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This thesis assesses the welfare of immigrants in Greece and examines the changes in their welfare following the outbreak of the economic crisis in 2009. Data from 320 structured interviews and 42 semi-structured interviews with immigrants in urban and rural areas in Greece are analysed through Descriptive Analysis, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and Thematic Analysis. Analysis focuses on three aspects of immigrants’ welfare: (i) labour market integration and income; (ii) living conditions; and (iii) social integration. Among the most distinctive findings are: (i) weakening labour market position of immigrants; (ii) declining ability to financially support themselves and their families; (iii) deteriorating quality of housing and neighbourhood conditions; and (iv) decreasing levels of social integration. It is suggested that those welfare changes are directly linked to the eruption of the Greek economic recession in 2009. Last, this deprivation of immigrants’ welfare is of critical importance for humanitarian reasons, but also due to posing a serious threat for the political and socio-economic stability of Greece and the EU.
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Chapter 1
Introduction

This chapter starts with a presentation of the general context of the thesis by discussing the issue of immigrants’ welfare in Europe. Furthermore, it describes the specific context of the thesis by discussing the issue of immigrants’ welfare in Greece with special focus on the 2009 Greek crisis repercussions on immigrants’ welfare. It explains why Greece was chosen as a case study and it overviews the key argument of the thesis. Moreover, the present chapter discusses terminology and it outlines the key thesis aims. In accord, a description of the methodology applied to pursue those aims is offered accompanied by an overview of the data collection process. Finally, this chapter briefly discusses the theoretical relevance of the thesis and it concludes with a description of the thesis structure.

During the last three decades, the global migrant population has risen significantly, from approximately 154 million people in 1990 to 244 million people in 2015 (UN, 2016). With regards to Europe, it is estimated that one in three of all international migrants live in the European continent and migrants represent 8.7 per cent of the total European population (Eurostat, 2015). In addition, detections of clandestine border crossings into Europe have recently dramatically increased (OECD, 2015) with often devastating and even fatal repercussions for migrants (Carling, 2007; Düvell, 2008; Morehouse and Blomfield, 2011; UNHCR, 2015). So, it is of no surprise that the issue of migration -and its associated multidimensional implications- has been a research topic of ever growing interest for several academic studies (Brettell and Hollifield, 2014; Favell, 2001; Massey, et al., 1993) while being, at present, at the top of political agendas and public discussions (Geiger and Pécoud, 2014; Hansen and Hager, 2013; Krzyzanowski and Wodak, 2011; Van der Brug et al., 2015).

In everyday life, large scale migration is raising serious welfare concerns for everyone involved (Barrett and McCarthy, 2008; Fleischmann and Dronkers, 2010; Hansen and Lofstrom, 2003; Kogan, 2006). Particularly the impact of immigration on the native populations and the domestic institutions has emerged as a highly topical and controversial issue in the public and political realm as well as in literature whereas less attention has been paid to immigrants’ welfare (Adsera and Chiswick, 2007; De Haas, 2008; Dustmann
and Frattini, 2011; Nannestad, 2007; Kofman, 2000). The 2007/2008 international financial crisis has further intensified the interest in the welfare implications of migration (Bevelander and Petersson, 2014; Bratsberg, 2014; Moser and Horn, 2015) while it has been argued that immigrants have suffered more from the impact of the economic recession compared to the native populations. Accordingly, discussions over the states’ ability to protect peoples’ welfare from the effects of the financial downturn are highly topical today (Arai and Vilhelmsson, 2004; Canal-Domínguez and Rodríguez-Gutiérrez, 2008; Prean and Mayr, 2012).

In Europe, Greece was certainly one of the EU countries most severely affected by the economic downturn (Eurostat, 2015). It is indicative that the rates of unemployment in Greece tripled from 2009, the year when the economic crisis erupted, to 2013 (Hellenic Statistical Authority, 2013) while one year later, in 2014, the unemployment rate in Greece was the highest unemployment rate recorded in the EU, that is 26.5% (Eurostat, 2014). The demoralizing effects of the economic recession in Greece have been affecting both its immigrant and native population (Labrianidis and Vogiatzis, 2013; Michail, 2013; Triandafyllidou, 2012). Nevertheless, the difference between the two groups is that immigrants in Greece have traditionally experienced discrimination in the labour and housing market as well as in the social and political sphere in comparison to the natives (Bisin et al., 2011; Cholezas and Tsakloglou, 2008; Hatziprokopiou, 2004; Lazaridis and Wickens, 1999; Markova and Sarris, 1997).

A number of authors have emphasized the vulnerable position of immigrants in Greece throughout the last years and particularly since Greece was transformed to an immigration country in the beginning of the 1990s (e.g. see Bisin et al., 2011; Drudakis and Vlassis, 2010; Cholezas and Tsakloglou, 2008; Hatziprokopiou, 2004; Lazaridis and Wickens, 1999; Markova and Sarris, 1997; Maroukis, 2013). However, there is one issue that seems to be relatively understudied in the literature. That is the repercussions of the 2009 economic crisis in Greece on the welfare of immigrants. What can be said with certainty, though, is that, no matter their roots, the effects of the crisis on immigrants’ welfare occurred in the realm of an insufficiently developed legal framework on immigration, an ineffective welfare state with an in-built bias against immigrants living in Greece and a widespread system of immigrants’ precarious employment often falling outside the scope
of the Law (e.g. see Drydakis, 2012; Konsta and Lazaridi, 2010; Petmesidou and Guillén, 2014).

Greece was chosen as a case study because: (i) it allows the analysis of immigration under extraordinary conditions of severe economic recession (Meghir et al., 2010; Reinhart and Trebesch, 2015); (ii) it lacks an efficient and well-organized welfare state able to safeguard effectively the welfare of the vulnerable members of the Greek society (Ioakimidis and Teloni, 2013; Matsaganis, 2013); (iii) it constitutes a significant gateway to Europe for immigrants while being in the frontline for handling the overwhelming majority of asylum claims in the EU according to the Dublin regulations\textsuperscript{1} (Carrera and Gros, 2015; European Commission, 2015; Magliveras, 2011; Moraga and Rapoport, 2015); and (iv) the political unrest in the Middle Eastern and North African countries in combination to the geographical closeness of Greece to these countries classifies Greece as a geopolitically sensitive location in regards to immigration (Michaletos, 2011; Spinthourakis and Antonopoulou, 2011).

The key argument of the thesis is that the 2009 economic crisis took a heavy toll on immigrants’ welfare while it had a disproportionately negative effect on certain immigrant groups (depending mainly on immigrants’ specific employment patterns and exposures which were in turn dependent on immigrants’ gender and origin).

In regards to terminology, there is no general consensus in neither academia nor the public domain on the definition of the term “immigrant”. It is, furthermore, essential one to distinguish between defining immigrants by region of origin or by “entry category”\textsuperscript{2} given the implications this distinction generates (mainly for immigrants’ rights and entitlements, academic research purposes and public policy formulation and implementation.

\textsuperscript{1} The Dublin convention regulates that only one EU country is responsible for processing asylum applications; that country is the initial EU country of entry of the asylum applicants. Hence, apprehended undocumented immigrants from all EU countries can be reallocated to the initial EU country of entry for the examination of their legal cases and they remain in this country until their legal cases are resolved.

\textsuperscript{2} The most common “entry categories” are labour, education, family reunification and humanitarian protection (The Migration Observatory, 2016).
objectives). So, a few observations may offer assistance in defining the term immigrant for the purposes of this thesis.

In a broad perspective, the term immigrant is frequently used to define “one who migrates into a country as a settler” (Oxford English Dictionary, 2007). Within the EU context and in the thesis theoretical framework, an immigrant is defined as a person who “establishes their usual residence in the territory of a Member State for a period that is, or is expected to be, of at least 12 months, having previously been usually resident of another Member State or a third country” (European Migration Network, 2014). In the thesis’ empirical framework, immigrants are again defined by region of origin (using the aforementioned European Migration Network definition) and they are further grouped into five origin groups (i.e. the Balkans, Eastern Europe, Asia, Africa and the Middle East). This definition method was adopted due to its’ usefulness for data collection and analysis purposes (for further details see Chapter 3).

The rationale of defining immigrants by region of origin instead of by “entry category” for the purposes of this thesis may be described as follows: First, the heterogeneity of immigration in Greece from the early 1990s until the early 2010s (which is the focus period of the thesis empirical research) was relatively low; despite their legal categories, most immigrants would come to Greece from poorer countries in search of employment (see Chapter 4). Second, given the complexity of the Greek immigration law and the high number of undocumented immigrants in Greece (see Chapter 4), defining immigrants by region of origin was judged to be more objective than defining immigrants by “entry category”.

There is, furthermore, no general academic or public consensus on the definition of the term “refugee” either. Nonetheless, in the context of the thesis the refugee definition by the United Nation Refugee Agency will be adopted. More precisely, as refugee is defined as one who is unable or unwilling to accept protection provided by his country of origin and thus, he is forced to migrate into another country due to persecution; in this context, the term “persecution” refers to a threat to a person’s life or freedom due to his race, religion, nationality, political opinion or membership in a particular social group (The United Nation Refugee Agency, 2016).
Moreover, the definition of the term “citizenship” by the European Migration Network is adopted in this thesis. In detail, the word “citizenship” denotes a specific legal relationship between an individual and his or her state. An individual is granted citizenship of a state by means of birth or naturalisation, by declaration, choice, marriage or other means under national legislation. If an individual is not citizen of the state in which he or she resides, then he or she is considered a foreign citizen. As foreign citizen is also characterized a stateless person (i.e. someone with no registered citizenship or nationality) as well as the individual whose citizenship is unknown. As foreign-born is broadly characterized the individual who is born outside of his or her country of residence (European Migration Network, 2014).

Finally, in the present thesis, immigrants’ welfare is defined as consisting of the three constructs which emerged as the guiding concepts of the empirical research of the thesis; these are, immigrants’ labour market integration and income, living conditions and social integration (for a detailed discussion see Chapter 3).

The key aims of this thesis are as follows: (i) to examine the legal framework on migration to Greece and the position of immigrants in the Greek welfare state; (ii) to address the issue of immigrants’ welfare by looking into immigrants’ labour market and housing market integration as well as the conditions of their integration in the Greek society; (iii) to ascertain the effects of the recession on immigrants’ welfare by analysing self-collected quantitative and qualitative data measuring their welfare (i.e. labour market integration and income; living conditions; social integration) prior and during the economic crisis; (iv) to analyse the nature of those welfare effects and the reasons for which they occurred; and (v) to examine whether the economic crisis had varied effects on different immigrant groups (focusing on immigrants’ gender and region of origin), to identify the nature of these varied effects and the reasons for which they existed.

A mixed methods approach combining quantitative and qualitative methodologies was implemented to address the key aims of the thesis. This approach was adopted because it facilitates the wide breadth of this research. It also allows gaining depth of understanding of the research objectives (Johnson and Onwuegbuzie, 2004) and it facilitates placing emphasis on diversity in all different phases of the research process (Denzin and Lincoln, 2011). Quantitative data collection took place between August and September 2012 and
it involved 320 participants while qualitative data collection was conducted in April and August 2013 and it involved 42 participants.

This thesis studies immigrants’ welfare in a country that was recently and rapidly transformed from a mono-cultural emigration country to a multi-cultural immigration country in the beginning of the 1990s while lacking (and still being in lack of) sufficient state, legal and social structures able to facilitate immigrants’ integration and protect effectively their welfare. Data collection was, furthermore, conducted in a time when the country was confronted with unparalleled economic, political and social conditions and challenges. So, the collected data allowed for the comparison of immigrants’ welfare prior and during the 2009 economic crisis. Particularly, data analysis enabled the investigation of changes in immigrants’ welfare following the eruption of the recession while taking into consideration their background characteristics (i.e. their gender and region of origin) allowing for the identification of immigrant groups that were more (or less) vulnerable to the recession impact. Overall, the thesis provides new empirical evidence and insights into the relatively understudied matter of immigrants’ welfare in an EU country that has been on the verge of economic and political collapse for seven successive years (i.e. from 2009 to 2016) while lacking an effective public policy and a functional legal framework on migration. In accord, the thesis affirms the inefficiency of the social security system for immigrants in Greece and thus, it strengthens the view that the Southern European welfare model is ineffective in providing adequate welfare support for people in need, especially in times of economic turmoil (e.g. see Antonopoulos, 2006; BaldwinEdwards, 2002; Bloemraad, et al., 2008; De Hart, 2008; Featherstone and Papadimitriou, 2008; Ferrera, 1996; Guild et al., 2009; Joppke, 2010; Rhodes, 1997).

The thesis is structured as follows: Chapter 2 situates the issue of immigrants’ welfare in the European context. Hence, it considers the welfare state regimes of Europe and the process of social policy harmonization at the EU level. It overviews the relative economic welfare of immigrants and natives in the EU and it examines the eligibility of those two groups for welfare provision vis-à-vis their actual rates of welfare receipt. Finally, it concludes on the matter of immigrants’ economic welfare and social protection in the countries of Europe. Chapter 3 describes the methodology employed in order to meet the key aims of the thesis. It explains why a mixed methods approach was adopted combining quantitative and qualitative methodologies and it discusses quantitative and qualitative
data collection and analysis considerations. Chapter 4 places the issue of immigration in the Greek context. More precisely, it reviews the demographic, legal and socio-economic aspects of immigration in Greece with special focus in the period from the early 1990s until the early 2010s. Chapters 5, 6 and 7 discuss the welfare of immigrants in Greece and the repercussions of the 2009 economic recession on key aspects of their welfare by means of analysing and discussing relevant academic studies and primary data (i.e. self-collected quantitative and qualitative data). More precisely, Chapter 5 focuses on immigrants’ integration in the Greek economy and their position in the labour market; Chapter 6 describes immigrants’ living conditions (i.e. their economic status, housing integration and accommodation conditions) in Greece; and, Chapter 7 centres on the conditions of immigrants’ social integration and the levels of their social integration in Greece. Lastly, Chapter 8 overviews the key insights of the thesis, it discusses the thesis’ theoretical relevance, methodological innovation (and limitations) and it provides policy recommendations as well as suggestions for future research.
Chapter 2

The Welfare of Immigrants across the EU: a literature review

2.1. Introduction

Each migration period has unique characteristics while migration events have only little similarity across different parts of the world. Nonetheless, the need for adequate social protection of immigrants is always topical particularly in Southern Europe where an efficient welfare system is a goal yet to be achieved (Arango and Finotelli, 2009). Also, what scholars have found so far highlights the vulnerability of the immigrant population -especially in this part of Europe- and in respect with most aspects of life. The topicality of the issue of immigrants’ welfare has further increased on the account of the 2007/2008 international financial downturn and the inefficiency of state mechanisms to revert the negative consequences of the economic recession on peoples’ welfare (Prean and Mayr, 2012). So, migration constitutes a recurrent topic the study of which is important for gaining a better understanding of its nature and multifaceted dimensions. The lessons we gain by studying this intriguing matter are of great value for promoting academic knowledge but also for public policy formation purposes. Indeed, the development of public policies aiming at the protection of the vulnerable members of our society needs to be constantly informed by relevant academic research and vice versa.

With this in mind, this chapter provides the necessary conceptual tools for the study of immigration, with special focus on the study of immigrants’ welfare. More precisely, section 2.2 offers the theoretical context for studying the economic welfare and social protection of immigrants and natives in Europe. In doing so, the famous study by Esping-Andersen (1990) “The three worlds of capitalism” together with the work by other well-known authors, like the “Southern model’ of welfare in social Europe” by Ferrera (1996), are used as a guide for the distinction between different welfare regimes and as a reference point for the assessment of core welfare principles, policies and outcomes in four parts of Europe, namely, Anglo-Saxon countries, Scandinavian countries, countries of the Continental Europe and Southern European countries. The relative economic welfare of immigrants and natives in Europe is, furthermore, analysed and discussed by looking at certain economic constructs (i.e. labour market participation, unemployment, over-qualification, income and risk of poverty and/or social exclusion). Recent studies on the
welfare implications of the 2007/2008 international financial crisis on the immigrant population in Europe are also taken into consideration.

In section 2.3, the identification of the key characteristics of the most distinctive welfare regimes and the analysis of the relative economic welfare of immigrants and natives are further used for analysing immigrants’ welfare protection in Europe. Particularly, immigrants’ eligibility to welfare provision across Europe and their actual levels of welfare receipt (in comparison to the native population) are analysed for assessing whether immigrants are adequately supported by the European welfare states. Special reference is made to the South European welfare states where the division between welfare state “insiders” and “outsiders” is highly evident, generating serious welfare support gaps; as anticipated, those gaps impact negatively on the welfare of the vulnerable members of the Southern European societies. Finally, in section 2.4 the key insights of this chapter are discussed in light of the multidimensional challenges generated by the currently unfolding European refugee crisis.

2.2. Welfare state regimes and the economic welfare of immigrants and natives in Europe: a comparative analysis

This section offers the theoretical background for studying the impact of welfare state arrangements on immigrants’ welfare in the EU. As background for this study, I will briefly present: (i) the historical developments towards social policy co-ordination at the EU level; (ii) the most distinctive welfare regimes across the EU; (iii) the levels of welfare provision those welfare regimes provide; (iv) the classification of EU countries into the aforementioned welfare regimes; and (v) the relative economic welfare of immigrants and natives in the EU. This brief presentation will shed light into the links between immigration and the welfare state in the EU context and it will form the basis for the assessment of immigrants’ social protection across the EU. Particular interest is devoted to the social protection gaps which affect greatly the vulnerable parts of the population, especially in the countries of Southern Europe; those gaps will be further proposed as a possible explanation of the inefficient social protection of immigrants in this part of Europe.
2.2.1. The harmonization of social policy at the EU level

Büchs (2007) argues that, historically, there have been attempts at the EU level towards the harmonization of social policy (i.e. towards the alignment of the conditions of social protection in the EU member states). Hence, at present day, several EU countries share certain common principles as well as similar institutional characteristics and comparable courses of evolution of their welfare state systems (Bercusson, 2009). Yet, these welfare state systems are also characterized by distinctive social policy organization and arrangements given their different historical developments and public policy priorities (Eikemo et al., 2008). In particular, in each welfare state system there is a distinct kind of affiliation between the family, social policy and the labour market (Atkinson, 2009). Thus, today, the conditions of social protection are quite dissimilar in different parts of the EU.

The debate about the harmonization of the EU member states’ social policy was initiated in the 1950s (Eurofound, 2010). In those early days, the outcome of this debate between the six founding countries of the European Economic Community (i.e. Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg and the Netherlands) was not to include harmonization in the Treaty of Rome (1956) as one of the preconditions for the implementation of the Common Market (Baldwin, 2008). And, during the 1970s and the 1980s, every EU-enlargement\(^1\) was gradually making the prospect of harmonization pragmatically less feasible, as it was increasing diversity between the member states. In addition, the variety of social protection systems gradually stopped being perceived as a source of competition distortion and as non-compliable with free labour mobility across the EU. Hence, at this point, it was decided that the process of harmonization should not be legally imposed and that, social policy will remain in the domain of national competence of the member states\(^2\) (Esenturk, 2010).

After the Single European Act (1986), which was the first major revision of the Treaty of Rome (1957) and which led to the creation of the Single Market in 1992 (Hiller and Kruse, 2010), the European Commission began to seek the implementation of a social dimension for the supranational European Community of the time (Eurofound, 2010). Hence, in 1989 the Community Chapter of the Fundamental Social Rights of Workers was adopted by

---

\(^{1}\) 1973: Denmark, Ireland and United Kingdom; 1981: Greece; 1986: Portugal and Spain.

\(^{2}\) European Community report 1982.
declaration by all member states, except from the United Kingdom\(^1\). This significant and symbolic agreement set out the fundamental values based on which the European labour law model as well as the European social model were shaped in the following years (Bercusson, 2009). In addition, the basic social rights outlined in the Community Chapter were afterwards included in the Chapter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union. More importantly, the subject Chapter of Fundamental Rights became legally binding, through the ratification of the Treaty of Lisbon in 2009 (Eurofound, 2010). The social rights guaranteed on the grounds of the EU were among others the following: the prohibition of child labour, the workers’ right of collective bargaining and action, the guarantee of working conditions that respect safety, health and dignity, the entitlement to social security benefits and social services in cases like illness, maternity and loss of employment (Guild, 2010).

In more recent years, the Lisbon Strategy, declared by the European Council in Lisbon in 2000, set out a number of actions facilitating among others the convergence of national social policies in order to promote in a time span of ten years social cohesion together with sustainable and knowledge-based economic growth across the EU (Lundvall and Lorenz, 2012). The success of the Lisbon Strategy (which was revised to Europe 2020 in 2010) has often, though, been contested (Copeland and Papadimitriou, 2012; Van Vliet, 2010). Indeed, the policy practice which is the most frequently used in the EU can be described as follows: Specific and commonly decided targets at the EU level are pursued and accomplished at the national level. For instance, in recent years the establishment of adequate and sustainable pensions have been at the top of the EU social policy agenda and the decentralised governments have been working singularly towards this common direction. This practice embeds the subsidiarity principle (Tholoniat, 2010). As described in the Treaty of Maastricht (1992), this principle means that the EU is given central competencies only in those occasions where there are reasonable grounds to expect that a centralised policy will produce better outcomes for the member states than a decentralised policy (Lejour, 2007). So, public policy formation evolves with respect to the diversity of the welfare systems across the EU (Tholoniat, 2010).

\(^1\) J. Major, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom stated at the time: “You keep social Europe and we will keep the jobs”.
2.2.2. Welfare state regimes across the EU

The diversity of welfare provision across the EU countries is well documented in literature (e.g. Eikemo et al., 2008; Ferrera, 2009; Schubert et al., 2009). This diversity allows the classification of the EU welfare states into different welfare regimes. In facilitating this process, Arts and Gelissen (2002) developed the following criteria for the general categorization of different welfare states into welfare regimes: the level of selectiveness (i.e. who is eligible for what), the range of covered risks, the structure of benefits and services, the sources of funding and the organizational settings. These criteria and others such as core values and social objectives may lead to several alternative welfare state typologies. However, the most well-known and influential typology of welfare states is described by Esping-Andersen in his study “The three worlds of capitalism” (1990) (Andreß and Heien, 2001; Goodin et al., 1999; Manow, 2004; Pierson, 2000).

As discussed by Esping-Andersen (1990), the welfare state can be found in three variations: as a social democratic, a liberal or a corporatist regime. There are four fundamental differences that underline each of these welfare types. First, each of them implements a unique level of decommodification (i.e. a unique level of citizens’ reliance on their social rights for meeting their needs). Second, the stratifying effects of social policies vary significantly in reference to each type of welfare regime. Third, the distinctive nature of each welfare regime generates a distinct relationship between the family, the market and the state in regards to social provision. Fourth, the dynamics generated between the structure of employment and the welfare state are in accord with the prevalent characteristics of each welfare regime. Building upon Esping-Andersen’s welfare typology, the EU welfare states can be clustered according to the degree of their resemblance to each of the three above-mentioned welfare regimes (i.e. social democratic, liberal, corporatist).

Social-democratic welfare regime

In regards to the Scandinavian countries, their welfare states resemble the social democratic regime. Promotion of equality and solidarity as well as commitment to full employment and income protection are among the fundamental concepts that orchestrate the function of this welfare regime. The basic aim of the welfare state is embedded in the protection of citizens’ social status while social protection is considered fundamental right of each citizen. Thus, the social security net includes all citizens (Goodin et al., 1999). In
particular, all citizens are entitled to universalistic welfare programmes, but these programmes are further adjusted to the individual needs of each citizen (Andreß and Heien, 2001). The political mobilisation of workers is very intense and generous welfare entitlements allows them independence from the market. At the same time, though, the attainment of the welfare system relies greatly, in terms of cost, on the majority of citizens being in employment. Consequently, the right to work is greatly protected and it has the same status as the right of income protection (Manow, 2004). In relation to the fusion of the welfare state and the family, a social democratic welfare state is strongly interventionist; hence, it is responsible for the welfare of the people in need, the aged and the children, irrespective of the support they might be receiving from their families (Sørensen, 2005). In addition, strong gender egalitarianism is promoted through widespread gender egalitarian policies (e.g. parental leave and public daily childcare), which, among others, lead to high employment rates among women (Iversen and Stephens, 2008).

Liberal welfare regime

The Anglo-Saxon countries of Europe (i.e. Ireland and the United Kingdom) bear a resemblance to the liberal model of welfare state (Eikemo et al., 2008). Some of the most distinctive characteristics of this model are liberal policies (e.g. universal health and multiculturalism), market economy, welfare residualism and low levels of state intervention in the labour market regulation. The principal values embedded in this type of welfare state are citizens’ autonomy and independence. So, the welfare role of the state is characterized as marginal, whereas, the welfare role of the market is seen as central. In addition, the core purpose of a liberal welfare state is the combat against poverty (Esping-Andersen, 1990). More precisely, universal transfers in a liberal regime are quite modest and the clientele of the welfare state consists mainly of people with low income, members of the working class and people whose lives are dependent on state provision (e.g. people with serious health problems) (Valeyeva et al., 2011). The recipients of welfare provision are frequently subject to strict entitlement criteria as well as to extensive means-tested assessment. The rationale behind means-tested social assistance is that it constitutes an effective way of ensuring that only people who cannot participate in the labour market receive nonmarket income (Andreß and Heien, 2001). Nonetheless, social provision for an extended number of risks is in place; particularly in health care, the risk coverage is universal (Bambra, 2005). Despite the provision of welfare support for an extended
number of risks, the liberal model of welfare is very efficient in keeping the cost of the welfare state at low levels (Goodin et al., 1999) while the levels of public employment are lower than in the Scandinavian countries, where welfare support is provided for a comparably larger number of risks (Ngai and Pissarides, 2008). In relation to the financing of social services, these are funded by the revenues of general taxation. Cash benefits, in particular, are also partially financed by social insurance payments (Jensen, 2008). As a final note, the liberal welfare state fails to significantly reduce poverty and social inequality levels (Häusermann and Schwander, 2010).

Corporatist welfare regime

In regards to the corporatist welfare regime, this is found in the countries of continental Europe (i.e. in Germany, France, Austria and the Benelux countries). The primary values of the corporatist welfare regime are embedded in the solidarity of the group, the social economy of the market and in mutual helping social policies. The fundamental value rooted in this type of welfare system is social cohesion while the principal goal is attainment of security and stability (Castles and Mitchell, 1991). The right to social provision derives from the citizens’ position in both the labour market and the family and its’ redistributive impact is negligent. In regards with the fusion between the welfare state and the family, the welfare role of the state is subsidiary and thus, the welfare role of the family is central (Humpage, 2010). In relation to the structure of social provision, different occupational groups are entitled to different welfare benefits and the level of these benefits is relatively equivalent to the level of social contributions paid. The source of funding for this kind of social provision is social insurance payments. In addition, welfare benefits are generally characterized by generous replacement rates and extended coverage of risks (Andreß and Heien, 2001) while the levels of public spending are high, financed by high levels of general taxation. Nevertheless, not all social groups are eligible to social assistance. In contrast, there is segmentation in the coverage of population, which takes the form of different rules for different social categories. Hence, a gap between secure insiders and insecure outsiders is created (Bambra, 2007). Also, the segmented labour market (mainly in the disadvantage of women) generates strong dualism in the distribution of economic and social capital (Häusermann and Schwander, 2010). Finally, in regards to the performance of the corporatist model, it provides very significant income security and stability but, it fails to considerably reduce poverty levels (Goodin et al., 1999).
As a concluding note, the social democratic model excels in the combat of poverty and in the reduction of income inequality (Goodin et al., 1999). In relation to health inequality, though, there is no solid evidence to suggest that health inequalities in the social democratic countries are less significant than in the countries of the liberal or the corporatist welfare regime. Yet, all Scandinavian countries, apart from Finland, display relatively less significant social inequalities in mortality (Siegrist and Marmot, 2009). Furthermore, the labour market in the countries belonging to the social democratic regime is less segmented than in the countries of the liberal or the corporatist welfare regime. In addition, the social democratic welfare state is more efficient in the combat against primary inequalities and inequalities generated by the labour market. Hence, even though in the Scandinavian countries there are significant aggregate wage gaps, these are considerably counterbalanced by means of taxes and social transfers (Häusermann and Schwander, 2010).

**Southern European welfare regime**

In relation to Southern European countries (i.e. Greece, Italy, Portugal and Spain), some scholars have made the case that Southern Europe has an underdeveloped welfare state model. This is mainly attributed to three key factors: first, the range of available social services is very limited (Ferrera, 1996); second, welfare provision is characterized as residual for the majority of the population and so, the involvement of the Church and the family in the provision of social protection is vital and notably widespread; third, the economic structures of Southern Europe are dualistic in the sense that a large share of the population is working under precarious conditions while the size of the hidden economy is very large. Those three key factors have granted the description of the Southern European welfare regime as a rudimentary welfare state of the Latin periphery (Leibfried, 1993). Taking as an example Italy, Esping-Andersen (1990) argues that Italy does not belong to a distinctive welfare state regime. In contrast, Italy has adopted a variation of the corporatist welfare state model. On the one hand, social provision is segmented on the basis of employment related criteria. On the other hand, family has a central role in the provision of various forms of social security. This role is often vital as in a plethora of cases the welfare state is literally absent.

Nevertheless, Ferrera (1996) argues that Southern Europe should be distinguished as a separate welfare regime as he sees in the countries of Southern Europe a discrete welfare
state model, with common institutional characteristics and common problems. More precisely, the financing of social provision by social contributions is among the most prevalent common institutional characteristics of the Southern European welfare regime. General taxation also contributes to the funding of social provision but, to a much smaller extent and mainly in specific areas of social care (e.g. in health care). A distinct characteristic of the Southern European welfare states is also nepotism. Nepotism is deeply rooted in this area of Europe and it provokes two main effects: first, nepotism causes the underdevelopment of family related benefits and services, as family is frequently left with no choice than to “substitute” an absent welfare state. With the intervention of the family, the need for social provision becomes no longer intensive and so, a perpetual cycle is maintained.

Second, nepotism leads to low female employment rates. For instance, very often, women need to stay home and take care of a dependent member of the family, which the welfare state has neglected (Ferrera, 1996). Also, social benefits in Southern Europe are disproportionately distributed in favour of the elderly (as opposed to the non-elderly) members of the society. One of the implications of this disproportionate distribution is the underdevelopment of child care. Hence, child care falls almost entirely on the shoulders of the family and more precisely on the shoulders of the female members of the family (Esping-Andersen, 1994). So, overall, the inadequacy of the safety net in Southern Europe is closely linked to the over-reliance on family for the provision of welfare support (Saraceno, 2003). Welfare support is also often enhanced by community work and by the altruistic work of non-governmental organizations (Arriba and Moreno, 2002).

Besides lacking efficient and rational administrations, Southern European welfare states also share a plethora of problems (Ferrera, 1997). The most prevalent and distinctive common problem of the South European welfare regime is dualism. In detail, the social security net in Southern Europe is insufficiently developed. The welfare state is very generous -and sometimes extremely generous- towards insiders while social protection for outsiders is seriously problematic (Ferrera, 1996). Unavoidably, those peaks of generosity towards privileged groups of the population in combination with the serious gaps in the social protection of the unprivileged strata of the population generate polarization in society (Rhodes, 1997).
The anti-poverty performance of the Southern European welfare state is, furthermore, seriously problematic as all social benefits, apart from most retirement programs, fail to reduce poverty considerably (Ioakimidis and Teloni, 2013). The major reason is that social assistance is underdeveloped and patchy. The complexity of the social security system, in combination with its’ administrative weakness, constitute additional reasons for the limited receipt of social benefits by those in need (Matsaganis et al., 2003). Greece, for instance, lacks a national universalistic minimum income support scheme (Venieris, 2013). Additionally, the administrative incapacity of the state in Southern Europe generates a costly benefit provision process for both the providers and the receivers of social assistance and thus, it further hinders the provision of welfare support (Saraceno, 2003). The most affected social groups by the problematic anti-poverty performance of the Southern European welfare state are the following: First, long-term unemployed; due to their long absence from employment their right for unemployment compensation has been exhausted. Second, new entrants to the labour market; as they have no previous employment record, they are not eligible for unemployment benefits. And third, precarious employees; due to their precarious working conditions, they have no social entitlement for social assistance (Matsaganis et al., 2003).

