Reshaping the Post-Soviet Periphery: The Impact of Men's Labor Migration on Women's Lives and Aspirations in Rural Armenia

Victor Agadjanian
Arusyak Sevoyan
Cecilia Menjívar

Center for Population Dynamics
Arizona State University

March 2007

Introduction and conceptualization

This paper examines the impact of men's international labor migration on their non-migrant wives' economic conditions, social interactions, and migration aspirations. We use data from a survey of 1040 rural married women and a parallel community survey carried out in 2005 in 52 villages of two *marzes* (provinces) of Armenia and complement the statistical analysis of the survey data with insights from in-depth interviews with migrant's wives conducted in three of the villages in the same year.

As one of the independent nations that emerged from the rubble of the Soviet empire fifteen years ago, Armenia's migration dynamics are exemplary of the post-Soviet international migration system. Despite its large scale, vast area, and complex economic mechanisms and ever evolving legal regimes, this migration system, has not been adequately studied. As was the case of several other former Soviet republics, men's labor migration, primarily to Russia, was an important feature of Armenian rural life for decades. The collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 and the economic paralysis and the military conflict with neighboring Azerbaijan that ensued led to massive emigration from Armenia in the early 1990s. In that period, long-term and potentially permanent family relocation abroad replaced seasonal male labor migration as the predominant form of migration. By the turn of the century, however, Armenia's political situation stabilized and economic growth began to perk up. Emigration subsided and temporary labor migration began to regain its predominance in the migration flow as economic opportunities in Russia, itself recovering from a post-Soviet slump, began to beacon again. Importantly, however, the new labor migration flow now links two sovereign nations. While citizens of Armenia, like those of most countries constituting the Commonwealth of Independent States, do not need a visa to enter Russia, securing decent employment there becomes increasingly challenging due both to the convoluted legislation and rising popular xenophobia. Despite the recent economic and socio-political changes on both the sending and receiving ends of this migration system, labor

migration to Russia, locally known as *khopan* (lit. “virgin land” in Armenian), remains widespread and generates a sizeable portion of Armenia’s national income (OSCE 2006; Roberts and Banaian 2005;).

Despite the massive scale of international labor migration, the literature on the implications of that migration for sending areas, and especially for family members who stay behind, is limited and inconclusive. Studies of relatively new migration systems such as those that emerged in response to dramatic geopolitical shifts of the late 20th century are particularly scarce. Our study, while contributing to the overall literature on the effects of migration on sending areas, also aims at filling the gaps in research on migration in the post-Soviet space.

Although the economic benefits derived or expected from migration are often taken for granted in the literature and are assumed to sustain the migration flow, studies show that such benefits may not be straightforward and depend both on migrants’ incorporation into the receiving economy and on the structure of economic opportunities in sending areas. In this study we estimate the economic effects of migration by comparing women married to labor migrants and women married to non-migrants, and accordingly, comparing the two types of households. While we do expect to find that households with migrants have higher total income than households without migrants, we also anticipate that this gap will be larger in settings where alternative forms of employment for both men and women are more limited. While we expect to find that the extra income of migrant households is converted into household material assets, we also assume that the choice of such assets is driven by rational assessment of their utility in a particular context. Thus in settings where agricultural investment does not hold promise of an appreciable return or where such an investment is not an attractive option due to men’s absence, we should not see any excess of agricultural assets among households with migrants

(cf. Bever, 2002). The utility of household consumer assets such as automobile ownership can also be influenced by migration.

Social implications of migration for non-migrating family members, especially female spouses, are much less well understood than the economic ones. While the reconfiguration of marital relations as a result of one spouse's migration is typically acknowledged, specific shapes and outcomes of that change are often found to be contradictory (Aysa and Massey 2004; Reeder 2001; Salgado de Snyder 1993). Some authors posit that migration fosters non-migrant women's autonomy and empowerment by both shifting the burden of decision-making to them and affording them greater autonomy and opportunities for socialization (Gonzalez de la Rocha, cited in Salgado de Snyder 1993; Goodson-Lawes 1993; Gulati 1992; Khaled 1995; Parreñas 2005; Pribilsky 2004; Others, on the contrary, argue that men's migration and a steady flow of remittances that such migration generates cement gender inequality, hinder women's autonomy, and in fact may even increase women's economic and social dependence on their husbands (e.g., Bever 2002; Erman 2001).

