

## **Power Structure in Labour Families; The Case Study: Lar City, Iran**

Halimeh Enayat<sup>1</sup>

Fatemeh Nowrouzi<sup>2</sup>

**Abstract:** This study examines the relationship between migration and power structure in Larian labour families. The research method for conducting this study is fieldwork research, and the technique of data collection is self-administration questionnaire, using face to face interviews. The sample size of this research was 570 women. 285 ones were selected among women whose husbands were labor migrants and 285 women whose husbands were employed in the city of Lar, Iran.

The findings show that there is a small difference regarding women's power in migrant families and those whose husbands live in Lar. The linear regression shows that there is a relationship between husbands' migration and women's power. This value increases with regard to the duration of the husband's absence.

**Keywords:** Larian Labour Families, Migration, Power Structure, Women's Power.

---

1. Associate Professor, Department of Sociology, Shiraz University, e-mail: henayat@rose.shirazu.ac.ir

2. Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, Payame Noor University,  
e-mail: fatemeh\_ Nowrouzi @ yahoo.com

## **Introduction**

The connection between migrants and host society will transfer a lot of new cultural elements to that society (Lahsaeizadeh, 2004, p. 41). The migration of man as the head of the family has tended to cause some changes in the structure of the family, and in this way the consideration of woman's role has become more and more significant. In this study, the power structure of those families in which husbands are migrants is examined and women's activities in the domain of decision making is studied , as well. Subsequently, the families' position from different sources in regard to power structure in the family institution is going to be studied while it was considered the husband to be present or not.

## **Statement of the Problem**

City of Lar is located in the south-central part of Larestan in the Fars province, Iran. Its old and previous name was Lad (Vosoughi, 1992, p.24). Its area is 33,667 square kilometers and it was divided into two parts after an earth quake in 1960; six kilometers from the old city, the new city was built. (Rahmani, 1996, p. 15).

The people of Larestan have had to work very hard since a long time ago, for various reasons, mostly because of the bad weather and lack of jobs for men in the region, which forces them to migrate to other cities and even other Persian Gulf countries. Vosoughi (2001) states that the increased migration from Iran to the Persian Gulf from 1919 to 1939 resulted from two factors: the oppression of the Persian rulers at the time and the imposed "unveiling law" by the government of Reza Shah in Iran.

Studies on migrants in the Persian Gulf are not available in a large number. Vosoughi (2001) states that this figure would be about twenty thousand people just from the area of Larestan. Based on the reports by the governor of Larestan at that time, 35 percent of the people of Larestan and 30 percent of male headed families in the city of Lar are now working in Arabic countries (ibid). The immigrants are divided into three categories:

- 1- Citizens who have been granted Arabic citizenship.
- 2- Seasonal labor migrants.
- 3- Illegal immigrants who get labor visa for working in Arabic countries after a while.

Vosoughi (2001) explains the economic impact of migration on the region of Lar that has been resulted into :

1- High investment deposits in local banks, 2- The rising of the life standards of the people employed in the Persian Gulf states and local employees, and 3- The rise of the average cost of public services and living. With the migration of men , the shape and form of their families will change; sometimes they should be considered as single- parent families. Since Larestan is one of the rare areas in Iran which faces this social phenomenon, this study aims to examine the relationship between labor migration and the structure of power among families in the city of Lar. To this end, two groups of people are going to be examined: (1) women whose husbands are labor migrants (2) women whose husbands work in Lar.

### **Objectives**

The objectives of this study are four–folded. The primary objective of this research is to study the relationship between power structure and labor migration of men. The second objective is the comparison of power structure between three groups of women<sup>3</sup>. The third objective is to study the relationship between the migration of husband and some resources as intermediate variables. Finally, the study aims at investigating the relationship between some resources as intermediate variables and women’s power in the family.

### **Hypotheses**

There is a relationship between husbands’ migration and women’s power in the family.

There is a relationship between duration of husbands’ migration and women’s power in the family.

There is a difference between three groups of women defined earlier with regard to power structure in the family.

There is a relationship between men’s migration and social, economical, cultural, symbolic and demographical resources of women

---

3. a) women whose husbands usually migrate but were present in Lar during the interview; b) women whose husbands migrate and were out of Lar during the interview; c) women whose husbands do not migrate.

There is a relationship between social, economic, cultural, symbolic and demographical resources of women affecting their power in the family.