As a final point, the effects of the recent international financial crisis have brought the welfare states of Southern Europe under notable strain. In addition, widespread fiscal austerity in the wake of the Eurozone crisis, particularly in Greece and Portugal, have in fact augmented the long-established inefficiency of the Southern European welfare states in the provision of adequate social assistance (Petmesidou and Guillén, 2014). Focusing on Greece, the long and deep economic downturn has highlighted and augmented the serious gaps in the supply of social protection. In particular, the long-established distinction between welfare state insiders and outsiders continued to generate a complex and unequal system of welfare cleavages. In short, the welfare state continued to favour employees in the public sector over employees in the private sector, self-employed employees over salary earners, standard over atypical, precarious workers, middle aged over younger employees and male over female workers. Additional expressions of this problematic social provision include considerable allowances for large families and no, or very limited, allowances for families with up to two children and inadequate rent support schemes that often fail to provide assistance to poor families. Also, despite the severity of the economic crisis and the rapid unemployment increase, Greece continued to lack a “last resort” social
assistance scheme and unemployment insurance continued to be provided for a maximum period of twelve months with less than complete coverage (Matsaganis, 2012). As a result, in the wake of the increasingly problematic social policies for the people in need, the significance of family care (mainly provided by female family members) has become increasing important. This constant and progressively evident substitution of formal social support mechanisms by informal social support mechanisms has brought “the crisis into the households” and has created “invisible” crisis victims (Lyberaki and Tinios, 2014).

2.2.3. The relative economic situation of immigrants and natives in the EU Having assessed the core social principles and welfare arrangements across Europe, our attention is drawn upon the relative economic welfare of immigrants and natives in the EU. Particularly since the eruption of the 2007/2008 international financial crisis, the study of this crucial issue has gained growing academic attention and significance. More precisely, a number of studies have demonstrated the various challenges confronted by immigrants in the European labour markets (e.g. Bisin et al., 2011; Blume et al., 2007; Ekberg, 2011). Those studies offer, among others, various indications that the prosperity of immigrants in Europe is at considerable risk. For example, in 2007, immigrants in Europe exhibited, on average, lower rates of receipt of social provisions compared to the native population even though they were at greater risk of poverty and social exclusion (Barret and Maître 2011). In addition, in the recession years 2008 and 2009, there was a higher increase in unemployment rates among immigrants than among natives in all EU countries with the exception of Luxembourg and the UK (IOM, 2010) placing immigrants at even higher risk of poverty and social exclusion. So, with the purpose of gaining a more spherical and topical view of the welfare of immigrants in Europe, the following section looks into the relative economic situation and labour market position of immigrants and natives across Europe, with special focus on the years following the eruption of the recent international financial crisis.

Immigrants had significantly lower employment rates than natives between 2009 and 2012. Also, the employment rates for immigrants decreased significantly during the same period (i.e. from 2009 to 2012) particularly in Hungary, Greece and Denmark. It should be noted, though, that this observation does not apply to Slovenia and Malta where immigrants experienced an increase in their employment rates during the same period (OECD, 2014). Furthermore, the low employment rates of immigrant women, particularly
of those with at least one child, appears to be the main reason behind the difference in the employment rates between the foreign-born and the native-born populations. In addition, in the period from 2009 through 2012 immigrant women had considerably lower employment rates than native women. A larger than 15% disparity between the employment rates of immigrant and native women was found in Sweden, Slovenia, Finland, France, Germany and the Netherlands. However, this phenomenon was reversed in Malta, Cyprus, Italy, Luxembourg and Greece where women of foreign background had higher employment rates than native women during the same years under consideration (Eurostat, 2014).

Immigrants’ labour force participation rate constitutes another enlightening indicator of immigrants’ economic situation in the EU. More precisely, immigrants participate notably less in the European labour force compared to the natives. The low labour force participation of immigrants may be partly responsible for their constantly higher unemployment rates relative to the ones of the native population (Eurostat, 2014) It is revealing that, the foreign-born population in the EU had 5.69 percentage points higher unemployment rates compared to the native-born population in the year 2012 (see Figure 1). This observation applies to both genders, with immigrant women experiencing even higher unemployment rates than immigrant men. Also, the largest disparity between the unemployment rates for native-born and foreign-born populations was found in Spain, Belgium and Greece while the only countries where unemployment was higher among natives than among immigrants was Poland, Slovakia and Hungary (see Figure 1) (OECD, 2014). Last, unemployed immigrants are also more likely than unemployed natives to become long-term unemployed. This is particularly true for non-EU born immigrants. For instance, in Denmark the levels of long-term unemployment for immigrants from non-EU countries are five times higher than the levels of long-term unemployment for natives (Fleischmann and Dronkers, 2010).
Figure 1. Disparity (%) in unemployment rates between foreign-born and native-born populations in various EU countries, 2012

Source: OECD, 2014

A closer examination of the foreign-born population in the EU also reveals the significance of the duration of immigrants’ stay in their host country. As the duration of residence in the migrant-receiving country expands, the employment opportunities for immigrants increase (Eurostat, 2013). Also, first generation-immigrants have, on average, worse labour market outcomes in terms of unemployment than second generation immigrants. This may be partly attributed to the fact that immigrants’ children usually have a less strong ethnic identity than their parents and the stronger the ethnic identity of immigrants, the worse their employment opportunities (Bisin et al., 2011).

Taking into consideration the factor of citizenship, non-national EU citizens (i.e. immigrants who have citizenship of an EU member state but are residents of another EU member state) confront less labour market disadvantages than non-EU nationals (i.e. immigrants with foreign citizenship who are residents of an EU member state) (Eurostat, 2014). It is revealing that the unemployment rates of non-national EU citizens and non-EU nationals were 12.5% and 21.3% respectively during 2012. Also, the highest unemployment rates for non-EU nationals were recorded Spain (i.e. 38.6%), Greece (i.e. 35.2%) and Sweden (i.e. 30.5%). Indeed, Sweden offers an illustrative example of the
weaker labour market position of non-EU born immigrants compared to EU-born immigrants. As argued by Ekberg (2011), the impact of the economic recession upon EU born immigrants and natives was of similar severity. However, non-EU born immigrants suffered notably more by the economic crisis compared to both population groups (i.e. their position in the Swedish labour market deteriorated remarkably more). Furthermore, according to Fleischmann and Dronkers (2010), non-EU born immigrants are mainly originating from countries with lower political stability and freedom as well as with lower levels of GDP per capita compared to their countries of destination. The different levels of those political and economic indicators are usually linked with significantly higher risk of unemployment for non-EU-born immigrants in comparison to EU-born immigrants.

Moreover, high-skilled immigrants are considerably more likely to be employed in low or medium skilled occupations than high-skilled natives in the EU. This observation applies for both genders with immigrant women being a less favourable position than immigrant men in terms of skills downgrading (see Table 1). As indicated by OECD (2015), the difference in the over-qualification rates between native and immigrant employees was particularly high in Greece, Italy, Spain, Cyprus and Estonia during 2012 (the over-qualification rate is defined as the proportion of the employed population, with high levels of education, being occupied in low and medium skills jobs). According to Reyneri and Fullin (2010), over-qualification rates also vary for immigrants from different countries. Particularly, immigrants from high-income countries have the same probability with natives to be overqualified. On the other side of the spectrum, immigrants from low-income countries (particularly recent immigrants from non-EU countries) have the highest probability of being overqualified compared to all other employees (Eurostat, 2013).
Table 1. Over-qualification rates of native-born and foreign-born employees in the EU-28, by groups of gender and place of birth, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Native-born</th>
<th>Foreign-born</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men</strong></td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women</strong></td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: OECD, 2015

Overall, the labour market position of immigrants in the EU is, on average, considerably worse than the labour market position of the native population. As anticipated, this observation has serious implications for the economic situation of immigrants in the EU countries. The most outstanding implication is reflected upon income levels. Foreign-born people have, on average, lower income levels than natives. However, the income gap between foreign-born people with children and the native population is much wider than the income gap between foreign-born people with no children and the native population. Hence, household composition constitutes a highly influential factor when assessing the income levels of foreign-born and native-born people in the EU (European Commission, 2013).

As anticipated, low income levels increase critically the risk of poverty or social exclusion for immigrants in the EU (the indicator at risk of poverty or social exclusion is defined as the situation of people either being at risk of poverty or severely materially deprived or living in a household with a very low work intensity). To be precise, 38.1% of the foreign-born population in the EU countries was at risk of poverty or social exclusion during 2012.

By taking a closer look into this matter it becomes apparent that EU-born immigrants had slightly higher levels of risk of poverty or social exclusion than the native population (i.e. 27.7% and 24.3% respectively). Nonetheless, non-EU-born immigrants had significantly higher levels of risk of poverty or social exclusion than both EU-born immigrants and natives (i.e. 45%, 27.7% and 24.3% respectively). Thus, the high levels of risk of poverty
or social exclusion amongst the foreign-born population in the EU (i.e. 38.1%) may be partly explained by the notably high risk of poverty or social exclusion for non-EU-born immigrants (i.e. 45%) (see Table 2).

Also, the largest gaps in the levels of risk of poverty or social exclusion between EU nationals and non-EU citizens were recorded in Belgium (i.e. 40.9 percentage points), France (i.e. 37.4 percentage points), Sweden (i.e. 34.2 percentage points) and Denmark (i.e. 33.6 percentage points). Furthermore, immigrant women had higher risk of poverty or social exclusion than immigrant men. In fact, non-EU-born immigrant women had the highest risk of being in poverty or being socially excluded compared to all other population groups under consideration (see Table 2). Nevertheless, in a few countries (i.e. in the Czech Republic, Denmark, Greece, Spain, France, the Netherlands and Sweden) immigrant men were confronted with higher risks of poverty or social exclusion compared to immigrant women (Eurostat, 2014).

Table 2. Native-born and foreign-born people (both EU-28 born and non-EU-28 born) at risk of poverty or social exclusion, by groups of gender and country of citizenship, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Native-born</th>
<th>Foreign-born</th>
<th>Of which</th>
<th>Of which</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EU-28-born</td>
<td>Non-EU-28 born</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU-28</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Eurostat, 2014

***

Several steps towards the harmonization of social policies across the EU member states have been made at the EU level. Most importantly, the Chapter of Fundamental Rights became legally binding through the ratification of the Treaty of Lisbon in 2009 (Eurofound, 2010). Nevertheless, the process of social policy harmonization has been dictated by the subsidiarity principle and thus, each EU member state has sustained in a great extent its own distinct social policy and welfare state characteristics. Those distinct
characteristics allow for the broad classification of the EU welfare states into separate welfare state regimes. So, the Anglo-Saxon countries may be grouped into the liberal welfare regime, the Scandinavian countries into the social democratic welfare regime, the countries of the continental Europe into the corporatist welfare regime and the Southern European countries into the Southern European welfare regime (e.g. see Esping-Andersen, 1990; Castles and Mitchell, 1991; Ferrera, 1996). This distinction offers the conceptual context for assessing the nature of social policies in the EU and the levels of social provision across various EU countries. It also constitutes the first crucial step for the study of the welfare protection of immigrants in the EU member states. In fact, the topicality of this discussion is particularly evident nowadays, as the impact of the 2007/2008 financial crisis has intensified the need for adequate social security mechanisms while placing serious financial constraints on public finances (e.g. see Lyberaki and Tinios, 2014; Petmesidou and Guillén, 2014). Also, the review of academic studies and empirical data from the EU show that the relative economic welfare of immigrants is, in general, inferior to the one of the native population (e.g. see European Commission, 2013; Eurostat, 2014; Fleischmann and Dronkers, 2010; OECD, 2014; Reyneri and Fullin, 2010).

More precisely, immigrants have, on average, lower labour market participation rates, higher unemployment rates, higher over-qualification rates and higher risk of poverty or social exclusion in comparison to the native population. This is particularly true for immigrant women as well as for non-EU born immigrants as they are confronted with the worst labour market conditions compared to all other population groups under consideration; thus, their relative economic welfare is at the greatest risk. Furthermore, the recent and on-going economic downturn has imposed a heavy price on immigrants’ welfare across the EU. So, it has further worsened their relative economic situation and thus, it has intensified the need for their social support (e.g. see European Commission, 2013; Eurostat, 2014; OECD, 2014). And, studying the degree in which the European welfare states can support immigrants in meeting their basic needs and confronting the welfare implications of the economic crisis is important for appropriate social policy formation and public funds allocation into social security programs/schemes. Finally, as of 2015, West European states are struggling to cope with high numbers of incoming refugees. This makes the economic disadvantages of immigrants even more topical (UNHCR, 2015).
2.3. The social protection of immigrants in the EU countries

The present section studies immigrants’ eligibility to welfare provision and their levels of actual welfare receipt across Europe by targeting the following objectives: First, the social protection of immigrants in Europe is assessed by looking into the degree in which different welfare regimes (i.e. the social democratic, liberal, corporatist and Southern European welfare regime) influence the integration of immigrants into welfare. Second, the degree of welfare protection of immigrants across various European countries vis-à-vis the welfare protection of the native population is assessed and discussed. The accomplishment of those objectives will offer a closer look into the variety of welfare arrangements and the ensuing complexity and constantly changing nature of the matter of immigrants’ welfare and social protection across Europe. Hence, arguably, the insights of this section will serve as background knowledge for gaining a spherical view of immigrants’ welfare and thus, developing well-informed social policies aiming at their support.

2.3.1. Immigrants’ eligibility to welfare provision in the EU

According to welfare magnet hypothesis, the generosity of the welfare state affects significantly the geographic allocation of immigrants. In particular, immigrant welfare recipients, acting as rational actors who seek to maximize their income, are likely to choose a destination country that will offer them the highest levels of welfare assistance. In addition, immigrants are vulnerable to economic fluctuations and so, by choosing countries with generous welfare benefits they “secure” themselves from unfortunate labour market risks (Borgas, 1999).

This tendency is empirically confirmed in the United States (i.e. the more generous the welfare benefits offered in a State, the more intense the geographic concentration of immigrant welfare recipients in that State). Natives, though, do not engage in internal migration towards States with higher levels of welfare provision because the costs of internal migration deter them from actually migrating. On the contrary, immigrants need to incur the migration costs to the United States and the marginal cost of selecting the particular State of destination is insignificant compared to the total cost of migrating (Borgas, 1999; McKinnish, 2007).
In reference to the EU, variations in welfare states’ generosity may distort the distribution of immigrants between different EU member states. Nevertheless, the magnitude of this tendency is limited, as other parameters have greater influence upon immigrants’ choice of destination (De Giorgi and Pellizzari, 2009). The most prevalent of these parameters are income opportunities, labour market conditions, accessibility to the labour market, presence of ethnic networks, distance to the home country and official language of the destination country. So, the welfare magnet hypothesis is not strongly confirmed by empirical evidence from the EU (Guilietti et al., 2011; Nowotny, 2011).

The discussion of the welfare magnet hypothesis links with a critical aspect of all welfare systems, namely the social protection of immigrants. More precisely, varied concepts of citizenship and nationhood embedded in different European welfare regimes shape diverse migration policies. The implementation of these migration policies leads to different sets of rules for acquiring citizenship status as well as work and residence permits. More notably, migration policies form distinct immigration categories (e.g. asylum seekers, undocumented immigrants, family members, etc.). Eligibility of membership in each category is associated with specific rights and it determines immigrants’ access to social provision. For instance, the Geneva Convention grants refugees with convention status the same rights with nationals in reference to social assistance. On the contrary, asylum seekers have very limited or no entitlements to social assistance. Thus, distinct migration policies map out the assimilation of immigrants into welfare states (Sainsbury, 2006).

In a broader sense, welfare regimes as defined by Esping-Andersen (i.e. the social democratic, liberal and corporatist welfare regime) facilitate different levels of immigrants’ integration into the welfare state. This is also true in the case of the Southern European welfare regime (Morrisens and Sainsbury, 2005). More precisely, the social democratic welfare regime, is characterized by restrictive immigration entry policies and controls and, at the same time, by adequate inclusive welfare policies for those immigrants who have managed to pass the national borders and enjoy legal status in the country (for the sake of simplicity, asylum policies which constitute a subset of immigration policies, are not reviewed here). The employment-based social security schemes are the most open to the integration of immigrants into the welfare state in comparison to all other social security schemes (e.g. residence-based social security schemes). Employment-based social security schemes though have as a precondition immigrant workers’ social
contributions. The downside of this precondition is that, by its nature, it delays immigrants’ entitlement to social rights and welfare benefits (Banting, 2000).

The liberal welfare regime is mainly characterized by more open entry policies and controls but, also by more restrictive policies in terms of immigrants’ access to welfare entitlements. One of the corner-stones of the liberal welfare regime is means-tested social benefits which allow flexibility in the definition of who is entitled to what. Negative public perceptions of immigrants (in this context, due to their alleged overreliance on welfare benefits) have resulted into welfare policies which allow immigrants restrictive access to welfare provision. Nonetheless, immigrants’ restrictive access to welfare entitlements has not increased public support for the welfare state (Banting, 2000).

The corporatist welfare regime is strongly work-oriented. Hence, immigrants’ eligibility for social rights is firmly associated with their participation in the native labour market. Also, native labour unions facilitate the integration of immigrant workers into the welfare state with the purpose of avoiding work and wage competition. So, the nature of the corporatist welfare regime allows for a smoother assimilation of foreign workers in the welfare system. As a result, the barriers for the participation of foreign workers in welfare schemes (e.g. old-age pension schemes and health insurance schemes) are very limited (Sainsbury, 2006). Nevertheless, formal eligibility of immigrants for social rights may often be restrained in practice. For instance, in Germany, utilization of social assistance may jeopardize the renewal of resident permits and especially long-term reliance on welfare schemes may eliminate the potential of acquiring citizenship or permanent residence (Diehl and Blohm, 2003).

Immigrants’ access to social assistance in Southern Europe is in most cases ambiguous as the duality in the labour market is also reflected in the welfare state. So, as long as eligibility to welfare provision is closely linked to employees’ contributions, significant gaps in the welfare coverage of the immigrant population are generated (Ferrera, 1996). In particular, a considerable number of immigrants (particularly newcomers) are employed in precarious jobs in the shadow market due to the segmentation of the native labour markets, the tertiarisation of the native economies and the drop in the number of natives employed in the agricultural sector. This irregular type of immigrants’ employment serves the needs of the native economies for low-paid, flexible labour and it
fills employment positions which are no longer preferred by the natives but are crucial for sustaining economic growth. The weak nature of the welfare states also generates precarious jobs for immigrants who fill the gaps of the welfare coverage for the vulnerable members of the society (Ribas-Mateos, 2004). For instance, in Italy, natives rely greatly on immigrant labour for the provision of elderly care services. The welfare state provides no or strict means-tested public care for the elderly and thus, the responsibility for their care is almost entirely on the shoulders of their relatives. Hence, many families in Italy hire immigrants to take care of their senior family members; and, approximately half of those immigrant care workers are employed irregularly (Van Hooren, 2012). So, overall, a large number of immigrants serve the needs of the native labour markets and welfare states by being employed in the black market. However, immigrants themselves have restrained eligibility for social provision. In particular, the welfare states regard employees’ contributions as a precondition for social insurance. Also, the states have not taken adequate measures (e.g. through suitable labour legislation or migration policies) in order to protect immigrants against social risks irrespective of their position in the labour market. Thus, immigrants’ employment in the shadow market deprives them of the right to social provision (Ribas-Mateos, 2004).

Last, Hooijer and Picot (2015) argue that welfare state generosity alone is a necessary but not sufficient condition for the efficient integration of immigrants into the welfare state. In detail, certain institutional parameters, which are separate to welfare state generosity, influence the effects of welfare state upon immigrants. First, the nature of migration policy formulates distinct immigration categories which in turn influence the outcomes of welfare state generosity upon the immigrant population. So, for instance, economic immigrants usually enjoy better welfare coverage than humanitarian immigrants and joining family members. Also, the type of the welfare state is influential when determining immigrants’ social rights and eligibility to welfare provision. For example, eligibility to universal social benefits is easier granted than eligibility to insurance-based social benefits. Last, the degree of labour market regulation has an indirect but important impact upon immigrants’ welfare entitlements. In particular, a highly-regulated labour market may constrain immigrants from accessing well-paid and high-status jobs. This situation is then translated into limited access to welfare provision in welfare states where the principle of social insurance determines eligibility to welfare entitlements. So, certain institutional parameters (i.e. labour market regulation, migration policy and determinants
of eligibility to welfare provision) influence the degree in which immigrants can benefit from welfare policies no matter of how generous those policies might actually be.

2.3.2. Immigrants' welfare receipt across the EU

Having discussed the welfare magnet hypothesis and having assessed immigrants’ eligibility to social provision in different welfare regimes, the present section focuses on immigrants’ actual welfare receipt across Europe. Brucker et al. (2002) indicates three main reasons for which immigrants are likely to be dependent on welfare in their host countries. These reasons may be summarised as follows: (i) Discrimination against immigrants may prevent them from securing employment or may condemn them to reduced wages; (ii) Existing immigrant networks in the host countries may help newcomers secure welfare benefits (e.g. through channelling information) and thus, attach them to strings of welfare dependence; (iii) Prospective immigrants may act as rational actors who wish to maximize their personal interest when choosing their destination country. So, they might choose the welfare system where they know that they will have the highest probability of securing welfare benefits (i.e. self-selection of immigrants).

Nonetheless, Brucker et al. (2002) highlight three prevalent reasons for why immigrants are not likely to be dependent on welfare assistance in their destination countries. More precisely, immigrants may be excluded from the welfare system due to: (i) restrictive legislation in the host country; (ii) immigrants’ lack of information regarding their social rights in the host country; (iii) immigrants’ pending or unauthorised legal status and/or their employment in the shadow economy may deprive them eligibility to social insurance. So, are immigrants in the EU indeed dependent on welfare and if so, are they more or less dependent on welfare compared to the native population? For assessing this question and thus, gaining a better understanding of the relationship between immigration and the EU welfare systems, the discussion in the following section is mainly centred on immigrants’ welfare use vis-à-vis the natives’ welfare use in various EU countries.

Boeri and Monti (2007) explore this matter of immigrant-native welfare use across the EU-25 countries and in reference to the years from 2004 to 2006. The authors’ main objective is to examine whether any of the two groups (i.e. immigrants and natives) is over-represented in the population of net beneficiaries of the EU welfare systems. In relation to contributory benefits immigrants constitute a minority in the population of recipients while the opposite is true in relation to non-contributory benefits. Nevertheless, when controlling
for the characteristics of immigrants and natives (e.g. household composition, age, educational attainment, etc.), the probability of the two groups to receive social transfers is only marginally -if not at all- affected by their immigrant or native status. Barret and Maître (2011) also assess this controversial issue of welfare receipt by immigrants across the EU27 member states by using empirical data referring to the year 2007. Their analysis shows that there is weak evidence to support the view that immigrants are more likely than natives to receive welfare payments, even though immigrants have considerably more possibilities of being in poverty. In addition, even when immigrants do present higher rates of welfare receipt in comparison to the natives, this is the case only in few countries and the received benefits are mainly related to unemployment support.

Focusing on a longer time period, from 2004 to 2007, Boeri (2010) empirically tests the welfare receipt of immigrants in the EU27 to reach similar conclusions. What is distinctive in Boeris’ study, though, is that he takes under consideration the skill composition of immigrants as well as the generosity of the welfare state in various member states. According to the authors’ findings, immigrants in the EU are not net recipients of the welfare state as immigrants’ fiscal contribution to the welfare state is at least as high as the value of the welfare assistance they receive. Nevertheless, even though this observation holds in full for skilled immigrants, in the case of unskilled immigrants the results are slightly different. More precisely, there is “residual dependency” of unskilled immigrants on non-contributory benefits in the member states with the most generous welfare systems. And, in these member states (i.e. in the member states with the most generous welfare systems), unskilled immigration is associated with immigrants’ self-selection.

Furthermore, and given the heterogeneity of the EU, the review of country-specific studies may also generate valuable insights in regards to immigrants’ welfare protection across the EU countries. Hansen and Lofstrom (2003) conducted a country-specific analysis of the welfare receipt of immigrants and natives in Sweden to conclude that immigrants enjoy higher levels of welfare provision compared to the natives. This may be explained as follows: Refugees in Sweden have higher levels of welfare receipt compared to the native population. However, non-refugee immigrants have similar “structural state dependence” with natives (i.e. the condition of being on welfare has the same impact on the probability of the two groups to remain on welfare). Hence, it is the higher levels of
welfare assistance directed towards and received by refugees in Sweden that may explain the gap in the welfare receipt between immigrants and Swedish nationals. This finding is reinforced by the work of Andren (2007) who claims that differentiated rates of entry into welfare for refugees may explain immigrants’ higher welfare participation and their stronger dependence on the Swedish welfare system in comparison to the native population.

Higher rates of welfare participation among immigrants than among natives have also been observed in Germany (Frick et al. 1999; Riphahn, 1998). Immigrants in Germany participate more in the welfare system compared to the natives due to their lower income levels and their more populous households. In other words, immigrants in Germany are more likely than natives to be eligible for welfare benefits; and, their higher eligibility rates are responsible for their higher rates of welfare receipt (Castronova et al., 2001). So, when controlling for the observed characteristics of the two groups (e.g. household composition, labour market status, etc.), their welfare receipt follow very similar patterns. Thus, being an immigrant per se does not affect ones’ probability of receiving welfare assistance benefits in Germany (Riphahn, 2004). The only exception in this finding relates to second-generation Turkish immigrants as they show evidence of residual welfare dependence (i.e. even when controlling for their observable characteristics, Turkish immigrants are more likely than natives to receive welfare assistance) (Riphahn et al., 2010).

Norway constitutes another example of a country where immigrants have more possibilities than natives of receiving welfare support (Bratsberg et al., 2010). The higher propensity of welfare dependency among immigrants can be attributed to their household composition and most importantly, to their labour market characteristics; these characteristics include immigrants’ higher employment rates in industries that are vulnerable to macroeconomic fluctuations and immigrants’ higher rates of employment exit (Bratsberg et al. 2010). Also, Farrell and Frijters (2008) point at the direction of welfare state incentives in order to explain immigrants’ higher rates of welfare receipt in Norway (i.e. the Norwegian welfare system does not provide enough incentives to immigrants in order to improve their human capital during their early years of employment and as a result their future employment prospects are adversely affected).
Contrasting findings are discussed by Barrett and McCarthy (2007) in their country-specific study regarding the welfare receipt of immigrants and natives in Ireland. Their study focused in the year 2004 and it demonstrated that only 7 per cent of immigrants, as opposed to 15 per cent of natives, were in receipt of welfare payments during this year. It should also be mentioned that, immigrants in Ireland have lower rates of welfare participation for reasons other than their observable characteristics (Barrett et al., 2006). A few years later, in 2008, Ireland was severely affected by the international financial crisis of the time. The economic recession had a more severe impact on immigrant labourers than on native labourers (Barret and Kelly, 2010). Between the years 2007 and 2011 total employment in Ireland fell by 13% but, for immigrant workers’ employment fell by 21% (Kingston et al., 2013). Under those unfavourable economic circumstances, immigrants were still less likely to receive welfare payments than natives (there was only a small surge in the number of immigrants in Ireland receiving welfare assistance following the eruption of the economic crisis). Hence, even in the period after the outbreak of the Irish economic crisis, which took a heavy toll on immigrants’ welfare, immigrants in Ireland had lower probability than natives to be on welfare payments (Barret et al., 2013).

Barrett and McCarthy (2008) focused their analysis on the United Kingdom to produce similar findings. More precisely, the authors used data from the British Household Panel Survey (BHPS) to provide evidence of the less intense welfare use among immigrants than among the native population. Dustmann and Frattini (2013) also studied the welfare use of immigrants in the United Kingdom to produce the following findings. During the years 2001 to 2011, immigrants from the European Economic Area countries had a positive fiscal contribution to the public finances as they contributed 34% more to the public cashier than they took out in the form of social benefits or transfers. On the contrary, natives had a negative fiscal contribution to the public finances as they contributed 11% less to the public cashier than they received in the form of welfare benefits and transfers. It should be noted, though, that immigrants from non-European Economic Area countries had a notably more modest -but still positive- contribution to the public finances as they contributed just 2% more to the public cashier than they received as social assistance benefits and transfers.
The last country to be discussed for the purposes of this section is Spain. As argued by Muñoz de Bustillo and Antón (2009), immigrants in Spain are in receipt of lower social welfare transfers and lower public healthcare transfers than natives; also, they are less likely to receive an old-age pension from the Spanish state. These findings hold true even when controlling for the observable characteristics of the two groups. In a later study, Muñoz de Bustillo and Antón (2011) documented the relatively higher levels of moderate and severe poverty of the people of immigrant background as compared to the native-born people in Spain. Most importantly, social transfers fail to reduce the magnitude of poverty among immigrants in the country. The relatively lower rates of welfare receipt of immigrants than of Spanish nationals are also ascertained in the work of Rodríguez-Planas (2013). The author attributes the native immigrant gap in the receipt of welfare assistance to the notably low welfare participation rates of recent immigrants. More precisely, mainly due to their (often undocumented) legal status and their low employment contributions, the participation rates of recent immigrants in welfare programs is notably low.

***

It is difficult to assess the welfare protection of immigrants in the EU countries. The large variation in welfare arrangements across the EU distorts the geographic allocation of immigrants and generates different living conditions for them. These conditions are further altered in accordance to the specific characteristics of immigrants. Nevertheless, the following general conclusions can be made. First, the generosity of the welfare state constitutes one of the parameters in the destination decision of immigrants in the EU (Nowotny, 2011; Razin and Wanda, 2011). Employment opportunities and labour market conditions appear to be additional (and often more influential) factors in immigrants’ destination decisions (De Giorgi and Pellizzari, 2009). Second, welfare state generosity per se does not guarantee the adequate welfare provision for immigrants as certain parameters, like the degree of labour market regulation and the nature of migration policies, influence the degree in which immigrants can actually benefit from welfare state policies (Hooijer and Picot, 2015). Third, immigrants are not sufficiently protected by the European welfare states (Matsaganis et al., 2003).

Furthermore, the studies reviewed for the purposes of this section are split between those suggesting the presence of higher rates of welfare use among immigrants relative to the native population (e.g. in Sweden, Germany and Norway) and those suggesting the
opposite (e.g. in Ireland, the United Kingdom and Spain). Even so, the following insights may be generated: With regards to the first category of studies, the welfare patterns of immigrants and natives become similar when the individual and household characteristics of the two groups are considered. In certain countries immigrants continue to exhibit higher rates of welfare participation than natives even after controlling for the observable characteristics of the two groups. In part, this finding may be attributed to certain immigrant groups who exhibit higher rates of welfare participation compared to the total population of the country (e.g. refugees in Norway). Also, the following conclusion can be drawn in relation to the second category of studies: When immigrant-native welfare participation is assessed by taking into consideration the individual and household characteristics of the two groups, it becomes evident that immigrants are relatively in greater need to receive welfare assistance (e.g. immigrants in Ireland experience higher poverty rates than natives) but, they are still under-represented in the population of beneficiaries of welfare provision. As a final note, the usefulness of those findings relies greatly on the recognition of the diversity of the welfare state structures and policies across the EU and the uniqueness of each immigration event.

