

ABSTRACT

LEACH, BRANDI LYNN. Gender, Social Capital and Migration from the Dominican Republic to the United States. (Under the direction of Martha Crowley.)

Existing research argues that gender affects social capital usage in migration. The power perspective suggests that unequal power relationships encourage potential migrants to rely on social capital from members of the dominant group, typically men. Conversely, the homophily perspective posits that relatively equal power relations may allow a tendency for gender homophily in social capital use to become evident. Because evidence for the power perspective comes largely from Mexico and evidence for the homophily perspective comes from Thailand, these perspectives must be tested in an alternative national context to determine their generalizability and the extent to which power differentials mask a tendency towards gender homophily in migrant social networks. Using data on migration from the Dominican Republic to the United States, this paper finds limited support for the power perspective and no support for the homophily perspective.

Gender, Social Capital and Migration from the Dominican Republic to the United States

by
Brandi Lynn Leach

A thesis submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
North Carolina State University
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Science

Sociology

Raleigh, North Carolina

2009

APPROVED BY:

Theodore Greenstein

Steve McDonald

Martha Crowley
Chair of Advisory Committee

BIOGRAPHY

Brandi Leach is a graduate student in sociology at North Carolina State University where she studies the sociology of global development, social inequality and migration.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I benefitted from the support and encouragement of many people while working on this thesis, but my deepest thanks go to Martha Crowley, the chair of my committee, for her extraordinary effort. My discussions with Martha taught me how to be a better researcher and her insightful comments brought clarity to my theoretical arguments. Additionally, Martha's enthusiasm and support were invaluable for overcoming doubts and difficulties. I also owe thanks to the other members of my committee, Ted Greenstein and Steve McDonald, both of whom offered valuable advice on methods of data analysis. I want to thank Ted specifically for his expertise with SAS and his willingness to share it with me. And my thanks go to Steve for his comprehensive knowledge of social capital and his careful analysis of my arguments. I also benefitted tremendously from the assistance of Peg Brant who helped me to find solutions to the many data puzzles that I encountered. And finally, I must thank my partner, Chris, for his patience and support throughout this project and during all of my time in graduate school.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables	v
Introduction	1
Social Capital, Gender and Migration.....	2
Dominican Republic – U.S. Migration.....	6
Hypotheses.....	8
Method	9
Data	9
Measurement.....	10
<i>Dependent Variable</i>	10
<i>Independent Variables</i>	11
<i>Control Variables</i>	12
Analytic Strategy.....	14
Results	15
Discussion.....	17
Conclusion	21
References	24
Tables	27

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of Variables	27
Table 2: Logistic Regression Estimates of Migration Likelihood	28

INTRODUCTION

Social networks act as a key facilitator of migration by providing social capital in the form of beneficial information and resources to potential migrants (Massey 1990). Research suggests that access to social capital varies by gender (Burt 1998; McGuire 2002) and that power differentials within the household may restrict women's access to migration-specific social capital (Cerrutti and Massey 2001; Kanaiaupuni 2000). This perspective—which I term the *power perspective*—derives from research on Mexican migration and argues that patriarchal gender relations limit the freedom of women to migrate. This also limits their stores of migration-specific social capital leaving women reliant on the social capital of men in their migration. Alternatively, gender may also affect the usefulness of social capital for migration when the information is only applicable to migrants of a specific gender (Curran, Garip, Chung and Tangchonlatip 2005). This *homophily perspective* finds support in research on internal migration in Thailand and posits that migration is a gendered process (DeLaet 1999; Hondagneu-Sotelo 1994) because much of the information gleaned from social networks is gender-specific. This encourages the use of social capital from network members of the same sex. (Curran et al. 2005).

It is not clear from existing research whether these perspectives are generalizable to alternative national contexts. Furthermore, both perspectives imply that gender homophily in social networks is the norm and that gender-based power differentials disrupt the normal functioning of networks. These perspectives must be tested in an alternative national context to determine their generalizability and the extent to which

power differentials mask a tendency towards gender homophily in migrant social networks. The Dominican Republic provides an ideal test of the two perspectives because the prevailing gender relations are less patriarchal than those found in Mexico (Sana and Massey 2005) which permits an examination of whether the gender homophily found in internal migration is evident in international migration when gender-based power differentials are reduced.

In this paper I use data on migration from the Dominican Republic to the United States in order to test the relative merits of the two perspectives. First, I review the theory underlying social capital use in migration before presenting relevant research on the power and homophily perspectives. Second, I discuss the history of migration from the Dominican Republic, describe the less patriarchal gender norms in the country, and present hypotheses that posit a greater influence of gender homophily in Dominican migration as compared to Mexican migration. Finally, I test the hypotheses using logistic regression. Findings provide mixed support for the power perspective and no support for the homophily perspective. I conclude with a discussion of the implications and limitations of my research.