The literature dealing with the social effects of migration disproportionately focuses on changes in relationships between spouses and in women's positions within the household. However, husbands' physical absence combined with women's reliance on remittances may also affect the intensity and content of women's social interactions outside the household—with relatives, in-laws and neighbors. In our analyses, we look at women's social interactions and relationships—both those driven by economic needs and those that do not explicitly involve material exchanges. In general, we hypothesize that, controlling for income, economically-driven interactions will be more prevalent among women with non-migrant husbands than among those with migrant husbands, whereas the opposite will be true for interactions that are not centered on material or financial exchanges.

Finally, we look at women's migration intentions. Husband's migration is expected to make their wives more prone to migrate too. Armenia's sociopolitical stabilization and macroeconomic growth of recent years notwithstanding, we expect to find a strong positive association between husband's migration status and woman's intention to move out of the community and especially to migrate internationally. However, we also expect that this association will be mediated by household's material conditions, women's economic and social embededness in the community, and a variety of community characteristics that make life in a given rural community more or less attractive.

Data and methods

We use data from a survey and qualitative interviews carried out in Ararat and Tavush *marzes* (provinces) of Armenia in the fall of 2005. The two marzes were chosen to represent different levels of economic development and migration traditions. Ararat (pop. c. 270,000, according to the 2001 Census), located in the center of Armenia and in the proximity of Yerevan, Armenia's capital and by far the largest city, is a more affluent marz than Tavush (pop. c. 135,000), located on the border with Georgia and Azerbaijan. Tavush was among the parts of Armenia most affected by the crisis of the early 1990s: the near total collapse of small state-owned industrial enterprises set up as part of Soviet modernization was further exacerbated by the closing of the Armenia-Azerbaijan border and the military conflict between the two countries. As the crisis evolved into stagnation, migration from Tavush, both Russia-bound and to other places within Armenia, began to grow. In contrast, the economy of Ararat marz was not as devastated by the crisis of the early 1990s, and its proximity to the Armenian capital has helped its relative economic recovery. At the same time, compared to Tavush, Ararat has had a more established tradition of male seasonal labor migration to the European part of the Soviet Union and to Russia after its collapse.

For the survey, in each marz 26 villages were selected with a probability proportional to size. In each village, 20 households with married women aged 18-49 were selected through a random walk algorithm but so as to oversample women with migrant husbands (the village household rosters were in most cases grossly outdated to be used for sampling frames). In each selected household, one woman was interviewed. In the resulting sample of 1040 women, 36 percent were married to men who spent at least three consecutive months since the beginning of 2005 working or looking for work outside Armenia (the definition of "current migrant" employed in the study). The survey questionnaires included modules dealing with the women's and household's demographic and economic characteristics, time use, spouses' migration and employment, health and reproduction, social networks, and gender attitudes. In addition to the individual women's survey, in each village a community survey was also carried out. That survey collected information on key community economic and social characteristics from the village head or his deputy.

Besides the survey, in three of the villages 27 (9 per village) qualitative in-depth interviews were carried out with women married to current labor migrants. The goal of the interviews was to expand and deepen the understanding of changes introduced by husbands' migration in women's economic conditions and social lives through women's own perceptions of these changes. We use the information obtained through these interviews to complement the survey data analysis.

Statistical model

We use standard statistical tools for the survey data analysis. Our main predictor is a dichotomy—whether a respondent's husband is a current migrant or not. For the analysis of household income, we use OLS regression with the natural logarithm of total household monthly

income as the outcome variable. For analysis in which the outcomes are dichotomies we use binomial logistic regression. For count outcomes, Poisson regression is used. The models control for individual, household, and community economic and social characteristics. To account for the clustering of observations in villages we use the random intercept specification in all statistical models. All analyses are performed with the SAS statistical software package. The bivariate associations between husband's migration status, on the one hand, and woman's and household economic characteristics and intentions to migrate, on the other, are presented in Table 1. Table 2 presents the bivariate associations between husband's migration status and woman's social interactions and exchanges. Finally, Table 3 summarizes the results of multivariate tests.

