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Abstract

The present study aims to compare the Sexual Intelligence Quotient (SIQ) in a sample of migrant and non-migrant men and women. 400 participants were selected, divided into four groups: G1: Women born and residing in Mexico; G2: Mexican migrant women living in the United States; G3: Men born and resident in Mexico; G4: Mexican migrant men living in the United States. The sexual intelligence coefficient scale (Millan, Alvarez-Gayou and Pérez, 2012) was applied. A “One Way ANOVA” analysis was performed. The results show significant differences (p < .05) suggesting that at least in this sample, migratory phenomenon and culture are factors that may be related to the coefficient of sexual intelligence. This is a first study of a broader project that will address issues of sexual health, gender roles and gender identities in migrant and non-migrant men and women.
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Introduction:

Gender is an integral part of the migration process. The impacts of migration on women and men depend on many factors, all of which have gender implications. These include: the type of migration (temporary, permanent, irregular, regular, labor, induced by natural disasters or conflicts, independent or as dependent spouse); The policies and attitudes of sending and receiving countries, and gender relations within the household. Gender affects how migrants adapt to the new nation, the degree of contact with the original country and the possibility of return and successful reintegration.

Discrimination and gender norms in the home and society push particular groups of people to migrate in particular ways and others to stay where they are. The way in which this occurs varies according to the different contexts. For example: there may be an expectation that men will financially support the family; So they migrate in order to earn money while their wives are left behind; Migration could be seen as a rite of passage for young men. It may be less acceptable for women to move and travel alone, so migrating may be difficult, or migrate for shorter distances than men, either internally or within the region (as is the case in Africa); The rule may be that the woman moves to the home of her husband's family after marrying; Mothers and fathers might consider it an obligation for their daughters to migrate and send money home to support the family, so they are encouraged to leave (Boyd and Grieco, in Jolly and Reeves, 2005).
Thus, the role of gender as a category of analysis in the migration phenomenon allows a broader perspective to understand sociocultural influences in the construction of identities and forms of interaction between men and women. Gender, sexuality and migration are elements of complex historical-socio-cultural realities with economic and political implications, both in the public and private spheres.

Previous studies have described the relationships between gender and migration in which aspects such as femininity-masculinity and marital satisfaction in migrants and non-migrants have been specified (Ojeda, Melby, Sanchez, Rodarte, 2007); The transformation of the roles of women when the husband migrates (Loza, Vizcarra, Lutz, Quintanar, 2007); Gender, condom use, HIV / AIDS and migration (Cárdenas-Elizalde, 1988; Fosados and Col. 2006; Hernández-Rosete, Sánchez and Pelcastre and Juárez 2005; Gender, human rights and migration (Balbuena, 2003); The influence of gender on the social incorporation of migrants (Giorguli and Itzigsohn, 2006); Sex trade and migration (Agustín, 2002, 2005); Labor trajectories and migration (Papail, 2002) family and migration (Vega, 2003); Even the methodological models that have been used to investigate and understand the relationship between gender and migration as well as the social aspects of migration have been described (Ángeles and Rojas, 2000; Martine, Hakkert and Guzmán, 2000).

At the same time, sexual health has been an issue that has occupied the interest of international institutions such as the World Health Organization. In this sense sexual health has been understood as "a state of physical, emotional, mental and social well-being related to sexuality; It is not merely the absence of disease, dysfunction or weakness. Sexual health requires a positive and respectful approach to sexuality and sexual relations, as well as the possibility of obtaining pleasure and safe sexual experiences, free of coercion, discrimination and violence. For sexual health to be achieved and maintained the sexual rights of all people must be respected, protected and fulfilled".

Sexual rights embrace human rights that are already recognized in national laws, international human rights documents and other consensus documents. These include the right of all persons, free from coercion, discrimination and violence to:

- Achieve the highest levels of health available in relation to sexuality, including access to sexual and reproductive health care services;
- Finding, receiving and sharing information regarding sexuality;
- Sex education;
- Respect for physical integrity;
- The choice of partner;
- Decide to be sexually active or not;
- Consensual sex;
- Consensual marriage;
- Decide whether or not, and when to have children; Y
- To pursue a satisfying and pleasurable sexual life.