2.4. Conclusions

Despite several attempts at the EU level towards the alignment of social policy across the EU member states, the formation of social policy in the EU is, to this day, dictated by the subsidiarity principle. Consequently, each EU member state is to a considerable extent characterized by distinct social policy and welfare state arrangements (Atkinson, 2009). The assessment of these distinct arrangements allows the broad categorization of the EU member states into four separate welfare regimes: (i) the liberal welfare regime (Anglo-Saxon countries); (ii) the social democratic welfare regime (Scandinavian countries); (iii) the corporatist welfare regime (countries of the continental Europe); and (iv) the Southern European welfare regime (Southern European countries) (e.g. see Castles and Mitchell, 1991; Esping-Andersen, 1990; Ferrera, 1996). So, the terms of social provision vary across Europe generating different levels of welfare support for those in need. In relation to immigrants, different welfare regimes allow them different levels of welfare state integration (Morrisens and Sainsbury, 2005). Social policies in the social-democratic welfare regime are more inclusive in terms of immigrants’ access to welfare entitlements (particularly in comparison to social policies in the liberal welfare regime) while
immigrants’ eligibility to welfare provision in the corporatist welfare regime is closely linked to their participation in the labour market. Last, immigrants’ social rights entitlement in the Southern European welfare regime is ambiguous, generating serious gaps in the support they receive by the welfare state (Banting, 2000).

Assessing welfare states’ efficiency in covering immigrants’ and natives’ need for welfare provision first requires considering the relative economic welfare of the two groups and then assessing their levels of welfare receipt. The review of relevant studies revealed that immigrants had, on average, lower labour market participation rates, higher unemployment rates, higher over-qualification rates and thus, higher risk of poverty and/or social exclusion compared to the natives between 2009 and 2012. Also, the most affected groups among the immigrant population, were immigrant women and non-EU immigrants as they were confronted with the worst labour market conditions during this period (e.g. see European Commission, 2013; Eurostat, 2014; OECD 2015). The relative economic situation of immigrants and natives in the EU is generally not clearly reflected in the welfare receipt of the two groups. Several studies support that immigrants exhibit, on average, higher rates of welfare receipt compared to the natives (particularly in social-democratic welfare states (e.g. see Bratsberg et al., 2010)) while plenty of studies support the opposite (particularly in Southern European welfare states (e.g. see Rodriguez-Planas (2013)). Nevertheless, when taking into account the individual characteristics and household composition of the two groups it becomes apparent that immigrants’ levels of welfare receipt are, on average, lower than the ones of the native population, even though the former are in relatively greater need of welfare support.

Particularly today, the recent international financial crisis has generated increasing fiscal and budgetary pressures on the EU countries and thus, it has led some governments to reduce public spending for promoting immigrants’ integration (Collet, 2011; Lyberaki and Tinios, 2014; Venieris, 2013). Yet, immigrants have been suffering more compared to the natives from the effects of the economic recession (Ekberg, 2011; IOM, 2010; OECD, 2014; Prean and Mayr, 2012) and they continue to exhibit lower rates of welfare participation compared to the native population despite their greater need for welfare provision (e.g. Barret and Maître 2011; Muñoz de Bustillo and Antón, 2009). In reference to the countries of Southern Europe, the inefficiency of the welfare state and the distinction between welfare state insiders and outsiders continue to raise great obstacles for
immigrants’ welfare state integration and thus, to threaten their welfare (e.g. see Petmesidou and Guillén, 2014).

Moreover, assessing immigrants’ social protection unveils the life situation of only a fraction of the EU population. Yet, arguably, immigrants’ welfare portraits and is closely linked with the welfare of all individuals in the EU irrespective of their ethnic background. Hence, by safeguarding the social rights of immigrants through the development and implementation of appropriate public policies, the European countries safeguard the social rights of all individuals within their borders. And, the omens for the near future are alarming. The outburst of the Syrian civil war and the overall socio-political and economic unrest in the Middle East, has forced an increasing number of refugees to seek shelter in Europe adding to the complexity of recent times and generating the urgent need for more public spending, not less. Those recent migration developments have also highlighted once again the long-standing inefficiency of the European welfare states (particularly in Southern Europe) to protect the vulnerable members of our society (Schuster, 2011). And, precisely due to the complexity of the migration phenomenon in Europe and its constantly altering nature, theoretical and empirical studies constitute a necessary basis and crucial starting point for the formation and implementation of well-informed, appropriate and efficient public policies.

Greece, in particular, serves an intriguing example of a Southern European welfare state as it has been one the EU countries most severely affected by the economic recession while having within its borders an increasing number of immigrants and refugees in need of welfare support (Eurostat, 2014). It is alarming that, the severity of the economic crisis combined with the inefficiency of the welfare state create a volatile socio-political situation and find a great number of people on the brink of a humanitarian crisis (Drydakis, 2012). Hence, the need to explore further this matter is imperative. With this in mind, the following chapters of this thesis focus on the welfare of immigrants in Greece particularly in light of the recent economic crisis. So, Chapter 4 discusses the migration history and the immigration policies in Greece while Chapter 3 analyses the methodology of the thesis empirical research; the findings of this research are then examined in Chapters 5, 6 and 7 which discuss immigrants’ labour market position, living conditions and social integration in Greece.
Chapter 3

Researching the immigration experience in Greece: Methodological and data collection considerations

3.1. Introduction

The present chapter describes the methodology which was employed in order to address the key aims of the thesis (for further information on the key aims of the thesis see Chapter 1). Methodological and data collection considerations are also addressed and discussed with the purpose of gaining a better understanding of the research rational and limitations within the context of the thesis. More precisely, section 3.2 explains why a mixed methods approach (combining quantitative and qualitative methodologies) was chosen for fulfilling the research objectives of the thesis. Section 3.3 describes the quantitative data collection, analysis and presentation and it provides an overview of the demographic characteristics of the sample. Section 3.4 overviews the qualitative data collection, analysis and presentation and it offers a description of the demographic characteristics of the sample. Finally, the limitations of both the quantitative and qualitative studies are presented and discussed in section 3.5.

3.2. A mixed methods approach

The key objectives of the present thesis were to research the welfare of immigrants in Greece and to examine changes in their welfare following the outbreak of the 2009 economic recession (for further details see Chapter 1). A mixed methods approach combining quantitative and qualitative methodologies was adopted for addressing these objectives. This approach was chosen because it allows large breadth of research while facilitating gaining depth of understanding of the research objectives (Johnson et al., 2007). Also, it permits emphasising on diversity during all phases of the research study (Denzin and Lincoln, 2011).

More precisely, using quantitative methodology facilitates: (i) the gathering of numerical, quantitative data; and (ii) the quantification and generalization of the research findings. On the other hand, the qualitative methodology allows for: (i) the gathering of detailed individual case information; (ii) the in-depth description and understanding of complex
phenomena and personal experiences; and (iii) the freedom of interviewees to interpret and give meaning to phenomena and own experiences (Johnson and Onwuegbuzie, 2004).

3.2.1. Quantitative data collection, analysis and presentation

Participants were selected through stratified proportional sampling. Particularly, the population of immigrants was divided into groups (strata) based on immigrants’ region of origin. Five groups were devised (namely the Balkans, Asia, Eastern Europe, Africa and the Middle East) with the purpose of developing a sample that would represent as closely as possible the actual population groups of immigrants in Greece (i.e. in terms of participants’ region of origin) (for further details on the demographics of immigrants in Greece see section 4.3.4). A proportional sample was then devised based on those strata.

The purpose of developing a proportional sample was the size of each stratum in the sample to resemble as closely as possible the size of its’ equivalent origin group in the immigrant population of Greece. Similarly, the gender distribution in each stratum in the sample was also considered; hence, the gender distribution in each stratum was formed with the aim to be as proportionate as possible to the gender distribution in each origin group in the population (for further details on the demographics of immigrants in Greece see section 4.3.4).

Interviews were conducted in various public and private places of socialization and employment (i.e. squares and open spaces, non-governmental organizations, ethnic communities and working spaces) in both urban and rural areas of Greece in an effort to ensure that potential participants had equal chances of being approached by the interviewer. Potential participants were also chosen at random to further increase the representativeness of the sample. During the process of the survey, conducted interviews were categorized into six groups (namely the Balkans, Asia, Eastern Europe, Africa and the Middle East) and, within these six groups, they were further divided into two smaller groups (namely male and female). With the aim of forming a sample that is proportional to the population studied (in terms of origin and gender; see previous paragraph), the accumulation of interviews in each group would stop whenever the desired size of this group had been approximately reached.
As a final note, conditions of sound random sampling (ensuring that each person in the population studied had an equal likelihood of selection) were extremely difficult to achieve. Theoretically speaking, conditions of sound random sampling would have been present in a telephone survey under the condition that all individuals in the population studied had a formally registered residence and they could be reached by telephone. However, this condition was not present as many immigrants in Greece do not have a formally registered residence or they cannot be reached for a telephone survey (for further information on immigrants’ housing integration in Greece see section 6.2).

A total of 320 participants were interviewed. The response rate was approximately 35%. 248 interviews were conducted in urban areas (i.e. in districts of Athens, Greece) and 72 interviews were conducted in rural areas (i.e. in the areas of Evia, the second largest island in Greece, located off the eastern coast of Central Greece and Kozani, a town in Northern Greece located in the West Macedonia region).

Potential participants were asked if they were interested to be informed about the survey. Upon positive responses, a thorough description of the survey’s details was given to each potential interviewee in order to obtain his/her informed decision on whether he/she would be willing to participate in the survey. Potential participants were also informed of their right to withdraw from the survey at any point they wished without being in any way obliged to express the reasons of their withdrawal. The average duration of the structured interviews was 20 minutes. Finally, to the best of my knowledge, no vulnerable individuals (e.g. under aged individuals or individuals with mental disabilities) participated in the survey and each interview was conducted with ethical considerations in mind (i.e. by taking into account participants’ different ethnic, cultural and religious norms and customs). No reimbursement was offered.

Interviews were conducted with the presence of only the interviewer and the interviewee and they were face to face. Participants’ names and contact details were made known only to the interviewer in order participants’ safety and confidentiality to be protected. Following participants’ preference, the vast majority of interviews (i.e. 267) were conducted in Greek and only 53 interviews were conducted in English. Data collection took place between August and September 2012.
The quantitative interviews were conducted with the use of a self-designed structured questionnaire (for questionnaire see Appendix 1). The questionnaire sought to overview the demographics of the sample and it allowed the gathering of data referring to immigrants’ welfare in Greece and to alterations in their welfare following the outbreak of the economic recession. More precisely, the questions were designed to investigate the conditions participants experienced in the first year they lived in Greece as well as in the recession year under investigation (i.e. 2012). Hence, each participant had to fulfil the two following criteria: (i) born outside Greece; (ii) residing in Greece and participating in the Greek labour market for at least one year prior to the year 2009. Given that the recent economic crisis erupted in Greece in 2009 (Featherstone, 2011) and that all participants had immigrated in Greece at least one year before 2009, this time frame allowed gathering information related to both the period before and during the economic crisis. The questionnaire covered the three constructs synthesizing and defining immigrants’ welfare in the thesis context (see Chapter 1 for further details). To reiterate, these were (i) labour market integration and income; (ii) living conditions; and (iii) social integration (for questionnaire see Appendix 1). Last, three scales were devised using combined Total scores from certain sets of questionnaire items to assess welfare changes before and after the crisis outbreak, taking into account participants’ background (i.e. their gender and region of origin) and using Mixed ANOVA methods. Those three scales were, namely, the economic hardship scale, the accommodation hardship scale and the social integration scale.

Following the questionnaire development and the design of the scales, a pilot survey was conducted with a small sample of 15 participants. Participants’ responses were assessed in two stages: first an item-by-item descriptive analysis was conducted to explore the responses to the individual questionnaire items; second, Mixed ANOVA methods were applied to examine the responses to the three scales. Via this process, the pilot survey served to: (i) ensure that the questions are clear, appropriate and understood by participants; (ii) establish the reliability and internal consistency of the three devised scales via the use of Cronbach alpha tests (Hof, 2012; Santos, 1999). In general, a Cronbach alpha test is the most common measure of reliability and internal consistency; so, it is a useful tool for determining the reliability of a scale shaped by multiple items in a questionnaire survey. In theory, Cronbach alpha values range from 0 to 1. The closer the Cronbach alpha value is to 0, the lower is the internal consistency of the scale; in adverse,
the closer the Cronbach alpha value is to 1, the more internally consistent the scale (Leontitis and Pagge, 2007).

After the conduct of the pilot survey, all questionnaire items were closely examined and all necessary adjustments were considered and implemented. The most notable adjustments were as follows: Potentially unclear items were rephrased in order to improve their clarity and “ease of understanding”. Moreover, the items used for devising the scales (i.e. the economic hardship scale, the accommodation hardship scale and the social integration scale) were thoroughly scrutinized to ascertain that scores to negatively framed items were reversed. Particularly, the scores for negatively framed questions were recoded as follows: score 5 was recoded as score 1, score 4 was recoded as score 2 and vice versa. As an example, the four questions measuring social integration consisted of two questions framed positively and two questions framed negatively in the questionnaire. Hence, the scores to the negatively framed questions were reversed as described above to allow meaningful Total score measuring of high versus low. Furthermore, the items that lowered the internal consistency of the scales were dropped. Following those adjustments, the Cronbach’s alpha scores for all three scales were improved to acceptable values as presented in the below description of the scales development process.

So, in what follows, an overall description of the scales is given. In reference to the economic hardship scale, two questionnaire items were used to investigate participants’ economic hardship. Those items were associated with two economic situations: (i) “Being financially unable to pay rent and/or debts (e.g. towards banks)” and (ii) “Having too little money to buy enough food for you and your family”. These items were adapted from previous research (Gomel et al. 1998; Greenglass et al. 2013; Hardaway and Cornelius, 2014) and they were deemed appropriate for this study following some modifications. Participants reported their responses by using a 4-point rating set: “Never”, “Rarely”, “Often” and “Always” (for questionnaire see Appendix 1). The economic hardship scale was then devised by using a combined Total score from the two items to assess economic hardship before and during the crisis (the higher the scores on the scale the worse the economic hardship). Based on previous research, two-item scales can reliably measure a construct (Drolet and Morrison, 2001), their internal consistency can be tested via a Cronbach’s coefficient alpha test (Eisinga, 2013) and they have been used in previous studies (e.g. see Frese, 1999; Löwe et al., 2005; Young et al. 2009; Waterman, 1993). An
internal reliability analysis was further conducted to ascertain the consistency of the two items to be jointly used to measure economic hardship. Results were positive, revealing adequate internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha = .70, $M = 3.16, SD = 1.29$).

In regards to the accommodation hardship scale, eight questionnaire items were used for researching participants’ accommodation hardships in Greece. Those eight items were associated with three housing related problems: (i) “Shortage of space”; (ii) “Too dark, not enough light”; (iii) “Lack of adequate heating or cooling facilities” and five neighbourhood related problems: (iv) “Insufficient transport”; (v) “Rubbish lying around”; (vi) “Burglaries, deliberate damage to property”; (vii) “Insults or attacks to do with someone’s race or colour”; and, (viii) “Drug trade and drug use and/or prostitution”. These items were adapted from previous research using self-report questionnaires to examine accommodation hardship (e.g. Bonnefoy et al., 2003; Corney et al., 1985; Spengler et al., 2004) and they were deemed to be appropriate for this study after some modifications were implemented. Participants reported their responses by using a 4-point rating set: “Never”, “Rarely”, “Often” and “Always” (for questionnaire see Appendix 1). The accommodation hardship scale was then devised using a combined Total score from the eight items to assess accommodation hardship changes before and during the crisis (the higher scores on the scale, the worse the accommodation hardships). An internal reliability analysis was conducted to ascertain the consistency of the eight items to be jointly used to measure accommodation hardship. Results were positive showing high internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha = .85, $M = 14.71, SD = 4.47$).

In relation to the social integration scale, four questionnaire items were used for investigating participants’ social integration in Greece: (i) “I feel that most people here can be trusted”; (ii) “Most people here treat me with respect”; (iii) “I am worried of being verbally assaulted due to my race or colour”; and (iv) “I am worried of being physically assaulted due to my race or colour”. These items were adapted from previous research on social integration using self-perceived integration measures (Jasinskaja-Lahti, 2006; Oxman-Martinez et al., 2012; Wu et al. 2012) and they were deemed to be appropriate for this study after some modifications took place. Participants were asked to score their level of agreement to the items using a 5-point rating scale: “Strongly Agree”, “Agree”, “Neutral”, “Disagree” and “Strongly Disagree” (for questionnaire see Appendix 1). The social integration scale was then devised using a combined Total score from the four items
to assess social integration changes before and during the crisis (the higher scores on the scale, the higher the social integration). An internal reliability analysis was conducted to ascertain the consistency of the 4 items to be jointly used to measure social integration. Results were very positive revealing very high internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha = .90, $M = 14.61$, $SD = 3.50$).

Finally, having certified the internal reliability of the three scales, a 2 (time: before the crisis/during the crisis) x 2 (gender: male/female) x 5 (origin: the Balkans/Eastern Europe/Africa/the Middle East/Asia) Mixed ANOVA test was conducted with repeated measures on time for each scale (i.e. for the economic hardship scale, the accommodation hardship scale and the social integration scale).

ANOVA procedures were chosen because they allow an assessment of both within subjects and between subjects effects while remaining robust in normal distribution violations. Also, there is no non-parametric test that is appropriate to sufficiently deal with interactions (Glass and Stanley, 1970; Howell, 1992; Kirk, 1968; Schmider et al., 2010; Shavelson, 1996). As a final note, size effects were calculated in terms of partial eta squared ($\eta^2_p$) values in the cases where Mixed ANOVA methods were used for the measurement of effect sizes. Based on convention, $\eta^2_p$ values of .01, .06 and .14 represent small, medium and large effect sizes respectively (Cohen, 1988; Hattie, 2009). Finally, given the large number of analyses conducted, only the ones which produced significant results were reported here using p < .05 as a criterion of significance. Also, a Bonferroni correction was applied to counteract multiple analyses.

Finally, following the pilot study and the implementation of the (aforementioned) necessary adjustments, the full-scale survey was undertaken. Descriptive analysis was then applied on collected data from the full-scale survey for a macro level assessment of participants’ welfare in Greece. Mixed ANOVA tests were also conducted to assess changes in participants’ welfare prior and during the crisis (i.e. for investigating within subjects effects in the sample) and to assess differences between participants’ welfare as a function of their gender and origin (i.e. for investigating between subjects effects in the sample). Last, changes in welfare during the crisis related to participants’ gender and origin were assessed as well through interaction effects.
3.2.2. Quantitative sample: Features

There were 193 male and 127 female respondents constituting the 60% and 40% of the population sample respectively. Similar gender distributions have been reported in other immigrants’ studies of Greece (e.g. see Lyberaki and Maroukis, 2005) while the male to female ratio of the sample was larger than the equivalent ratio of the native population (i.e. 49% men and 51% women) in the year when the structured interviews were undertaken, namely 2012 (Hellenic Statistical Authority, 2014).

All participants were adults and 70% of them (N=219) were aged between 30-49 years of age with younger age-ranges constituting 21.3% (N=68) of the sample and participants above 49 years old constituting only 10.2% (N=33) of the sample. Similar age distribution has been reported in other immigrants’ studies of Greece (e.g. see Hatziprokopiou, 2003) while the average age of the permanent population of Greece during 2012 was 41.9 years (Hellenic Statistical Authority, 2014). A breakdown of participants’ age is illustrated in Figure 2.

**Figure 2.** Participants’ age distribution
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Note: N = 320
Furthermore, participants were asked to report their region of origin by choosing one of the following pre-defined options: (i) The Balkans, (ii) Asia, (iii) Eastern Europe, (v) Africa and (iv) The Middle East. A world map was available to participants to assist them in providing the required information (for questionnaire see Appendix 1). The distribution of their region of origin can be summarised as follows: (i) The Balkans (N=102, 31.9% of the sample), (ii) Asia (N=72, 22.5% of the sample), (iii) Eastern Europe (N=59, 18.4% of the sample), (v) Africa (N=49, 15.3% of the sample) and (iv) The Middle East (N=38, 11.9% of the sample). Figure 3 shows the distribution of participants’ region of origin in the sample. Participants from the Balkans constituted the largest group followed by Asians, Eastern Europeans, Africans and Middle Easterners. Hence, the sample resembled as closely as possible the origin distribution of immigrants in Greece during the 1990s and the 2000s (Hellenic Statistical Authority 2011; Hellenic Statistical Authority 2001) (for further details on the survey sampling method see section 3.2.1 and on the demographics of immigrants in Greece see section 4.3.4).

Figure 3. Distribution of participants’ region of origin

Source: Own survey
Note: N = 320

In regards to participants’ year of immigration, all recruited participants had immigrated to Greece between 1990 and 2008. A display of participants’ year of immigration to Greece in given in Figure 4.
Participants were asked to choose from an array of reasons for immigrating to Greece (for questionnaire see Appendix 1). The most popular response was found to be “economic reasons” (reported by 65.4% of participants, N=209). The next most popular responses were as follows: 10.4% of the sample (N=33) recounted that there were “political, religious or ethnic related reasons” behind their decision to migrate, while 9.8% of respondents (N=31) stated that they immigrated to Greece in order to “try their luck”. The “intention of joining or following someone” had motivated the 9.5% of the sample (N=30) to immigrate to Greece. Finally, 4.3% of the respondents (N=14) linked their decision of migration with their endeavour “to escape from war, natural disaster of famine”. Figure 5 presents a breakdown of participants’ reasons for immigration to Greece.
The sample shows much diversity regarding participants’ educational level. As shown in Figure 6, 46.9% of participants (N=158) reported 7 to 12 years of educational attainment (commonly regarded as secondary education), while 31% of participants (N=99) recounted 6 years or less of educational attainment (commonly regarded as primary education). Also, 13 years or more of educational attainment (commonly regarded as tertiary education) were reported by 19.7% of the sample (N=63). In the same year (i.e. 2012), the corresponding percentage of native Greeks with primary education was 32%, with secondary education 42% and with tertiary education 26% (OECD, 2014). Hence, participants’ education level was slightly inferior to the educational level of the native population.
In relation to participants’ legal status on the date when data collection was undertaken (i.e. August and September 2012), the following observations can be made: more than half of participants (52.8% of participants, N=169) had a Temporary Residence/Work permit (for further details on immigration and citizenship policies in Greece see Chapter 4) while the second largest group in the sample (18.1% of participants, N=58) had no sufficient legal documents. The third largest group in the sample (16.9% of participants, N=54) had either Greek citizenship, political asylum, registration certificate or Visa while the remaining 12.2% of participants (N=39) had a Permanent Residence/Work Permit. A breakdown of participants’ legal status on the date of data collection is shown in Figure 7.
Mainly because of the insufficiently developed regularization programmes of undocumented immigrants in Greece (see section 4.4) and the issue of possible underreporting of the percentage of undocumented immigrants participating in the survey due to their fear of being arrested, deported or socially stigmatized (see section 3.3), the survey also looked into the amount of time participants have spent in Greece as undocumented immigrants, irrespective of their legal status during the time of interviews. So, 86 participants (26.9% of the sample) reported that they haven’t spent in Greece any time lacking sufficient legal documents, while 73 participants (22.8% of the sample) reported having been residing in Greece for one year or less without having the necessary legal documents. The remaining 161 participants (50.3% of the sample) reported having spent at least one year in Greece without legal authorization. This high percentage might be interpreted in two directions. Either as increasing confidence that the percentage of undocumented immigrants participating in the survey has not been underreported (in the sense that the percentage of participants who have spent at least one year in Greece as undocumented immigrants would have been underreported as well and thus, probably lower than 50.3%) or as confirming fears of underreporting the proportion of undocumented immigrants participating in the survey who falsely identified themselves as authorized immigrants (both during the time of the survey and throughout their period

**Figure 7. Participants’ legal status**
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of stay in Greece) and certifying the magnitude of the issue of immigrants’ undocumented residence and employment in Greece.

3.2.3. Qualitative data collection, analysis and presentation
Qualitative methods need to be used in tandem with quantitative methods in order to provide the level of detail necessary for the study of multidimensional, complicated or delicate social issues such as welfare (Mason, 2002; Richie and Lewis, 2003). In comparison to quantitative methods, qualitative research is often more effective in capturing underlying, complex or delicate factors influencing or provoking phenomena, understanding their consequences and the context in which they occur (Bryman, 2003; Denzin and Lincoln, 2011). In addition, qualitative methods allow research design flexibility while being sensitive to the social context (and the setting) in which data are produced. Accordingly, they can be tailored to capture the breadth and depth of the research objectives. Qualitative methods also allow adopting a dynamic view of social issues and thus, viewing them in terms of processes instead of in static terms (Munhall, 1988). So, overall, they can offer a rich and large volume of data as well as a holistic perspective of the social issue(s) studied (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1995).

Individual interviews (i.e. one of the most frequently applied methods in qualitative study) allow for a detailed and undiluted investigation of interviewees’ perspectives, understandings and feelings about the social world and themselves within it. So, with the help of interviewees’ accounts, social issues are viewed and examined within interviewees’ personal context. Thus, social issues are explored in detail and in depth through the eyes of interviewees for capturing, understanding and explaining their complex and/or sensitive roots, parameters and implications (Ritchie and Lewis, 2003). In addition, individual interviews are a suitable and convenient method for the study of diverse populations, populations who are geographically dispersed or populations who are not easy to gain access to (Mason, 2002; Denzin and Lincoln, 2011).

The use of qualitative methodology was deemed appropriate in this thesis for the following key reasons: (i) for examining immigrants’ welfare through immigrants’ personal and social contexts; (ii) for investigating changes in their welfare following the 2009 crisis and understanding “how” and “why” these changes occurred; and (iii) for
capturing immigrants’ thoughts and feelings about their welfare in past, present and future timeframes.

More precisely, the basic outline of the methodology which was employed for the qualitative interviews can be described follows: 42 immigrants were interviewed. The response rate was approximately 25%. Interviewees were selected through quota sampling with the purpose of forming a diverse population sample in terms of interviewees’ background characteristics (i.e. gender, age, origin, year of immigration and legal status).

A self-designed, semi structured questionnaire was used with the purpose of overviewing the demographics of the sample and investigating immigrants’ welfare throughout their period of stay in Greece, with special focus in the post-2009 crisis period. For this purpose, the sample consisted of interviewees who were fulfilling the following two criteria: (i) born outside Greece; (ii) residing in Greece for at least one year prior to the year 2009. These two criteria ensured that interviewees were in position to describe their welfare in the years prior to the 2009 economic crisis in Greece and to comment on if/how their welfare altered following the crisis outbreak.

As in the quantitative survey (see section 3.2.1), the questions addressed to interviewees centred around the three thematic areas synthesizing immigrants’ welfare in the thesis context (i.e. labour market integration and income; living conditions; social integration). Accordingly, the interview questions were grouped into three sets. The first set of questions allowed interviewees to describe their employment life and to comment on whether their employment situation and their labour market position altered in the post-2009 crisis period. The second set of questions gave interviewees the opportunity to describe their living conditions throughout their period of stay and to comment on whether/how the 2009 crisis affected their conditions of living. The third and final set of questions addressed to interviewees sought to investigate their social integration and to examine whether/how the conditions of their social integration changed in the post-2009 period (for interviews’ guide see Appendix 2). As a final note, interview questions were intended to encourage interviewees to bring their own meaning to social and personal phenomena as well as to attach their understandings and interpretations to experiences related to their welfare.
Approaching potential interviewees, informing them about the qualitative survey and obtaining their consent of participation was conducted in the same manner as with the quantitative survey (see section 3.2.1). 30 semi-structured interviews were conducted in an urban area (i.e. in the city centre of Athens, Greece) and 12 semi-structured interviews were conducted in non-urban areas (i.e. in the outskirts of Athens, Greece).

Following interviewees’ preference, most interviews (i.e. 38) were conducted in Greek and only 4 interviews were conducted in English. The average duration of the semi-structured interviews was one hour. Following interviewees’ consent, their responses to the open-ended questions were recorded by the interviewer; recorded interviews were then transcribed by the interviewer (and where applicable translated in English). Transcribed interviews were later filed under a case specific code to allow thematic analysis to take place (please see below for further details on the thematic analysis of the interviews). Data collection took place in April and August 2013 (see Appendix 3).

Thematic analysis was applied for the analysis and presentation of the collected qualitative data. The rationale behind using thematic analysis can be described as follows: (i) it is a flexible method that simplifies and thus, facilitates the summary and description of the main points of the data set; (ii) it produces clear findings and insights; and (iii) it may be used as a tool for conducting qualitative analyses suitable for advising policy developments (Braun and Clarke, 2006); and (iv) thematic analysis has been applied previously in several disciplines for the detailed analysis of sets of interviews (e.g. see Bogenschutz, et al. 2016; Vaismoradi et al. 2013).

The process of analysing the collected qualitative data consisted of the following steps: first, interview transcripts (N=42) were read thoroughly to identify interesting features in the data; further on, relevant and repeating features were grouped in a systematic fashion into separate codes. Second, these codes were reviewed in search for potential themes; then, similar and re-occurring codes were collated into separate themes. At this point, a detailed review of the themes was conducted in order to ensure that no significant data had been excluded from the coding process. Third, refining the themes allowed the clear definition and naming of each theme as well as the selection of vivid and representative interviews extracts to “accompany” each one of them and demonstrate its’ point more clearly. Fourth and final, reviewing the themes led to the grouping of relevant, re-
occurring themes into broad cross-interview themes that captured the essence of the majority of interviews and mapped the narrative of the interviews’ analysis presentation. Overall, this analysis process allowed the identification and manifestation of the most important patterns of meaning in collected data; those patterns had both affective (interviewees’ emotions) and cognitive (interviewees’ thoughts and interpretations of experiences) aspects.

3.2.4. Qualitative sample: Features

There were 30 male and 12 female interviewees constituting the 71% and 29% of the sample respectively (see Appendix 3). The number of female interviewees was lower than the number of male interviewees (particularly compared to the female-male ratio in the quantitative survey; see section 3.2.2) due to difficulties in gaining consent from female potential interviewees to participate in the qualitative survey. This may be attributed to the extended length of the qualitative survey (i.e. approximately one hour) and the greater hesitation of women (in comparison to men) to devote this amount of time as well as in the greater reluctance of women (in comparison to men) to disclose information in a qualitative survey (see section 3.2.2).

All interviewees were adults. 71.5% of interviewees (N=30) were aged between 30-49 years of age with interviewees above 49 years old constituting the 21.5% (N=9) of the sample and younger age-ranges constituting only the 7% (N=3) of the sample (see Appendix 3). The age distribution interviewees in the qualitative survey was similar to the age distribution of interviewees in the quantitative survey (see section 3.2.2).

Interviewees’ region of origin can be summarised as follows: (i) The Middle East (N=16, 38% of the sample), (ii) The Balkans (N=8, 19% of the sample), (iii) Asia (N=7, 17% of the sample), (v) Eastern Europe (N=6, 14% of the sample) and (iv) Africa (N=5, 12% of the sample). Hence, interviewees from the Middle East constitute the largest group of the sample followed by interviewees from the Balkans, Asia, Eastern Europe and Africa (see Appendix 3).