Results

Economic conditions and activities

The bivariate associations between the migration status of respondent's husband and economic outcomes are presented in Table 1. As expected, we find substantial differences in household income favoring households with migrant husbands. Thus, on average, women married to migrants reported an average household annual income of almost 108,000 Armenian drams (1 US$=460 AMD at the time of the survey), or twice as high as the average income reported with respondents with non-migrant husbands. The gap in income per capita is even larger. The differences in household incomes were particularly pronounced in the Tavush (poorer) marz, where alternative income-generating opportunities are scarcer than in the Ararat marz, with its relatively vibrant agriculture and proximity to the capital city.

Table 1 about here

We fit a multivariate regression using the natural logarithm of annual household income as the dependent variables. The model controls for individual characteristics, husband's characteristics, household characteristics, community social embeddedness, and the socioeconomic characteristics and migration prevalence in the community. The income gap persists wide after these controls are added.

The same multivariate test shows that whether woman works or not does not significantly influence household income. Does husband's migration affect women's outside-the-home employment? Table 1 shows no difference in the rate of employment between women married to migrants and those married to non-migrants. The multivariate test confirms the lack of any association between husband's migration and the likelihood of wife's employment.

In all, fewer than twenty percent of the survey respondents were working for an income, in money or in kind, at the time of the survey. Rural jobs are very scarce, especially for women. The dramatic shrinking of rural non-agricultural economy in the post-Soviet years several reduced employment opportunities in the public sector and many women were laid off. At the same time, few private employment opportunities emerged to compensate for the decline of the public sector. Almost none of the respondents worked in own or family business and the few women who worked in salaried employment as teachers or librarians in local schools or as nurses. Some of the interviewed women also mentioned that the husbands did not allow them to work. This usually had to do with the age of children and type of job. As women pointed out, their husbands would oppose their work until after children had grown up or they could find jobs that matched their training.

However, it appeared that lower return to village employment, was at least as strong a deterrent to looking for work as the shortage of jobs or husbands' preferences. Women who did work

complained that their salaries were too meager to consider them a contribution to the family budget. A mother of two living with in-laws said: “I work in the library of the local school. The salary is very low, it’s half time, the number of classes in our village school is very small, and that affects the work in the library. It’s 9000 drams [$19.50] [a month], I don’t hide it, I earn 9000, and that, you know, is very little, isn’t it? It’s very little in the family’s budget [Kn-Kh].” Thus not only the scarcity of jobs but the miserable pay, especially in comparison with the potential of husband’s earning in *khopan*, deterred women from paid employment.

The in-depth interviews stress women’s dependency on remittances from migrant husbands. Some migrants send the money on the monthly bases, some bring it on the return, and others send it whenever women call and ask for it. The interviews show that money received from husbands is spend on everyday expenses and to prepare for winter (the study was carried in mid-autumn, which has made preparation for winter a particularly prominent concern for our informants). Thus a woman in her early forties, with three children said:

> “If he does not send money we can’t [get by]…I’m waiting now for him to send money, winter is coming, we need wood and we need to prepare for winter. Sometimes he sends $100, sometimes $50, it depends. I have to fit in that amount, I can’t spend more, I buy everything that is most important. I would like to save some money, but can hardly make the ends meet. Everything he sends we spend on food, phone and electricity bills, children’s school expenses. We save on our clothing in order children could eat properly [Ma-Sh].”

According to our informants, little, if anything, is left after the basic needs are taken care of. Some women manage to save money to pay for tutors for their children to enter university or pay the educational fees and children’s living expenses and transportation in the city. For some women, buying a house so that their nuclear family can live separately from husband’s parents was a long-term goal that, they hoped, could be paid for with remittance money. However, even

in the few cases when that goal was achieved, husband's migration continued as there were no employment opportunities in rural areas.

The survey shows that women whose husbands migrate do not uniformly see their migration and work abroad as a boon to household's material conditions. Fewer than half of respondents married to migrants, 45%, said that their households' material wellbeing had improved since migration started and 14% thought that it had worsened. However, despite the litany of complaints that we heard in the interviews about chronic lack of money and the misgivings about the benefits of husbands' migration detected in the survey, women with migrant husbands were more optimistic than women with non-migrant husbands about their households' material conditions in the following year. This difference remains significant even after controlling for other factors. Notably, husband's migration status is the only predictor, besides household annual income, that had a significant effect on optimism about household future at the conventional level of statistical significance ($p<.05$). At the same time, there was no difference in the survey between respondents with migrant and non-migrant husbands in assessment of their households' wellbeing relative to other village households.