### **Research Method**

In order to collect data, a survey method was used in this study; questionnaires and interviews were used for data collection. The research population of the present study was all the households in Lar, amounting to 13,982 individuals, 30 percent of whom were labor migrants, and 70 percent were employed in Lar.

The sample size of this research was 570 persons according to Lin table. 285 samples were selected from those women whose husbands were labor migrants, and 285 women whose husbands were employed in Lar. The sampling method of this study was multistage cluster sampling.

### **Literature Review and the Theoretical Framework**

The relevant research that has been carried out can be classified into two groups:

Studies that have been conducted on immigration and gender roles between women and men.

The investigations that have been carried out to analyze the structure of power in the family.

According to Balani (1981) and Weist (1983), non-migrant women's role is a passive role. Even as subsistence workers or as wage-earners during men's absences, women are considered as "secondary" actors (Kanaiaupuni, 2000, p. 7).

Safilos Rothschild (1986) found that in Lesotho, where about half (47.7 percent) of men are absent from the country and are working in South African mines most of the year, it is believed that men make all the important agricultural decisions and do most of the heavy works in agriculture; despite the fact that they are present at home only one month per year.

Abyaneh (1989) examined power structure of a group of Iranian immigrant families in an effort to assess the status of Iranian immigrant women within the family and their relationship with their husbands before and after migration. The findings of the study suggest that Iranian immigrant families have become more male dominated in the United States than they were prior to the migration. This increase of male dominance is therefore to be considered not simply as a remnant

of the past, but rather a reflection of the structural conditions that affect the power structure of the Iranian migrant families .

Sakka et al. (1999) showed in their study that migration-repatriation experience affects task sharing towards adopting more "modern" patterns of behavior as well as adopting more "traditional" ones. On the other hand, migrants seem to adopt a more "traditional" attitude than non-migrants toward participation of women in family decision making. The migration-repatriation experience does not seem to lead to a change in the status of women towards "modernization".

Aleida Van Rooij (1999) found that men's migration has two dimensions; first men's migration affects women's independence in everyday chores and also affects women's status to be considered as the head of the family in the absence of their husbands; second as a result of husband's migration, women become more vulnerable, and therefore, they are not able to meet the financial needs because of their limited access to vital resources. Migration also causes a change in the decision making process inside the migrant families and affects women's role in decision making process in comparison with other families (Effati, 2003).

Kanaiaupun (2000) demonstrated that solidarity and long-term value of social relationships depend, however, on the reputability of both non-migrant women and their migrant partners and their conformity to social standards of behavior. Non-migrant women often feel socially isolated and lonely during their spouses' absence; and their behavior and activities are watched vigilantly by the husbands' kin. Many women show negative reactions to their employment, particularly if they work outside the home, and suffer socially, because they are stigmatized as unprotected women vulnerable to gossip and innuendo. Thus, women's reliance on their absent husband and the limited decision-making power reflect their economic dependence and the implicit threat of abandonment in a context of few alternative economic opportunities. Finally, findings also highlight women's relative powerlessness in the migrant labor system.

Duroux (2001) conducted a research entitled: "The temporary migration of males and the power of females in a stem-family society". These migrants' wives had to change their way of lives during their husbands' long absence and they learned to make decisions by themselves and take on a myriad of responsibilities, which often required self-sacrifice. Because of these efforts, their households were

not disrupted.

Effati (2003) carried out a research on "the impact of seasonal migration of men on rural women's activity", in three provinces of Iran. The findings of the research revealed that women took most of their husbands' responsibilities such as household management during their absence. Husbands' migration had changed gender division of labor and roles in the rural areas.

Fazyleh Khani (2004) found out that the migration of rural men affects working women and how women can change their situation and their livelihoods in the absence of their husbands.

Ghaderi (1996) found that wife's education, husband's education, husband's job status, wife's employment, husband's age, and wife's birth place had a meaningful correlation with power structure in the families of Shiraz.

Mahdavi and Sabouri Khosrowshahi (2003) found out that factors such as women's education, employment and participation in decision making on marriage would incline the power structure closer to a more democratic family, while submissive self-conception, on the part of women, and the authoritarian one, on the part of men, causes power structure to lean toward a less democratic family.