SOCIAL CAPITAL, GENDER AND MIGRATION

Social capital theory provides a framework for studying how social networks facilitate migration. The theory of social capital describes how resources embedded in social relationships facilitate individual goal attainment (Coleman 1988; Lin 2008). Social networks aid migration by reducing the risks and increasing the benefits of migration by sharing information and economic resources (Massey 1990; Massey and

Espinosa 1997; Zahniser 1999). Information on safe travel methods reduces the risks of migration; whereas information regarding potential jobs in the receiving country increases the perceived benefits of migration. Likewise, sharing transportation or housing among network members reduces the economic cost of migration (Zahniser 1999).^{1,2}

Two perspectives describe how gender affects the use of social networks to facilitate migration, the power and homophily perspectives. According to the power perspective, power dynamics play a role in how network resources are accessed and may affect social capital use in migration. Power matters when individuals invest in relationships with the expectation of returns (Portes 1998). Workplace studies demonstrate that women are perceived as less legitimate than men and therefore have more difficulty mobilizing network resources (Burt 1998; McGuire 2002). This encourages women to “piggyback” on their male network ties by drawing on the men’s social network resources in order to reach their goals (Burt 1998). Similarly, the new economics of labor migration (NELM) theory posits that migration is a family investment based on the expectation of economic returns (Stark and Bloom 1985). Stereotypes regarding women’s fitness as economic providers may make investment in their migration seem like a poor choice. Women must therefore “piggyback” on the resources

¹ Some scholars distinguish between *accessed* and *mobilized* social capital where accessed social capital refers to the potential resources embedded in a network and mobilized social capital refers to the specific use of these resources (Lin 2008). I will limit my analysis to accessed social capital because of data limitations.

² Social networks may also have negative effects such as constraining individual freedom or encouraging downward leveling norms (Portes 1998); however, in keeping with prior research I focus on the ways in which social networks facilitate migration.

of male relatives in order to migrate (Andrews, Ybarra and Miramontes 2002; Cerrutti and Massey 2001; Kanaiaupuni 2000).

This power perspective of social networks and migration finds support in studies of migration from Mexico to the U.S. Quantitative research presents a typical migration model whereby married women follow their spouse's migration and rely on either their spouse or other male relatives for support (Cerrutti and Massey 2001; Kanaiaupuni 2000). Qualitative research also finds women relying heavily on male contacts during their migration. Andrews, Ybarra and Miramontes (2002) interviewed undocumented female Mexican immigrants in the U.S. and found that many of the women had made their first border crossing attempt with a spouse or male family members. In addition, those who did not travel with male relatives still relied on social connections to former male migrants during their journey. All of the scholars suggest that their results may be explained by the patriarchal gender norms that dominate Mexican culture. They argue that married women are expected to stay home and care for children and the household, whereas married men are expected to migrate if it is necessary to provide economically for their families (Kanaiaupuni 2000).

An alternative to the power perspective is the homophily perspective that argues the gendered nature of migration encourages the use of same-sex, or homophilous, network ties (DeLaet 1999; Hondagneu-Sotelo 1994). Social capital reduces the economic risks of migration by providing information about job opportunities in receiving countries. However, the jobs that immigrants typically acquire are themselves gendered due to the use of stereotypes in hiring practices (Ehrenreich and Hochschild

2002; Waldinger and Lichter 2003). This may limit the applicability of job related information received from people of the opposite gender. Women also face gender-specific risks in migration. In particular, the threat of sexual assault and exploitation by employers may be greater for female migrants (Curran et al. 2005) thereby encouraging women to use information from same-sex ties for risk avoidance.

Taken together, this evidence suggests that migration networks may operate most effectively on the principle of gender homophily. Research on internal migration in Thailand supports the homophily perspective. Curran et al. (2005) find that women in Thailand rely on their contacts with other women in their household or immediate social circle when making migration decisions. They suggest that the relatively greater equality of women in Thailand means that female-based social networks are more instrumentally effective compared to those in Mexico.

The research presented demonstrates that gender affects social capital usage in migration. The power perspective suggests that unequal power relationships encourage potential migrants to rely on social capital from members of the dominant group, typically men. Conversely, the homophily perspective posits that relatively equal power relations may allow a tendency for gender homophily in social capital use to become evident. Because evidence for the power perspective comes largely from Mexico and evidence for the homophily perspective comes from a study of internal migration it is necessary to test these two perspectives by examining international migration to the U.S. from a country with less patriarchal gender relations. For that, I turn to the Dominican Republic.