Agricultural assets, work, and income

Interestingly, we also find no net statistical differences between women married to migrants and those married to non-migrants in household's agricultural assets—land and cattle ownership, suggesting that in the context of stagnant rural economy investment in agricultural assets are not prioritized. (Alternatively, we could argue the reverse—that the size of land holdings is not a trigger for migration, but because we do not have data on the history of land ownership, we would be on shakier ground with this argument.)

There were no bivariate differences between the two categories of households in the likelihood of selling agricultural products from owned or rented fields. However, when we control for the size of land holdings and other characteristics, this differences does become significant: other things equal, the odds of selling or exchanging at least part of harvest among households with migrant husbands was only 64% those among households with non-migrant men. The in-depth interviews with women married to migrants shed some light on these differences. They suggest that few of those women spend much time working in the fields. Instead, most of their daily routine revolves around household work and childcare.

Consumer assets

While we find no difference in the size of housing (measured by the ratio of household members per sleeping rooms), and its quality (approximated by indoor plumbing), there was a statistically significant net advantage of "migrant" households in using natural gas for cooking, which in the context of rural Armenia is a clear sign of household wellbeing. Yet migrant households were significantly less likely to own an automobile, which, we surmise, is due to the fact that the adult men of such households (the only category of household members who are culturally acceptable in the driver's seat) are not around.

Social ties and exchanges

Husband's migration status had no effect on women's membership is formal organizations or groups, nor did it have any net association with women's attendance of village social events such celebrations or funerals. Yet women with migrant husbands may socialize more with others, as they were significantly more likely, to visit other villagers' houses. This bivariate association, however, did not withstand a multivariate test. However, we find considerable differences between these two groups in likelihood of having engaged in collective activities with other village women: women married to migrants were significantly more likely than women

married to non-migrants to have engaged in joint work in the fields or tending animals, in selling produce in markets, making preserves for winter, and being involved in children's afterschool activities. We fit a logit model predicting women's participation in any such activity: the greater likelihood of women married to migrants to participate in them remains statistically significant even after the addition of controls.

Women married to non-migrants seemed to be less involved in social interactions involving economic exchanges, especially with non-relatives. The survey respondents were asked whether they had received any money as a gift, interest-free loan, or loan with interest since the beginning of the year, or approximately in the ten months preceding the survey (respondents were not asked whether they had given any money to others as we expected the bias in response to this question to be much greater). As Table 2 indicates, there were little differences between the two categories of women, regardless of the source of money. The only noticeable difference was with regard to interest-free loan from non-relatives—migrants' wives reported having received such loans less often than non-migrants' wives—but the difference was not statistically significant after controlling for household income and other factors.

A picture similar to that of financial help emerged also when we looked at non-financial assistance received from kin, in-laws, or other people in the three months preceding the survey: little difference between women married to migrants and those married to non-migrants was noticeable no matter what type of assistance we considered. It is possible that women underreported instances of both financial and non-financial assistance, but we see no reason to believe that this underreporting somehow affected our comparison between the two groups of women.

Migration preferences

Finally, we focus on women's migration preferences. We look at the intention to move out of the village and the intentions to move to two types of destinations—within Armenia (usually to the capital city) or abroad. More than half of the respondents stated that they would like to move out their villages; almost twenty percent of them said that would like to they would like to leave Armenia, mainly for Russia.

While the intention to move internally was somewhat more prevalent among women married to non-migrants, women married to migrants were much more likely to want to move abroad. That women whose husbands are migrants are much more inclined to moving abroad than women with non-migrant husbands is not surprising. What is remarkable, however, is that, contrary to our expectation, this association remains largely impervious to the addition of controls—household income and assets, assessment of household's economic prospects, women's economic activities and social embededness in their communities, having relatives living abroad, and the community-level characteristics. This result indicates that the link between husband's migration and wife's willingness to emigrate (presumably to settle in the place of husband's work) remains strong even as the attractiveness of migration diminishes—both due to increased barriers and xenophobia at destination and political and economic stabilization at origin. In contrast to the differences between the two groups of women in the intention to migrate abroad, the differences in the intention to move in another place in Armenia disappears once we control for other factors.