Mousavi (2004), has offered sociological investigation on the relationship between power and leadership in contemporary Iranian families. In the same year, Zolfagharpour et al. (2004) have studied the power structure and marital satisfaction of men. Afterwards, Mohammadi (2004) in his study entitled "Deference, women's power or men's violence?; Strategic study of women" investigated attributively the concept of deference. Assurance Garousi (2008) has done a comprehensive research on the power structure in the city of Kerman. Enayat & Soroush (2008) have measured the amount and type of resistance in the face of patriarchal power structure in the family.

Ayazi & Nasehi (2010) have studied the power structure in the family between wife and husband from the view point of Islamic verses and narratives. Based on their study, although man as husband is the head of the family, he has a relative position and power in an Islamic family and does not have the absolute power.

Enayat and Dastranj (2009) have investigated the power structure of families in Lar city. The results indicate that 2 percent of the families are democratic, 88.6 percent are semi-democratic and 9.6 percent are nondemocratic families;

and variables such as age, men's education, women's level of education, women's earnings, length of marriage, family and women's employment have a significant relationship with the dependent variable. Kiyani et al (2009) have studied the distribution of power in the families and have offered a model based on GT theory in Tehran.

Micro-level perspectives examine migration in relation to the household unit. Kanaiaupuni (2000) suggested that "non-migrant women bear a significant share of the costs of migration" and "husbands' migration may be a sign of empowerment in some perspectives, for instance, among many poor women in rural Mexico, the added responsibilities are unwanted and exacerbate their already marginalized position in the society". Kanaiaupuni (2000) As Newman indicated "men's power is still considered more acceptable to both men and women" (1999, p. 79); and White & Klein confirmed in their book that "Authority is a type of resource that is constructed by the normative system of a specific culture" (2002, p. 21); this culture exists in Lar too.

There are two different views in the theory of female-headed family:

"Lonely mothers have been depicted as weak and vulnerable".

"The departure of men (either through death, divorce or leaving), may have positive results both for wives and their children. Potential gains include greater scope for decision making, self-esteem, a sense of achievement in parenting under difficult circumstances, greater control over finances, greater personal freedom, reduced physical or emotional abuse and..." (Chant, 1997, p. 40).

Resource theories have explained the model of this study. Ahlander and Bahr (1995) indicated that "the key issue in resource theory is relative power conceptualized as a function of external resources". White and Klein explained "resources as the broadest of the three concepts include the other two (power and authority) as subjects. Resources include all the knowledge, skills, techniques, and materials that are at the ready disposal of a person or group" (White and Klein, 2002: p.150).

According to Sprey (1979) power is "the ability of an individual or a group to exercise effective control over others and things" (Ibid, p.151). Ahlander and Bahr (1995) indicated that the "marital partner with the greater resources would have more power and therefore dominate [the] decision making process".

The theory used as a theoretical framework for this study is "Randall Collins"

theory about the distribution of individuals in physical space, with their respective capital or resources to be used in exchange, and with inequality in the resources. This part of Collins theory related to resources is very important for the study:

"the respective resources of individuals are critical: power is the capacity to coerce or to have others to do so on one's behalf, material resources are wealth and the control of money as well as property or the capacity to control the physical settings, and symbolic resources are the respective level of linguistic and conversational resources as well as the capacity to use cultural ideas, such as ideologies, values, and beliefs" (Turner, 2003, p.496).

Other aspects of his theory that are related to this study are deference and talk. Bordieu indicates four types of capitals;

(1) economic capital, or product property (money and material objects that can be used to produce goods and services); (2) social capital, or positions and relationships in groupings and social networks (groups and organizational memberships, network ties, social relations, and so forth); (3) cultural capital, or informal interpersonal skills, habits, manners, linguistic styles, educational credentials, tastes, and life styles, and (4) symbolic capital, or the use of symbols to legitimate the possession of varying levels and configuration of the other three types of capital).

These variables are used as measuring part of the dependent variable. The more the people have these resources, the more power they have. Any of these capitals affect the decision making process in the family (Ibid, p.496).

As inequality theory indicates "women get less of the material resources, social status, power, and opportunities for self actualization and this inequality results from the organization of society, not from any significant biological or characteristic differences between women and men" (Ritzer, 2001: 120).

### **Fieldwork Research**

In this study, power structure includes three parts: decision-making, operational pattern, and subjective pattern.