The Dominican Republic provides an excellent test of the power and homophily perspectives because its society is not characterized by the traditional, patriarchal gender relations found in Mexico. This permits an examination of the strength of homophily in the relative absence of patriarchal gender relations. The more egalitarian gender relations are due in part to the relatively large percentage of female heads of household that make women less reliant on and less dominated by men (Sana and Massey 2005), and further by the incorporation of U.S.-style gender relations undertaken by returning migrants (Grasmuck and Pessar 1991). If the power perspective holds and patriarchal gender relations limit the efficacy of female networks, then migration from the Dominican Republic should display more homophilous migration patterns.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC - U.S. MIGRATION

According to Bray (1987), emigration from the Dominican Republic did not begin in earnest until 1961 and the assassination of the dictator Trujillo. At that time, the U.S. actively encouraged immigration from the Dominican Republic as part of their larger anti-communist agenda. There was a fear that the location of the Dominican Republic would leave it vulnerable to Cuba's communist influence and so migration was used as one method of establishing friendly relations with the Dominican Republic. This policy resulted in a substantial influx of Dominican immigrants who came to serve as a source of social capital for future immigrants (Grasmuck and Pessar 1991). The Dominican Republic's location on the island of Hispaniola shapes the pattern of emigration. Most importantly the necessity of crossing an ocean increases the difficulty and cost of migration which in turn reduces the amount of undocumented migration and raises the

average income level of emigrants as compared to migrants from Latin America to the U.S. (Grasmuck and Pessar 1991). It also means that repeat migration between the Dominican Republic and the U.S. is relatively rare; however, it is common for migrants to return to the Dominican Republic after accumulating some desired amount of money (Bray 1987).

A comparison of statistics from the United Nation's Demographic Yearbook (United Nations 1999, 2001) between the Dominican Republic, Mexico and Thailand reveals the differing gender relations of the countries. The marriage rate³ in the Dominican Republic was 3.5 per 1,000 people as compared to 7.4 in Mexico and 5.8 in Thailand. Additionally, the divorce rate of 1.16 per 1,000 people in the Dominican Republic is substantially higher than Mexico's rate of 0.48.⁴ These data indicate that traditional marriage is less dominant in the Dominican Republic and Thailand than in Mexico. Sana and Massey (2005) argue that the non-traditional household structure in the Dominican Republic means that men are not viewed as breadwinners and household authority figures as they are in Mexico. This has implications for NELM and the power perspective that posits that male migration is perceived as a better economic investment for households due to their higher earning potential. Additionally, because support for the homophily perspective is derived from data on internal migration, it is necessary to

³ Due to data availability, statistics for the Dominican Republic and Mexico are from 1998 and statistics for Thailand are from 1999. 1999 was the first year in which my data from the Dominican Republic were collected by the Latin American Migration Project, so it is appropriate to use UN statistics from this period.

⁴ The U.N. data does not provide the divorce rate for Thailand.

test the two perspectives using the international migration data from the Dominican Republic.

Hypotheses

The less traditional family structure of the Dominican Republic makes it an excellent location to test the power and homophily perspectives. Researchers argue that traditional gender relations in Mexico mean that women are expected to remain at home while their husbands migrate to the U.S (Cerrutti and Massey 2001; Kanaiaupuni 2000). Given the less traditional family structure in the Dominican Republic I expect that women's likelihood of migration will be similar to that of men. Therefore, my first hypothesis is:

H1: Women in the Dominican Republic will be equally likely as men to migrate.

The power perspective also suggests that men's social capital resources are more effective than women's for instrumental purposes (Burt 1988; McGuire 2002) and specifically for migration as conceptualized in NELM (Massey and Espinosa 1997) because men are thought to have more economic and social power. Because the Dominican Republic has less traditional gender relations than Mexico I expect the gap between the power of men's and women's networks to diminish or disappear altogether. Therefore, my second hypothesis is:

H2: In the Dominican Republic, the number of social network ties to female migrants will have the same effect on migration likelihood as the number of social network ties to male migrants.

The homophily perspective argues that migration is a gendered process and therefore social network use should reflect gender homophily (Curran et al. 2005). However gender homophily within networks may be suppressed or trumped by gender-based power differentials. If this is true, then a society such as the Dominican Republic with fewer power differentials between men and women than Mexico should exhibit greater gender homophily in migrant social networks. This leads to the final hypothesis: *H3: In the Dominican Republic, social network ties to migrants of the same-sex (gender homophily) are positively correlated with the odds of migration.*

One reason for testing the power and homophily perspectives in the Dominican Republic is to see if they operate in a different national context. It is possible, but not expected, that neither perspective holds true in the Dominican Republic. Lack of support for all three hypotheses would argue for alternative mechanisms affecting migration from the Dominican Republic.