Although the results of the last statistical test are straightforward, considerations and misgivings underlying women's migration preferences are not. Women's inclination toward migration is shaped by their assessment of different factors, such as the economic constraints of life in Armenia, economic and social prospects in Russia, the needs of children, and the desire to be with their husbands. For example, one of the interviewees, who had recently married and had

given birth to her first child less than a month before the interview, was primarily concerned about consolidating her family expenses: ”I don’t want to leave but life might force me to...When he’s there and we’re here the expenses are high, they are divided between two places, but if we live together, it will be easier[An-Ac].” Another interviewee, a woman in her early forties, felt much less ambivalent about joining her husband in Russia but could not do it immediately because of the children:“[My husband and I] have always treated each other with love and understanding. It’s just recently that he’s been away for a long time, but it is just temporary. As soon as the children get married I’ll also leave and it will be much better. I like living there but for now I have to think about my daughters, their marriage [Za-Ach].” And here is how a 27-year-old woman described her uncertainties: “My husband should come and take me with him, we have a house in Min Vodi [city in southern Russia] ... I don't know what will happen. He may come and wait until a year passes since my father's death, and then we will leave. Or, we may have finances to buy a house here and stay. I don't know what will happen [Kr-Kh].” Although Russia was the most common potential destination for the study participants, it was not the only one. Thus an interviewee whose husband worked in Russia wanted both of them and their children to move to Spain instead, where she had relatives.

Discussion

Post-Soviet Eurasia has emerged as a major migration field that is shaped both by the legacy of the shared political past of the countries that make it up and by present-day economic and geopolitical realities and interdependencies of the region. The dynamics and implications of this relatively new migration system that connects the old parts of the former Soviet Empire and not well known, and our study, despite its largely cross-sectional perspective, fills some of the gaps. At the same time, our study contributes to a more general understanding of the impact of men’s labor migration on women’s lives and expectations in sending areas. As we expected, and is common in other migration systems, rural men’s labor migration, ceteris paribus, dramatically

increases their families' monetary income, relative to families with no migrants, even though women married to migrants may remain ambivalent about the material benefits of their husbands' migration. Not surprisingly, the monetary income gap between households with and without migrants is particularly wide in poorer areas with fewer income-generating alternatives, even though the levels of labor migration from such areas may be lower than from areas of greater affluence and more diversified economies.

Do migration and the economic windfall that it generates lead to families' greater investment and women's greater embeddedness in their communities? Our results suggest that, on balance, the financial resources generated through migration are not reinvested into the rural economy and therefore do not lead to any greater economic anchoring of migrants' families in rural society. Some of the income generated by migrants is indeed converted into the improvement of their households' living conditions, such as the use of natural gas for cooking. However, in most cases, we do not find any noticeable differences between migrant and non-migrant households in material quality of life. On some counts, such as automobile ownership, which is not just a means of transportation but a key status symbol in rural society, migrants are significantly less endowed than non-migrant households as practical considerations seemingly override that of prestige. Most importantly, however, remittances from migrants are not invested in rural means of production. Migrant households are no different from the rest in ownership of land and domestic animals. In fact, migration remittances serve the families to extricate themselves further from the penance of agricultural work. As a result of migration, migrant households are much less dependent of agriculture either for their dietary subsistence or cash or barter income. At the same time, the inexorable and pervasive poverty of rural areas, coupled with prohibitively high costs of fuel and industrial materials, discourages the investment of the income remitted by migrants in non-agricultural activities. In general, we find no connection between men's migration and the likelihood of their wives being gainfully employed outside the

home, even though at this stage of the investigation we cannot argue about any causal connection between husband's and wife's employment.

If husbands' migration does not help women to anchor themselves in the community economically, does it affect their social engagement and attachment? Our results suggest that migration may trigger greater engagement of women in informal collective activities with other village women, presumably due to a combination of greater social autonomy and freedom of movement in their husbands' absences and compensatory roles of outcome-specific social interactions. At the same time, after controlling for other factors, having a migrant husband does not seem to be more conducive either to casual social networking or, on the other extreme of the interaction continuum, to exchanges involving money either as gifts of loans.

Our findings with respect to women's own inclinations to migrate are perhaps the most sobering testimony to the social uprooting with potential devastating consequences that international labor migration causes in Armenia's rural areas. These inclinations were much more prevalent among women married to migrants than among women married to non-migrants even after controlling for household income, women's optimism regarding household's material future, and a number of other individual, household, and community characteristics.