Furthermore, 26 interviewees (62% of the sample) had immigrated in Greece in the 1990s while 16 interviewees (38% of the sample) had immigrated in Greece in the 2000s but before 2009 (see Appendix 3).
In addition, 9 interviewees (21.5% of the sample) reported not being in possession of the necessary legal documents to live and work in Greece during the year of the interview (i.e. in 2013), while the remaining interviewees (N=33, 78.5% of the sample) reported being in possession of such documents.

3.3. Methodology limitations

First, immigrants’ disclosure of information was often challenging or impossible due to their undocumented status and their consequent fear of police arrest and deportation. The hostility of extreme right-wing organisations also created additional fears and mistrust among immigrants and thus, hindered the disclosure of information. In order to build trust between immigrants and the interviewer and thus, overcome those barriers, all immigrants who were approached were assured of the confidentiality of their identities and statements. Also, they were given a detailed account of the purposes of the interviews and of the interviewer’s background (i.e. educational qualifications during the time of the interviews and university affiliation). Nonetheless, several immigrants were still unwilling to take part on the account of their fear of being victimized by far-right extremists and/or being arrested or prosecuted by the police.

Second, cultural barriers and immigrants’ social remoteness constituted additional dissuasive factors during the data collection process. In particular, approaching socially marginalised immigrants was very challenging due to their social isolation while cultural restrictions on expressing personal experiences and understandings prevented them from disclosing information. In tackling this challenge, ethnic communities were approached with the purpose of developing a relationship of trust between the interviewer and immigrants who were either socially marginalised or unwilling to participate in the study due to cultural considerations. Approaching ethnic communities with respect and genuine interest in their welfare allowed the conduct of a good number of interviews with socially marginalised immigrants. However, conducting interviews with certain immigrant groups, for instance interviewing women from Islamic countries, was very challenging due to their social marginalization and strict cultural restrictions on communicating their personal experiences and interpretations to strangers.
Third, poor language skills often made the communication between immigrants and the interviewer troublesome or even impossible. So, several immigrants were excluded from the interviews’ process due to their lack of English and Greek language skills. The rationale behind their exclusion was that they were either not in position to fully comprehend the questions addressed to them or that their responses were not entirely understood by the interviewer. In addition, several structured and semi-structured interviews involving immigrants with basic English or Greek language skills were excluded from the final sample in order to ensure that all interviews were valid (i.e. ensuring that all interviews had been conducted under conditions of unrestricted exchange of information between immigrants and the interviewer).

Fourth, as per one of the participation criteria to the structured and semi-structured interviews, immigrants had to be living in Greece and participating in the Greek labour market for at least one year before the crisis eruption (i.e. before 2009). This criterion was put in place in order immigrants to be in position to disclose information regarding their lives both before the crisis outbreak and during the crisis (accordingly, the assessment and comparison of collected data referring to the pre-crisis period and the during-crisis period allowed investigating the effects of the crisis on immigrants’ welfare in Greece). In accordance, the following considerations should be kept in mind when reflecting on the analysis outcomes. Particularly, immigrants who arrived in Greece after 2008 -and who were not targeted by the research- had less time at their disposal to build their lives in the country prior to the crisis eruption in comparison to immigrants who arrived in Greece before 2008 (and who were targeted by the research). Hence, newcomers may have had even less means at their disposal to confront the crisis effects by comparison to non-newcomers. In that sense, the negative effects of the crisis shown in the thesis findings may constitute a conservative estimate of the actual severity of the crisis impact on immigrants’ welfare in Greece, particularly on those arriving in the most recent wave of immigrant flows.

Fifth, the interviews involved the assessment of the impact of the 2009 crisis on immigrants’ welfare at a later stage in time and thus, once the crisis had already occurred (i.e. the structured and semi structured interviews were respectively undertaken in 2012 and 2013). Hence, immigrants were experiencing/living the effects of the crisis when the data collection was conducted. Accordingly, immigrants’ recollections from the pre-crisis
period may have been distorted from memory errors, inaccuracies and selectivity and/or may have been influenced by their status during the date of the interviews. With the aim of overcoming, as much as possible, this limitation, most questions addressed to immigrants required the disclosure of precise and frequently numerical information like, for instance, income levels and type of occupation.

Sixth, in regards to the quantitative survey, the proportionality of the quantitative sample to its population was difficult to achieve. The ethnic and gender distribution of the (documented and undocumented) immigrant population in Greece has been both volatile and challenging to be firmly defined throughout the period covered by the quantitative survey (i.e. from 1990 to 2008) (see section 4.3 for further details). In addition, during the data collection process, the region of origin identification criterion was often impossible to be applied before the structured interviews had been already undertaken. More precisely, in several cases, it was impossible for the interviewer to know the region of origin of potential participants before they were approached and invited to take part in the survey. Hence, the issue of the origin and gender distribution of the quantitative sample was treated with approximation in terms of its proportionality to the population.

Seventh and last, the conduct of the quantitative survey and the analysis of quantitative data involved the collection and comparison of data referring to two different and unequal time periods (i.e. the pre-crisis period and the during-crisis period). Precisely, within the context of the quantitative survey, the pre-crisis period is conceived as immigrants’ first year of immigration to Greece while the during-crisis period is conceived as the year 2012. So, given that all participants had immigrated in Greece from 1990 to 2008, the pre-crisis period is longer than the during-crisis period (i.e. 2012). The rationale of defining the pre-crisis period as participants’ first year of immigration in Greece was that it added homogeneity in collected data as all immigrants commented on their lives in Greece as newcomers irrespective of their exact years of arrival. Nevertheless, to ensure that the exact year of arrival was not a confounding variable for any subsequent analysis, the association between year of arrival and pre-crisis scores on the three scales (i.e. economic hardship, accommodation hardship and social integration) was assessed using Pearson’s correlation. No significant association between year of arrival and pre-crisis scores was found for any of the scales.
A mixed methods approach combining quantitative and qualitative methodologies was adopted with the purpose of investigating immigrants’ welfare in Greece and identifying changes in their welfare owing to the 2009 crisis outbreak. Research was centred around the three thematic areas synthesizing immigrants’ welfare in the thesis context, namely, labour market integration and income, living conditions and social integration. The quantitative methodologies (i.e. quantitative collection of data and their analysis via descriptive methods and Mixed ANOVA procedures) produced quantified and generalized research findings on immigrants’ welfare. The qualitative methodologies (i.e. qualitative collection of data and their thematic analysis) allowed immigrants to express their feelings, understandings and interpretations of phenomena and own experiences relevant to their welfare. So, overall, the mixed methods approach allowed for a good understanding of the research objectives, wide-ranging research on immigrants’ welfare and an emphasis on diversity and detail during all stages of the research process. As a final note, the adopted research procedures and outcomes on the three thematic areas synthesizing immigrants’ welfare are discussed in detail in Chapter 5 (focusing on immigrants’ labour market integration and income), Chapter 6 (focusing on immigrants’ living conditions) and Chapter 7 (focusing on immigrants’ social integration).
Chapter 4
Situating immigration in the Greek context

4.1. Introduction

The present chapter starts with a brief historical overview of the immigration movements in Europe following the end of the Second World War and an assessment of the most significant immigration and citizenship policies across the EU in recent years. Within this context, the issue of interdependence between historical developments, immigration developments and state policies is addressed and discussed. This discussion serves to place the Greek case in the European context and to situate immigration in Greece in a European comparative perspective. Greece can be classified as a critical case study in the EU bearing in mind the extreme effects of the 2009 economic crisis that brought the country to the verge of economic collapse; therefore, Greece offers a unique opportunity for the examination of immigration under extreme economic, social and political conditions in the EU. In addition, the inefficiency of Greek state to provide adequate welfare support to its citizens (see Chapter 2) is further reflected in the state’s incapacity to protect the welfare of its immigrant population.

So, a brief overview of the migration movements in Greece is conducted (with special emphasis on the recent migration history) together with a brief description of the evolution of the Greek legislation on migration and its reflection on immigrants’ integration in the Greek welfare state and labour market. In recent years, Greece has been confronted with extraordinary migration developments; the most important being Greece’s transformation from a traditional emigration country to a country of immigration in the beginning of the 1990s and the currently unfolding refugee crisis on its eastern shores. Gaining an overview of the recent migration history in Greece will serve to interpret the response of the Greek state towards immigrants and will offer assistance in understanding the rationale of (Greek and European) migration laws while appreciating the conditions under which those laws were created and implemented. Such an evaluation will also look into the administrative capacity of the Greek state and of its’ consequent ability and willingness to protect the welfare of immigrants in Greece. On the other hand, the examination of the Greek legislation on migration will depict the legal state in which immigrants have found
themselves in Greece throughout the years in terms of their rights and obligations and in respect with their position in the Greek welfare state and labour market.

The long-established incapacity of the Greek welfare state to provide welfare support in a fair, rational and effective manner (see Chapter 2) and the increasing size of precarious employment in the Greek economy (see Chapter 5) have been further augmented under the present conditions of deep economic recession. In relation to the immigrant population per se, the 2009 crisis has taken a heavy toll on immigrants’ economic welfare (see Chapter 5) and thus, it has intensified their need for labour market participation and welfare provision on equal terms with the native population. Hence, the study of the Greek legislation on immigration is particularly topical today. Existing laws on immigration have a critical function as they establish immigrants’ legal rights in Greece and thus, their levels of entitlement to welfare support and labour market integration.

The present chapter is structured as follows: In section 4.2 the demographic implications of migration in Europe are considered with special focus in the years following the Second World War. The notion of citizenship and the migration policies implemented in various EU member states are also discussed together with the consequent integration processes of immigrants across Europe. Section 4.3 discusses the recent migration history in Greece, a country predominantly of emigration which was recently transformed to a net-immigration country and is currently considered one of the most significant gateways to Europe for refugees originating from Asia, Africa and the Middle East. Section 4.4 looks into the efforts of the Greek state to form appropriate migration and citizenship policies in order to respond to these recent demographic developments owing to immigration. It also explores the interdependence between the recent migration history of Greece and the Greek migration laws and policies within the realm of the EU. Finally, section 4.5 discusses the main insights of this chapter in light of the 2009 economic downturn and the ongoing refugee crisis in Greece.

4.2. Migratory flows and demographic changes within the context of European migration policy

The present section offers a brief historical overview of the recent migratory flows in Europe and it discusses the notion of citizenship and nationhood embedded across various
EU countries. The time period covered extends from the end of Second World War to the year 2012. Within this time frame, a synopsis of the demographic changes in Europe owing to immigration is given together with a brief description of immigrants’ distinct characteristics, such as their origin, age and gender. In addition, there will be a discussion of the citizenship policies implemented across the EU member states, affecting greatly the mosaic of people of different backgrounds and of different legal rights in the EU. The discussion of these matters will enrich our understanding of the migration policy context of Europe deriving from, but, also orchestrating major migratory flows in the continent. Thus, it will constitute the basis for the closer study of particular immigration issues in the EU member states.

4.2.1. Migration in Europe since the end of WWII

Immigration is and always has been altering significantly the demographic landscape of the European continent. In fact, in our times, immigration can be hierarchized among the most prevalent factors responsible for the populations’ composition, size and rate of change in most areas of Europe (Coleman, 2008). So, it is not surprising that immigration has become, throughout the last decades, a recurrent, as well as a controversial issue, more than ever before. In reference to the EU, it is evident, even in everyday life, that immigration provokes demographic effects of great significance in all member states (Nimwegen and Erf, 2010). For instance, in most parts of Western Europe, immigration increases substantially the population size, while in Southern Europe it greatly serves towards keeping the population size constant (Herm, 2008).

Nowadays, Europe is certainly an immigration continent. However, migration history has followed different paths in different EU member states. Some countries, such as France, Germany, the United Kingdom, Denmark, Austria, Switzerland, Sweden and the Benelux countries have been net immigration countries as early as the 1960s and thus, they can be characterized as traditional host countries. On the contrary, countries like Spain, Portugal, Greece, Ireland, Norway and Finland, were emigration countries until the 1980s and only since then, they gradually transformed into net-receiving countries (Penninx et al., 2008).

More precisely, during the last decades, there have been important changes to the demographic map of Europe owing to immigration. In particular, the end of the Second World War found Europe confronted with massive population movements some of which
were forced due to border re-arrangements. The North-Western European countries found themselves dealing with an urgent need for economic reconstruction combined with serious shortages of labour. In response, an inflow of foreign workers occurred and thus, these countries were gradually transformed into net immigration countries. Parallel to this, migration flows followed a different route in the Mediterranean countries. This route led them to become net emigration countries. Among others, the Mediterranean countries were severely hit by remarkably low employment rates and so, a large fraction of their population was left with no other alternative than emigration. In fact, a large proportion of the immigrant population in North-Western Europe came from Portugal, Spain, Italy and Greece (Arango and Finotelli, 2009).

The rapid economic upturn, from the 1950s up to the 1970s, emerging from the reconstruction of Europe, sustained and intensified the recruitment of immigrant workers in North-Western Europe (Coleman, 2008). It is indicative that, legal frameworks, like the guest worker system, were the most extensively used throughout this period. At least during the early stages of this era, the Mediterranean countries that had been slower to industrialize, constituted once again an important source of immigrant labour. Gradually, though, Mediterranean countries became more prosperous and so, emigration movements progressively declined (not only towards North-Western Europe but to all destinations). In fact, the high level of remittances at the time contributed significantly towards the economic recovery of the net emigration countries. As a consequence, former overseas territories, colonial and ex-colonial countries served more intensively as a pool of immigrant labour for North West European countries.

Nonetheless, the economic recession, followed by the first oil-price crisis in 1973, provoked a general tendency in the North-West of Europe towards the adoption of restrictive policy measures on immigration. Consequently, the previous years’ active labour recruitment became lethargic. On the contrary, three Mediterranean countries, namely Spain, Portugal and Greece, became increasingly less inimical to immigrants, due to the economic incentives deriving from the process of joining the European Community (Stalker, 2002).
Since the end of the 1980s and until the two EU enlargements of 2004 and 2007\(^1\), the face of migration in Europe changed mainly due to the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe and the wars in Croatia, Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo. The most prevalent characteristic of this period was the large number of asylum seekers and refugees originating from these areas and spreading all over the rest of Europe. Their most common destinations were Spain, Greece, Germany, Italy, Portugal and the United Kingdom (Sobotka, 2010). In addition, the conflicts between Turks and Kurds enhanced further the stock of asylum seekers and refugees in Europe. With the exception of Germany, this situation did not result in notable restrictions regarding the nature of asylum and refugee policies (Zaiceva and Zimmermann, 2008). Besides these movements, the European countries (with the notable exceptions of the United Kingdom and the Mediterranean countries) remained relatively closed for economic migration. The Mediterranean countries in particular were gradually transformed into net immigration countries. It is also worth noting that, certain migration patterns were shaped during these years. For example, Romanians and Bulgarians emigrants were choosing mainly Spain and Italy as their destination country, while Poles were mostly choosing Ireland and the United Kingdom (Eurostat, 2006).

The two EU-enlargements of 2004 and 2007 impinged further remarkable changes on the European migration landscape. Particularly the United Kingdom, Denmark and Ireland received a large number of immigrants originating mostly from Poland, Lithuania, Latvia and Slovakia (Barrell et al., 2010). Progressively, more member states, like Greece, Portugal, Spain and Finland opened their labour markets to immigrants from the newly joined member states. Only Germany and Austria continued imposing restrictions until 2011. However, Germany did liberalize these restrictions and facilitated the access for high skilled immigrants to its labour market in 2008. In relation to the 2007 EU-enlargement, most EU25 countries facilitated the access of Bulgarians and Romanians to their labour markets. The most frequent destinations for immigrants, coming from the two new member states, were Spain and Italy (Kahanec et al., 2009).

\(^1\) With the 2004 EU enlargement ten European countries (i.e. Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovakia, and Slovenia) became members of the EU. With the 2007 EU enlargement two more European countries (i.e. Bulgaria and Romania) became EU member-states (European Commission, 2013).
The outbreak of the 2007/2008 international financial crisis imposed a decline in migration towards the EU27 countries. So, since 2008, immigration flows slowed considerably, like in the rest of the world, as a response to the economic recession (Coleman, 2010). It is indicative that, almost half of the EU8\(^1\) and EU2\(^2\) immigrant workers in the United Kingdom and Ireland, who had entered these destination countries between 2004 and 2009, returned to their homelands after the economic crisis erupted. This movement of repatriation may be party explained by the fact that, immigrant workers are usually more vulnerable to economic downturns in comparison to the native labour force. And, this relative vulnerability of immigrant workers may be attributed to many reasons, among which, poor native language skills, contingent work contracts, high concentration of immigrant workers in sectors of the economy tied to economic cycles (e.g. construction), intensification of possible discrimination incidences during harsh economic times and limited educational identifications (Fix et al., 2009).

Particularly since the outbreak of the Arab Spring in 2010, the ongoing events in the Southern Mediterranean countries have also stigmatized the recent migration movements in Europe. According to the European Commission (2011), hundreds of thousands of people have been displaced, mainly from the directly involved countries like Suria, but also from the wider Middle East area. The reasons behind the movement of these refugees and other humanitarian migrants have no close correlation with economic facts. Most frequently they relate to efforts to escape incidences like conflicts or prosecutions. This situation has generated large immigration flows towards the EU. Especially countries in the gateway of the EU, like Greece, Italy, Malta and Cyprus, witness on a daily basis a massive arrival of people from this part of the world.

---

\(^1\) Following the 2004 EU enlargement, citizens from the new EU member states (i.e. Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovakia, and Slovenia) could enjoy the right of free movement of workers in the EU and thus, to immigrate to other EU countries (Schmid-Drüner, 2015). Citizens who migrated from the (eight) East European countries towards the rest of the EU are referred to as EU8 migrant workers (OECD, 2012).

\(^2\) Following the 2007 EU enlargement, citizens from the new EU member states (i.e. Bulgaria and Romania) could enjoy the right of free movement of workers in the EU and thus, to immigrate to other EU countries (Schmid-Drüner, 2015). Citizens who migrated from Bulgarian and Romanian towards the rest of the EU are referred to as EU2 migrant workers (OECD, 2012).
Overall, the years covered so far (i.e. from the early 1970s’ until 2012) have shaped, to a degree, the current demographic picture of the EU. Table 3 illustrates the foreign and foreign-born populations in the EU27 member states by group of citizenship and country of birth in the year 2012. In particular, in 2012, foreign citizens\textsuperscript{1} in the EU27 represented the 4.1\% of the total population, while the foreign-born people\textsuperscript{2} accounted 6.5\% of the EU27 population. The variations in the concentration of foreign citizens in different member states were striking. The 77\% of all non-nationals in the EU27 resided in five member states. In particular, Germany was the country of residence for 7.7 million foreign citizens (who represented the 9.1\% of its total population), Spain for 5.1 million (who accounted for the 12\% of its total population), the United Kingdom for 4.9 million (who made up for 7.6\% of its total population), Italy for 4.4 million (who represented the 7.9\% of its total population) and France for 4.1 million (who denoted the 5.9\% of its population). The lowest percentages of foreign citizens in their total population were found in Poland, Lithuania and Slovakia (representing less than 2\% of the total population) and the highest in Luxembourg (representing 44\% of the total population) (Eurostat, 2014). Furthermore, in 2012, in every Member State (with the exception of Latvia, the Czech Republic and Luxembourg) the population of foreign-born people was larger than the population of foreign citizens (Eurostat, 2012). This can be attributed to two reasons: first, a number of foreign citizens born abroad have acquired the citizenship of their country of residence; second, the foreign-born population also includes nationals who have been born abroad or in a part of the state which no longer belongs to this state due to border rearrangements or dissolution (OECD, 2001).

\textsuperscript{1} The word “citizenship” denotes a specific legal relationship between an individual and his or her State. An individual is granted citizenship to a State by means of birth or naturalisation, by declaration, choice, marriage or other means under national legislation. If an individual is not citizen of the State in which he or she resides, then he or she is considered a foreign citizen. As a foreign citizen is also characterized a stateless person (i.e. someone with no registered citizenship or nationality), as well as, the individual whose citizenship is unknown (European Migration Network, 2014).

\textsuperscript{2} As foreign-born is broadly characterized the individual who is born outside of his or hers country of residence (European Migration Network, 2014).
Table 3. Foreign and foreign born population by group of citizenship and country of birth, 2012

| Country | FOREIGNERS | | | | FOREIGN-BORNS | | | | | |
|---------|------------|--------|--------|--------|------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
|         | TOTAL      | Citizens of other EU states | Citizens of non-EU states | TOTAL | Born in other EU states | Born in non-EU states |
|         | thousand | % | thousand | % | thousand | % | thousand | % |
| EU-27   | 20709.9  | 4.1 | 32967 | 6.5 |
| BE      | 1224.9 | 11 | 778.6 | 7 | 446.3 | 4 | 1699.2 | 15.3 | 797.1 | 7.2 | 902.1 | 8.1 |
| BG      | 42.4 | 0.6 | 11.3 | 0.2 | 31.1 | 0.4 | 88.1 | 1.2 | 32.9 | 0.4 | 55.1 | 0.8 |
| CR      | 423 | 4 | 151.3 | 1.4 | 271.7 | 2.6 | 390.8 | 3.7 | 138.2 | 1.3 | 252.7 | 2.4 |
| DK      | 258.7 | 6.4 | 134.9 | 2.4 | 223.8 | 4 | 531.5 | 9.5 | 169.2 | 3 | 362.3 | 6.5 |
| DE      | 7409.8 | 9.1 | 2744.8 | 3.4 | 4665 | 5.7 | 9931.9 | 12.1 | 3452.4 | 4.2 | 6478.5 | 9.1 |
| EE      | 206.6 | 15.7 | 14.4 | 1.1 | 192.2 | 14.6 | 210.8 | 16 | 19.8 | 1.5 | 191 | 14.5 |
| IE      | 487.9 | 10.6 | 388.8 | 8.5 | 99.1 | 2.2 | 685.5 | 15 | 504.7 | 11 | 180.8 | 3.9 |
| EL      | 975.9 | 8.6 | 151.2 | 1.3 | 824.2 | 7.3 | 1259.9 | 11.2 | 320.7 | 2.8 | 939.2 | 8.3 |
| ES      | 5562.1 | 12 | 2354.5 | 5.1 | 3207.6 | 6.9 | 6555 | 14.2 | 2353.4 | 5.1 | 4201.6 | 9.1 |
| FR      | 3858.3 | 5.9 | 1353.1 | 2.1 | 2505.2 | 3.8 | 7358.2 | 11.3 | 2131.4 | 3.3 | 5226.9 | 8 |
| IT      | 4825.6 | 7.9 | 1450.1 | 2.4 | 3375.4 | 5.5 | 5457.8 | 9 | 1747.7 | 2.9 | 3710.1 | 6.1 |
| CY      | 172.4 | 20 | 108.3 | 12.6 | 64.1 | 7.4 | 200.3 | 23.2 | 108.5 | 12.6 | 91.8 | 10.6 |
| LV      | 332.9 | 16.3 | 6.7 | 0.3 | 326.2 | 16 | 298 | 14.6 | 30.4 | 1.5 | 267.6 | 13.1 |
| LT      | 20.6 | 0.7 | 3 | 0.1 | 17.6 | 0.6 | 147.8 | 4.9 | 18.1 | 0.6 | 129.7 | 4.3 |
| LU      | 229.9 | 43.8 | 198.7 | 37.9 | 31.2 | 5.9 | 216.2 | 41.2 | 164.7 | 31.4 | 51.1 | 9.8 |
| HU      | 207.6 | 2.1 | 127.9 | 1.3 | 79.7 | 0.8 | 465.6 | 4.7 | 316.2 | 3.1 | 149.4 | 1.5 |
| MT      | 20.5 | 4.9 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| NL      | 697.7 | 4.2 | 360.8 | 2.2 | 336.9 | 2 | 1906.3 | 11.4 | 473.1 | 2.8 | 1433.2 | 8.6 |
| AT      | 947.7 | 11.2 | 382.7 | 4.5 | 565 | 6.7 | 1332.8 | 15.8 | 550.5 | 6.5 | 782.3 | 9.3 |
| PL      | 57.5 | 0.1 | 18.4 | 0 | 39 | 0.1 | 674.9 | 1.8 | 265.2 | 0.7 | 409.7 | 1.1 |
| PT      | 439.1 | 4.2 | 108 | 1 | 332.1 | 3.1 | 853.8 | 8.1 | 212.1 | 2 | 641.7 | 6.1 |
| RO      | 36.5 | 0.2 | 7 | 0 | 29.5 | 0.1 | 193.5 | 0.9 | 87.1 | 0.4 | 106.4 | 0.5 |
| SI      | 85.6 | 4.2 | 6.1 | 0.3 | 79.5 | 3.9 | 230.1 | 11.2 | 21.4 | 1 | 208.7 | 10.2 |
| SK      | 70.7 | 1.3 | 54 | 1 | 16.7 | 0.3 | 156.9 | 2.9 | 131.8 | 2.4 | 25.1 | 0.5 |
4.2.2. The characteristics of immigrants in EU27 and their reasons for immigration

One third of foreign citizens in EU27 during 2012 were citizens of another member state. European countries outside the EU27 constituted the second larger pool of foreign citizens for the EU countries. In this category, the majority of foreign citizens had come from Turkey, Albania and Ukraine. Countries in the African continent were the third most popular countries of origin of foreign citizens in the EU27. In detail, almost half of immigrants from Africa were living in North Africa, Morocco and Algeria before they emigrated to the EU27. Furthermore, Asian countries, particularly India and China, were the next larger pool of foreign citizens in the EU27. Finally, the smallest proportion of foreign citizens in the EU27 had originated from America. And, the majority of immigrants originating from the American continent were coming mostly from Ecuador, Brazil and Colombia (Eurostat, 2013).

According to the European Commission (2011), there were citizens from at least 175 countries residing in the EU27 in the year 2010. However, Penninx et al. (2008) argues that, the immigration patterns in the EU were not always that complicated. In particular, up to the 1980s immigration patterns could be categorized into three large categories: first, immigration flows from former colonies to ex-colonial European powers (i.e. the United Kingdom, France, Belgium and the Netherlands); second, labour immigration from specific sending countries (e.g. Greece and Italy) to certain receiving countries (e.g. Germany); third, refugee movements from Eastern to Western Europe. After the end of 1980s and progressively until today, this kind of categorization became a much more difficult and complicated task. Today, people from almost all parts of the globe immigrate to the EU. Hence, the current channels of immigration in the EU are difficult to be distinguished and categorized.

Source: Eurostat, Statistics in focus 2012, 2012
Note: - denotes non-availability of data
More specifically and in reference to asylum applicants, there were 257,800 asylum applicants registered in the EU27 in 2010. Most of these people were coming from Afghanistan (8%), Russia (7%), Serbia (7%), Iraq (6%) and Somalia (6%). The countries with the highest rates of applicants registered were Cyprus, Sweden, Belgium, Luxembourg and Austria (Eurostat, 2011). Since then, the number of asylum applicants increased rapidly and reached almost 450,000 in 2013. The number of asylum applicants within the EU28 in 2013 was the highest since 1901. Particularly asylum applicants from Syria witnessed their numbers increasing to more than 50,000 in 2013 and thus, representing almost the 12% of total asylum applicants from all non-EU countries. The remaining countries with the highest rates of asylum applicants were Russia (10%), Afghanistan (6%) and Serbia (5%). The EU countries with the highest number of asylum seekers registered were Germany, followed by France, Sweden, the United Kingdom, Italy and Belgium (Eurostat, 2014).

In relation to the gender distribution of immigrants, the number of male immigrants was slightly higher than the number of female immigrants (52% and 48% respectively). Figure 8 shows the proportion of male and female immigrants in the countries of the EU27 in the year 2012. The largest proportion of male immigrants, compared to the proportion of female immigrants, was documented in Slovakia (i.e. male immigrants made up 61% of total immigrants). On the contrary, the highest share of female immigrants, compared to the share of male immigrants, was reported in Cyprus (i.e. female immigrants represented 67% of total immigrants) (Eurostat, 2014).
Figure 8. Proportion of male and female immigrants, EU-27 countries, 2012

Source: Eurostat, Statistics in focus, 2012

Regarding the age distribution of immigrants, in 2012, immigrants in the EU27 member states were, on average, of much younger age than the resident population of their country of destination. This observation applies for both sexes (see Figure 9). Poland, Latvia and Estonia were the only countries in which this common tendency didn’t apply. The largest positive difference between the average age of the resident population and of the foreign population was in Italy, Greece, Finland, Denmark and the United Kingdom (Eurostat, 2014).
Adopting an overall view of the demographic map of EU27 it becomes evident that some member states, like the United Kingdom and Belgium, are characterized by a higher concentration of immigrants in their populations compared to others, like Sweden and the Netherlands. The factors that contribute towards making some destinations more attractive to immigrants than others can be grouped as follows: first, the indicative characteristics of each country; these include the economic opportunities provided, the level of wages, the quality of services, the availability and accessibility of amenities and others (OECD, 2004). This view is reinforced by the work of Nimwegen and Erf (2010), who argue that economic conditions constitute a major push and pull factor of European migration. In addition, Baldwin-Edwards (2002) classifies the design and generosity of the welfare state as key determinants on the choice of destination; and, the generosity of a welfare state is associated with the level of the resources available for the citizens, through cash transfer programs or subsidized services (Lundberg et al., 2008). Second, the existence and level of concentration of family members and compatriots (OECD, 2004). Indeed, the prospect of family reunion has a very significant role in determining immigrants’ destination. In this concept, the colonial linkages are of great importance as immigration from former colonies was, in the majority of cases, followed by family reunion migration (Hooghe et al., 2008). Third and last, the geographic distance between the country of origin and the possible countries of destination (OECD, 2004). Geis et al. (2011) highlight the
significance of geographic distance as an influencing factor on the choice of a destination country as well. Moreover, the authors point out that the cultural distance between the possible host countries and the country of origin makes some destinations more attractive than others. Following the same line of thinking, Fafchamps and Shilpi (2013) argue that the possible countries of destination, which are characterized by social proximity with the countries of origin, are more appealing to prospective immigrants than the ones which are not.

4.2.3 The notion of citizenship in Europe

After having assessed the demographic features related to immigration in the EU, our attention is drawn upon the notion of citizenship and its interconnection with immigration. In relation to citizenship acquisition in the EU27, 817,000 people acquired citizenship of an EU member state in 2012 (4.3% less people had acquired citizenship in the previous year). The highest number of citizenship acquisitions in 2012 was recorded in the United Kingdom, followed by Germany, France and Spain. The people who were granted citizenship in 2012 mostly came from Africa (25%), Asia (25%), non-EU27 Europe (20%) and North and South America (15%). It should also be mentioned that, in some EU27 countries the majority of citizenships were granted to immigrants from only one state (e.g. in Greece the 84% of citizenship acquisitions were given to people from Albania) (Eurostat, 2014). Furthermore, the naturalization rate can be used as an indicator of the effectiveness of national citizenship policies. In the majority of cases, the less restrictive the national citizenship policies the higher the naturalization rates. Yet, in specific countries (i.e. in Italy, Greece, Finland, Ireland, Germany and Luxembourg) this tendency is not existent. On the contrary, these countries have naturalization rates below the EU average, even though they have relatively less restrictive national citizenship policies (British Council and the Migration Policy Group, 2011).