Decision Making: In order to deal with this variable, a scale was made using questions C-C. These questions ask about whom will make decisions about the following issues in the house:

The upbringing of children, home's daily shopping, where to travel, inviting



friends and relatives, determining the time of the eating, buying necessary furniture (such as carpet, TV, etc), the kind of the required items for the household , the amount of children's pocket money, how to spend free-times, decisions on clothing (for example the kind of clothing for the parties), the amount of money required for the house in a week, naming their children, decisions on the number of their children, , decisions on children's age gap, how and what to cook, buying a house, supervising their childrenfor their homeworks, the number of clothes for buying, house decoration, buying a car, punishing and encouraging their children, visiting relatives and friends, giving gifts to relatives and friends are several examples of this category.

The Cronbach's Alpha was 0.8038.

Operational Pattern: This variable includes ten items. These items ask how much your husband helps you in the following activities:

**Table1:** Indicators of operational pattern related to women's power in the family

|                                                      |
|------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>House cleaning</b>                                |
| Buying clothes                                       |
| Daily shopping                                       |
| Cooking                                              |
| Washing the dishes                                   |
| Helping children with their homework                 |
| Payments & loans ( related to the bank)              |
| Looking after children at the time of their sickness |
| Washing clothes                                      |
| Looking after young children                         |
| Household trivial repairs                            |

The Cronbach's Alpha was 0.8203.

Ideological Pattern: An index was made for measuring this variable. For formulating this index 16 items were used. The participants were asked how much the following matters corresponded to or existed in their family.

**Table2:** Indicators of ideological pattern related to women's power in family

|                                                                                             |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| In our family we make decisions about the number of our children and birth control devices. |
| In our family we make decisions about the future of our family together.                    |
| My husband doesn't care much about my requests.                                             |
| My ideas are very important in our life decision makings process.                           |
| I can influence my husband's decisions.                                                     |
| In our family, I can manage my household's affairs better than my husband.                  |
| I am able to take care of financial issues better than my husband.                          |
| I can deal with children better than my husband.                                            |
| I am better in family relationships compared to my husband.                                 |
| Children obey their father more than me.                                                    |
| My husband believes that housekeeping is women's duty.                                      |
| My husband believes that women should have access to their bank accounts.                   |
| My husband believes that women should take part in outside economic activities.             |
| My husband makes decisions about the household issues by himself.                           |
| In our family my husband has the final say.                                                 |
| My husband and I make decisions together on many issues.                                    |

Cronbach's Alpha was 0.6012.

Intermediate variables include five resources: economic resources: (property, savings, salary (income)), social resources (family relatives, social network, social ties, employment status of the mother), cultural resources (education, training) symbolic resources (priority in talking, deference and demeanor) and demographic resource (family size).

### **Independent variables**

**Absent Husband:** Absent husband stands for a husband who wasn't in Iran in the time of interview and was working in Persian Gulf countries.

**Duration of Husband's Absence:** Duration of husband's absence stands for the period that

husband lived abroad without his family due to migration (months per year).

Duration of Husband's Presence: Stands for the period that the husband lived in Iran with his family (months per year).

## FINDINGS

The sample of this study included married women. Two groups of women were used in this study. The first group was those whose husbands had migrated to Persian Gulf Countries and the other group were those whose husbands lived in Lar.

### Migration

According to table 3, the average number of months that their husbands lived abroad was 7.7, but that of those who lived in Lar was 5.36. The average number of years that husbands were living to Persian Gulf Countries due to migration was 24.26. The minimum and maximum number of months the migrants lived abroad was 0.33 and 30 respectively; but for those husbands living in Lar, it was 0.5 and 12 months at the time of the interview respectively. The number of years that migrant men had traveled to Persian Gulf Countries varied between 2 and 55 years.

**Table (3)** Statistics for migration 1, migration2 and migration 3

| Statistics     | Migration 1 | Migration 2 | Migration 3 |
|----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Mean           | 7.76        | 5.36        | 24.26       |
| Median         | 6           | 6           | 24          |
| Mode           | 6           | 6           | 30          |
| Std. Deviation | 3.88        | 2.19        | 11.58       |
| Variance       | 15          | 4.15        | 134.30      |
| Skewness       | 2           | 0.67        | 0.31        |
| Kurtosis       | 7.77        | 1.38        | -0.66       |
| Range          | 29.67       | 11.5        | 53          |
| Minimum        | 0.33        | 0.5         | 2           |
| Maximum        | 30          | 12          | 55          |

Migration 1: Number of months that migrants lived abroad

Migration 2: Number of months that migrants lived in Lar

Migration 3: Number of years that husbands were living in Persian Gulf Countries

The relationship between husbands' migration and women's power was examined in this study. Husbands' migration was considered an independent variable and women's power as a dependent variable. Some intermediate variables were needed for the design of the present study. These variables in the first part were as dependent variables related to husbands' migration and in the second part, as independent variables for women's power.