It should be emphasized that the excessive proclivity of women with migrant husbands to leave the village and move abroad, primarily to Russia, was due more to the opportunity to do so rather than a particularly strong discontent with life in their villages. Russia's labor market, buoyed by high prices of Russia's most important export—energy resources, beacons strong all over post-Soviet Eurasia, and despite arcane immigration laws, a convoluted bureaucracy, and growing grassroots-level hostility toward foreign workers, especially toward those from the south of the former Soviet empire, relocating to Russia is still relatively easy for Armenian citizens.

The psychological costs of permanent move are further abated by a long established tradition of Armenian migration and the presence of some two million ethnic Armenians on the Russian territory.

Of course, as the in-depth interviews vividly show, women's migration aspirations and expectations are conditioned by a variety of constraints of personal and family nature. However, it is important to stress that from women's perspective, a major issue is not the financial, social, or psychological costs of moving. One of their main concerns is about prolonged separation from their husbands that migration engenders. This concern has both an emotional and a pragmatic aspects: women yearn for companionship and, presumably, sexual intimacy disrupted by migration; at the same time, they are also concerned that the husbands' prolonged absence can lead to the rupture of their marriages and the cessation of the financial lifeline for them and their children (Menjívar and Agadjanian forthcoming).

As is typical of migration intentions, not all of them are eventually materialized (De Jong 2000; De Jong et al. 1985; Gardner et al. 1986). Accordingly, not all of the study participants of our study who expressed such intentions would eventually migrate. The fluctuations of personal and family fortunes as well as macro-economic and macro-political shifts in that volatile part of the world may alter and re-alter migration individual and family preferences, plans, and decision. It seems likely, however, that as long as the economic stagnation of sending areas continues and the inter-country employment and income imbalances persist and even grow, men's labor migration will continue to exert its paradoxical influence on families left behind—providing them with extra financial resources yet, at the same time, also uprooting them for their communities.

References

Aysa, María and Douglas S. Massey. 2004. "Wives Left Behind: The Labor Market Behavior of Women in Migrant Communities." Pp. 131-144 in *Crossing the Border: Research from the Mexican Migration Project*, Jorge Durand and Douglas S. Massey, eds. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Bever, Sandra Weinstein. 2002. "Migration and the Transformation of Gender Roles and Hierarchies in Yucatan." *Urban Anthropology*, 31 (2): 199-230.

De Jong, Gordon F. 2000. "Expectations, gender, and norms in migration decision-making" *Population Studies* 54: 307-319.

De Jong, Gordon F., Brenda Davis Root, Robert W. Gardner, James T. Fawcett, and Ricardo G. Abad. 1985. Migration intentions and behavior: Decision making in a rural Philippine province. *Population & Environment* 8 (1-2): 41-62.

Erman, Tahire. 2001. "Rural Migrants and Patriarchy in Turkish Cities." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 25 (1): 118-133.

Gardner, R.W., G.F. De Jong, F. Arnold, B.V. Carino. 1986. "The best-laid schemes: an analysis of discrepancies between migration intentions and behavior." *Population and Environment* 8(1-2):63-77.

Goodson-Lawes, Julie. 1993. "Feminine Authority and Migration: The Case of One Family from Mexico." *Urban Anthropology*, 22 (3-4): 277-297.

Gulati, Leela. 1992. "Migration and Social Change in India." *Asian Migrant*, 5 (4): 124-126

Khaled, Louhichi. 1995. Migration and Women's Status: The Jordan Case. *International Migration*, 1995, 33 (2): 235-250

Menjívar, Cecilia and Victor Agadjanian. "Men's migration and women's lives: Views from rural Armenia and Guatemala" *Social Science Quarterly* (forthcoming)

OSCE. 2006. Labor Migration from Armenia in 2002-2005: A Sociological Survey of Households. The Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, Yerevan office. http://www.osce.org/yerevan/item_11_18193.html (Accessed in March 2007).

Parreñas, Rhacel Salazar. 2005. *Children of Global Migration: Transnational Families and Gendered Woes*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Pribilsky, Jason. 2004. "'Aprendemos a convivir': Conjugal Relations, Co-parenting, and family life among Ecuadorian transnational migrants in New York City and the Ecuadorian Andes." *Global Networks*, 4 (3): 313-334.