In this order of ideas Millán, Álvarez-Gayou and Pérez (2012) describe the concept of Sexual Intelligence Quotient as the integration of three basic aspects: sexual assertiveness, sexual self-knowledge and sexual knowledge; From which they develop an instrument to measure this Quotient.

Method:-

Participants:-
400 participants were selected, divided into four groups:
G1: Women born and residing in Mexico n = 100 (living in Yucatan, Campeche and Tabasco)
G2: Mexican migrant women living in the United States n = 100 (from Michoacán, Tamaulipas, San Luis Potosí, Nuevo León, Mexico)
G3: Men born and resident in Mexico n = 100 (living in Yucatan, Campeche and Tabasco)
G4: Mexican migrant men living in the United States n = 100 (from Michoacán, Tamaulipas, San Luis Potosí, Nuevo León, Puebla and Jalisco)

All migrant men and women were at least 10 years living in the United States (City of Houston Texas).
The average age of each group was: G1: 42 years; G2: 38 years; G3: 45 years; G4: 43 years

The educational level in terms of years of education of the participants was minimum 6 years of education and maximum was 18 years of education.
**Measures:**
The scale of Sexual Intelligence Quotient (Millán, Álvarez-Gayou and Pérez, 2012) was applied. The scale contains 47 items divided into two dimensions:

**D1. Sexual assertiveness and self-knowledge**, included 8 factors:
F1. Guilt, (ex. I feel guilty if I have sexual fantasies.)
F2. Self-consciousness, (ex. I know well my body responses with sexual stimuli.)
F3. Need to please, (ex. It's hard for me to say no in a sexual situation)
F4. Disclosure, (ex. I express what I like and dislike about sex)
F5. Shame, (ex In the exercise of my sexuality, I care a lot what others think of me)
F6. Intolerance, (ex. I hate that someone does not want to have sex with me)
F7. Self-awareness, (ex. I realize when I am sexually attracted to a person)
F8. Respect. (ex. I care that the person I have sex with enjoys it.)

**D2. Measures the level of knowledge that the person has regarding basic aspects of sexuality**. There are 15 items that respond as "true", "false" and "I do not know".
Ex. The condom has pores through which the HIV virus can pass.

**Procedure:**
The first part of the application was made in the cities of Campeche, Merida (Yucatan) and Tabasco in México, the second part of the application was made in the city of Houston Texas. Once the instrument was applied, a statistical analysis was performed comparing the averages of the scores of each factor and the average of the total score of the instrument. A "one way ANOVA" analysis was used to compare the groups.

**Results:**

**Table 1:** Means of the score of each factor for each group.

| FACTORS          | Women G1 Non migrants | Women G2 Migrants | Men G3 Non migrants | Men G4 Migrants |
|------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| F1 GUILT         | 9.8                   | 11.1              | 10.9                | 11.2            |
| F2 SELF-CONSCIOUSNESS | 12.3                | 14.3              | 14.7                | 14.1            |
| F3 NEED TO PLEASE | 11.6                 | 13.6              | 11.7                | 11.2            |
| F4 DISCLOSURE    | 16.9                  | 18.6              | 16.5                | 17.6            |
| F5 SHAME         | 8.6                   | 11.4              | 11.6                | 11.7            |
| F6 INTO TOLERENCE| 12.4                  | 13.8              | 11.4                | 12.3            |
| F7 SELF-AWARENESS| 12.3                 | 13.2              | 12.3                | 12.6            |
| F8 RESPECT       | 16.5                  | 18.3              | 15.6                | 15.9            |
| D2 KNOWLEDGE     | 8.1                   | 11.8              | 9.4                 | 10.7            |
| PT TOTAL SCORE   | 108.5                 | 126.1             | 114.1               | 117.3           |

The table above shows the averages of the scores obtained in each factor and the total score for each group. Below is the graph of each factor and the results obtained from the “one way ANOVA” analysis.
As shown in the previous figure the differences (p < .05) are presented only between the group of non-migrant women and the other groups $F = 6.435$

As shown in the previous figure the differences (p < .05) are presented only between the group of non-migrant women and the other groups $F = 8.329$

As shown in the previous figure the differences (p < .05) are presented only between the group of non-migrant women and the other groups $F = 6.435$
As shown in the previous figure the differences (p < .05) occur only between the group of migrant women and the other three groups $F = 19.367$.