**Table (4)** Independent t- test for women's power - between women whose husbands migrate and those who do not

|                             | F     | Sig   | t     | df     | Sig.<br>(2-tailed) | Mean<br>Difference |
|-----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Equal variances assumed     | 0.831 | 0.362 | 4.211 | 568.00 | 0.000              | 6.1263             |
| Equal variances not assumed |       |       | 4.211 | 566.25 | 0.000              | 6.1263             |

According to table 4, there is a significant difference regarding women's power in the family between women whose husbands migrate and those who do not.

**Table (5)** Regression model and ANOVA Test and Beta coefficient for husbands' migration and women's power

| Mode | R        | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|------|----------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| 1    | 0.174(a) | 0.030    | 0.029             | 17.36638                   |

F: 17.734 sig: .000

Beta: .174

t: 4.211 sig: .000

According to table 5, the R square reported the proportion of the variation of the dependent variable explained by the independent variable which is equal to 0.030, showing a very low explained proportion.

While the output of sum of square for residual is higher than the same output for regression, indicating a very low explained proportion of women's power by husband's migration, the small significant value of F statistics shows that the independent variable efficiently explains the variation of the dependent variable.

The small significant value of t statistic (4.211) shows the importance of husbands' migration in predicting women's power. Beta indicates that by a unit

increase in husbands' migration as independent variable, the amount of women's power also increases 0.174.

**Table (6)** Regression model and ANOVA Test and Beta coefficient for duration of husbands' migration and women's power in the family

| Model      | R        | R Square    | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|------------|----------|-------------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| 1          | 0.185(a) | 0.034       | 0.033             | 17.34485                   |
| F = 20.186 |          | Sig = 0.000 | Beta = 0.185      | t = 4.493 Sig = 0.000      |

According to table 6, there is a positive correlation between duration of husbands' migration and women's power in the family. The R square (0.034) shows a very low explained proportion but this value is higher than the previous relationship. Beta indicates that a unit increase in husbands' migration causes 0.185 increase in the amount of women's power. F statistics shows that the independent variable can explain the variation of the dependent variable.

**Table (7)** Group statistics and One Way Anova for Women's power in three groups of women<sup>4</sup>

| Group                                                                                  | Mean     | N          |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|------------|
| 1) Women whose husbands do not migrate                                                 | 156.7404 | 285        |
| 2) Women whose husbands migrate but were in Lar at the time of the interview           | 160.4397 | 141        |
| 3) Women whose husbands were migrants and were out of Lar at the time of the interview | 165.2431 | 144        |
| Total                                                                                  | 159.8035 | 570        |
| F                                                                                      | 11.86    | Sig: 0.000 |

As table 7 illustrates, there is a considerable difference between the three groups of women with regard to power structure in the family. F statistics shows that husbands' migration is an important variable in predicting the variation in power among the three groups of women. The small significant value of F statistics (11.86) indicates the importance of the independent variable in predicting the dependent variable. Furthermore, table 7 also demonstrates that the power structure among the third group is more egalitarian than the other two groups.

**Table (8)** Correlation between variables of research

|                                      | Husbands' migration | Women's power |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------|
| Husbands' migration                  | 1                   | 0.174(**)     |
| Women's property                     | 0.084(*)            | 0.101(*)      |
| Women's savings                      | -.014               | 0.089(*)      |
| Women's income                       | -0.209(**)          | 0.049         |
| Communication with women's relatives | 0.132(**)           | 0.111(**)     |
| Women's use of mass media            | -0.013              | 0.149(**)     |
| Women's social ties                  | 0.061               | 0.208(**)     |
| Women's education                    | -0.218(**)          | 0.033         |
| Women's training                     | -0.074              | 0.152(**)     |
| Employment status of women           | -0.195(**)          | 0.033         |
| Priority in talking                  | -0.011              | 0.173(**)     |
| Women's deference                    | 0.023               | 0.445(**)     |
| Family size                          | 0.240(**)           | 0.042         |

Table 8 illustrates the Pearson correlation between research variables. It indicates that the correlations between some variables are strong and are significant at the 0.01 level. There are relationships between some variables but they are significant at the 0.05 level.