In general, the nature of citizenship policies adopted in various EU member states is regarded to be significantly correlated with the integration of immigrants (Guild et al., 2009) as immigrants’ integration relates to all aspects of citizenship (i.e. legal status, rights, political and other forms of participation in the society, identity and sense of “belonging”) (Goodman, 2010). Moreover, the word citizenship by definition, entails the notions of inclusion and exclusion and thus, it is significantly linked with the incorporation of immigrants in the host state. The legal process of granting of citizenship, as well as the
various related policies and practices, rely mainly on the authority of each EU member state. Therefore, there are variations in the nationality laws of the countries within the EU27. As a consequence, the outcomes of these national legislations in terms of immigrants’ integration differ as well (Bloemraad et al., 2008). In relation to immigrants’ integration policies, traditionally, the following broad models can be distinguished in the EU27: the German model of differential exclusion, the universalistic, assimilationist model of France and the multicultural model of the Netherlands. Yet, many commenting voices have been heard on the grounds of the effectiveness of national integration models as well as on the plausibility and efficacy of their simplified categorization (Entzinger and Biezeveld, 2003). For example, a parliamentary inquiry conducted in the Netherlands in 2004 revealed that immigrants who had succeeded economically in the period between 1970 and 2000 had done so despite the government policy rather than on account of the government policy (Christopoulos, 2006). In addition, national immigrant integration policies within the EU27 have a considerable degree of convergence (Joppke, 2010).

More precisely, general tendencies across the EU regarding the development of nationality laws can be identified. The evolution of nationality laws in the EU was generally lethargic until the 1980s. Nevertheless, since then, it progressively became evident that, a large proportion of immigrants, who had entered the EU, had become permanent residents and so, certain alterations in the nationality laws were introduced. In particular, the general tendency was towards the integration of long-term immigrants. On the basis that naturalization is a means of integration, the liberalization of the nationality laws was seen as a tool to achieve this aim (De Hart, 2008). This is the reason why the EU countries facilitated the acquisition of citizenship for first and second generation immigrants as well as why they widened the acceptance of multiple nationality (Joppke, 2003). The aforementioned tendency lasted approximately until 2000, when the naturalization policies in the EU member states gradually evolved to become more restrictive. So, in many EU member states strict naturalization tests were introduced. As a consequence, citizenship was transformed to a form of reward for successful integration instead of being a means of successful integration like in the previous years (De Hart, 2008). Nevertheless, this observed tendency towards more restrictive civic requirements in several member states was enclosed within a liberal framework and thus, it was partly abolished (Joppke, 2008).
Moreover, the steps that have been made at the EU level towards the convergence of national integration policies and the improvement of their effectiveness to meet preferred targets have been progressively fruitful. They have resulted in the partial limitation of some of the differences present in national legislations and also in the upgrading of desired outcomes. An Agreement of great importance was the “Common Basic Principles for Immigrant Integration Policy in the European Union” decided by the European Council in 2004. These basic principles can be summarized as follows: First, the integration process is dynamic and requires the mutual effort from both immigrants and national citizens of the EU member states. Second, the word integration in the EU concept implies adaptation of the EU values (as displayed in the EU Treaties) and devotion to them. Third, immigrants’ education and employment are recognised as particularly significant elements of the integration procedure. Fourth, good knowledge of the receiving country’s language, history and institutions is of great significance. Fifth, the need for equal access to both public and private services/goods for both immigrants and national citizens and the need for the free practice of different religions and cultures is imperative. Sixth and last, the participation of immigrants in the process of shaping policies which apply to them and thus, they directly affect them is of major importance (European Commission, 2011).

These basic principles have influenced to a considerable degree the national policies on immigrants’ integration and hence, they have promoted the convergence of national integration policies. On the one hand, they were agreed by the political leaders of the EU member states and so, to some extent, they mirror their political intentions. On the other hand, considering the interconnection between the EU member states, the above principles would influence the policies at the EU member states national level. An example of the interconnection between the EU27 member states is given by Parkers (2008). In detail, a possible integration policy failure in a member state could trigger an immigrant to turn to criminality. This in turn could create security risks to the rest of the EU27 member states due to the relative freedom of movement within the EU27 countries (Howard, 2009).

Goodman (2010) expresses the view that the above-mentioned level of convergence is existent but, also diverse across the EU member states. This is evident in different citizenship “strategies” adopted in various EU countries. More analytically, the prohibited citizenship strategy encompasses arduous and obligatory integration requirements (e.g. language and history knowledge). Germany, Austria and Denmark form the category of
countries adopting this kind of exclusivist citizenship strategies. In these countries, the obstacles for gaining full membership are plenty for an individual who is eligible for citizenship or residence. Furthermore, the conditional citizenship is characterized by “selectiveness”, which means that it serves towards the restriction of certain immigrant categories. Netherlands, France and the UK implement this kind of citizenship strategies. The reason is that the liberal access to citizenship that they offer is accompanied with quite demanding civic requirements, like language and history knowledge. Last, the enabling citizenship strategy rejects difficult and mandatory integration requirements as they are seen as obstacle to the final goal of the obtaining citizenship procedure, namely integration. Spain, Italy and Greece are the most profound examples of EU countries which elaborate this strategy.

As a final note, a general comment in relation to the efficacy of the integration process is given by Bloemraad, et al. (2008). The authors claim that the integration of immigrants is better served through policies which promote multiculturalism rather than assimilationism. The following example reveals the rationale of this claim. Attempts of the United States government towards the “Americanization” of immigrants via the promotion of abandonment of their native language have not resulted into the desired integration outcome. On the contrary, multilingual immigrants had more dynamic involvement in the economic, political and social life of the host society than immigrants who had abandoned the language of their homeland and they could only speak the language of their host country.

***

The knowledge of major immigration and settlement events in the European continent, from the end of Second World War until recent times (fueled by major historical events) is a necessary tool for assessing the various policy responses to immigration throughout this period. Assessing the diversity of immigrants’ populations in various parts of Europe (in terms of immigrant population size and composition) is also very helpful in understanding the different national policy responses to immigration (in terms of their direction, restrictiveness and interventionism). More precisely, from the end of Second World War until the beginning of the 1970s the migration map of Europe was mainly formed by post-war adjustments and refugee movements from Eastern to Western Europe (Zaiceva and Zimmermann, 2008). From the early 1970s until the mid-2010s, immigration
in Europe was of both economic nature (driven mainly by the first oil-price crisis in 1973, the ensuing economic downturn and the EU enlargements in 2004 and 2007 (Kahanec and Zimmermann, 2009)) and of humanitarian nature (driven mainly by the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1989, the wars in the Balkans in the 1990s and the ongoing unrest in the Middle East (European Commission, 2014)).

Partly due to national policies on immigration (e.g. the guest worker system in Northwestern Europe implemented mainly from the 1950s up to the 1970s), these immigration movements involved people of various distinct characteristics (e.g. in regards to their age, gender, legal status, motives for immigration, etc.) (Stalker, 2002), enriching the mosaic of people in various European countries and intensifying the need for effective integration policies (Eurostat, 2014). The EU has made several attempts towards promoting the integration of immigrants in the EU and the convergence of integration and citizenship policies across the EU member states (e.g. through the agreement on “Common Basic Principles for Immigrant Integration Policy in the European Union” decided by the European Council in 2004).

Nevertheless, today, national policies on immigration and citizenship are still considerably diverse. This is mainly attributed to different demographic changes owing to immigration as well as to different public policy priorities and budget allocation decisions (European Commission, 2014). Situating immigration in the European context is, however, an important first step for the analysis of immigration in any EU member state. This is particularly true for EU countries experiencing major historical events, like Greece, which is been challenged with economic downturn since 2009.

4.3. Migration history in Greece: a country of emigration becomes a country of immigration

As discussed in section 4.1, one could assume the existence of strong links between migration movements and respective political and socio-economic circumstances in migration-sending regions. In turn, those migration movements have a tremendous impact on the shaping of economic and socio-political conditions in migration-receiving regions (Massey et. al, 1993). Greece, in particular, is a country with a very rich migration history. In recent years, the immigrant population in Greece has risen at a quick pace. This
constitutes an unprecedented development, bearing in mind Greece’s history of being predominantly a country of emigration. Hence, the present demographic composition of Greece is a new phenomenon in the history of the country. The following paragraphs are dedicated to the description of the migration movements which led to the transformation of Greece from a land of emigration to a land of immigration and influenced greatly the political and socioeconomic reality in the country.

4.3.1. The years of emigration

Greece has been traditionally a country of emigration (Cavounidis, 2002). Since the formation of the Modern Greek state in the beginning of the 19th century, Greece was involved in two mass emigration waves: The first mass wave of emigration occurred in the end of the 19th century. More precisely, a rapid international price fall of the country’s main export product (i.e. currants) caused severe economic crisis and brought deep poverty to the people. The economic hardships of the time led to the declaration of bankruptcy in 1893 and to the consequent emigration of a massive number of Greeks. During those years, almost one sixth of the native population left Greece in search of a better life (Kassimis and Kassimi, 2004). The second mass wave of emigration occurred following the end of the Second World War with the biggest bulk of emigrants departing from Greece between 1946 and 1974 (Lianos, 1975). The civil war (1946-1949), the military junta rule (1967-1973), the socio-political unrest and the poverty of these years made over a million people to leave their homes and emigrate to all corners of the globe (Fakiolas and King, 1996).

Outward migration came to a halt following the first oil crisis in 1973. More importantly, there was also a notable increase in return migration during those years. It is indicative that since then (i.e. from the middle of the 1970s until the end of 1980s) the number of returning immigrants started to exceed the number of emigrants (Katseli and Glytsos, 1989). The most important pull factors for return migration at the time were, among others, the following: (i) international economic uncertainty and reduction in international demand for immigrant labour; (ii) adoption of restrictive immigration policies across Europe and integration difficulties in the host countries; (iii) restoration of democracy in Greece in 1974 (after 7 seven years of military dictatorship); and (iv) increasing economic opportunities following the entrance of Greece into the European Economic Community in 1981. So, between the mid-1970s and the late 1980s, approximately half of emigrants
of the post war period had repatriated, causing net migration in Greece to become almost zero (Kotzamanis and Stathakis, 2001).

### 4.3.2. The rise of immigration

Decline of emigration and rise of return migration in Greece almost overlapped chronologically with increasing immigration. Immigration towards Greece started increasing noticeably since the second half of the 1980s. The liberation process in the former communist regimes in Central and Eastern Europe marked the start of large immigration flows to Greece. Immigrants from Poland were the first to immigrate to Greece in waves. Polish immigrants were soon succeeded by Bulgarians and Romanians (Cavounidis, 2002). Nonetheless, the size of those immigration flows was relatively small compared to the size of the immigration flows which were about to follow.

Only a few years later, the dissolution of the Soviet Union by the end of 1991 triggered the creation of fifteen independent states (i.e. Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Estonia, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Moldova, Russia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine and Uzbekistan), some of which became main sources of immigrants to Greece (i.e. Georgia, Ukraine, Russia and Moldova) (Matthews, 2000). More importantly, the abandonment of communism in Albania marked the greatest immigration movement in modern Greek history. Certainly, immigration towards Greece reached its peak at the beginning of the 1990s. Within an impressively short period of time, Greece received a great number of immigrants coming mainly from one single country, neighbouring Albania. It is revealing that two thirds of the total number of immigrants coming to Greece during that period were Albanians (Kostaki et al., 2009) (see Table 2).

It should be noted, though, that it is almost impossible to estimate with accuracy the magnitude of immigration towards Greece during this period. This wave of immigration (i.e. approximately between 1990 and 2000) involved mainly the undocumented crossing of the northern borders of Greece (predominantly the Greek-Albanian and Greek-Bulgarian boarders). The majority of such immigrants were also residing and working in Greece without possessing the necessary legal documents (Cavounidis, 2002).
Hence, the government’s attempt to calculate the size and the key demographic characteristics of the immigrant population in Greece during that period was susceptible to failure. The 1991 Census collected information only for those immigrants who were European Union citizens as well as for those immigrants from non-EU countries who had legal authorization to live and work in the country (Kuriakou, 2004). So, the great number of undocumented immigrants in Greece were excluded from the process of demographic recording. According to the 1991 Census, 142,367 foreigners were living in Greece at the time (see Table 2). However, this figure is misleading and it does not reflect accurately the actual population of foreigners living in the country during that year (Hellenic Statistical Authority, 2014).

The accuracy of the Census data was enhanced ten years later, when the 2001 Census was conducted. The 2001 Census attempted to provide information about immigration at the national level as well as in comparison to the general population (Marvakis et al., 2001). The outcome of the 2001 Census was reasonably successful. Based on approximate calculations, only 100,000 immigrants were excluded from the registration procedure, mainly, due to their undocumented status (Kuriakou, 2004). According to Census outcomes for the year 2001, Greece had approximately 797,091 immigrants living within its borders. The native population of Greece in the same year was 10,964,020 (see Table 4). So, immigrants represented 7.27% of the general population. The comparison of the 2001 Census figures to the 1991 Census figures reveals the remarkable increase in the documented population of immigrants in Greece during the 1990s. This population increase is impressive, even after considering the calculation barriers deriving from the undocumented status of a great number of immigrants. So, during the 1990s, approximately 654,724 individuals immigrated to Greece. Consequently, the population of immigrants in the country increased from 142,367 in 1991 to 797,091 in 2001 (Hellenic Statistical Authority, 2001) (see Table 4).

Furthermore, two distinct waves of immigration can be traced in the years between 1991 and 2001. The first large influx of immigrants occurred in the beginning of 1990s when a great number of Albanians immigrated to Greece due to the outbreak of the severe political and economic crisis in Albania at the time (King and Vullnetary, 2003). The second large migration influx occurred towards the end of 1990s. It involved the immigration of individuals from the rest Balkan countries (predominantly from Bulgaria and Romania).
as well as from Pakistan and India (Kassimis and Kassimi, 2004). A considerable number of Albanians participated in this second wave of immigration too. The fall of the financial “pyramid schemes” in Albanians’ banking system led to the economic crisis of 1997 and triggered further mass departures of Albanians towards Greece (King, 2005).

4.3.3. Recent developments in migration movements

In recent years, the 2009 economic crisis and the subsequent increase in unemployment generated an increase in emigration movements from Greece. Indeed, unemployment in 2013 was three times higher than in 2009 (i.e. the unemployment rate increased from 9.10% in May 2009 to 27.63% in May 2013) (Hellenic Statistical Authority, 2013). It is worth noting that, in 2011, emigrants marginally outnumbered immigrants (Eurostat, 2013). The distinctive difference between the present waves of emigration and the emigration waves of the past (see section 4.3.1) is that, in current times, emigrants are not predominantly low-educated persons. On the contrary, present emigration movements involve a great number of highly-educated individuals (Papadakis et al., 2012).

The above observations are of even greater interest when analysed in conjunction with the latest developments in immigration movements towards Greece. In particular, undocumented entry and residence in Greece has revived notably in recent years. Those undocumented immigration movements involve mainly the crossing of the eastern borders of Greece (i.e. the Greek-Turkish borders) as opposed to the first major wave of undocumented immigration to Greece which involved mainly the crossing of the northern borders of the Greece (i.e. the Greek-Albanian and the Greek-Bulgarian borders). In 2010, the number of people entering Greece without legal permit was reaching 500 per day. And, in the same year, 90% of all apprehensions for undocumented entrance to the European Union occurred in Greece. It is also particularly alarming that, the number of irregular arrivals in Greece has recently increased tremendously. Only between February 1 and March 2, 2016 the number of people who crossed irregularly the Aegean Sea to the Greek islands reached 56,335 (with a daily average of 1,943 irregular crossings) (European Commission, 2016). Those immigration movements to Greece have been predominantly fuelled by the wars in Afghanistan (from 2001 to 2014) and Iraq (from 2003 to 2011) and the destabilization of certain parts of Africa and the Middle East, with the most outstanding development being the outburst of the Syrian civil war (from 2011 to present) (European Commission, 2016; Morehouse and Blomfield, 2011; Park, 2015).
The rapid increase in undocumented immigrants and refugees arriving in Greece in conjunction with the implementation of the Dublin II Regulation (2003/343/CE) has led to an ongoing socioeconomic, political and above all humanitarian crisis within the Greek borders. Dublin II Regulation regulates the principle of only one EU country being responsible for assessing an asylum application. That country is the initial EU country of entry. Thus, Dublin II Regulation provides for the reallocation of apprehended undocumented immigrants from all over the EU to the initial EU country of entry for the examination of their legal cases. Finally, undocumented immigrants remain in this country until their legal cases are resolved. So, the majority of refugees and undocumented immigrants crossing the Greek-Turkey borders get trapped in Greece often against their own will. The most common aspiration among them is to reach other EU countries. However, in the majority of cases, this aim is impossible to be accomplished through legal channels (mainly due to EU regulations). Hence, Greece has become a “black hole” for refugees and undocumented immigrants whose welfare is at great risk. Also, trafficking networks are thriving, taking advantage of the vulnerability of undocumented immigrants and refugees and the incapability of both the Greek state and the European Union to protect them (Hyland, 2016; Lowen, 2013; Spinthourakis and Antonopoulou, 2011).

The time frame of those developments (i.e. refugee and undocumented immigration crisis) overlapped with the severe economic crisis which has lately hit Greece and has crippled the Greek economy. Natives have suffered dearly from the devastating economic conditions and the austerity measures implemented in response to the recession. This unfortunate economic situation has long prepared the ground for the creation of social unrest, political turmoil and the genesis of political and ideological extremism (Berecz and Domina, 2012). Immigrants, who form a vulnerable population group in Greece, are frequently targets of far-right rhetoric and violence. This is particularly true for newcomer immigrants (Lazaridis and Tsagkroni, 2016). Hence, besides the endless struggle against unfortunate economic conditions, immigrants are also confronted with the danger of becoming Greece’s scapegoats. And, it is alarming that immigrants in Greece have been framed by fragments of the society as well as by several politicians as the main cause of unemployment and social dissolution (Angouri and Wodak, 2014; Figgou et. al, 2011).
Based on the 2011 Census data, the foreign population in Greece in 2011 was 911,929 (see Table 4). In the same year, the general population of Greece was 10,815,197. So, foreigners represented 8.4% of the general population. It is worth noting that, the vast majority of immigrants in Greece came from countries that are geographically close to Greece. More precisely, the following findings can be drawn in relation to the nationality of foreign residents in Greece: First, approximately 750,000 foreign residents in Greece were from Europe. In fact, 600,000 foreigners were from the Balkans (i.e. mainly from Albania and Bulgaria), 70,000 were from Eastern Europe (i.e. mostly from Romania, Georgia, Ukraine, Poland and Russia), 40,000 were from Western Europe (i.e. predominantly from the United Kingdom and Germany), while the rest 40,000 were from other European countries. On this note, German nationals were the only immigrant group whose population decreased rapidly (i.e. it was more than halved) between the years 1981 and 1991. Second, the remaining 162,000 foreign residents in Greece were from Asia, Africa and the rest of the world. The most commonly reported Asian countries of origin were the following: Pakistan (i.e. reported by 34,177 foreigners), India (i.e. reported by 11,333 foreigners), Bangladesh (i.e. reported by 11,076 individuals) and Philippines (i.e. reported by 9,804 foreigners). The most frequently reported African country of origin was Egypt (i.e. reported by 10,455 foreigners). Foreigners from the rest of the world comprised only a negligible share of the total population of foreign residents in Greece (Hellenic Statistical Authority, 2013) (see Table 4).
Table 4. Permanent foreign residents in Greece by country of nationality, in the years 1981, 1991, 2001 and 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thousand</td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>Thousand</td>
<td>% of total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>3.563</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>20.556</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>0.0008%</td>
<td>2.413</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>0.0006%</td>
<td>1.923</td>
<td>0.018%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.0001%</td>
<td>1.911</td>
<td>0.018%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>14.022</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
<td>10.998</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>19.337</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
<td>14.651</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>0.0005%</td>
<td>9.624</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>1.515</td>
<td>0.015%</td>
<td>12.918</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>0.0008%</td>
<td>1.720</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>20.233</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
<td>8.525</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>0.0008%</td>
<td>3.605</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>1.602</td>
<td>0.016%</td>
<td>2.131</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total population of third country nationals</td>
<td>171.424</td>
<td>1.76%</td>
<td>142.367</td>
<td>1.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total population of Greece</td>
<td>9.739.441</td>
<td>10.259.900</td>
<td>10.964.020</td>
<td>10.815.197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hellenic Statistical Authority, various years

Note: - denotes number lower than 100
4.3.4. Characteristics of immigrants in Greece

A further breakdown of demographic figures based on immigrants’ nationality will allow the extraction of additional information relating to the prevalent characteristics of immigrant groups in Greece (e.g. their gender composition, their employment characteristics, etc.). So, the following paragraphs are dedicated to the description of the most distinctive characteristics of some of the most populous immigrant groups in Greece. First, it can be argued that Albanians form a unique immigrant group in Greece. Greece constitutes the only European country where only one immigrant group, Albanians, make up for more than 50% of the total foreign population (Ministry of Interior, 2013). Hence, Albanians are the barometer of several migration related issues in Greece. Particularly in the 1990s, immigration from Albania covered the extended demand for cheap and flexible labour in the agricultural and construction sectors of the economy. In relation to gender, predominantly Albanian men were absorbed in this type of occupations. Albanian women were most frequently employed as domestic workers.

Moreover, until the launch of the first regularization programme in 1997 for the legalization of undocumented immigrants (see section 4.4), the majority of Albanians in Greece were trapped in a paradox; the paradox of being “legitimized” by the Greek labour market (i.e. by being willingly hired in great numbers by Greek employers in order fill the gaps in the labour market), but, at the same time, not being “legitimized” by the Greek State (i.e. by not having legal authorization to live and work in the country). The Greek State was tolerating the undocumented status of a great number of Albanians due to its administrative inability to tackle effectively this issue or due to the economic merits deriving from the undocumented status of Albanian labourers. The most obvious of those merits was the supply of labour at minimum cost. Finally, in relation to the gender composition of the first generation of Albanian immigrants, Albanian men were outnumbering Albanian women (Census, 2001).

A similar gender structure (i.e. male immigrants outnumbering female immigrants) was also found among the first generation of Romanian immigrants in Greece. On the contrary, immigrants from Bulgaria were to their majority of female gender. In regards to employment, Romanian men were known to be mainly employed in building/construction occupations (Boersma and Lazarescu, 2009) while Bulgarian men were known to be mainly employed in agricultural occupations. Last, it was common for Bulgarian and
Romanian women to be primarily employed in the domestic sector and in the services sector (Kretsos, 2007).

Furthermore, several observations can be made in regards to certain populous immigrant groups from Asian countries, namely from Pakistan, Philippines, India and Bangladesh. Immigrants from Pakistan started coming in Greece during the 1970s following an official agreement between Pakistan and Greece for the employment of Pakistani nationals in Greece. The majority of Pakistani immigrants were employed in shipyards at the time. Since that period, though, the number of Pakistani immigrants in Greece increased considerably. Hence, in more recent years, Pakistani nationals have been also employed in different type of occupations (predominantly in the services sector, the manufacturing industry and the construction sector). In relation to gender, Pakistani immigrants in Greece have been to their vast majority of male gender. On the contrary, the great majority of immigrants from Philippines have been women. Philippine immigrants started coming to Greece at the end of the 1970s. They have been traditionally employed in the domestic services sector as the most common occupation among them is that of the domestic worker (Ministry of Interior, 2013).

Finally, immigration from India to Greece started increasing at the beginning of 1990s. Indian immigrants have been predominantly occupied in the agricultural sector as well as in the stockbreeding and fishing industry. The majority of Indians in Greece have been males (Ministry of Interior, 2013). Immigrants from Bangladesh also form a male dominated immigrant group. The first Bangladeshi immigrants started coming to Greece in the 1970s but, only after the 1990s did their population increase significantly. Bangladeshi immigrants have been mainly employed in the manufacturing sector, in the building/construction sector and in the services sector (e.g. in companies, restaurants, shops, hotels, etc.). As a final note, in recent years, a growing number of undocumented Bangladeshi immigrants live in Greece due to the difficulties they encounter in becoming employed and renewing their residence and work permits (Boersma and Lazarescu, 2009) (see section 4.4).

***

A dramatic change in the demography of Greece has occurred since the last quarter of the twentieth century as the country has been transformed from a great exporter of migrants...
to a great receiver of migrants. On this note, immigration movements have involved both documented and undocumented immigrants entering, living and working in the country, transforming the estimation of the actual population of foreigners (i.e. the population of both documented and undocumented immigrant residents) into a very challenging and often impossible task. Those demographic changes reflect the magnitude of the recent historical developments which influenced the fate of thousands of people and shaped contemporary reality in Greece.

In relation to Greece’s capability to protect the welfare of its immigrant population, Greece has not managed yet to develop a sufficient and functional welfare state (see Chapter 2) which could, among others, provide immigrants with a safety net in times of need. Hence, immigrants’ employment in Greece is of major importance as a means of safeguarding their welfare. Considering the integration of immigrants in the native labour market it becomes apparent that the factors of origin and gender are decisive for the allocation of immigrant labour in different economic sectors and in different types of occupations. So, even though the labour market is highly segmented, a few general remarks can be made. Most of male immigrants are predominantly employed in construction occupations (mostly Albanians and Romanians) and in the agricultural sector (mainly Indians and Bulgarians). A clearly smaller share of immigrant men is employed in manufacturing and services jobs (mostly Bangladeshis and Pakistanis). As for immigrant women, the majority of them offer services in the domestic sector of the economy (this observation holds true for immigrant women of different origins). At this point it should be mentioned that, limitations of recording undocumented immigrants have constituted constant barriers in portraying with accuracy their employment status and characteristics.

Today, Greece is suffering through its seventh consecutive year of the severe economic crisis. The on-going deep recession in conjunction with immigrants’ close dependence on their participation in the labour market for meeting their basic needs create an amalgamation which threatens their welfare. It also makes the study of immigration policies in Greece imperative for gaining a better understanding of immigrants’ legal rights in Greece and thus, of their prospects of integration in the labour market and welfare state.
4.4. Immigration policies in Greece

During the last decades, the importance of the Greek migration policy, shaped by Greek nationality Law, has been increasing due to significant demographic developments owing to migration (see section 4.2). More precisely, in the beginning of the 1990s the need for a concrete legal framework for migration became imperative and migration policy turned into a key topic in the public and political arena. However, contemporary Greece has not yet managed to form effective laws on migration as well as operating and pragmatic migration policies. That creates tremendous problems in managing migration and protecting the welfare of foreign and native residents in Greece. In an attempt to gain an understanding of the repercussions of Greek migration laws and policies on the welfare of people in Greece the following paragraphs examine the most significant turning points of the Greek legislation on migration.

4.4.1. The initial attempts for the formation of a legal framework of migration

The regulation of the status of foreigners was first attempted by the Greek State in 1929 with the purpose of meeting the legal needs generated by the arrival of nearly one million Greek refugees from Asia Minor following the defeat of Greece in the Greek-Turkish war of 1919-1922 (Kokkali, 2011). The Act 43/10 on Establishment and movement of legal aliens in Greece, policy controls, passports, deportations and replacements gave, for the first time, legal context to the status of foreigners. The “1929 law” (amended in 1948) remained valid for more than sixty years after its enactment but, it was never strictly applied (Papantoniou-Frangouli and Leventi 2000). More precisely, until the mid-1980s, the inflow of immigrants to Greece was so limited that there was no pressing need for the development and implementation of laws on migration. The Greek State and the Greek society were not yet alarmed by the undocumented presence of non-Greek nationals in

---

1 One of the most significant amendments of the “1929 law” was reflected in the introduction of gender equality principles. Particularly, in the first half of the 1980s Greek women were given the right to pass on their Greek citizenship to their children, while previously, only Greek men possessed the right to do so. Moreover, Greek women were no longer bound to lose their Greek citizenship after getting married to foreign spouses. In parallel lines, foreign women were given the right to acquire the Greek citizenship if they would become married to a Greek spouse. Those legal developments were of great significance, promoting equality and fairness. However, the actual implementation of those legal provisions was by far free of important and frequently insurmountable obstacles (Papantoniou-Frangouli and Leventi 2000).
Greece. The need for effective legislation on migration was created only after the unforeseen transformation of Greece from a migrant-exporting country to an immigrant-receiving country in the early 1990s (Lazaridis, 1996).

The first massive entrance of immigrants in the Greek territory (in the beginning of 1990s) involved mainly the undocumented movement of people from neighboring Albania to Greece. Greece was undeniably unprepared to receive such large number of immigrants in such a short period of time. In an attempt to cope with this unprecedented situation, the “1929 Law” was replaced in 1991 by the Act 1975/1991 on Entry, exit, stay, employment, deportation of aliens, procedure for recognition of foreign refugees and other provisions (Siadima, 2001). The two main objectives of the Act 1975/1991 were the restriction of entry of undocumented immigrants as well as the expulsion of those undocumented immigrants who were already present in Greece. So, the 1991 Law had a highly restrictive and most notably a highly “onedimensional” approach (i.e. persistence on an endeavor to restrict access to undocumented immigrants in the country). That approach was unrealistic and detached from the reality of those years as the undocumented arrival of immigrants as well as their undocumented residence and employment in the country was deemed highly unlikely to be reversed. So, the Act 1975/1991 failed to address effectively a plethora of issues arising from the seemingly irreversible migration inflow. Those issues included the integration of immigrants in the Greek society, their integration in the native labour market and their social security protection (Papantoniou-Frangouli and Leventi 2000).

Five years later, in 1996, the Greek State made its first tentative steps towards accepting that Greece had become a country of immigration. Greece introduced the 2404/1996 Law, which was essentially an official agreement between Albania and Greece for the employment of Albanian nationals in Greece. The agreement entailed the employment of Albanians in agricultural occupations on a strictly seasonal basis. Overall, the 2404/1996 Law constituted a positive development towards the regulation and control of immigration from Albania to Greece as well as towards the employment protection of Albanians in the Greek territory (Antonopoulos, 2006).
4.4.2. The evolution of the Law in the 2000s

The inability of the Greek state to arrest and deport a notably high number of undocumented immigrants, who continued entering, living and working in the country, led to an even more considerable shift in the law. This entailed the regularization of undocumented immigrants already present in the country. In particular, the Law 2910/2001 on *Entry and sojourn of foreigners in Greek territory, naturalisation and other measures* included, among others, the framework for a regularization programme named “Green card II”. The “Green card II” theme was the continuation of the so-called “White card” initiative which was entered into force in 1997. The possession of the “White card” (i.e. a residence and work permit valid for a six month period) was a necessary precondition for the acquisition of the “Green card”, which constituted a residence and work permit for one up to five years and which could also be renewed after its’ expiration (Levinson, 2005).

More precisely, the “White card” initiative was the first legalization program introduced by the Greek State and it constituted an essential and positive legal development, facilitating, among others, the integration of immigrants in the Greek society. Nonetheless, several bureaucratic and administrative obstacles were identified during the implementation of “the 1997 legalization program”. The most important pitfall was that many undocumented immigrants were initially exempted from the application procedure while others were given permits which lasted for only six months and thus, they were quickly re-characterized as undocumented after the expiration date of their permits. Therefore, the need for a second regularization program was vital (Papantoniou-Frangouli and Levanti, 2000). In fact, the “2001 regularization program” aimed at those immigrants who had not benefited from the “1997 regularization program” due to the aforementioned reasons but, also at those immigrants who were excluded from the “1997 legalization program” because they couldn’t fill in the required documents. So, the “2001 regularization program” was of great significance as it provided undocumented immigrants the right to live and work in Greece by means of renewable permits (Fakiolas, 2003).

