.097 **	(0.032)	-0.105 **	(0.040)	-0.080 **	(0.041)	-0.115 **	(0.052)	-0.114 *	(0.065)
Currently working	-0.285	(0.220)	-0.257	(0.235)	-0.279	(0.239)	-0.006	(0.335)	-0.397	(0.349)
Relationship resources										
Marital status (ref: legally married)										
Single			0.344	(0.428)	0.322	(0.465)	0.759	(0.751)	-0.449	(0.834)
Consensual union			0.470 *	(0.263)	0.542 **	(0.274)	0.700 **	(0.345)	0.457	(0.359)
Number of children under 12			0.106	(0.090)	0.123	(0.092)	0.162	(0.118)	0.243	(0.181)
Years in relationship			-0.003	(0.021)	-0.005	(0.021)	-0.034	(0.040)	-0.013	(0.029)
Differences between partners (man-woman)										
Age difference			0.050	(0.039)	0.031	(0.038)	-0.020	(0.051)	0.110 **	(0.054)
Educational differences			-0.034	(0.036)	-0.037	(0.038)	-0.029	(0.050)	-0.063	(0.053)
Social resources										
Visits a friend once a week					-0.284	(0.242)	**-0.049**	(0.301)	**-0.976** **	(0.451)
Visits family once a week					-0.305	(0.227)	**-0.744** **	(0.280)	**0.838** **	(0.380)
Perceived lack of social support					0.228 **	(0.091)	**-0.142**	(0.172)	**0.396** **	(0.121)
Number of extended family co-residents					0.060	(0.063)	0.073	(0.087)	0.130	(0.119)
Sigma	1.270 **	(0.128)	1.252 **	(0.147)	1.177 **	(0.144)	1.105 **	(0.179)	1.207 **	(0.458)
Wald Chi-Squared	48.6 **		54.3 **		52.7 **		30.9 **		44.7 **	
N	417						271		146	

* p<.10
** p<.05

Table 5: Estimates from Poisson Models Predicting Emotional Dissonace Factor

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		In Mexico		In U.S.	
Constant	1.282 **	(0.211)	1.046 **	(0.240)	1.250 **	(0.267)	1.820 **	(0.351)	0.260	(0.414)
Migration										
U.S. residence	-0.046	(0.136)	-0.165	(0.147)	-0.237 *	(0.143)				
Personal resources										
Age	-0.002	(0.005)	0.004	(0.006)	0.001	(0.007)	-0.014	(0.012)	0.004	(0.009)
Years of education	-0.034 **	(0.009)	-0.032 **	(0.011)	-0.026 **	(0.012)	-0.028 **	(0.014)	-0.016	(0.022)
Currently working	-0.079	(0.071)	-0.043	(0.073)	-0.031	(0.073)	-0.010	(0.096)	0.054	(0.121)
Relationship resources										
Marital status (ref: legally married)										
Single			-0.003	(0.139)	-0.029	(0.143)	-0.213	(0.197)	0.116	(0.225)
Consensual union			0.142 **	(0.075)	0.120 *	(0.076)	0.084	(0.100)	0.215 *	(0.125)
Number of children under 12			0.065 **	(0.027)	0.063 **	(0.028)	0.051	(0.033)	0.098 *	(0.057)
Years in relationship			-0.010	(0.007)	-0.012 *	(0.007)	0.000	(0.011)	-0.012	(0.012)
Differences between partners (man-woman)										
Age difference			0.008	(0.011)	0.005	(0.011)	0.011	(0.014)	-0.004	(0.018)
Educational differences			0.003	(0.011)	0.004	(0.011)	-0.012	(0.013)	0.035 *	(0.021)
Social resources										
Visits a friend once a week					-0.130 **	(0.069)	-0.128 *	(0.084)	-0.257 *	(0.139)
Visits family once a week					-0.156 **	(0.067)	**-0.260** **	(0.079)	**0.151**	(0.134)
Perceived lack of social support					0.033	(0.031)	**-0.029**	(0.047)	**0.090** **	(0.043)
Number of extended family co-residents					0.004	(0.020)	**-0.024**	(0.025)	**0.080** **	(0.038)
Sigma	0.069	(0.084)	0.013	(0.091)	0.015	(0.085)	0.000	(0.032)	0.000	(0.073)
Rho	-0.909 **	(0.106)	-0.861 **	(0.288)	-0.863 **	(0.273)				
Wald Chi-Squared	17.0 **		28.4 **		41.7 **		33.0 **		32.5 **	
N	417						271		146	

* p<.10
** p<.05

Figure 1: Theoretical framework integrating migration into resource theory of relationship power