According to table 8, different variables have been affected by husbands' migration. There are positive correlations between husbands' migration and women's property, family size, and communication with women's relatives. But the relationships between husbands' migration and women's income, women's education, and job status of women are negative.

Women's property and their savings, social ties, use of mass media, communication with women's families, priority in talking, and deference have a positive effect on women's power in the family. Other variables do not affect their power in the family.

Of all the fifteen independent variables (husbands' migration, women's

property, savings, income, relatives, use of mass media, social ties, education, training, employment status, priority in talking, deference, family size, age of women, and duration of marriage which forced into the regression equation, six variables were more important in relation to the women's power.

**Table (9)** Model Summary and ANOVA for study of man's migration and woman's resources as independent variables and woman's power

| Model | R        | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | F      | Sig      |
|-------|----------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|--------|----------|
| 6     | 0.536(f) | 0.288    | 0.280             | 15.00210                   | 37.476 | 0.000(f) |

Predictors: (Constant), Deference, Priority in talking, husbands' migration, women's training, women's relatives, women's income

In the next step of the study, men's migration, social, economic, cultural, symbolic and demographical resources enter the final model of research as independent variables and their effect on women's power in the family is measured. The results are shown below:

According to table 9, the value of F (37.476) and the significant level (0.000) for the computed equation reveals that it is extremely improbable that R in this population be zero. Thus, there is a significant relationship between women's deference, women's priority in talking, husbands' migration, women's training, women's relatives, and their income as independent variables and women's power in the family in the regression equation.

The value of R (0.536) indicates that there is a strong correlation between these variables. The amount of adjusted R square for the best model is 0.280 which means that these six variables could explain 28.8% of variance of the dependent variable; therefore, this model is acceptable and can be adopted in this study.

Table 10 shows that deference is the first important variable in connection with women's power. The value of 0.437 for its Beta weight shows that 43.7 percent of women's power change is explained by deference. In other words, it can be said that with increase in women's deference in the family, there is an increase in women's power in the family.

Husbands' migration is the second variable that affects women's power. Though this variable is the main factor considered in the study, findings of this study show

that deference is more important in women's power in the family. The amount of Beta is 0.179 and indicates that 17.9 percent of the increase in women's power is explained by husbands' migration.

The third variable is priority in talking. The value of Beta shows that 17.1 percent of the increase in women's power is because of women's priority in talking. Therefore, by increasing women's priority in talking, women's power in the family also increases. Another variable is women's training; the value of 0.11 for its Beta weight shows that 11 percent of women's power is explained by women's training. This relation is direct and positive. Women's relatives are considered as another variable that was included in the equation. It seems that in the families who have more communication with women's relatives, women's power is higher. The sixth variable is women's income; this variable explained only 7.9 percent of the dependent variable.

**Table (10)** Coefficients for independent variables and women's power in multiple regressions

| Model               | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients | T       | Sig.  |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|---------|-------|
|                     | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      |         |       |
| (Constant)          | 89.833                      | 5.485      |                           | 16.378* | 0.000 |
| Deference           | 1.379                       | 0.114      | 0.437                     | 12.12** | 0.000 |
| Priority in talking | 1.048                       | 0.219      | 0.171                     | 4.780** | 0.000 |
| Husbands' migration | 6.311                       | 1.305      | 0.179                     | 4.837** | 0.000 |
| Women's training    | 0.415                       | 0.139      | 0.110                     | 2.987** | 0.003 |
| Women's relatives   | 0.398                       | 0.142      | 0.101                     | 2.803*  | 0.005 |
| Women's income      | 2.826E-05                   | 0.000      | 0.079                     | 2.094*  | 0.037 |

### Conclusion

The findings of the study show that there is a positive relationship between husbands' migration and women's power in the family, but this relationship is not significant. This value grows with longer duration of husbands' absence.

In connection to the study of power in the family among the three groups of



women, it is worth noting that women whose husbands were absent and were out of Lar at the time of the interview had the highest power in the family, followed by those whose husbands were migrants but were in Lar during the interview. Finally, women whose husbands did not migrate had the lowest level of power.

In the first section of the study, the effects of migration on women's resources (economic, social, cultural, symbolic, and demographic resource) have been measured.

**Economic resources:** Husbands' migration increased women's properties (car, computer, shop, land, and cell phone). This increase was related to remittances. But there was not a relationship between husbands' migration and women's savings.