Nonetheless, it should be mentioned that, the 2001 Law failed to address effectively the employment rights of foreign workers in Greece. More precisely, it lacked the elementary provision of equality of foreign and native workers and it placed foreign workers in an
impasse. The reason was that foreign workers needed to be in employment in order to acquire and keep possessing a residence permit, otherwise they faced imprisonment. Thus, foreign workers were in a position of dependence on their employers and thus, vulnerable to their possible exploitation. Undocumented foreign workers were in the most vulnerable position as they did not possess the right of access to civil and criminal courts for offences made against them or for violations of their working rights (Papadopoulou, 2004). Furthermore, the administrative delays were enormous. Foreigners would apply for the issuance or renewal of their permits but, the bureaucratic delays were so prolonged that, frequently, they would receive their issued or renewed permits after their expiration date. So, foreigners were paying for permits, which were frequently of no value, as those permits would often expire by the time they receive them (Triadafyllidou, 2009).

As a final point, the 2001 Law also encapsulated provisions regulating immigration to Greece for the reasons of work and family reunification. Hence, it rationalized, simplified and enhanced considerably the legal context for migration movements towards Greece (Fakiolas, 2003). Moreover, and in relation to citizenship acquisition, the 2001 Law provided that the required period of legal residence in the country would be ten years in order for someone to be eligible to apply for citizenship. Applicants for citizenship were also required to take a so-called citizenship test so as to prove they met a set of naturalization standards. Those standards included excellent knowledge of the Greek history, language, and culture (Kiprianos et al., 2003). Hence, several immigrants were discouraged from acquiring citizenship due to the strictness of those criteria as well as due the ponderous, expensive and non-transparent administrative procedure leading to citizenship acquisition.

A few years later, in 2005, a new law was launched (i.e. Law 3386/2005) with the purpose of addressing pending immigration matters from the previous decade and strategically managing migration flows. Through the Law 3386/2005, EU directives regarding aliens’ right to family reunification (i.e. EU directive 2003/86) as well as aliens’ right to acquire the status of “long term resident” (i.e. EU directive 2003/109) were included in the Greek legislation on migration. The new law also introduced a new stay permit on the account of different purposes (e.g. family reunification, employment, etc.) which replaced the previous existing separate work and residence permits. Consequently, employment permits were granted to individuals under the condition that they were in possession of a
Those developments simplified and rationalized previous legislative provisions for the arrival, residence and employment of foreigners in Greece. It is also of great importance that the 3386/2005 Law incorporated in its field of effect legal provisions for the protection of victims of human trafficking (Kambouri and Hatzopoulos, 2009) as Greece has been frequently considered a hub of human trafficking. Unfortunately, though, the crucial problem of human trafficking is still present today, mainly due to ineffective prevention and prosecution procedures (Christides, 2013).

In 2007, the 3386/2005 Law was modified by the Law 3536/2007 in order to include yet another regularization program. The particular regularization act aimed at those undocumented immigrants who had not been able to legalize their residence and employment in Greece according to the 3386/2005 Law due to weaknesses in legislation. The ultimate purpose of the new regularization act was to offer the opportunity to immigrants who had involuntarily been excluded from previous regularization programs (due to legal gaps or inefficient provision of public services) to be granted legal status (Konsta and Lazaridi, 2010). Hence, Greece made a substantial progress in legislation through the inauguration of the 3536/2007 Law.

Three years later another law was passed by the Greek government, namely the Law 3838/2010 on Naturalization and Citizenship. This law altered the notion of Greek citizenship in the sense that it incorporated the concept of *jus soli* (before the 3838/2010 Law, Greek legislation on naturalization and citizenship was built upon *jus sanguinis* principles). More precisely, the 2010 Law facilitated the naturalization process for second generation immigrants. It provided the right to Greek citizenship to immigrants who were born and raised in Greece by parents who had both lived permanently and legally in the country for at least five consecutive years. It also provided Greek citizenship to second generation immigrants who were living permanently and legally in the country and they have studied in a Greek school for a period of at least six years. Hence, the naturalization process for second generation immigrants primarily required their parents’ declaration of their date of birth or of the date they completed their six years of school attendance (Palaiologou and Faas, 2012). Overall, the Law 3838/2010 contributed significantly towards the rationalization and modernisation of legislation on migration by facilitating access to citizenship acquisition and enhancing aliens’ integration in Greece. The only pitfalls of the process leading to citizenship acquisition according to the 2010 Law were
the high application fees (i.e. ranging between 100 and 700 Euros according to the category of the applicant) as well as time consuming and complex administrative and legal procedures. Last, a major and essential innovation of the 3838/2010 Law was granting the right of participation in municipal and prefectural elections to immigrants with permanent or long term residence permits. However, a low number of foreign residents registered to vote in the local elections that were conducted in the same year following the inauguration of the 3838/2010 Law (i.e. only 12,000 out of total 203,700 foreign residents registered to vote) (Christopoulos, 2013).

Finally, one year later (i.e. in 2011) the deep economic recession in Greece and the consequent increase in unemployment for foreign-born residents (i.e. in 2011 unemployment among foreign-born residents reached 22.2%) motivated the Government to reduce the number of required employment stamps for permit renewals. This legal development facilitated notably the permit renewal process (Triandafyllidou, 2014).

4.4.3. Recent developments and adjustment to current challenges

In 2013, the Council of State (i.e. the Supreme Administrative Court of Greece) held unconstitutional the provisions of the Law 3838/2010 granting non-citizens the right to participate in municipal and prefectural elections and facilitating the process of citizenship acquisition. The rationale behind this decision was that those particular provisions of the Law 3838 were not compatible with the Constitution of Greece. More precisely, the Council of State ruled that the naturalization process according to the 3838/2010 Law was based merely on formal requirements (i.e. duration of residence in Greece, duration of attendance at Greek schools and lack of serious criminal convictions) without making any individualised judgement regarding the applicants’ bond to the Greek nation. Also, according to the Council of State, voting rights are accorded by the Constitution only to Greek citizens and cannot be extended to non-Greek citizens without a revision of the relevant provision of the Constitution (Ministry of Interior Affairs, 2013). Thus, the legal environment for citizenship and political rights acquisition became stricter following the decision by the Council of State. Unlike the Law 3838/2010, the particular decision of the Council of State weakened social cohesion and solidarity and created an injustice towards immigrants. The number of citizenship applications submitted following the launch of the Law 3838/2010 was 39,722 (to their majority applicants were of Albanian origin). Of those applicants, 13,425 acquired Greek citizenship. However, after the decision of the
Council of State all successful applicants were deprived of their Greek citizenship and their cases resulted in a legal impasse (Ministry of Interior Affairs, 2013).

Looking at the overall picture, since the beginning of the 1990s and until the year 2013, the Greek State gradually produced 40 Laws and 48 pieces of secondary legislation (i.e. 6 Presidential Degrees and 42 Regulatory Acts) with the purpose of regulating immigration issues. All those pieces of legislation shaped an extremely complicated legal framework which has been repeatedly proven inadequate for the management of issues relating to immigration and immigrants. To combat this, a new Law (namely Law 4151/2013) was introduced in 2013. This new legislation consolidated and modified all previous legal acts regulating immigration. It consisted of 140 Articles which “reshaped” the context of migration policy in accordance to European regulations and in tandem with domestic needs. The most important provisions and provoked changes of the new Law can be described as follows:

First, the categories of residence permits were reduced from 50 to 19 in order to simplify the procedure for residence permits acquisition and renewal. It should also be noted that, the acquisition of residence permits remained linked to the possession of employment stamps with the purpose of combating the employment of immigrants in the shadow economy.

Second, the five-year residence permit was qualified as the main type of long term residence permit (i.e. third country nationals who live in Greece legally for five consecutive years can apply for a long-term residence permit which is typically valid for five years with the possibility of multiple renewals after its expiration date for five more years). It is of great importance, that the possession of this permit also gives the right to third country nationals to live and work in any other EU country of their preference (in addition to Greece). In detail, until the launch of this Law, only third country nationals who had been granted Greek citizenship had the right to live and work in other EU countries; yet, the new Law provides this freedom of residence and employment across the EU to third country nationals with long-term residence permits without requiring them to having previously acquired the Greek citizenship. Residence permit is also granted to the under aged children of third country nationals with long term resident permits. When those children reach adulthood, they are also granted the five-year long term residence
permit with the option to renew it for another five years. The underlying purpose of that legal provision is to provide those young adults the opportunity to decide whether they wish to remain in Greece and apply for citizenship or try their luck in another country.

Third, the 4151/2013 Law alters the procedure for sending an invitation for employment to young aliens (e.g. for seasonal work). According to the Law, the procedure of sending an employment invitation is adjusted to the needs of the Greek labour market by shifting planning from the regional to the central level. That shift allows the overall coordination of employment invitations with the labour market needs and work opportunities across the whole country.

Fourth, the 4151/2013 Law includes no legal provision for the legalization of undocumented immigrants who are already living and working in Greece. The regularisation programs were a common practise of the past as Greece has always had large numbers of undocumented immigrants within its borders. Today, undocumented immigration to Greece has once again become a primary public issue as the number of individuals arriving, living and working without legal authorization in Greece is increasing. It is revealing that, 96,550 individuals were arrested during the first six months of 2015 and 173,034 individuals were arrested during the first six months of 2016 for undocumented entrance and residence in Greece (Hellenic Police, 2016). The precise number of undocumented immigrants in Greece remains unclear. Based on estimations, undocumented immigrants in Greece comprise nearly 9% of the total population (Teunissen et al., 2016). Fifth and last, the legal provisions for family unification became stricter. It is indicative that DNA tests are required according to the 4151/2013 Law as a proof of family ties.

Arguably the 4151/2013 Law has more positive than negative aspects even though it is undeniably too early to make grounded judgments. Amongst its positive provisions are: (i) the simplification of administrative procedures; (ii) the codification of the all existing legislation on migration; (iii) the introduction of the five years residence permit which allows third country nationals with long-term residence status to live and work in other EU counties; and (iv) the acquisition of this permit by their children when they reach adulthood. On the other side certain pathologies remain: (i) the lack of any provision for the regularization of the already existing undocumented immigrants in the country and (ii)
the required employment stamps for the acquisition of residence permit as immigrants’ unemployment has increased severely in recent years.

As a final note, the efforts made by the Greek state to tackle migration related issues have resulted in the following administrative divisions: At the national level, the Ministry which has the overall responsibility over immigration matters is the Ministry of Interior. Other Ministries involved include the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Health and the General Secretariat for Gender Equality (Law 3536/2007). At the regional level, the line of responsibility is perhaps more complicated, due to the recent re-organisation of local government structures. This major re-organisation occurred in 2012 and it was made possible via the implementation of the so-called “Kallikratis Programme”. One of the “Kallikratis Programme” outcomes, generated by the Article 78 of the Law 3852/2010 “New Architecture of Government and Decentralized Administration”, was the re-allocation of responsibility for implementing integration and migration policies from the central level to decentralised administrative structures/public bodies. Conferring responsibility to local authorities aimed at enhancing the efficiency of implementing such policies. The “Kallikratis” Programme” also made provisions for the foundation at the municipality level of Migrant Integration Councils. The preliminary role of those Councils is to provide advice services on matters relating to the integration of immigrants into local societies. The mere fact of setting up of those Councils, irrespective of how effective they will actually prove to be, constitutes a positive development for enhancing the integration process of immigrants in Greece.

***

Significant demographic changes have occurred in Greece over the past decades. In recent years, those demographic changes have taken the form of migration movements towards Greece. Since the end of 1980s, large-scale immigration to Greece generated the vital need for a pragmatic legal framework on migration. The efforts of the Greek State to manage migration movements and protect the welfare of immigrants through the creation of appropriate legal rules met several and often insurmountable challenges. Despite those challenges, significant legal progress has been made, bearing in mind that, the substantial efforts to develop effective migration laws were initiated in the beginning of the 1990s.
Nonetheless, the need for further progress and improvement is imperative. Greek migration policy and Law have immersed in controversies and have frequently failed to tackle constantly emerging migration related issues. Immigrants have often been confronted with significant barriers in their efforts to legalize and secure their residence, employment and social insurance in Greece. Those barriers may vary from actual legal pathologies to long administrative delays. In addition, the Greek State has repeatedly failed to tackle undocumented immigration and to provide an effective legal framework for the legalization of its undocumented immigrant population, placing in jeopardy those peoples’ position in the native society and labour market.

So, today, Greece is still lacking a pro-active, realistic and effective legal framework either for managing migration or for the regularization, integration and social insurance of immigrants. In the absence of a well-developed and functional welfare state, able to limit the social and economic risks faced by natives -and, even more so by immigrants-, the pathologies of the current legal system on immigration gain even greater significance. Immigration Law in Greece is not sufficient in securing immigrants’ integration in the native society, labour market and welfare state and thus, it does not provide immigrants equal opportunities with natives to pursue, protect and promote their welfare. The evolution of the current legal system on immigration remains to be seen. But, arguably, future legal developments need to promote legal equality between immigrants and natives and to enhance social harmony particularly under the current conditions of deep economic recession.

4.5. Conclusions

Migration has always been part of the landscape in Europe. In recent history, the migration period from the end of the Second World War until the beginning of 1970s was dominated by the implications of the post-war adjustments, predominantly supply-driven migration, and the repercussions of decolonization (Зайцева and Zimmermann, 2008). Alongside with those mainly labour migration waves, there were also refugee movements from Eastern to Western Europe which added the element of humanitarian migration in the post-war years (Bade, 2003). Furthermore, the migration period extending from the early 1970s until the mid-2010s, was shaped by three major historical events: the first oil-price crisis in 1973, the ensuing economic downturn and the EU enlargements in 2004 and 2007
(Kahanec and Zimmermann, 2009). So, those years were dominated by mainly economically driven migration. With regards to humanitarian migration, the migration years since the early 1970s were predominantly shaped by the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1989, the wars in the Balkans in the 1990s and the on-going unrest in the Middle East (European Commission, 2011; UNHCR, 2015). In response to those demographic developments owing to immigration, the EU has gone a long way, particularly since the 1980s, towards the integration of immigrants into the European societies. In line with EU policy agreements (e.g. the agreement on “Common Basic Principles for Immigrant Integration Policy in the European Union” decided by the European Council in 2004), the EU member states have also achieved a significant degree of convergence in terms of immigration and citizenship policies. Nevertheless, there is still considerable divergence across the EU countries due to different national policy choices and different budget allocations for immigrants’ integration programs. Also, the demographic changes owing to migration have been notably diverse in various parts of the European continent, triggering different public and state responses (European Commission, 2011).

Greece, in particular, has a very rich emigration tradition. Yet, in recent years Greece was been transformed into a net-immigration country as well as into a modulator of EU migration waves. From the beginning of the 19th century and up until the beginning of the 1970s, Greece was predominantly a country of net-emigration as various turbulent political, social and economic developments would motivate, and often force, a great number of Greeks to seek shelter and a more prosperous life elsewhere (e.g. see Kotzamanis and Stathakis, 2001). In the following years, though, and particularly since the beginning of the 1990s, Greece witnessed an unprecedented increase in immigration, mainly from neighbouring Albania. So, Greece was rapidly transformed to a country of net-immigration. According to the 2001 Census data, two thirds of the immigrant population in Greece were drawing their origin from Albania, Bulgaria and Romania. Particularly Albanians were outnumbering all other national groups as they were representing the 57.5% of the total population of immigrants in Greece. Immigrants from former USSR countries (predominantly from Georgia, Ukraine, Russia, and Moldova) were accounting for the 10% of immigrants in Greece. Immigrants from EU countries were accounting for the 6% of foreign residents in Greece. The remaining 13% of immigrants in Greece had drawn their origins from a large number of countries (European Commission, 2013; European Commission, 2011; Mediterranean Migration Observatory,
2004). In more recent years and particularly since the beginning of the 2010s, immigration to Greece has once again increased significantly. Today, immigrants, such as refugees originating from Africa and the Middle East, are using Greece as a gateway to Europe with the hope of a safer and better life for themselves and their children. This historic population movement has been known as the European refugee crisis (UNHCR, 2015).

The Greek state has attempted to address the major socio-economic challenges owing to the aforementioned demographic developments by constructing immigration policies and evolving its national legal framework on immigration (Gropas, 2015; Kostaki et al., 2009). Great progress has been made in this regard, as a plethora of Laws on immigration have been launched since the turn of the 1980s. Nonetheless, the deep divisions between welfare state “insiders and outsiders” (see Chapter 2) and the extended size of the shadow economy (see Chapter 5) continue to shape an inhospitable environment for immigrants in Greece and to intensify the need for their legal protection. Hence, revisions of the Law at the national and European level are imperative as immigrants’ labour market integration and social insurance are still hindered by legal pathologies (Konsta and Lazaridi, 2010) while the impact of the 2009 economic crisis has created additional barriers towards their socio-economic integration. It is alarming that, in 2013 and only two years after the launch of one of the most open citizenship Laws in Greece, the 3838/2010 Law, the Council of State (i.e. the country’s highest Administrative Court) deemed unconstitutional the 3838/2010 Laws’ divisions facilitating second-generation immigrants’ access to citizenship and voting rights. This development took place in the midst of a rapid increase in racism and xenophobia in the Greek society and the opening of detention centres for undocumented immigrants as a means of tackling the significant increase in criminality in Greece (Christopoulos, 2013; Gropas, 2015).

Finally, the recent European refugee crisis has placed Greece in a very neuralgic and politically sensitive place (UNHCR, 2015). This historic development has generated the great need for combined, drastic measures from the Greek state and the European Union as Greece’s limited resources and bureaucratic ineffectiveness have deemed the country incompetent to deal with the unprecedented waves of people trying to reach Europe at any cost and the consequent growing humanitarian crisis at the borders of Europe.
So, overall, the pathologies of the Greek administration, legal system, welfare state and labour market have been augmented following the 2009 economic recession and have restrained even further the state’s capacity to protect the welfare of its’ immigrant population. These developments have intensified the need for academic research on the issues surrounding immigration and welfare in Greece. Hence, the following chapters assess immigrants’ labour market integration, living conditions and social integration in Greece in light of the 2009 economic recession through the lens of secondary literature and empirical research findings.
Chapter 5
Economic recession and immigrants’ position in the labour market

5.1. Introduction

In recent years, several authors have examined the welfare of immigrant workers in the European labour markets (e.g. Adsera and Chiswick, 2007; Dustmann and Frattini, 2013; Fleischmann and Dronkers, 2010). Particularly today, the welfare of immigrant workers in the labour markets of Europe is at the epicentre of academic, political and public interest due to the negative consequences of the international financial crisis of 2007/2008. It has also been argued that immigrant workers are suffering more from the negative impact of the growing economic recession compared to the native workforce (Arai and Vilhelmsson, 2004; Canal-Dominguez and Rodríguez-Gutiérrez, 2008; Prean and Mayr, 2012). It is revealing that, throughout the European Union (with the exception of the UK and Luxembourg) unemployment among immigrants increased more than unemployment among nationals in the post 2007/2008 economic crisis years (IOM, 2010). Greece was one of the EU countries most severely affected by the economic recession. As anticipated, the repercussions of the economic downturn on the welfare of workers in the Greek labour market have been devastating. It is indicative that in April 2016 the highest unemployment rate in the European Union was recorded in Greece, where unemployment reached 23.3% and youth unemployment reached the unsustainable 47.4% (Eurostat, 2016).

Based on secondary literature, the present chapter first provides the context for the study of immigrants’ integration in the labour market of Greece. Second, based on self-collected (quantitative and qualitative) data it examines the welfare of immigrant workers in Greece and it ascertains changes in their position in the labour market following the 2009 economic recession. In doing so, work related features, such as unemployment, income and work satisfaction, prior and during the economic crisis are examined and discussed while particular immigrant groups with different levels of vulnerability to macroeconomic fluctuations are identified. So, overall, Chapter 5 offers valuable insights into the welfare of immigrant workers in Greece and into whether, and if so, how this welfare altered on account of the negative effects of the recent economic crisis.
This chapter is structured as follows: section 5.2 provides some background information on the Greek economy, discusses the integration of immigrants in the Greek labour market and briefly examines the relative labour market position of immigrant and native labourers based on secondary literature. Section 5.3 utilises the findings of the quantitative survey (for more details on the quantitative survey see Chapter 3) in order to describe immigrants’ integration in the labour market and to assess how immigrants’ position in the labour market altered in the post-2009 economic crisis years. Section 5.4 uses the findings of the qualitative survey (for more details on the qualitative survey see Chapter 3) in order to present immigrants’ personal stories from their time in the labour market of Greece. Finally, section 5.5 discusses the quantitative and qualitative research findings of this chapter in conjunction with key literature review insights.

5.2. The prosperity of immigrant workers in the Greek labour market and their integration process in the Greek economy

The welfare of immigrant workers in the Greek labour market and the impact of migration on the Greek economy have been recently at the focus of academic discussions and debates. However, the long-standing lack of adequate statistical data, the undocumented or pending legal status of a great number of immigrants and the extensive size of the Greek shadow economy have posed enormous barriers in the academic study of immigrant labour in Greece (Schneider and Williams, 2013). Notwithstanding these barriers, there has been a number of authors whose studies have enriched our understanding of the complex issues around immigration in Greece. So, the following paragraphs are aimed at offering a brief overview of studies on the welfare of immigrant workers in the Greek labour market and on the multidimensional effects of labour immigration on the Greek economy since the beginning of the 1990s. The review of those studies indicates that the effects of labour immigration on the Greek economy have been, on average, positive (mainly via the revitalization of agriculture and the invigoration of small-scale enterprises). Yet, immigrant workers in Greece have been traditionally confronted with unfavourable labour market conditions; and those conditions have deteriorated even further in the years of the crisis.
5.2.1. The Greek economy through transformation, from economic prosperity to economic recession

The Greek economy has been in the eye of the hurricane since the eruption of the 2009 economic recession. In the landmark year of 2009, Greece had a combination of three debts, namely (i) a big budget deficit (which reached 15.4 percent of GDP), (ii) a large public deficit (which reached 127 percent of GDP) and (iii) an unsustainable current account deficit (which reached approximately 15 percent of GDP) (Tsoukalis, 2013). Also, Greece had a serious credibility deficit which was casting a shadow on its reputation in the international and European markets. Finally, the Greek sovereign debt crisis triggered the Eurozone crisis (Argyrou and Tsoukalas, 2011).

By 2014, the Greek economy had shrunk by approximately a quarter of what it was in 2008 and the Greek state had become dependent upon rescue loans from other European Union countries as well as from the International Monetary Fund in order to avoid bankruptcy. It is indicative that, in 2014, the highest overall unemployment rate in the European Union was recorded in Greece (i.e. 26.5%) (Eurostat, 2014). Also, wages in the private sector declined by 21.1% between 2009 and 2012 while wages in the public sector declined by 28.3% during the same period (OECD, 2013). Certainly, the economic downturn will continue to shape the economic environment in Greece for years to come and the people of Greece will continue to suffer from the devastating impact of the surrounding economic circumstances. However, the economy of Greece has not always been in such a bad shape. Indeed, in recent years, Greece’s economy has gone through transformation; from economic boost to economic bust.

Between 2001 (the year when Greece adopted the euro as its official currency) and 2007, Greece was among the fastest growing economies in the Euro area. It is revealing that Greece was having an average 4.2% growth rate of GPD per year. Greece was also paying low interest rates for its government bonds because investors were expecting the Greek economy to continue to flourish and because Greece had the support of a strong currency, the euro (Park, 2012). However, since economic uncertainty started to spread to international markets (following the outbreak of the global financial crisis in 2007) and Greece lost its financial credibility by misreporting official economic statistics, the interest rates on Greek government bonds increased sharply. As an example, in July 2010, Greece
had to pay an interest rate of 9.73% on its two-year government bonds, while, in July 2011, Greece had to pay an interest rate of 25% on the same government bonds (ECB, 2013). The increase in interest rates on government bonds opened the Pandora’s Box and along the way the economic activity in Greece, such as investment, consumption and real output, deteriorated drastically. A plethora of unpopular policy measures have also been implemented with the purpose of reviving the Greek economy. Those measures include cuts in wages and pensions, the dismissal of a great number of public sector employees and increases in taxes (particularly in direct taxes on households). Austerity measures have not yet managed to re-establish the competitiveness of the Greek economy while, at the same time, a great number of people in Greece are facing serious economic hardships.

5.2.2. The integration process of immigrant workers in the Greek labour market
The Greek state has displayed regulatory weakness with regards to the labour market. Standard forms of employment -commonly found in the public sector- enjoy higher levels of protection than non-standard forms of employment -commonly found in the private sector- while the widespread black market falls entirely outside the scope of the Law. Since long before the crisis, the majority of immigrants in Greece have been employed in non-standard or black market occupations. Hence, they have been poorly protected or utterly unprotected by social insurance and labour market legislation. Consequently, their union representation has been inadequate, they have been vulnerable and exposed to employment exploitation and their wages (commonly received in cash) have been below those agreed in collective bargaining agreements (Featherstone and Papadimitriou, 2008).

More precisely, since the early 1990s immigrants from Albania have been outnumbering all other national groups in Greece (see sections 4.3.2 and 4.3.3). Lazaridis and Romaniszyn (1998) conducted a study to explore the employment of undocumented Albanian immigrants in urban areas of Greece during the years 1993, 1994 and 1995. The authors highlight the high concentration of Albanian male workers in the building/construction sector as well as the high concentration of Albanian female workers in the domestic services sector. The employment of Albanians in great numbers in building/construction occupations is also noted in a later study by Baldwin-Edwards (2004). The author argues that, 27% of all documented building/construction workers in Greece were Albanians and also that Albanians represented 75% of all documented immigrant construction workers during the year 2002. Similar employment patterns to
Albanians can be observed among Bulgarian immigrants (the second largest immigrant group in Greece) (see sections 4.3.2 and 4.3.3). As argued by Markova and Sarris (1997), Bulgarian men were mostly working in building/construction occupations during their first years of arrival to Greece at the turn of the 1980s’ and the beginning of the 1990s. Also, Bulgarian women were mainly employed in housekeeping occupations or elderly care occupations (with a considerable proportion of Bulgarian women being employed in live-in jobs). Hence, the two most populous immigrant groups in Greece were commonly employed in the building/construction sector and in the domestic services sector.

Furthermore, a study by Lianos et al. (1996) referring to the first half of the 1990s’ reveals the great number of undocumented immigrants working in the Greek shadow economy. In addition, Cavounidis (2002) notes that, undocumented employment was widespread among both undocumented and documented immigrants in Greece at the time. So, according to Lianos et al. (1996) the influx of undocumented immigrant workers in Greece facilitated the expansion of the informal economy while it contributed towards the shrinking of the formal economy. Nevertheless, it should be mentioned that, Greece had a large shadow economy long before the arrival and clandestine employment of immigrants. Kanellopoulos (1995) estimated that the shadow economy in the 1980s was accounting for more than 30% of the Gross Domestic Product of Greece. Also, unregistered employees in Greece were representing between 16% and 20% of total employees in the country. Overall, a great number of immigrant labourers were working under precarious working conditions. In addition, their clandestine employment was contributing towards the expansion of the shadow economy and thus, it was diminishing the prospects of tackling it effectively (Cavounidis, 2002).

Iosifides (1997) studied the labour market participation of three national groups in Athens (namely, Albanians, Egyptians and Filipinos) during 1995 and 1996. The author’s findings suggest that the Athenian labour market at the time was highly segmented based on immigrants’ origin and gender and that, immigrants were frequently employed under precarious working conditions. Also, family businesses and small firms in Athens were dependent for their economic survival upon cheap and flexible immigrant labour. Besides this, the supply of low-cost immigrant labour was facilitating the creation of new jobs in the Greek economy. Those findings are reinforced by the work of Bermeo (2000) who also emphasized the positive impact of cheap and flexible immigrant labour on small-
scale enterprises in Athens. Furthermore, Bermeo (2000) argues that, the labour market competition between immigrant and native workers was very weak. The explanation for that lies in the unwillingness of natives to undertake the kind of jobs immigrants were willing to do (e.g. low-paid jobs with poor working conditions). A study undertaken by Baldwin-Edwards (2004) also pointed out that the employment of Albanian workers in Greece did not affect the employment terms and conditions of native workers. According to the author, Albanian immigrants were primarily employed in manual, unskilled or semi-skilled jobs that Greeks were not willing to undertake. Hence, Albanian immigrants were largely complementary to the native workforce.

On the positive effects of immigrant labour on the Greek economy, Cavounidis (1998) argues that, the employment of immigrant labourers in the 1990s provoked a considerable shift from unpaid family labour to wage labour. More precisely, activities which were formerly undertaken by predominantly female family members (i.e. mainly agricultural activities, household work, family care of the children, the elderly, or the diseased and supply of services in family-run firms) were later undertaken by employed immigrants. Nevertheless, Cavounidis (1998) argues that no certain conclusions can be drawn over the precise number of natives who moved from unpaid to paid employment after being substituted in their (unpaid) family work by immigrants. What can be said with certainty, though, is that in the years between 1998 and 2008 during which the immigration flows and the official employment of immigrants increased notably, 541.00 new jobs were created and 322.000 of those jobs were undertaken by native women (Papastergiou and Takou, 2013).

Considering income, Sarris and Zografakis (1999) evaluated the repercussions of undocumented immigration on the income of Greek households during the 1990s. The authors reached the conclusion that undocumented immigration provoked declining disposable income for poor and middle income households as well as for households headed by unskilled employees. The opposite effect was detected in regards with the rest of the Greek households. Undocumented immigration led to increasing disposable income for high income households and for households headed by skilled employees. Moreover, Lianos (2004) studied the impact of immigration on native wages in reference to the same period. The author argues that natives’ wages did not drop following the widespread
employment of immigrants in Greece. Yet, in the 1990s, native wage rates increased at a slower pace compared to previous years.

In relation to the rural and agricultural areas of Greece, Kasimis and Papadopoulos (2005) argued that, employing immigrant workers at low wages contributed towards sustaining the low costs of agricultural production. In turn, low production costs stimulated the growth of local economies. However, Chletsos et al. (2005) claimed that the higher the percentage of immigrant workers in the agricultural sector, the lower the share of agricultural production in the Gross Domestic Product. This negative relationship is attributed to the over reliance on cheap immigrant labour during the production process which leads to the maintenance of labour intensive techniques and does not give incentives for investment in more technologically advanced methods of production.

Furthermore, in looking at the general picture, a survey by the OECD published in the same year (2005) summarised the positive and negative effects of recruiting immigrant labourers in Greece. The positive effects were found to be particularly evident in the economic sectors of agriculture, construction and domestic services where natives refuse to be employed at the same low wage rates with immigrants. So, on the positive side, immigrants satisfy the demand for flexible and low-wage labour. On the negative side, the employment of immigrants, particularly through informal channels, leads to economic segregation and to the expansion of the shadow economy.

Moreover, Cholezas and Tsakloglou (2008) highlighted another key aspect of immigrations’ impact on the Greek economy. The authors argued that the supply of cheap immigrant labour constrained inflationary pressures by alleviating increases in production costs and product prices. Consequently, immigration assisted Greece in meeting the criteria for participating in the European Monetary Union. In addition, wage differentials between native and immigrant wages was classified as one of the primary reasons behind the positive impact of immigrant labour on the Greek economy. Demoussis et al. (2010) estimated the size of wage differentials between immigrant and native employees in 2004 and 2005. According to the authors, natives were getting paid higher wages than

---

1 Greece entered the European Monetary Union on January 1, 2001 and its official currency, drachma, was replaced by the euro (European Central Bank, 2001).
immigrants during the period under consideration and 48% of this wage differential could not be attributed to the observable characteristics of the two groups. The main reason behind those wage differentials was immigrants’ difficulty in gaining access to the labour market and the consequent occupational segmentation in the labour market of Greece. Among the same lines, Drydakis (2012) argued the existence of asymmetrical occupational access to the labour market by immigrant and native women. Based on field data for the years 2008 and 2009, the author also pointed out that, immigrant women were offered lower wages than native women for the same type of occupations.