METHOD

Data

I use data from the Latin American Migration Project (LAMP), a collaborative research project based at Princeton University and the University of Guadalajara, supported by the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. The data on migration from the Dominican Republic were collected over a two year period beginning in 1999. LAMP uses an ethnosurvey design that combines qualitative methods with random sampling of households to gather data. The ethnosurvey method uses interviews that are semi-structured and flexible in order to obtain information on every

household member. Although the question wording and order may change, the same information is collected for every household, thus ensuring comparability of data across households and communities.⁵

Seven communities from the Dominican Republic are included in the LAMP dataset. The communities were chosen to provide a diverse set of households and range from small agricultural communities to dense barrios in San Jose, the capital city. The names of the towns outside of San Jose, as well as the location of the neighborhoods within San Jose are kept confidential. The complete dataset contains 907 households (between 99 and 151 households from each community) and detailed information on their 5,913 members.

I limit my analysis to the migration behavior of the heads of household and spouses because detailed migration histories are only collected for these household members. In order to avoid issues of autocorrelation I use the random number generator function in SAS 9.1 to randomly select either the heads of household or spouse from each household resulting in a final sample size of 486 individuals.

Measurement

Dependent Variable

I model the dependent variable, likelihood of migration, on that of Curran et al. (2005) by using a dichotomous variable representing whether the respondent has ever migrated

⁵ For more information on the Latin American Migration Project, please visit the project's website at: <http://lamp.opr.princeton.edu/>. The dataset used in this paper is LAMP-DR7.

to the United States. A dichotomous variable is appropriate because repeat or seasonal migration between the Dominican Republic and the U.S. is rare; therefore, a continuous variable representing the number of migrations would be highly skewed.

Independent Variables

All three hypotheses examine the role of gender in migration and social capital usage. The first hypothesis tests the power perspective and concerns the gender of the potential migrant and its effect on migration likelihood. Gender is measured as a dummy variable, *female*, with male as the omitted category.

The second hypothesis also tests the power perspective and asks whether the gender of social network ties affects migration likelihood. I therefore construct two variables, *female migrant ties within household* and *male migrant ties within household*, that measure the number of female and male household members with migration experience who could act as a source of migration-specific social capital. Both variables are continuous and depict the total number of household members, including family members living abroad, who migrated to the U.S. prior to the respondent. For example, if there are three members in the household, a husband, a wife and a male child, and the husband migrated in 1979, the child migrated in 1999, and the wife never migrated, then the variable *male migrant ties within the household* would have a value of zero for the husband, one for the child and two for the wife, and the variable *female migrant ties within the household* would have a value of zero for all three family members.

The third hypothesis tests the homophily perspective and posits that gender homophilous social networks will increase the likelihood of migration. Therefore, I

construct two measures of gender homophily: *female x female migrant ties* and *female x male migrant ties*. The first variable interacts the measure of gender (*female*) with the gender of social network ties (*female migrant ties within household*) and allows me to test the effects of gender homophily on female migration by revealing whether female migrant social ties have the same effect on migration likelihood for men and women. The second variable interacts *female* with *male migrant ties within household* and is used to test the effects of gender homophily on male migration.

Control Variables

My models include controls for individual and community characteristics shown elsewhere to influence the likelihood of migration. Prior research (Curran et al. 2005; Cerrutti and Massey 2001) shows that age is correlated with the likelihood of migration such that younger adults are more likely to migrate than older adults. I include a variable, *age*, that measures age in years at either the time of migration or the time of the survey if the respondent never migrated. *Education* is a human capital measure which may reduce the risks of migration by providing additional informational resources or increasing potential job opportunities in the U.S. Previous research shows that education is positively correlated with female migration and negatively correlated with male migration (Kanaiaupuni 2000). I measure education as years of schooling completed. Marital status also affects migration patterns (Cerrutti and Massey 2001, Kanaiaupuni 2000) such that marriage decreases the likelihood of female migration while increasing the likelihood for men. Therefore I include a dummy variable, *married*, where not married is the omitted category. If the respondent has migrated, then their marital status

at time of migration is used; otherwise, their marital status at the time of the interview is used. Previous research suggests that having children is positively correlated with the likelihood of male migration, but has little or no effect on female migration (Cerrutti and Massey 2001; Kanaiaupuni 2000). Therefore, I control for whether the respondent has children by including a dummy variable, *children*, where a value of 1 indicates that the respondent has at least one child.

Migration research indicates that men in non-professional or low-skilled jobs are more likely to migrate to the U.S. than those with more highly skilled occupations (Cerrutti and Massey 2001). Two dummy variables control for the respondent's occupational status: *professional* and *non-professional*, where not employed is the omitted category. Detailed information about job responsibilities is not available, so occupations were classified according to broad job categories. Those employed in unskilled and semi-skilled trades, including low-level managers, are classified as non-professional; whereas, those employed in skilled trades or high-end service occupations are classified as professional. Respondents who were not working at the time of the survey for any reason are listed as not employed.