Although the findings of different researches show that women's income increases in the absence of their husbands because they have to work in the farm; but findings of this study are different and most of the women were unemployed. In other words, as noted earlier, husbands' migration caused a decrease in women's income. This is related to Lar's cultural context. Balani (1981), Weist (1983), and Cornelius (1989) noticed non-migrant women as passive. Even as subsistence workers or wage-earners during men's absences, women are considered "secondary" actors. They do not seek to maximize income, but work to supplement their husbands' income when necessary, or "are incorporated into the labor market" rather than actively pursuing job opportunities (Kanaiaupuni, 2000, p.7).

**Social resources:** Husbands' migration caused an increase in communication with women's relatives. In some societies, women whose husbands were absent supported by their husbands' families. Kanaiaupuni (2000) showed that women's behavior and movement are watched vigilantly by husbands' kin. Many of women had negative reactions to their employment, particularly if they worked outside the house, and they were socially stigmatized as unprotected women vulnerable to gossip and innuendo.

Women's use of mass media and social ties were not affected by husbands' migration. Because education level was low among women, many of them could not use mass media, specially newspapers and magazines, books, satellite and the Internet. Although many of them whose husbands were migrants had more communication with other countries (especially Persian Gulf Countries), but their

social ties were not higher than women whose husbands were non-migrants. The first group (whose husbands were migrants) had more responsibilities during husbands' absence and they could not take part in different organizations and social programs.

Husbands' migration caused a decline in women's job status. Women, whose husbands had migrated, accepted all of their husbands' responsibilities when they were out of Lar, so they did not have enough time for other activities.

Cultural resources: There was not a relationship between husbands' migration and women's training. As Kanaiaupuni (2000) indicates, non-migrant women often feel socially isolated and lonely during their spouses' absences. Generally, women are encouraged to remain at home. As relates to their

Symbolic resources: Husbands' migration did not influence women's priority in talking and women's deference in effect. Unfortunately, the value of males is higher than females in traditional societies such as Lar and the phenomenon migration could not change this perspective.

Demographic resources: Migrant families had a higher desire for more children, they believed that children can support the family in the absence of the father.

In the second section of the study, the effects of intermediate variables on women's power in the family have been measured according to Bourdieu and Collins' theories.

Economic resources: Women's property and savings increased their power in the family; however, the effect of property was more than savings. Women's income did not have an effect on their power in the family.

Social resources: Women's social ties, use of mass media and communication with their families had an effect on women's power in the family. On the other hand, women's education and work status did not affect their power in the family, and this is related to the cultural context of their society.

Reading newspapers, books and magazines and staying in touch with the internet and mass media in general can improve women's knowledge, and therefore, change their attitudes. More communication with women's relatives, and better familiarity of the children with their mother's families, results in more respect for women in the family, and consequently, their comments become more effective. Ghaderi (1996), Mahdavi and Sabouri (2003), and Enayat & Dastrang (2009)

indicate that women's employment and education can affect women's power in the family, but the findings of this study did not confirm this relation.

**Cultural resources:** There were positive relationships between women's priority in talking and deference and their power in the family.

Findings of the study shows that an increase in women's resources like economic (employment and salary) and social (education) does not have a strong effect on their power in the family. As mentioned earlier, socio-cultural context of the region is very patriarchal, the value of males is higher than females in Lar and the increasing resources of women cannot change the situation by itself. Women's employment, education and other resources without changes in men's attitudes or structural changes in their families may not necessarily increase their power.

**Demographical resources:** The size of the family, and women's age did not have an affect on women's power. Although husbands' migration increased the size of the family, but the size of family did not have an affect on women's power.

There is a significant relationship between women's deference, women's priority in talking, husbands' migration, women's training, women's relatives, women's income and women's power in the family. In fact, most of the findings of this study have been explained according to the cultural context and traditional attitudes of Lar's society, especially attitudes related to patriarchy in the family. Traditional attitudes in Lar are common because of this fact that most of the women can not use their valuable resources to increase their power in the family. Industrial development in the city of Lar, like other developing countries did not change social attitudes towards women.

Even though women whose husbands were migrants were supposed to see themselves in power more than women whose husbands were non- migrants in carrying out economic, social, and cultural affairs; in reality this was not the case. In fact, they did not actually accept their power in the family in the absence of their husbands.