**Fig. 4:** Average scores for factor 4 "disclosure"

As shown in the previous figure, differences (p < .05) were found between the group of migrant women and the other three groups, at the same time between the group of migrant men and the group of non-migrant men and non-migrant women $F = 12.231$.

**Fig. 5:** Average scores for factor 5 "shame"

As shown in the previous figure the differences (p < .05) occur only between the group of non-migrant women and the other groups $F = 7.962$. 
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As shown in the previous figure, the differences (p < .05) were presented between the group of migrant women and the other groups, at the same time between the group of non-migrant men and the groups of non-migrant women and migrant men $F = 15.668$

As shown in the previous figure, the differences (p < .05) occur only between the group of migrant women and the other three groups $F = 11.714$

As shown in the previous figure, the differences (p < .05) were presented between the group of migrant women and the other groups, at the same time between the group of non-migrant men and the groups of non-migrant women and migrant men $F = 15.668$.
As shown in the previous figure, the differences (p < 0.05) were presented between the group of migrant women and the other three groups, at the same time between the group of non-migrant women and the two groups of men $F = 14.854$

![Fig. 9: Average of the scores for the dimension of knowledge](image)

As shown in the previous figure, differences (p < 0.05) were found between the group of migrant women and groups of non-migrant men and women, as well as between the group of migrant men and non-migrant women $F = 21.279$

![Fig. 10: Average of the total scores](image)

As shown in the previous figure, the differences (p < 0.05) were presented only between the group of non-migrant women and the other groups $F = 32.368$

| Table 1: Correlation of the variables age and educational level with factors of the scale |
|---------------------------------|--------|---------------|
| FACTORS                        | Age    | Educational level |
| F1 GUILT                       | **     | **            |
| F2 SELF-CONSCIOUSNESS          |        | **            |
| F4 DISCLOSURE                  | *      |               |
| F5 SHAME                       |        | *             |
| F6 INTOLETANCE                 |        |               |
| F8 RESPECT                     | **     | **            |
| D2 KNOWLEDGE                   |        |               |
| PT TOTAL SCORE                 | *      | **            |

* moderate correlation $>.50$

** strong correlation $>.75$
**Discussion and Conclusions:**
As the results show, the differences between the groups show a clear trend indicating that the migrant women in the sample generally have higher scores than the other groups. In contrast, non-migrant women in the sample have the lowest scores. At the same time, the scores between migrant men and women are more similar than between migrant and non-migrant men.

In the case of correlation, it is clear that age and the years of education (level of education) are related with the almost all factors of the Sexual Intelligence Quotient.

These preliminary results are a first step in a broader investigation involving secondly interviewing migrant and non-migrant women and men with respect to their sexual health and gender roles.

Culture influences the emotional adjustment of individuals and their perception of subjective well-being in different ways. Two great cultural variables that have been taken into account in her study have been the dimensions of Hofstade, Individualism-Collectivism and Masculinity-Femininity.

Individualist cultures emphasize the individual's own needs and thus give more importance to the emotional world of the individual. Some authors have pointed out that this relevance of the emotional in the individualistic cultures is connected with the perception of the quality of life. That is, the subjective quality of life would be a balance between the negative and positive emotions of the individual. Individualist cultures would have higher levels of perception of subjective well-being than collectivist cultures (Diener, Suh, Lucas and Smith, 1999; Suh, Diener, Oishi and Triandis, 1998). On the other hand, collectivist cultures would give greater priority to cohesion with others and individual needs would be subordinated to group priorities. In this sense, collectivist cultures would pay less attention to the world of personal emotions (Fernández-Berrocal, Salovey, Vera, Ramos, Extremera, 2002).

To generate changes in the problematic of the couple and sexuality we require a confrontation with the culture that has given meaning to our lives and identities for more than a century (Rocha, 2008)
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