Finally, I control for one community level variable, *size of the community*, because previous research suggests that social capital functions differently in urban areas than in rural areas (Fussell and Massey 2004). Specifically, the effects of community level social capital have been shown to be weaker in urban areas than in rural areas. Community size is operationalized as a dichotomous variable where a value of 1

designates that the respondent lives in an urban area. Urban areas are defined as those communities within San Jose.

Analytic Strategy

I estimate five logistic regression models. The first model tests my hypothesis that men and women in the Dominican Republic are equally likely to migrate to the U.S. It includes my measure of the respondent's sex along with all of the control variables. If my hypothesis is correct then the odds ratio for the variable *female* will equal one. A value above one means that women are more likely to migrate whereas a value below one indicates that men have a greater migration likelihood.

Models 2 and 3 add in the measures of migrant ties within the household by gender. This allows me to test the second hypothesis that female-based migrant networks are just as effective as male-based networks for promoting migration. Model 2 adds the variable *female migrant ties within household* to test the effects of female-based migrant social capital on migration likelihood and Model 3 adds the variable *male migrant ties within household* to test the effects of male-based migrant social capital on migration likelihood. I expect both variables to have statistically significant effects because prior migration research demonstrates the effectiveness of social networks in promoting migration (Cerrutti and Massey 2001; Kanaiaupuni 2000; Massey 1990). If my second hypothesis is correct, then the odds ratios for *female migrant ties within household* and *male migrant ties within household* should be identical.

The final models, Models 4 and 5, test my third hypothesis that gender homophily is positively correlated with migration likelihood. Model 4 adds my first interaction

term, *female x female migrant ties*, which allows me to compare the effects of female-based social capital on the migration likelihood of men and women. If the interaction term is positive and statistically significant then I can conclude that gender homophily increases the likelihood of female migration. Conversely, if the interaction term is negative or non-significant then I must conclude that gender homophily is not positively correlated with female migration likelihood. Model 5 adds the second interaction term, *female x male migrant ties* and tests the effects of male-based social capital on migration likelihood. It is interpreted in the same way as the first interaction term; however, if the variable is positive and statistically significant then it implies gender homophily is operating within male migration networks and if it is negative or non-significant then gender homophily has no effect on male migration likelihood.

RESULTS

Table 1 lists descriptive statistics for all of the variables. The final sample consists of 486 individuals, of whom 28% are female. The average age (either at time of migration or the survey) is 44 years, with a minimum age of 14 and a maximum of 92 years. Eighty-seven sample members have migrated to the United States, most since 1978, the beginning of political stability in the Dominican Republic (Grasmuck and Pessar 1991). Of those with migration experience, only 13 people migrated more than once. Fewer than half of the respondents (42.8%) are married (either at time of migration or time of survey), but the majority (87.6%) have at least one child.

Table 2 shows the results of the logistic regression analyses. Model 1 tests my first hypothesis that women and men are equally likely to migrate from the Dominican

Republic to the U.S. The variable female is statistically significant and the odds ratio reveals that women are approximately 89% more likely to migrate than men. My hypothesis predicted that the odds ratio would equal one, indicating an equal likelihood of migration. The strong positive relationship between being female and migration likelihood is therefore unexpected. One possible explanation is that women receive greater returns on human capital thereby encouraging migration. I elaborate on this explanation in the discussion section.

Models 2 and 3 (Table 2) test my second hypothesis that the number of social network ties to female migrants will have the same effect on migration likelihood as the number of social network ties to male migrants. Model 2 adds my measure of female social network ties and the variable's effect is positive and statistically significant. The odds ratio indicates that for each additional woman with migration experience in the household, the likelihood of migration increases by approximately 166%. Gender remains significant in this model such that being female increases the odds of migration by approximately 107%. Model 3 adds the measure of male social network ties within the household so that I can compare the effects of male and female network ties on migration likelihood. The odds ratio for *male migrant ties within household* shows that for each additional male household member with migration experience the likelihood of migration increase by approximately 71%. My hypothesis predicted that both measures would reach statistical significance; however, the relatively strong effect of female network ties was not anticipated. One possible explanation is that women are more likely

than men to encourage the migration of other household members. I discuss this explanation in more detail in the discussion section.

Models 4 and 5 (Table 2) include the interaction terms intended to test my final hypothesis predicting a positive association between gender homophily and migration likelihood. Neither interaction term achieves statistical significance. Additionally the change in the pseudo R^2 between Models 3, 4, and 5 is non-significant indicating that the addition of the interaction terms does not increase the ability of the models to predict migration likelihood. These findings provide no support to my final hypothesis or the homophily perspective.

DISCUSSION

The Dominican Republic provides an ideal location for testing the power and homophily perspectives on gender, social capital and migration. The power perspective argues that traditional gender relations restrict the movement of women and reduce the efficacy of female-based social networks; however, the majority of this research focuses on Mexican migration. My research empirically tests this perspective by examining migration in the context of less traditional gender relations within the Dominican Republic and observing if the pattern differs from that found in Mexico. I also test the homophily perspective which argues that migration is a gendered process, and therefore, gender homophily within migrant social networks should increase the likelihood of migration. I theorize that the relative absence of gender-based power differentials in the Dominican Republic will allow the effects of gender homophily to become evident.