## References

Abyaneh, P. (1989). Immigrations and Patriarchy; the Case of Iranian Families. *Journal of Women's Studies*. 17, 67-69. Britain: Gordon and Breach.

Ayazi, M.A. and Mohammad Nasehi, M. (2010). Study of Distribution of Power Structure in Marital Relationship in Family from View of Verses and Hadith. *With Woman in Culture and Arts*. Second year, p. 113.

Bahr, K. and Ahlander, N. (1995). Beyond Drudgery, Power & Equity: toward an Expanded Discourse on the Moral Dimensions of Housework in Family. *Journal of Marriage & the Family*. 57 (1), 54-68.

Census of Larestan. (2006). Tehran: Statistical Center Of Iran.

Chant, S. (1997). *Women-headed Households (Diversity and Dynamics in the Developing World)*. Saint Louis: MARTN'S PRESS, INC.

Enayat,H. and Dastrang, M. (2009).The Study of Power Structure in Family; Case Study of Lar City, Iran. *Journal of Women's Research; Women in Development and Politics*. 28, p. 107.

Enayat, H & and Soroush, M. (2008). The Women's Rate and Type of Resistance in Facing the Structure of Power in Daily Life. *Women's Research*. 25, p. 85.

Duroux, R. (2001). The Temporary Migration of Males and the Power of Females in a Stem-Family Society: The Case of 19th-century Auvergn. *History of the Family*. 6 (1), 33-49.

Effati, M. (2003). Tasir Mohajerat Fasli Mardan Bar Fahaliathaye. Retrieved July 20, 2012 , from <http://www.olumensani.com/FA/ArticleView.html?ArticleID=70607&SubjectID=6927>.

Ghaderi, N. (1996). Investigation of Social-Economical Factors Affect Power Structure of Family: A Case Study of Shiraz. M. A. thesis, Shiraz: Shiraz University.

Garousi,s. (2008).The Study of Power Structure in Families in Kerman City. *Journal of Women's studies*. 17, p. 7.

Kanaiaupuni, S. M. (2000). *Sustaining Families and Communities: Non Migrant Women and Mexico-U.S. Migration Processes*. Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin – Madison.

Khani, F. (2004). The outcome of The Men's Individual Immigration on Women's Function in Rural Areas. *Journal of Women's Studies*. 4.

Kiyani, M. et al. (2010). The Study of How Power Distributes in Family; a Model Based on GT; Study of Tehran's Models. *The journal of family research*. 22, p. 175.

Lahsaeizadeh, A. (2004). *Migration and Urbanization*. Shiraz: Zar publication.

Lin, N. (1976). *Foundation of Social Research*. McGraw Hill: New York.

Mahdavi M. S. and Sabouri Khosrowshahi, H. (2003). The Investigation of the Power Structure in the Families. Tehran: Al Zahra University. *Journal of Women's Studies*. 4, 26-65,

Mohammadi, M. (2004). Deference, Women's Power or Men's Violence? *Women's Strategic Studies*. 23, p. 41.

Mousavi, K. (2004). *Power and Leadership in Iran's Contemporary Family; A Sociological*

Study. *The Humanities International Magazine*. Eleventh year, 3, 123 - 132.

Newman, W. L. (1999). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. willingboro: TKM productions.

Rahmani, S. (1996). *The Physiognomy of Larestan*. Qum: The Cultural Institute of Ham-Sayeh.

Ritzer, G. (2000). *Sociological Theory*. Singapore: McGraw-Hill.

Safilos-Rothschild, C. (1986). 'Determinants the Ability of Household Members to Adapt to Social and Economic Changes. Amsterdam: De'Leeuwenborch.

Sakka, D., Dikaiou, M. and Kiosseoglou, G. (1999). Changing Roles of Men and Women. *International Migration*. 37 (42), 742-753.

Turner, J. (2003). *The Structure of Sociological Theory*. Kentucky: Thomson Wadsworth.

Vosoughi, M.B. (2001). *Larestan - What do I know about Iran?* Tehran: Cultural Research Office.

Vosoughi, M.B. (1992). *The History of Larestan*. Shiraz; Rahgosha Publication.

White, J. M. and Klein, D. M. (2002). *Family Theories*. California: Sage Publications.

Zolfagharpour, M., et al. (2004). Analyzing the Relationship between the Structure of Power in the Family and the Women Employees and Housewife's Marital Satisfaction in Tehran. *The journal of Novelties and Consultation Research*. 11, p. 37.