Indeed, according to Lianos (2010), immigrant women were at the lowest level of the income scale as they were also earning lower wages than immigrant men. Lianos (2010) also identified the remaining factors (besides gender) affecting immigrants’ income levels in Greece. Those factors can be summarised as follows: First, immigrants’ income levels are positively associated with their length of stay in Greece and their employment stability. Second, the educational level of immigrants has a positive impact on their wages but, only in the case of postgraduate qualifications (i.e. the lower levels of educational attainment have no or minimal impact on immigrants’ wages). It is revealing that postgraduate qualifications provoke an increase of 59% to 69% on immigrants’ wages. Third and last, immigrant employers and self-employed immigrants have higher chances to be earning a high wage compared to immigrant employees.

Furthermore, the negative effects of the 2009 economic crisis have had an impact on both the native and immigrant labourers. Nevertheless, the distinctive difference between the two groups is that immigrant workers in Greece have traditionally experienced disadvantage in the labour market compared to native workers (Drydakis, 2012). Following the 2009 economic recession, the following radical developments have dominated the labour market participation of immigrants and natives in Greece: First, by 2013 unemployment among immigrants had increased to 40.4% while in the same year unemployment among natives was 26.2%. It is indicative that, the number of immigrants working in the building/construction sector in 2008 was 114,700 while in 2013 it was only 43,000 (Hellenic Statistical Authority, 2014). Second, in the economic sectors where employment relations are not regulated by collective bargaining and minimum wage schemes the percentage of immigrant labour relative to native labour increased notably.
For instance, in 2008, 50% of the total workforce in the crop and livestock production were immigrant workers and the rest 50% were native workers. By 2013 the percentage of immigrant workers had increased to 73% (and so, the equivalent percentage for native workers had dropped to 27%) (Zografakis and Kassimis, 2013). Also, in 2013 the average wage of immigrants was 650 euros per month or less (with 27% of immigrants receiving 500 euros or less, 80% receiving 800 euros or less and only 5.2% receiving 1.000 euros per month or more). In the same year, the average wage for natives was 980 euros per month (with 8.1% of natives receiving 500 euros or less, 34.6% receiving 800 euros or less and 34.9% receiving 1.000 euros or more per month). Third, in 2013, 41% of households headed by immigrants were living in absolute poverty. The majority of those households were not assisted by official public institutions but were reliant on voluntary social solidarity networks for the coverage of their basic needs. Fourth and last, the high levels of unemployment but, also of undocumented employment among immigrants have deprived them the opportunity to be granted (or renew their) residence and work permits (the submission of employment stamps constitutes a prerequisite for the approval or renewal of residence/work permits; see section 4.4). It is revealing that from 2008 to 2013 the number of immigrants who couldn’t renew their residence and work permits reached 100.000 (Hellenic Statistical Authority, 2014).

***

From the review of studies on immigration related issues in Greece it can be concluded that, since the beginning of the 1990s, immigration had both positive and negative effects on the Greek economy. The positive effects may be briefly described as follows: (i) the revitalization of agriculture, (ii) the growth of small-scale enterprises (which are often perceived to be the backbone of the Greek economy), (iii) the restraint of inflation and (iv) the creation of new jobs (mainly for native women). The negative effects include: (i) the expansion of the shadow economy, (ii) the overreliance on cheap immigrant labour resulting in delays in developing and adapting technologically advanced production techniques (mainly in agriculture), (iii) the suppression of wages and (iv) the deterioration of working conditions.

In addition, immigrants have traditionally experienced disadvantage in the Greek labour market as compared to the native labour force. And, immigrants’ disadvantageous position in the native labour market offers a probable explanation for the positive economic impact
of immigrants’ employment in the Greek economy. In particular, immigrants’ terms of employment have been inferior to those of the natives and this difference cannot always be explained by the observable characteristics of the two groups. This supplementary -and often devalued- role of immigrants in the labour market facilitated parts of the economy to grow and often to flourish. As a final note, the recent economic crisis has deteriorated further immigrants’ terms of employment in Greece. Also, the negative effects of the recession have been disproportionately more severe in the case of immigrant labourers than in the case of the native labourers. So, overall, the thin prospects of improving immigrants’ position in the Greek labour in the near future generates the imperative need for policy intervention in order to at least mitigate the well-documented vulnerability of immigrant workers in Greece.

5.3. Evidence from the quantitative interviews

One of the key objectives of the quantitative survey was to research immigrants’ employment integration in Greece and to detect alterations in their position in the labour market following the outbreak of the 2009 crisis. With this purpose, the questionnaire (for questionnaire see Appendix 1) referred to the first year they had spent in Greece prior to the economic recession as well as to the year of the interview (i.e. 2012) (see section 3.2.2). Given that the recent global economic crisis erupted in Greece in 2009 (Featherstone, 2011), this time frame allowed gathering information related to both the periods before and during the economic recession (see section 3.2.1). Analysis of collected data led to several findings. On average, almost all aspects of immigrants’ position in the native labour market have been downgraded causing, among others, a significant drop in their income. Taken that income has a strong and positive link to peoples’ prosperity and happiness (Caporale, 2009), immigrants have witnessed a significant degradation of their welfare in Greece during the last years.

5.3.1. Unemployment

Most participants (i.e. 65.4%) reported having immigrated to Greece for economic reasons (see Figure 5 in Chapter 3). On average, though, their unemployment significantly increased since their first year of arrival to Greece. In fact, as evident in Figure 10, unemployment amongst participants increased from 7.8% to 21.9% in the post 2009 economic crisis period (see Appendix 4).
The variables of gender and region of origin were also assessed in order to ascertain possible differences between male and female unemployment as well as between unemployment of participants from different regions of origin. Figure 10 illustrates that men had, on average, lower unemployment than women during their first year in Greece (i.e. 6.2% and 10.2% respectively). However, male unemployment sharply increased (i.e. reaching 26.4%) in the post 2009 economic crisis years. Hence, in 2012 male participants confronted almost twice as high unemployment as female participants despite the fact that female unemployment also increased following the 2009 economic crisis (i.e. reaching 15%) (see Appendix 4).

**Figure 10.** Male and female unemployment, 1st year of stay and 2012

![Unemployment Chart](image)

Source: Own survey

Note: N = 320; N of males = 193; N of females = 127

Additional information is revealed by taking into consideration participants’ origin. As evident in Figure 11, the degree of exposure to unemployment was very different for participants from different regions of origin. More specifically, there was an increase in unemployment among participants from the Balkans (i.e. from 3.9% to 13.7%), Eastern Europe (i.e. 8.5% to 15.3%) and Asia (i.e. from 4.2% to 12.5%). However, there was a
much higher and sharper increase in unemployment among participants from Africa (i.e. from 18.4% to 51.0%) and the Middle East (i.e. from 13.3% to 43.3%). This unemployment increase resulted in approximately half of Africans and Middle Easterners being out of employment in the year 2012 (see Appendix 5).

**Figure 11.** Unemployment among participants from different regions of origin, 1st year of stay and 2012

Furthermore, participants were asked to report the aggregate period they have been out of employment since their first year of immigration to Greece. Participants’ responses revealed that as many as 41.6% of participants have never been out of employment in Greece while 40% of participants have been out of employment for less than one year in total (see Appendix 6). This finding hints at the view that immigrants’ notably high unemployment in the year 2012 (i.e. 21.9%) was attributed to the unprecedented negative economic climate in the post 2009 economic crisis period.

Source: Own survey

Note: N of participants from the Balkans = 102; N of participants from Eastern Europe = 59; N of participants from Africa = 49; N of participants from the Middle East = 38; N of participants from Asia = 72
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As a final note, participants were asked to express their views regarding their future employment prospects in Greece. More than half of participants (i.e. 58.8%) expressed the view that they are likely to become unemployed or remain unemployed for a long period (i.e. for more than 6 months) (see Appendix 7). Hence, the majority of participants expressed feelings of insecurity about their employment future in Greece.

**Underemployment**

As per participants’ responses, the burst of unemployment was accompanied by a substantial increase in underemployment. Particularly, employed participants experienced a notable loss of working days per month as well as a loss of working hours per day. So, by the year 2012 the share of participants working in part-time employment had significantly increased (i.e. by 19.6%) while the share of participants working in full-time employment had decreased (i.e. by 15.3%). It is also worth noting that, there was a considerable reduction in the percentage of participants working 9 hours or more per day (i.e. by 14.7%), particularly among participants from the Balkans (i.e. the share of participants from the Balkans working 9 hours or more per day dropped by 30.4%). Finally, men suffered relatively more by the increase in underemployment compared to women (e.g. the share of men working 22 days per month was reduced by 12.9%, while the equivalent share of women was reduced by only 1.6%) (see Appendix 8 and Appendix 9).

**5.3.2. Economic sectors**

With the purpose of gaining a better understanding of immigrants’ labour market experiences, participants were asked to indicate in which economic sector(s) they had been employed throughout their period of stay in Greece. Descriptive analysis of participants’ responses showed that more than half of participants reported not working during 2012 in the same sector of the economy in which they were working during their first year of immigration in Greece.

As shown in Figure 12, the most evident reduction of immigrant labour occurred in the “Building/Construction” sector, in the “Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing” sector and in the “Tourism” sector. It is revealing that almost two thirds of participants who were employed in “Building/Construction” occupations during their first year of immigration
to Greece had moved to different type of occupations by 2012 or they had become unemployed. In fact, only the economic sector of “Domestic services” employed roughly the same number of participants prior and during the economic recession. It is also of great significance that a considerable shift from skilled to unskilled occupations occurred during the time period under investigation. It is indicative that the only sector of the economy that increased its share of immigrant labour was the unskilled sector (i.e. by 5.4%) (see Appendix 10).

**Figure 12.** Composition of employment among participants, 1\textsuperscript{st} year of stay and 2012

These findings can be further analysed by taking into account participants’ gender. So, the “Building/Construction” sector, the “Skilled” sector and the “Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing” sector were male dominated sectors (i.e. the share of male immigrants being employed in those sectors during their first year in Greece was 23.3%, 23.0% and 17.1% respectively while the share of female participants working in the same sectors during their first year in Greece was negligent). On the contrary, the “Domestic services” sector was a female dominated sector (i.e. 60.6% of immigrant women, as opposed to 9.8% of immigrant men, were employed in domestic services jobs during their first year in Greece)
A further breakdown of the composition of employment among participants based on their origin reveals additional information. The sharp drop in the percentage of immigrant labour in the “Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing” sector was mainly attributed to the sharp reduction in the share of workers from the Balkans employed in this sector (i.e. from 24.5% to 11.8%). Furthermore, participants from the Balkans increased notably their representation in skilled occupations (i.e. from 5.9% to 14.7%). On the other hand, there was a dramatic increase in the number of Eastern Europeans working in unskilled occupations (i.e. from 3.4% to 23.7%). In addition, Eastern Europeans witnessed the largest drop in their employment share in the “Building and Construction” industry (i.e. from 22.0% to 5.1%), followed by Africans (i.e. from 12.2% to 2.0%) and Middle Easterners (i.e. from 16.7% to 6.7%) (see Appendix 11).

5.3.3. Income
The labour market issues described so far were partly responsible for notable changes in participants’ monthly income. As shown in Figure 13, the greatest differences between the reported monthly incomes received by participants during their first year in Greece and the reported monthly incomes received by participants during the year 2012 were found in the higher and in the lower levels of the income distribution. In particular, the following observations can be made: There was an increase in the number of workers with no income (i.e. by 9.1%) and in the number of workers earning 200 € or less per month (i.e. by 5.6%). There was also drop in the share of high-income workers earning 800 € - 1100 € (i.e. by 13.4%) and in the share of very high-income workers earning 1100 € or more (i.e. by 4.3%). No great alterations were observed in respect with the intermediate income levels (see Appendix 12).
The categorization of those findings according to participants’ gender reveals that men experienced more severe income reductions than women. More precisely, women had, on average, lower income than men prior to the economic recession. However, men suffered more severe income reductions than women following the crisis outbreak. Hence, women ended up earning, on average, a higher income than men in the post-2009 crisis period (see Appendix 12).

Finally, assessing participants’ income fluctuations by taking into consideration participants’ origin reveals that Middle Easterners and Africans witnessed the greatest income reductions in the lower levels of the income distribution. It is alarming that, by the year 2012, the share of Middle Easterners with no income had increased by 26.7%. Last, participants from the Balkans experienced the highest income losses in the higher levels of the income distribution (i.e. by the year 2012, the share of participants from the Balkans earning more than 801 € per month had dropped by 17.7%) (see Appendix 13).
As anticipated, the notable drop in participants’ earnings altered their perception over the sufficiency of their earnings. More precisely, participants were asked how sufficient they perceive their income for the coverage of their basic needs and how this perception has altered throughout the years. Figure 14 shows that 30% of the participants who regarded their income as “more than enough” during their first year in Greece had changed their views by 2012 and they regarded their income as “not enough”. This shift in participants’ perceptions resulted in 60.9% of all participants regarding their income as “not enough” for the coverage of their basic needs in 2012. So, overall, more immigrants regarded their income as sufficient during their first year of arrival in Greece than in the year 2012 (see Appendix 12).

**Figure 14.** Participants’ perceptions regarding their income sufficiency, 1st year of stay and 2012

Moreover, the differences in perceptions between the two genders were trivial. More important were the variations detected among participants from different regions origin. Particularly, the share of Africans, Middle Easterners and participants from the Balkans earning a “non-sufficient” income during their first year of stay in Greece was 46.9%, 30% and 39.2% respectively. By 2012, the share of participants from the same regions of origin earning a “non-sufficient” income had increased by 40.9%, 40% and...
27.5% respectively. So, Africans had the greatest representation in the group of participants earning a “non-sufficient” income during both periods under analysis.

In addition, the share of Africans earning “just enough” income was greatly reduced by 2012 (i.e. from 40.8% to 8.2%). No similar tendency was detected amongst the rest immigrant groups. As a final note, the share of participants from all regions of origin earning “more than enough” income dropped notably by 2012. It is revealing that the share of participants from Asia who reported having “more than enough” income during their first year of stay in Greece was reduced by 38.9% in 2012 (i.e. from 61.1% to 22.2%) (see Appendix 13).

**Level of remittances**

The drop in participants’ income was also accompanied by a drop in participants’ level of remittances. In other words, participants were remitting less money to their homelands following the eruption of the economic recession than during their first year of immigration to Greece. As illustrated in Figure 15, the most notable change occurred among participants sending no remittances to their home countries as their share in sample increased from 35.6% to 64.4% by the year 2012 (i.e. it increased by 28.8%). This increase was mostly reflected to men, as the share of male participants remitting no money to their home lands was more than doubled (see Appendix 12).
Figure 15. Participants’ levels of remittances per month, 1st year of stay and 2012

![Bar chart showing remittances levels]

Source: Own survey
Note: N = 320

Work satisfaction

Finally, participants were asked to comment on their feelings about their work. In detail, they were asked to rate their levels of work satisfaction on a Likert scale ranging from “Very satisfied” to “Very dissatisfied” with reference to their first year of immigration to Greece and with reference to the year 2012. Descriptive analysis of collected data showed that the aggregate levels of work satisfaction dropped considerably by the year 2012. It is revealing that, by 2012, the share of participants feeling satisfied or very satisfied with their work had decreased by 20%. No notable differences were observed in the levels of work satisfaction for male and female participants. Both genders were feeling less satisfied with their work in the aftermath of the economic crisis (see Appendix 10). Last, Africans and Middle Easterners experienced the greatest loss of work satisfaction compared to all other immigrant groups. By the year 2012, the percentage of Africans and Middle Easterners feeling satisfied with their work had dropped by more than 25% (see Appendix 11).
Overall, core aspects of immigrants’ position in the native labour market (i.e. employment rate, income level, income sufficiency, type of occupation and degree of work satisfaction) have worsened drastically in recent years threatening their welfare. Results indicated a substantial increase in immigrants’ unemployment following the outbreak of the 2009 economic recession (i.e. by 14.1%). This increase in unemployment was accompanied by an increase in underemployment among participants (i.e. there was a 19.7% increase in the share of participants working in part-time occupations and a 6.9% drop in the share of participants working in fulltime occupations). Also, more than half of employed participants reported having moved to a different economic sector following the eruption of the economic crisis. One of the key effects of this re-allocation of immigrant labour was the occurrence of a substantial shift from skilled to unskilled occupations. It is indicative that the share of Eastern Europeans working in unskilled occupations was increased from 3.4% to 23.7% in the aftermath of the economic crisis.

Furthermore, the analysis showed a substantial drop in immigrants’ monthly income by the year 2012 (i.e. the share of high-income workers earning more than 800 € was reduced by 17.7% while the share of low income workers earning less than 800 € was increased by 14.7%). Men have been the main victims of those income reductions even though women had, on average, lower income than men prior to the years of the economic crisis. It is also particularly worrying that the share of Middle Easterners with no income had increased by 26.7% by the year 2012. Last, as anticipated, the analysis of participants’ responses revealed a significant drop in the aggregated levels of work satisfaction (i.e. by 20%), in a substantial loss of income sufficiency (i.e. in 2012, 60.9% of participants reported having a non-sufficient income for the coverage of their basic needs) and in a notable decrease in the levels of remittances (the share of participants sending no remittances to their homelands increased by 28.8%).

5.4. Evidence from the qualitative study

To reiterate, one of the main purposes of the semi structured interviews, during which 42 immigrants were interviewed (for a detailed discussion on the qualitative survey see sections 3.2.3 and 3.2.4), was to research on their personal stories from their time in the labour market in Greece and to investigate how they experienced the effects of the crisis.
on their income and their labour market integration. Hence, interviewees were asked to comment on their terms of employment before and after the eruption of the economic crisis in 2009. Given that all interviewees were participating in the labour market for at least one year before the eruption of the crisis and that interviews were conducted in 2013, interviewees could comment on their income and on their labour market integration during the recent years of economic turbulence.

The cross-interview theme “from settled to hopeless” was extracted from interviewees’ responses regarding their labour market integration and income in Greece. The theme was expressed in relation to the following key areas of immigrants’ labour market experience: (i) Demand for immigrant labour; (ii) Working hours; (iii) Income; (iv) Social insurance; and (v) Work satisfaction. The following section overviews and discusses these key areas with regards to the years before the economic crisis as well as in relation to the economic crisis years.

Interviewees described a settling working experience allowing them to work under satisfying labour market conditions in the years before 2009. More specifically, interviewees recalled high demand for immigrant labour before the crisis eruption:

“The first three years I was working in the fields. I remember I was getting paid fifty euros per day for my work and most of the times the people who I was working for were giving me food and coffee. My wife was cleaning houses. The one day she was going to a house to do the ironing the other day to another house to do the cleaning and she had work like me, every day. She was getting good money as well.” (Interview 38).

As per interviews’ analysis, high demand for immigrant labour was often translated into long working shifts. Interviewees’ work schedule was described overall positively as it was allowing them to earn a satisfactory income: “At the beginning, when my mother came, it was very good, she had work; she was working seven days per week” (Interview 17). Similarly: “Until three to four years ago, it was good, I was working everyday eight, nine or ten hours... Greek people had money and so, we had money...” (Interview 35).

Commonly expressed by interviewees was also their ability to utilize their salary savings and develop their own business activities in Greece. On this note, all interviewees who
started their own businesses (through the investment of their work savings) reported that they had stable and settled employment since their first year of immigration in the country:

“Work was going well and so, I managed to save some money. Then, I thought to open a furniture shop. And I did. It was the year 2000. The first years it was going very well. It was a good period for me.” (Interview 13).

Among the same lines, the process of making their investment decision and implementing it in Greece was described positively by interviewees:

“The first years I was in Greece I was working at a moving company. I worked there for a long time and I liked the work. I had a good salary and my social insurance; I was taking my leaves from work and I was going back home to see my family. I was making more than a thousand euros per month. So, with this money I rented this place [he was a mini market owner], eleven years ago. I was doing very well... I was making two and a half thousand euros per month and some months even more.” (Interview 33).

Interviewees who reported experiencing employment stability also recalled having social insurance (which allowed them to have work and residence permit in Greece; see section 4.4 for further details):

“I was working for twelve years at the same job. I was working in a pips construction factory. I had my salary every month, my social insurance, my papers.” (Interview 24)

Furthermore, interviewees expressed satisfaction from their work earnings and their full-time employment routine in the pre-crisis period:

“When I came here and until three years ago, I was having a very good salary and I was working every day. I was working with marble; I was cutting marble. I was working for good people. I was getting paid forty-five euros per day plus six euros per hour if I was working overtime.” (Interview 25).

Salary satisfaction was indeed commonly expressed by interviewees:
“I remember the first seven years I was working in hair salons. I had some experience from back home and it was not difficult at all to find a job here. Even without experience, I believe it would have been easy. We [her and her mother] were both very well paid and we gathered a satisfactory amount of money which it would have been impossible to gather in Ukraine with the same amount of work.” (Interview 29).

Interviewees, furthermore, recalled having a good working relation with their employers:

“But before that [before the economic crisis] it was very good. I was getting paid well, I had my social insurance, a good relationship with my boss, he liked me and I liked him.” (Interview 11).

In a capsule, work satisfaction in the pre-crisis years was a common theme among interviews: “When I first started working here, work was going very well. I was very satisfied.” (Interview 6).

Overall, interviewees were “settled” before the crisis in terms of their income and labour market integration. Indeed, income and work satisfaction, job and employment stability characterized interviewees’ experience in the Greek labour market before 2009.

In direct contrast to the pre-crisis period, interviewees’ experience in the labour market was remarkably different in the years following the 2009 crisis outbreak. Their responses showed that they have run out of hope and that their position in the labour market has deteriorated. Importantly, they were hopeless about their prospects, as unemployment has rapidly grown and finding a job has become very hard, particularly for those at an older age:

“I know it will be very difficult [for me] to find another job now. There are so many people looking for work now and I am not young anymore. I am almost forty and the employers prefer to hire young people. And I have been looking for a few months now and I had no luck. There are so many people like us [unemployed] and this is a big problem.” (Interview 38).

As per interviewees’ accounts, work opportunities have been notably scarce during the crisis:
“Two years ago, the factory closed down and we were all left without jobs. The last months they [the employers] weren’t paying us as well. But, I knew that they didn’t have money to pay us. Two years now I am unemployed. I cannot find anything.” (Interview 24).

Interviewees have also expressed concerns over the future of their children in Greece due to high unemployment among youth. They appeared pessimistic about the situation as they struggled to cope with it:

“My oldest son is twenty-six years old. He has been unemployed for three years now. All my children want to leave. There are no jobs. Nothing. So, what can I tell them? I left home and now they are leaving again. It is so ... [the interviewee did not finish her sentence because she got very emotional].” (Interview 14).

Feelings of disappointment and futility were also expressed by interviewees regarding the thin prospects of making a start in Greece:

“There are no jobs and for the ones who come in recent years it is even more difficult. If you don’t speak the language and all the people you know are poor and cannot give you any help other than some food you cannot easily progress. You cannot make a start. The most important thing is to make a start in the place you go. It is very disappointing because these people came and they are not given the opportunity to make a start.” (Interview 31).

Even interviewees who were in employment at the time of the interview expressed serious concerns regarding underemployment:

“Now everything has been reduced and the working hours and the money they pay me [she works as a domestic worker]. My husband hasn’t worked for almost two years [he was a translator]. Now he gathers scrap metals from the streets to make some money.” (Interview 7).

Uncertainty over their work schedule was a common theme in interviewees’ accounts:

“I work in the fields but, not many days per week. I work one or two days per week. They [the employers] pay me ten to twenty euros per day. I go there [in the fields] early in the morning and I leave when the work is done, midday, afternoon, depends.” (Interview 21).
Particularly interviewees working in the building/construction sector described very negatively their employment situation:

“Until the last three, four years I was working in construction. But, you know how things turned out. Construction is dead now. I started not having much work, not getting paid, until the point where I was sitting home doing nothing.” (Interview 11).

Hopelessness was, furthermore, exacerbated by uncertainty over payments as some employers stopped paying them altogether:

“But, two years ago, they [the employers] stopped paying us. I hadn’t been paid for one year and then, they fired me. I lost all that money. Now my unemployment benefit [the period he is entitled to receive an unemployment benefit] is ending and I still haven’t found another job. (Interview 22).

Late payments were also commonly reported by interviewees in relation to the crisis years:

“...they [the employers] always delay our payments. They keep telling me “come next week for your money” and so, I do that and then they tell me the same thing again. I haven’t been paid for three months now.” (Interview 10).

In the context of the above circumstances, employees were, moreover, frequently underpaid:

“Now that they [the Greeks] don’t have money, we don’t have money either. This is how it goes. Now they [the employers] pay us fifteen to thirteen euros per day and we are lucky if we find work one or two days per week.” (Interview 35).

Concerns over uninsured employment and the implications of lacking social insurance stamps for being granted and/or renewing a work and residence permit were also common among interviews:

“And when I have work they don’t pay for my social insurance stamps. So, it is impossible to have papers [residence and work permit] unless I pay on my own for my social insurance stamps. And this is what I do. Because only if I have papers I might find a better job and make a proper start.
I work very well with wood. But the days I work are so few that I end up working for paying for social insurance stamps, my food and my cigarettes. And that’s it.” (Interview 23).

Last, interviewees were desperate over their present and future employment in Greece during the crisis:

“But, since three years ago and until now their business [his employers’ business] is not going well and they don’t need me very often anymore; So they fired me and now they call me for work only two times per week and sometimes only one. And now they give me thirty euros per day and no social insurance. And I go [there to work] because I have nothing else.” (Interview 25).

Hopelessness over their future employment prospects was so intense as to lead them believing that there is no way out of the situation while living in Greece:

“I like Greece but I don’t think I can stay here any longer. I am very worried. I have to think of my future. I don’t want to keep doing the job I am doing now forever. I want to find something better, but if I stay here I won’t. I feel that if I stay here my life will get worse and worse. I see it from my friends. All of them have problems and many of them have left. I feel there is no good future for me here.” (Interview 8).

So, as shown below (in an extract taken from the interview of a married couple), leaving from Greece was perceived as the only solution:

Man: “Now, as you see, we are forced to go. We have no choice. We cannot stand this situation any longer. We have become sick”

Woman: “In one week we will be gone. We will go to America, to Boston.”

Man: “If you don’t have a job everything goes wrong and you feel angry every day. We don’t like it that we are leaving. Greece has become our second country. We got used here all these years. And we are not young any more. But we now have to do everything from the beginning. Again.” (Interview 7)

Occasionally, some interviewees have lost hope that the situation can be improved even if they try their luck elsewhere:
“I now think that I have tried everything. And nothing has worked. Ever since I got fired from the factory everything is going from bad to worse. And I have spent all my money with the hope that I will find a new job here [in Greece] or in Germany but nothing.” (Interview 24).

“Hopelessness” was, therefore, expressed in relation to immigrants’ position in the labour market as most areas of employment (e.g. finding a job, social insurance while working, payment conditions, future job prospects amongst the employed, etc.) have notably worsened during the crisis.

***

Most interviewees commented positively on their employment situation in Greece in the years prior to the economic crisis and they expressed the general feeling of being “settled” in Greece with regards to their income and labour market integration. Common themes among interviews were high demand for immigrant labour, full-time, well-paid, stable and insured employment, ability to make savings and satisfaction from work. However, when interviewees were asked to comment on their employment situation in the post-2009 crisis years their responses were profoundly different. Most interviewees described negatively their experiences in the labour market and they expressed the general feeling of being “hopeless” when considering their income and labour market integration in the crisis years as well as their future employment life in Greece. Parenthetically and without diminishing the value of interviewees’ accounts referring to the years before the crisis, it should be mentioned that, those accounts may have been influenced by interviewees’ later experience which is far from positive. Thus, the positivity of interviewees’ views about their employment situation in the pre-crisis years may have been exaggerated due to the harsh comparison of interviewees’ terms of employment before the crisis and their terms of employment during the crisis (see section 3.3).

Returning to interviews’ analysis, interviewees reported deteriorating labour market conditions in Greece following the outbreak of the crisis. More precisely, interviewees were gradually confronted with increase in unemployment and underemployment, non-consistent payments, reductions in wages, uninsured employment and decreasing levels of work satisfaction. Given that this situation compares unfavourably with interviewees’ labour market position and terms of employment in the pre-crisis years, it is concluded that they witnessed rapidly worsening terms of employment and deteriorating labour
market conditions in Greece in recent years. Overall, the cross-interview theme “from settled to hopeless” epitomises interviewees’ thoughts and feelings for this development in their employment life in Greece.

5.5. Conclusions

The body of literature reviewed in this chapter highlighted that, on average, the quality of employment for immigrants in Greece has been of a low order long before the 2009 economic crisis. The economic crisis, though, further deteriorated immigrants’ position in the labour market. One of the main reasons why the 2009 economic downturn has taken a heavy toll on immigrants’ labour market participation is their employment in great numbers in economic sectors which are very sensitive to macroeconomic fluctuations, like the building/construction sector (OECD, 2009). Those economic sectors have been affected greatly by the recent economic downturn (Hellenic Statistical Authority, 2013) and the people working in them have been confronted with various challenges like lay-offs, wage cuts and worsening working conditions. So, even though immigrant workers have traditionally been in a vulnerable position in Greece, the recent economic crisis has further deteriorated their work life in the country.

The findings of the quantitative and qualitative analysis conducted for the purposes of this chapter confirm this bleak picture. Analysis revealed that core aspects of immigrants’ position in the Greek labour market have worsened drastically in recent years (i.e. employment rate, income level, type of occupation and degree of work satisfaction). Among the most distinctive analysis findings were increases in unemployment and underemployment, a shift from skilled to unskilled occupations, a drop in monthly incomes and loss of work satisfaction. The cross-interview theme “from settled to hopeless” encapsulated immigrants’ thoughts and feeling for these transitions. Moreover, notable differences were observed between different immigrant groups. It was shown that key economic sectors in Greece were gender-specific and occupied immigrants from certain regions of origin. The most distinctive cases were found to be the domestic services sector and the building/construction sector. Indeed, the majority of female immigrants reported working as domestic workers while the majority of male immigrants reported working in building/construction occupations. Also, most of female domestic workers reported having immigrated to Greece from Eastern Europe while most male workers in
the building/construction sector reported having immigrated to Greece from the Balkans and Eastern Europe. Additionally, based on quantitative and qualitative findings, domestic workers were only marginally affected by the economic recession. In sharp contrast, workers in building/construction occupations were greatly affected.

These findings are in accordance with the recent developments in the economy of Greece. According to the Labour Institute GSEE-ADEDY (2012), the building/construction sector was greatly affected by the recent economic crisis. The employment levels in the economic sector of building and construction were dropped by 22.7% between 2008 and 2009 and by 73.2% between 2009 and 2010 (Labour Institute GSEE-ADEDY, 2012). However, this has not been the case for the economic sector of domestic services. The employment levels in the domestic services sector were increased by 11.5% from 2008 to 2009 and they were only slightly decreased by 5.5% from 2009 to 2010 (Labour Institute GSEE-ADEDY, 2012). Hence, the recent developments in the Greek economy are in accordance with the following finding of this chapter; that is that certain immigrant groups have been affected more severely by the economic crisis than others. This finding is explained by the concentration of immigrants of different origin and gender to different sectors of the economy which have been affected to a greater or lesser extent by the crisis repercussions.