The results of my analyses provide mixed support for the power perspective and no support for the gender homophily perspective. In support of the power perspective, the results depict a clearly different pattern of migration from the Dominican Republic to the U.S. than that found in Mexico-U.S. migration. Not only are women more likely overall to migrate than men, but it appears that social ties to female migrants have a greater effect on the migration of men and women than ties to male migrants. The first finding supports the idea that traditional gender relations restrict women's movement because in their relative absence in the Dominican Republic women appear to be quite free to migrate. However, my first hypothesis predicted that the migration likelihoods of men and women would be equal. The fact that they are not suggests that there is some unmeasured factor promoting the migration of women.

One possible explanation is that women may receive greater returns on human capital from migration than men due gender discrimination in their home country (Kanaiaupuni 2000) or labor market conditions (McMichael 2008). Although I have argued throughout this paper that the Dominican Republic has less patriarchal gender relations than Mexico, this applies mainly to household dynamics and does not mean that the Dominican Republic has eliminated all discrimination against women. Even societies characterized by relatively high levels of gender equality such as the U.S. exhibit gender discrimination in job placement and pay (Levine 2009; Ortiz and Roscigno 2009). Dominican women may increase their earning potential by moving to a society with fewer barriers to female employment, such as the United States. Research on the Dominican agricultural sector provides limited support for this argument by illustrating

one case where men displaced female employees at a time of increasing job scarcity (Raynolds 2001).

Even when discrimination in the home country does not exist, labor market conditions in the U.S. may favor the employment of female migrants thereby encouraging the migration of women. Scholars report that migrant women make up an increasingly large share of the global labor force (McMichael 2008) and that some employers favor women for their supposed docility (Pyle 2001). This explanation lends additional support to the power perspective because Dominican and Mexican women likely compete for similar jobs in the U.S. labor market, yet women do not make up the majority of Mexico to U.S. migrants (Massey, Durand and Malone 2002). Dominican women are less restricted by patriarchal gender relations and therefore are better able to take advantage of these job opportunities through migration.

The significance of male and female migrant ties within the household also provides limited support for the power perspective. Prior research shows that while women may benefit from having men in their migrant networks, the reverse is not true and the presence of women in men's migrant networks may even decrease the likelihood of migration (Curran and Rivero-Fuentes 2003). This is generally assumed to result from either job segregation in destination countries or the lack of power granted to women in countries of origin. However, the large, positive effect of having female-based migrant networks on migration likelihood combined with the lack of significance of the gender homophily interactions suggests that it is not sex segregation in destination countries that is driving the process. It does support the power perspective which argues that gender

inequality reduces the effectiveness of female-based networks. However, once again, the results do not completely support my hypotheses. My second hypothesis predicted that the gender of social network ties would not matter because neither men nor women would have greater influence or power. The finding that social ties to women are a better predictor of migration than ties to men suggests that women have greater power and influence, at least in the area of migration.

Prior research suggests that women in the Dominican Republic may have more influence over migration than men. Grasmuck and Pessar (1991) argue that female migrants from the Dominican Republic frequently encourage other family members to join them in the U.S. when they intend to stay indefinitely because the presence of other family members increases their resource base and stability. Conversely, men are more likely to view migration as temporary and as a means to increase their wealth before returning to the Dominican Republic; therefore, they do not encourage other family members to migrate. Grasmuck and Pessar explain that this difference in attitudes results from the greater freedoms and returns to human capital that women enjoy in the U.S. as compared to the Dominican Republic. Conversely, men are more likely to experience reduced freedoms and returns to human capital through migration.

Neither the homophily perspective nor my final hypothesis are supported by the results. Gender homophily seems to have no effect on migration likelihood from the Dominican Republic. One possible explanation is that although many aspects of migration are gendered, social networks are able to convey gender neutral resources to potential migrants.

One limitation of the present study is that it does not analyze the interaction between gender, social capital and marriage. Prior research shows that unmarried women in Mexico exhibit greater gender homophily in social capital usage than married women (Curran and Rivero-Fuentes 2003). It is possible that the strong influence of female migrant social capital and the lack of support for the homophily perspective found in this study can be explained by a failure to separate married from unmarried women and that the finding only applies to unmarried women. Unfortunately, the relatively small sample size used in this study prevents this analysis.