Reeder, Linda. 2001. "Conflict Across the Atlantic: Women, Family, and Mass Male Migration in Sicily, 1880-1920. *International Review of Social History*, 46: 371-391.

Roberts, Brian W. and King Banaian. 2005. Remittances in Armenia: Size, Impacts, And Measures to Enhance Their Contribution to Development. Armenian International Policy Research Group. Working Paper No. 05/01.

Salgado de Snyder, V. Nelly. 1993. "Family Life Across the Border: Mexican Wives Left Behind." *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 15 (3): 391-401.

Table 1. Bivariate associations: economic characteristics and intention to migrate (percent unless noted otherwise)

	Married to non-migrant	Married to migrant	p
Tavush province	71.5	28.5	
Ararat province	55.0	45.0	
Mean age	33.1	36.6	**
Mean HH annual income (Armenian Dram)	53613	107581	**
Mean HH income per capita (Armenian Dram)	9904	22567	*
Land owned by household (Ha, mean)	0.64	0.51	*
At least part of harvest is sold or exchanged [a]	39	37.4	
HH owns cattle	39.7	27.5	**
Respondent worked for income in past four weeks	16.8	16.2	
HH owns car	41.6	28.8	**
HH cooks with gas	52.3	65.2	**
House has flush toilet	15.4	16.2	
Thinks that majority of HHs are richer than her HH.	21.1	22.8	
Thinks that HH material conditions will improve in a year	37.4	44.2	*
Wants to move permanently to another place in Armenia	38.7	34	
Wants to move permanently abroad	14.6	25.1	**

Notes: 1 USD=460AMD at 2005 exchange rate. Significance level: ** p<.01; * p<.05.

[a] Of those who own or rent land

Table 2. Bivariate associations: social interactions and exchanges (percent)	Married to non-migrant	Married to migrant	p
Attended a celebration since the beginning of year	70.7	67	
Attended a funeral since the beginning of year	58.4	67	**
Respondent visited at least one house in past week	69.2	77.8	**
At least one person visited her in past week	80.9	84	
Money received from any informal source since the beginning of year			
money as gift received since new year	16.4	18.1	
money as interest-free loan received since new year	29	22.8	*
money as loan with interest received since new year	11.6	13.4	
got any type of money	44.5	44.4	
From own kin			
money as gift received since new year	11.4	13.6	
money as interest-free loan received since new year	10.5	8.4	
money as loan with interest received since new year	4.6	3.7	
got any type of money	20.8	23	
From husband's kin			
money as gift received since new year	10.8	8.4	
money as interest-free loan received since new year	13.4	11	
money as loan with interest received since new year	3.8	3.7	
got any type of money	23.7	19.6	
From non-kin			
money as gift received since new year	3.6	2.6	
money as interest-free loan received since new year	15.7	10.5	*
money as loan with interest received since new year	7.6	10	
got any type of money	24.8	20.9	
Participated in collective activities with other women	29.9	39.9	*
Working in fields or tending animals	15.2	20.3	*
Selling produce	6	9.7	*
Making preserves for winter	25.3	32.7	**
After school activities	9.5	12.5	
Participated in voluntary village activities	10.5	11.5	
Member of an organization/association	8.8	10.7	

Notes: Significance level: ** p<.01; * p<.05.

Table 3 Summary of multivariate results: the effect of being married to migrant relative to being married to non-migrant

HH income (log)	+
Respondent worked for income in past four weeks	ns
Thinks that HH material conditions will improve in a year	+
Thinks that majority of HHs is richer than her HH	ns
Land owned by household (Ha, mean)	ns
At least part of harvest is sold or exchanged	-
HH owns car	-
HH cooks with gas	+
House has flush toilet	ns
Attended a celebration since the beginning of year	ns
Attended a funeral since the beginning of year	ns
Respondent visited at least one house in past week	ns
At least one person visited her in past week	ns
Participated in collective activities with other women	+
Received financial assistance from others	ns
Received non-financial assistance from others	ns
Wants to move away permanently	+
Wants to move abroad permanently	+
Wants to move within Armenia permanently	ns

Notes: + positive effect at $p<.05$; - negative effect at $p<.05$; not significant at $p<.05$