Another limitation comes from the measure of social capital which is restricted to household members. It is probable, almost inevitable, that people's migration decisions are influenced by social relations both inside and outside the household. The effect of outside social relations is unmeasured in the current study and therefore the results could be spurious. The data do not include measures of social capital outside the household. Also, the analysis strategy is modeled on prior research which typically focuses on household social capital (Cerrutti and Massey 2001; Curran and Rivero-Fuentes 2003; Kanaiaupuni 2000). Having a similar measure allows for a comparison of the pattern of migration from the Dominican Republic to that from Mexico.

CONCLUSION

This paper has shown support for the power perspective of gender and social capital use in migration and demonstrated the importance of testing migration theories in multiple locations, but it has also raised further questions. The dominance of women in Dominican migration is one such question. There are many researchers arguing for the

feminization of migration (Ehrenreich and Hochschild 2003; Sassen 1988); however, few have examined the interaction of gender relations with local and global structural factors such as labor markets and global commodity chains (for a notable exception, see Reynolds 2001). It seems clear that conditions in the United States are contributing to the dominance of women in Dominican migration, but further research is needed to understand how gender relations shape these effects.

Migration patterns and gender norms shape each other in a dynamic process. Grasmuck and Pessar (1991) describe early Dominican migrants as predominately male and hailing from a society characterized by traditional, patriarchal gender norms. Over time, the movement between the United States and the Dominican Republic brought the two societies' normative standards closer together which in turn shaped future migration. Longitudinal studies of Dominican migration could help us to better understand this dynamic process.

Future research should explore alternative measures of social capital, such as the resources actually used by Dominican migrants (mobilized social capital) in order to more fully understand how gender relations are negotiated through migration. It may be that gender homophily within migrant social networks opens up the psychological possibility of migration as potential migrants identify themselves with prior migrants, but that mobilized social capital is gender neutral. Such nuances are hidden in analyses of accessed social capital. Researchers should also attempt to develop more complete maps of migrant social networks that extend beyond the household. This type of data is time

consuming and difficult to gather, but it would vastly increase our understanding of how people use social capital in migration decisions.

Finally, the support for the power perspective provided by this paper suggests that some objective measure of gender relations be incorporated into studies directly comparing migration data from multiple countries. Measures of gender ideology have been developed for the United States (Davis and Greenstein 2009); although, as Davis and Greenstein point out, these measures may not be comparable across countries. The challenge for future researchers is to develop an objective, generalizable measure of gender relations that can be used in assessing its effects on migration.

REFERENCES

- Andrews, Tracy J., Vickie D Ybarra and Teresa Miramontes. 2002. "Negotiating Survival: Undocumented Mexican Immigrant Women in the Pacific Northwest." *The Social Science Journal* 39:431-449.
- Bray, David B. 1987. "The Dominican Exodus: Origins, Problems, Solutions." Pp. 152-170 in *The Caribbean Exodus*, edited by B.B. Levine. New York: Praeger Publishers.
- Burt, Ronald S. 1998. "The Gender of Social Capital." *Rationality and Society* 10:5-46.
- Cerruti, Marcela and Douglas S. Massey. 2001. "On the Auspices of Female Migration from Mexico to the United States." *Demography* 38:187-200.
- Coleman, James S. 1988. "Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital." *The American Journal of Sociology* 94: 95-120.
- Curran, Sara R. and Estela Rivero-Fuentes. 2003. "Engendering Migrant Networks: The Case of Mexican Migration." *Demography* 40: 289-307.
- Curran, Sara R., Filiz Garip, Chang Y. Chung and Kanchana Tangchonlatip. 2005. "Gendered Migrant Social Capital: Evidence from Thailand." *Social Forces* 84:225-255.
- Davis, Shannon N. and Theodore N. Greenstein. 2009. "Gender Ideology: Components, Predictors, and Consequences." *Annual Review of Sociology* 35: 87-105.
- DeLaet, Debra L. 1999. "The Invisibility of Women in Scholarship on International Migration." Pp. 1-20 in *Gender and Immigration*, edited by G.A. Kelson and D.L. DeLaet. New York: New York University Press
- Ehrenreich, Barbara and Arlie Hochschild. 2003. *Global Woman: Nannies, Maids, and Sex Workers in the New Economy*. London: Macmillan.
- Fussell, Elizabeth and Douglas S. Massey. 2004. "The Limits to Cumulative Causation: International Migration from Mexican Urban Areas." *Demography* 41:151-171.
- Grasmuck, Sherri and Patricia R. Pessar. 1991. *Between Two Islands: Dominican International Migration*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Hondagneu-Sotelo, Pierrette. 1994. *Gendered Transitions: Mexican Experiences of Immigration*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

- Kanaiaupuni, Shawn Malia. 2000. "Reframing the Migration Question: An analysis of Men, Women, and Gender in Mexico." *Social Forces* 78: 1311-1347.
- Levine, Judith A. 2009. "It's a Man's Job, or So They Say: The Maintenance of Sex Segregation in a Manufacturing Plant." *The Sociological Quarterly* 50: 257-282.
- Lin, Nan. 2008. "A Network Theory of Social Capital." Pp. 50-69 in *The Handbook of Social Capital*, edited by D. Castiglione, J.W. Van Deth and G. Wolleb. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Massey, Douglas S. 1990. "The Social and Economic Origins of Immigration." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. 510: 60-72.
- Massey, Douglas S., Jorge Durand and Nolan Malone. 2002. *Beyond Smoke and Mirrors: Mexican Migration in an Age of Economic Integration*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Massey, Douglas S. and Kristin E. Espinosa. 1997. "What's Driving Mexico-U.S. Migration? A Theoretical, Empirical, and Policy Analysis." *The American Journal of Sociology* 102:939-999.
- McGuire, Gail M. 2002. "Gender, Race and the Shadow Structure: A Study of Informal Networks and Inequality in a Work Organization." *Gender and Society* 16: 303-322.
- McMichael, Philip. 2008. *Development and Social Change: A Global Perspective*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Ortiz, Susan Y. and Vincent J. Roscigno. 2009. "Discrimination, Women, and Work: Processes and Variations by Race and Class." *The Sociological Quarterly* 50: 336-359.
- Portes, Alejandro. 1998. "Social Capital: Its Origins and Applications in Modern Sociology." *Annual Review of Sociology* 24: 1-24.
- Raynolds, Laura T. 2001. "New Plantations, New Workers: Gender and Production Politics in the Dominican Republic." *Gender and Society* 15: 7-28.
- Sana, Mariano and Douglas S. Massey. 2005. "Household Composition, Family Migration, and Community Context: Migrant Remittances in Four Countries." *Social Science Quarterly* 86: 509-528.

- Sassen, Saskia. 1988. *The Mobility of Labor and Capital*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stark, Oded and David E. Bloom. 1985. "The New Economics of Labor Migration." *The American Economic Review* 75(2):173-178.
- United Nations. 1999. *Demographic Yearbook*. New York: Publishing Division of the United Nations.
- _____. 2001. *Demographic Yearbook*. New York: Publishing Division of the United Nations.
- Waldinger, Roger and Michael Lichter. 2003. *How the Other Half Works: Immigration and the Social Organization of Labor*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Zahniser, Steven S. 1999. *Mexican Migration to the United States: The Role of Migration Networks and Human Capital Accumulation*. New York: Garland Publishing.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics (Omitted Categories in Parentheses)

Variable	Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
<i>Dependent Variable</i>				
Ever Migrated to U.S.	0.176	0.382	0	1
<i>Independent Variables</i>				
Female (Male)	0.288	0.453	0	1
<i>Family Migrant Network</i>				
Female Migrant Ties w/in Household	0.178	0.622	0	6
Male Migrant Ties w/in Household	0.142	0.502	0	5
<i>Controls</i>				
Urban Area (Non-Urban Area)	0.223	0.417	0	1
<i>Personal Characteristics</i>				
Age	44.335	15.277	14	92
Years of Education	8.825	5.089	0	22
Married (Not Married)	0.428	0.495	0	1
Children (Dichotomous)	0.876	0.330	0	1
<i>Occupation (Not Employed)</i>				
Professional	0.343	0.475	0	1
Non-Professional	0.391	0.489	0	1

Note: n=486

**Table 2. Logistic Regression Estimates of Migration Likelihood - Odds Ratios Presented
(Omitted Categories in Parentheses)**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Female (Male)	1.892 *	2.067 **	2.055 **	2.007 **	2.059 **
<i>Family Migrant Network</i>					
Female Migrant Ties w/in Household		2.659 ***	2.213 ***	2.179 ***	2.049 ***
Male Migrant Ties w/in Household			1.711 *	1.717 *	1.997 *
<i>Interaction Terms</i>					
Female × Female Migrant Ties				1.183	1.589
Female × Male Migrant Ties					0.428
<i>Controls</i>					
Urban Area (Non-Urban Area)	1.148	1.170	1.164	1.170	1.167
<i>Personal Characteristics</i>					
Age	0.911 ***	0.897 ***	0.894 ***	0.894 ***	0.893 ***
Years of Education	0.959	0.972	0.969	0.969	0.969
Married (Not Married)	4.419 ***	4.412 ***	4.522 ***	4.537 ***	4.541 ***
Children (No Children)	1.304	1.471	1.421	1.429	1.441
<i>Occupation (Not Employed)</i>					
Professional	0.659	0.650	0.656	0.659	0.617
Non-Professional	1.112	1.341	1.383	1.388	1.319
-2 Log Likelihood	362.69 ***	338.72 ***	335.74 ***	335.67 ***	334.60 ***
McFadden's Pseudo R ²	0.189	0.243	0.250	0.250	0.252

Note: n=486. *p< 0.1, **p< 0.05, *** p< 0.01