Overall, Chapter 5 considered the impact of severe and varied crisis effects on the employment situation and labour market position of immigrants. More precisely, employment sectors in Greece have been gender and origin specific since long before the crisis. Following the crisis eruption, those sectors were affected to a different extent by the crisis repercussions. Thus, immigrants of different gender and origin experienced effects of varied severity on their labour market integration and income. In addition, in the aftermath of the crisis, immigrants’ perception of their employment prospects in Greece was very pessimistic, painting a bleak picture of their future employment life in the country. It is argued that immigrants’ deteriorating employment situation and labour market position impacted negatively on their welfare in Greece, which is important considering that labour market integration and income is one of the three thematic areas synthesizing immigrants’ welfare in the thesis. Last, such deterioration of immigrants’ employment welfare intensifies the interest for the pre- and during-crisis assessment of the other two thematic areas synthesizing immigrants’ welfare (i.e. living conditions and
social integration) with the aim of gaining a holistic understanding of the impact of the crisis effects on immigrants’ welfare in Greece.
Chapter 6
Economic recession and immigrants’ living conditions

6.1. Introduction

Accommodation is an essential human need and it constitutes a basic prerequisite for social integration (Whitehead and Scanlon, 2007). In relation to Europe, immigrants have traditionally been in a less favourable position compared to natives in regards to accommodation conditions as they are more likely to experience discrimination in the housing market, to live in overcrowded dwellings and to pay a higher percentage of their income for their accommodation rent (Huddleston et al., 2011). This creates concerns regarding their integration into the European societies. And, challenging economic circumstances in the aftermath of the 2007/2008 international financial crisis make those concerns particularly acute. Indeed, accommodation conditions have always been closely linked with financial resources and, at present, immigrants’ economic status in Europe has been deteriorated by the effects of the crisis outbreak (Prean and Mayr, 2012). Hence, in recent years, securing adequate accommodation conditions has become even more challenging for immigrants across the countries of Europe (Rybkowska and Scheider, 2011).

In regards to Greece, immigrants’ participation in the labour market has been notably undermined in the 2009 crisis aftermath provoking, among others, a considerable reduction in their income levels (e.g. see Drydakis, 2012; Hellenic Statistical Authority, 2014; Zografakis and Kassimis, 2013). Consequently, several issues related to immigrants’ welfare have emerged. The most prevalent of these issues are linked to the development of their economic status throughout their period of stay in Greece and their consequent ability to secure adequate accommodation conditions and support financially themselves and their families. With this in mind, this chapter provides the theoretical context on immigrants’ integration in the housing market of Greece and it utilises quantitative and qualitative findings in order to: (i) investigate the living conditions of immigrants in Greece with focus on their economic status and accommodation conditions; (ii) ascertain changes in immigrants’ economic status and accommodation conditions following the outbreak of the economic crisis in 2009; and (iii) examine whether certain
immigrants groups were more or less vulnerable to the economic crisis impact on their living conditions in Greece.

The present chapter is structured as follows: By using secondary literature, section 6.2 discusses immigrants’ housing integration in Greece while assessing the intensity of ethnic discrimination in the Greek housing market. Section 6.3 utilises the findings of the quantitative survey (for more details on the quantitative survey see Chapter 3) to describe immigrants’ living conditions in Greece and to assess whether their economic status and accommodation conditions altered in the post 2009 economic crisis period. Section 6.4 uses the findings of the semi structured interviews (for more details on the semi structured interviews see Chapter 3) to present immigrants’ personal insights on how their living conditions evolved since their first year of immigration to Greece. Lastly, section 6.5 provides an overall assessment of the development of immigrants’ living conditions in Greece in recent years based on the theoretical and empirical findings of this chapter.

6.2. Immigrants’ housing integration: insights from the literature

In recent years, the effective integration of immigrants in Europe has gained importance. Accordingly, various integration mechanisms and state policies (e.g. workforce development and education systems for culturally and linguistically diverse communities) have fuelled plenty discussions and political debates (Dustmann et al., 2012). Yet, integration strategies vary from time to time and from place to place and thus, their outcome may never be fully predicted and controlled (Hatziprokipiou, 2003). What can be argued, though, is that unrestricted access to the housing market is a significant factor facilitating the socio-economic integration of immigrants in Europe (e.g. see Harrison et al., 2005; Schneeweis, 2011). Finally, Greece offers a critical case in Europe for studying immigrants’ housing integration due to the unforeseen transformation of Greece to an immigration country in the early 1990s and the consequent, unexpected entry of a considerable number of immigrants in the Greek housing market.

6.2.1. Housing integration of immigrants in Greece

In regards to the residential segmentation of Athens, the capital of Greece, the Athenian landscape can be generally characterized as ethnically diverse. Immigrants are rarely the majority of residents in any of the urban neighbourhoods. Also, immigrants’ geography
of residence in Athens reveals the absence of ethnic ghettos. So, the areas where the concentration of immigrant residents is high are characterized by ethnic diversity and no single ethnic group constitutes an ethnic majority. In fact, Athens is one of the most plural and diverse European cities (Arapoglou, 2006; Arapoglou and Sayas, 2009).

Nonetheless, at the smaller spatial scale, immigrants’ origin appears to influence the geography of their residence. Immigrants from Albania live in the same residential areas with Greeks. Albanians form the largest share of the immigrant population in Athens and thus, them sharing the same residential space with Greeks lowers the overall degree of spatial segmentation of Athens (Arapoglou, 2016; Kandylis et al. 2012). On the contrary, immigrants from Central and Eastern Europe as well as immigrants from Asia and Africa (particularly immigrants from the less developed Asian and African countries) appear to be concentrated in residential communities (Arapoglou, 2016).

Maloutas (2007) also explains that the employment opportunities offered in different areas of the city also influence the residential dispersion of immigrants in Athens. In detail, Albanians are mostly employed in the agricultural sector and in the building/construction sector and the majority of employment opportunities in those two sectors can be found in the periphery of Athens. Hence, Albanians are mainly concentrated in peripheral residential areas of the city. On the other hand, Bulgarians mainly live in areas close to the Athenian city centre as they mainly work in the domestic services sector. The majority of employment opportunities in the domestic services sector can be found in the densely-populated areas close the city centre of Athens. In parallel lines, Arvanitidis and Skouras (2008) identify economic reasons as the most important factor influencing immigrants’ location patterns in the city of Volos, a medium-sized city of Greece. In Volos, like in Athens, no visible ethnic ghettos can be traced. Immigrant residents are dispersed in the city but they mainly occupy old, low-quality and thus, low-priced dwellings.

Finally, according to Arapoglou (2016), immigrants’ position on the occupational landscape tends to influence their spatial dispersion across Athens. More evidently, the suburban areas of Athens (which are characterized by high-quality and high-price dwellings) are mainly inhabited by immigrants employed at the top of the occupational ladder. In adverse, the peri-urban areas of Athens (which are characterized by low-quality
and low-price dwellings) are mainly inhabited by immigrants employed at the lowest level of the occupational ladder (Arapoglou, 2016).

Despite the low degree of spatial segmentation in Athens, the racial inequalities in the Athenian housing market are significant. In general, housing discrimination occurs when a house-seeker has more restricted access to the house market and she/he is less likely to rent or buy a property compared to other house-seekers with the same observable characteristics (Dymski, 2005). Also, housing discrimination occurs when a house-seeker is left with no other choice but to accept a higher price or more stringent contract terms compared to other house-seekers with the same observable characteristics in order to buy or rent a property (Drydakis, 2010). Hence, housing discrimination places serious barriers for the harmonious social and economic integration of immigrants and ethnic minorities.

In relation to Europe in general and Greece in particular, the presence of housing discrimination against immigrants and ethnic minorities is not in question (OECD, 2008; OECD, 2005). Focusing on Greece, there are clear inequalities between immigrants and natives in relation to housing status and immigrants are often the victims of discriminatory treatment in the housing market (Kandylis and Kavoulakos, 2011; Lazaridis, 2004).

In detail, Drydakis (2010) conducted a study covering the period between November 2006 and October 2007 in order to measure the degree of housing discrimination against Albanian women in the housing rental market of Athens. One of the findings of his study is that Albanian women have lower access to the Athenian housing rental market compared to native women. This finding is particularly true in the case of new, repaired and above-ground rental apartments. Also, an earlier study by Hatziprokopiou (2003) referring to the period between September 2001 and July 2002 provides evidence that Albanians experience discrimination not only in the city of Athens but also in Thessaloniki, the second most populous city in Greece. More precisely, Hatziprokopiou (2003) claims that there is a considerable tendency among landlords in Thessaloniki to refuse to rent their properties to foreigners and particularly to Albanians. In relation to accommodation quality, the author claims that the accommodation conditions of Albanians in Thessaloniki are notably inferior to the accommodation conditions of the native population. According to Maloutas and Karadimitriou (2001), this finding also holds true in the case of Athens (i.e. natives enjoy higher quality of accommodation compared to immigrants in the city of Athens). More precisely, buildings in Athens are
vertically segregated with natives mainly occupying the higher floors of the buildings and immigrants mainly occupying the lower floors. Residential apartments on the lower floors are most frequently darker, less spacious and less comfortable than those apartments on the upper floors. Hence, according to Maloutas (2007), immigrants have an increased share in lower quality dwellings in the capital of Greece.

Moreover, Drydakis (2010) argues that immigrant women in Athens have lower access to rental properties in middle-class and upper-class residential areas compared to native women. Also, Albanian women are more likely to pay a higher rent than native women for the same rental property; this difference in rent value is the highest in the upper-class areas of Athens. So, according to Drydakis (2010), landlords promote ethnic residential segregation in the capital city. Last, an intriguing observation is made by Balabanidis (2013) who argues that there is a tendency among landlords in Greece to rent properties to immigrants at a lower rent in exchange for immigrants repairing the rented property. This tendency leads to the renovation of a great number of old dwellings and the revitalization of many city neighbourhoods that have been “abandoned” by natives. Upgrading obsolete buildings and rejuvenating downgraded neighbourhoods also generates economic activity. Immigrants give a boost to local economies by opening clothing stores, food stores and other retail stores and by providing the necessary clientele for stores owned by natives in downgraded city areas.

As a final note, a survey conducted by the National Centre for Social Research in collaboration with the University of Thessaly amongst 2.100 Greek households during 2002 captured the levels of racial intolerance in the greater Athens area. The survey showed that 44% of respondents said that Albanians and Roma should live separately from Greeks (Baldwin-Edwards, 2005). Drydakis (2011) argues that discrimination against Albanian rent-seekers in Athens may be attributed to negative stereotypes and feelings of prejudice against Albanians. So, overall, Albanian rent-seekers anticipate experiencing discrimination in the housing market and more often than not they actually do. Nevertheless, Hatziprokoioi (2003) argues that discrimination against Albanians in the Greek housing market becomes gradually less intense. Discrimination in the housing market is not that dissimilar to discrimination in the labour market; incidents of exploitation and discriminatory treatment become with time less frequent and less acute.
Last, Kandylis et al. (2012) reinforce this finding by arguing that Albanians’ living and working conditions improved rapidly between 1991 and 2001.

***

The overview of evidence-based studies highlights the presence of housing discrimination against immigrants in Greece. Immigrants have restricted access to the Greek housing market and they often have to accept more stringent contract terms than natives for renting or buying a property. This finding is particularly true in the case of new, above-ground dwellings in upper-class residential areas. Nevertheless, there is evidence of integration trajectories influencing the lives of both immigrants and natives. In particular, housing discrimination against Albanian immigrants (who participated in the first major immigration movement to Greece in the early 1990s and who make up for more than half of the immigrant population in Greece) becomes gradually less acute. Hence, it appears that immigrants’ unrestricted access to housing (and their contribution to the upgrading of buildings and residential areas) is not a utopian scenario.

6.3. Evidence from the quantitative interviews

The present section describes immigrants’ living conditions in Greece by means of quantitative analysis findings. Amongst the core analysis objectives was to examine whether and in what degree immigrants’ living conditions changed following the outbreak of the Greek economic recession in 2009. Interviews were conducted between August and September 2012 and led to the collection of data related to the period before the economic crisis as well as to the period during the economic crisis (for further details on methodology see section 3.2.1). Analysis revealed a considerable deterioration of immigrants’ economic status, which was accompanied by an extensive worsening of their housing and neighbourhood conditions. Those findings complement the findings of the previous section and indicate a significant degradation of immigrants’ welfare in Greece.

6.3.1. Measuring economic status using descriptive analysis

As discussed in Chapter 5, participants experienced severe income reductions during the period between their year of immigration to Greece and the recession year 2012. So, among the key aims of this section is to assess the repercussions of those income reductions on basic economic aspects of life which are regarded as strongly related to the
overall quality of life (Diener and Suh, 1997). More precisely, the following four key aspects of immigrants’ economic life are assessed: (i) economic ability to purchase enough food for themselves and their families; (ii) financial capability to cover the cost of child rearing; (iii) economic ability to pay rent and/or debts (e.g. towards banks); (iv) the frequency of getting disconnected or using less than needed in relation house utilities.

Food

Participants were initially asked to comment on their financial capability to buy enough food for themselves and their families both during their year of arrival in Greece and during the year 2012. Figure 16 shows how the purchasing power of participants has dwindled over the last years. The percentage of participants who reported being constantly unable to ensure enough food for themselves and their families increased considerably (i.e. from 0.6% in first year to 1.9% during 2012) revealing signs of an emerging humanitarian crisis. Accordingly, the percentage of participants being often unable to afford nutrition increased significantly (i.e. from 6.3% in first year to 8.4% during 2012). An increase also occurred in the percentage of participants facing rarely financial difficulties in buying sufficient amount of food (i.e. from 18.4% in first year to 20.9% during 2012) while a considerable decrease occurred in the percentage of immigrants being always financially able to provide themselves and their families with enough food (i.e. from 74.4% in first year to 68.8% during 2012). The evaluation of these outcomes in relation to participants’ gender indicates that men were less financially capable of providing themselves and their families with sufficient food during their first year of stay in Greece compared to women. In addition, men’s relative incapability gradually grew and ended up being even more distinctive during the year 2012 (see Appendix 12).
Figure 16. The frequency in which participants were financially unable to afford nutrition, 1st year of stay and 2012

![Diagram showing the frequency of financial inability to afford nutrition](image)

Source: Own survey
Note: N = 320

Further insights are generated by bringing into analysis the factor of participants’ region of origin. On average, participants from Africa and the Middle East reported being more frequently financially unable to provide an adequate diet to themselves and their families in comparison to all other groups. It is indicative that only 40.8% of Africans and 53.3% of Middle Easterners answered “never” in the question of how often during 2012 they had too little money to buy enough food for themselves and their first-degree relatives. On the contrary, the percentage of Eastern Europeans also answering “never” in the same question was more than doubled (i.e. 89.8%). In addition, analysis revealed that Eastern Europeans were, on average, the most financially able to provide themselves and their families with enough food, compared to all other groups (see Appendix 16).

Child rearing
A significant proportion of the sample reported having dependent children (i.e. 56.9% of participants reported having children aged 16 years old or younger). So, some of the questions addressed to participants aimed to gather information regarding their ability to afford the cost of bringing up their children as well as to detect if and how this ability changed in the years of the economic recession. Descriptive analysis of collected data
showed that participants were more financially able to cover the cost of meeting their children’s needs during their first year of stay in Greece than during the year 2012 (see Appendix 15).

As evident in Figure 17, the percentage of participants who never had any financial difficulties in covering their children’s needs decreased by 8.3% while the proportion of participants who were often financially unable to afford the cost of child rearing increased by 7.9%. In relation to gender, men faced more frequently than women financial constraints in bringing up their children both in their year of stay to Greece and during the year 2012. It is indicative that in 2012, almost 10% more women than men were in position to report never having any financial obstacles in taking care of their children’s needs (see Appendix 15). As a final note, no significant variations were found among participants from different regions of origin regarding the frequency in which they were confronted with financial constraints in covering their children’s expenses (see Appendix 16).

**Figure 17.** The frequency in which participants were financially unable to afford the cost of child rearing, 1st year of stay and 2012

Source: Own survey

Note 1: N = 320

Note 2: The N/A answer indicates that participants had no children

Note 3: In the context of the questionnaire interview the term “childrearing” was defined as the process of providing children with everything necessary for their physical, social, emotional and intellectual development (primarily food, clothing, housing, education, safety, etc.)
Rent and/or debts

Third, participants were asked how often they had been unable to meet their financial obligations towards third parties (i.e. to pay their rent and/or meet their financial commitments towards lenders (e.g. towards banks)). Descriptive analysis of participants’ responses showed that a smaller percentage of participants reported never having any difficulties in paying their rent and/or debts during 2012 than during their year of arrival. On the contrary, the percentage of participants who reported failing on a frequent basis to pay their rent and/or their debts was considerably higher for the year 2012 than for their year of arrival. Second, there was an important increase in the percentage of immigrants who were always financially unable to pay their rent and/or their debts between the two time periods under analysis (see Appendix 15).

The assessment of those findings as a function of participants’ gender adds further insights into the analysis. Compared to women, men were more often financially unable to pay rent and/or debts during their first year of stay in Greece. This difference became far more obvious during 2012. It is revealing that in 2012, 43.5% of male participants (as compared to 28.3% of female participants) reported being often unable to pay rent and/or debts, while 14% of male participants (as compared to 3.1% of female participants) reported being always unable to meet the same financial obligations (see Appendix 15).
**Figure 18.** The frequency in which participants were financially unable to pay their rent and/or debts, 1<sup>st</sup> year of stay and 2012

![Diagram showing frequency of financial inability to pay rent and/or debts](image)

Source: Own survey

Note 1: N = 320

Note 2: In the context of the questionnaire interview the answer “never” was not only chosen by those who had never had any difficulty in paying their rent and/or debts but also by those who never had this type of financial obligations.

Likewise, considerable differences were observed among participants from different regions of origin. More precisely, Asians experienced the largest reduction in their financial ability to fulfil their commitments towards landlords and/or lenders (i.e. the share of Asians who reported being often financially unable to pay rent and/or debts increased from 13.9% in their first year to 47.2% during 2012). Also, analysis revealed that the already high percentage of African and Middle Eastern participants with financial incapability of paying rents and/or debts during their first year in Greece increased by the year 2012 (i.e. the share of Africans who reported being often unable to pay their rent and/or their debts increased from 36.7% in first year to 57.1% during 2012, while the share of Middle Easterners who reported being in the same financial situation increased from 20% in first year to 33.6% during 2012). Finally, it is revealing that, as many as 32.7% of African participants and 33% of Middle Eastern participants reported being constantly unable to pay their rent and/or their debts in 2012 (see Appendix 16).

*Utilities*

138
Participants were asked how often they used to get disconnected or use less than they needed in relation to water, gas, electricity and telephone, because they couldn’t afford the cost. Descriptive analysis of collected data showed that participants were in a better financial position to afford the cost of their utility bills during their first year in Greece than during 2012. More specifically, the share of participants who reported being often financially unable to afford the cost of their utility bills increased from 18.1% in first year to 40.6% during 2012. Also, the share of participants who reported being constantly unable to afford the cost of their utilities bills increased from 5% in first year to 20.3% during 2012 (see Appendix 15). Figure 19 offers a graphical representation of those figures.

Furthermore, the analysis of the above findings as a function of participants’ gender and region of origin revealed only a few noteworthy observations. In comparing male and female participants, a general remark is that, men were less often than women unable to afford the cost of utilities in their first year in Greece. However, the opposite is true for 2012, as men were more often than women unable to pay the cost of utilities bills (see Appendix 15). Furthermore, no huge variations were identified among participants from different regions of origin. As general observation, Asians, Africans and Middle Easterners reported being more often unable to cover utilities’ cost than Eastern Europeans and participants from the Balkans. This observation applies for both periods under consideration (i.e. participants’ first year of stay in Greece and 2012) but it becomes more profound in 2012 (see Appendix 16).
**Figure 19.** Participants’ use of utilities according to their financial ability to afford utilities’ cost, 1st year of stay and 2012

Source: Own survey  
Note 1: N = 320  
Note 2: The N/A answer indicates that participants’ accommodation was provided by their employer who was also responsible for covering the cost of utilities.

In addition, participants were asked to identify who they can rely on in case of financial difficulties. Approximately half of participants said that they would rely on family and friends if they were confronted with financial difficulties during both periods under analysis (i.e. participants’ first year of stay in Greece and 2012). Also, by 2012, the share of participants who would rely on their personal savings increased by 16% and the percentage of participants who had no one to rely on dropped by 17%. This observation suggests an improvement of participants’ financial situation throughout their period of stay in Greece and of their integration in the native society. Furthermore, in 2012, only 3.4% of participants would rely on welfare benefits in case of financial difficulties whereas 9.4% of participants would rely on charity and the Church to overcome their financial hardships; it is revealing that only 3.4% of participants reported being in receipt of social support in 2012 (see Appendix 17). Nonetheless, almost half of participants reported never having any difficulty accessing health care services or treatment in Greece. It should be kept in mind, though, that the most frequently mentioned problems in
accessing health care were the high cost of medical treatment and serious administrative delays (see Appendix 18).

6.3.2 Measuring economic hardship using Mixed ANOVA methods

Main effects of time, gender and origin

As discussed in section 3.2.1, an economic hardship scale was devised with the purpose of assessing changes in participants’ economic hardships before and during the crisis, taking into account participants’ background and using Mixed ANOVA methods (the higher the scores on the scale the more severe the economic hardship). Analysis showed that, there was a significant effect of time on economic hardship scores $F(1,309) = 39.90, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .11$. Particularly, economic hardship total scores were significantly lower before ($M = 3.15, SD = 1.29$) than during 2012 ($M = 3.80, SD = 1.39$). This shows an overall increase in participants’ economic hardships during the economic crisis. Statistically significant between-subjects main effects were found for gender $F(1,309) = 8.03, p < .01, \eta^2_p = .025$ and origin $F(5,309) = 15.20, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .19$. Particularly, female economic hardship scores were overall significantly lower ($M = 3.22, SD = 1.25$) to male economic hardship scores ($M = 3.63, SD = 1.37$; see Figure 20) showing that women experienced overall less severe economic hardships than men.

Figure 20. Female and male economic hardship mean scores

Source: Own survey

Note: N = 320
To ascertain further the effects of participants’ origin on economic hardship scores, post-hoc comparisons between the 5 origin groups were conducted. Between-subjects t-tests analyses showed that participants from Eastern Europe reported overall lower hardship scores ($M = 2.83, SD = .82$) than participants from the Balkans ($M = 3.48, SD = 1.25, p < .001$), the Middle East ($M = 3.89, SD = 1.56, p < .001$) and Africa ($M = 4.44, SD = 1.45, p < .001$). Participants from the Balkans ($M = 3.48, SD = 1.25$) had overall lower economic hardship scores than participants from the Middle East ($M = 3.89, SD = 1.56, p < .001$) and Africa ($M = 4.44, SD = 1.45, p < .001$). Finally, the same applies for participants from Asia ($M = 3.15, SD = 1.45$) who also had overall lower economic hardship scores than participants from the Middle East ($M = 3.89, SD = 1.56, p < .001$) and Africa ($M = 4.44, SD = 1.45, p < .001$). No other group differences were found. Overall, participants from Eastern Europe had the lowest economic hardship scores and participants from Africa had the highest economic hardship scores. Finally, the above observations show that in hierarchical order of increasing economic hardship severity Eastern Europeans experienced overall less severe economic hardships followed by participants from the Balkans, Middle Easterners, Asians and Africans.

**Interaction effects between variables**

There was a significant interaction between time and origin of participants F(5,309) = 3.88, $p < .005$, $\eta^2_p = .59$. This finding shows that economic hardship scores were highly influenced by the background of participants as shown in Figure 21. Remarkably, although, as noted above, there was an overall increase in economic hardship scores during the crisis, post-hoc analyses using within-subjects t-tests showed that participants from Balkans displayed non-significant changes in their economic hardship scores between their first year of immigration and 2012 ($p > .05$). This shows that participants from the Balkans did not experience a significant increase in their economic hardships during the economic crisis. On the contrary, the scores of all other groups were statistically higher during 2012 than before ($p < .05$) showing an increase in their economic hardships during the economic crisis. Nevertheless, the above reductions varied between groups as shown in Figure 21. No other interaction effects were found.
**Figure 21.** Economic hardship mean scores for participants from different regions of origin
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Source: Own survey

Note: N = 320

### 6.3.3 Measuring accommodation conditions using descriptive analysis

The aim of the following section is twofold: to gain knowledge of participants’ accommodation conditions in Greece and (ii) to discuss changes in their accommodation conditions following the outbreak of the economic crisis in 2009. For this purpose, the following key constructs are examined: (i) Type of accommodation (i.e. owned accommodation, rented accommodation, etc.); (ii) Housing related problems (i.e. shortage of space, lack of adequate lighting, etc.); (iii) Neighbourhood related problems (i.e. insufficient transport, burglaries/deliberate damage to properties, etc.); (iv) Housing and neighbourhood satisfaction.

**Type of accommodation**

So, first, participants were asked to report their type of accommodation in Greece during their first year of immigration as well as during 2012. The specific types of accommodation reported by participants can be outlined as follows: (i) Owned accommodation; (ii) Rented accommodation; (iii) Shared accommodation; (iv) Short stay
shelter; (v) Homelessness; (vi) Accommodation provided by employer. As shown in Figure 22, almost half of participants reported living in a rented accommodation during their first year in Greece while one third of participants reported living in a shared accommodation during the same time period under consideration. A significant proportion of the sample (i.e. approximately 11%) reported living in an accommodation provided by their employer. Also, less than 2% of participants reported spending their first year in Greece in a short stay shelter and less than 3% reported having nowhere to live in (see Appendix 19).

Notable differences were detected when participants’ accommodation type during their first year in Greece was compared with participants’ accommodation type during the year 2012. More precisely, there was a remarkable increase in the number of accommodation owners while considerably fewer participants reported living in a shared accommodation during 2012. The same tendency was found among participants whose accommodation was provided by their employer as their numbers dropped notably by the year 2012. On the other side of the spectrum, there was a similarly important increase in the number of participants who reported living in a short stay shelter and in the number of participants who reported having nowhere to live. Overall, this divergence in participants’ accommodation type between their first year of immigration to Greece and 2012 reflects clearly participants’ mobility between different accommodation types throughout their period of stay in Greece.

*Figure 22.* Participants’ accommodation type, 1st year of stay and 2012
By considering the factor of participants’ gender, additional insights are revealed. A notably higher number of male responders than female responders reported being homeless or living in short stay shelters. This difference increased in magnitude by the year 2012. Another remarkable difference between the two genders was the higher percentage of female participants than male participants who reported living in an accommodation provided by their employer. This observation holds true for participants’ first year of stay in Greece as well as for the year 2012. The last distinguishing point between the two genders is the higher number of male participants identifying shared accommodation as their accommodation type in respect to both time periods under analysis (i.e. participants’ first year of immigration to Greece and 2012) (see Appendix 19).

The assessment of participants’ responses by controlling for the factor of region of origin brought to light some additional notable observations. An increase in the number of accommodation owners occurred among participants from the Balkans and Eastern Europe
by the year 2012. It should be noted, though, that the highest percentage of accommodation owners during participants’ first year of immigration to Greece was found among participants from the Middle East. However, accommodation owners from the Middle Easterners kept their percentage stable between the two periods under consideration (i.e. participants’ first year of immigration to Greece and 2012). Furthermore, by 2012, a massive drop occurred in the number of participants from the Balkans who reported living in a shared accommodation (i.e. a drop of almost 45%) as the majority of them moved to rented or owned dwellings. On the contrary, almost half of African participants reported living in a shared accommodation during 2012. Moreover, the highest percentage of participants who reported living in an accommodation provided by their employer was formed by participants of Eastern European origin. The last point to be highlighted here concerns participants who reported living in a short stay shelter as well as to participants who reported having nowhere to live. The striking majority of those participants had come from Africa and the Middle East and their percentages increased significantly since their first year of immigration to Greece (see Appendix 20).

Housing related problems
The present section examines the frequency in which participants confronted housing related problems (i.e. shortage of space, lack of adequate lighting and absence of sufficient heating and cooling facilities) in reference to their first year of immigration to Greece and in reference to 2012. Descriptive analysis revealed that, participants were facing on a frequent basis the problem of shortage of space during their first year of stay in Greece as well as during the year 2012 (i.e. more than 40% of participants reported experiencing frequently the problem of shortage of space with their accommodation during both periods). To a lesser extent, the same observation applies to the housing related issue of not having sufficient heating and cooling facilities. Indeed, more than 25% of the sample reported living in houses without sufficient heating and cooling facilities during both periods under examination (i.e. participants’ first year of immigration to Greece and 2012). Moreover, the least frequent problem confronted by participants was lack of adequate lighting. Approximately 10% of participants reported living in houses without sufficient exposure to sunshine during their first year of immigration to Greece while approximately 7% of participants reported having the same housing related problem during 2012 (see Appendix 21). Overall, participants’ responses revealed the absence of notable fluctuations
in the occurrence frequency of housing related problems in the post 2009 economic crisis period.

The examination of those findings as a function of participants’ gender brings an additional dimension to the analysis. The frequency in which female participants reported having the above housing related problems was significantly lower than the frequency in which male participants reported facing the exact same problems (see Appendix 22). This finding holds true for both periods under analysis (i.e. participants’ first year of immigration to Greece and 2012). Finally, analysis revealed that participants’ region of origin constitutes an additional influential factor for the assessment of housing related issues experienced by immigrants. In detail, participants from Eastern Europe reported experiencing the problems of shortage of space, lack of adequate lighting and absence of sufficient heating and cooling facilities to a lesser extent compared to all other immigrant groups (see Appendix 23). Most importantly, participants from the Balkans constitute the only group experiencing a substantial reduction in the frequency of occurrence of those problems by the year 2012. On the contrary, Africans followed by Middle Easterners and Asians reported experiencing those housing related issues more frequently during 2012 than during their first year of immigration to Greece (see Appendix 23).

Housing satisfaction

With the purpose of gaining a better understanding of immigrants’ accommodation conditions, participants were asked to report their degree of satisfaction with their housing in respect with their first year of stay in Greece and in respect with the year 2012. Figure 23 shows that more than 45% of participants reported feeling satisfied with their housing in reference to both periods under consideration (i.e. participants’ first year of immigration to Greece and 2012); the percentage of participants feeling dissatisfied with their housing within the same time frame was approximately 20%. Also, differences between the two sexes were minor. Nonetheless, it should be noted that women reported, on average, higher levels of housing satisfaction than men. This difference in the housing satisfaction levels between the two sexes was more apparent during the economic recession (see Appendix 24).
**Figure 23.** Participants’ levels of housing satisfaction, 1\(^{st}\) year of stay and 2012

Furthermore, a unique trend was found among participants from the Balkans. Their levels of housing satisfaction were significantly higher during 2012 than during their first year of immigration to Greece. Yet, the opposite was true for all other groups. This decline in housing satisfaction levels was remarkably more evident among participants from Africa, the Middle East and Asia as their housing satisfaction levels dropped dramatically following the outbreak of the economic crisis (see Appendix 25).

**Neighbourhood related problems**

With the aim of deepening our knowledge of the neighbourhood environment in which immigrants live in Greece as well as of gaining an understanding of how this neighbourhood environment changed in the aftermath of the economic crisis, the next construct to be assessed here is neighbourhood related problems. So, participants were asked to comment on the frequency in which they were experiencing particular problems in their neighbourhoods during the first year they spent in Greece as well as during 2012. Those problems were the following: (i) Insufficient transport; (ii) Rubbish lying around; (iii) Burglaries or deliberate damage to properties; (iv) Racist insults or attacks and (v) Drug trade or prostitution.
In relation to transport, a higher number of participants reported living in neighbourhoods with insufficient transport during 2012 than during their first year of immigration to Greece. By 2012, there was also a significant increase in the number of participants who reported living in neighbourhoods with rubbish lying around. An equally significant increase occurred in the number of participants who reported frequent occurrence of burglaries and deliberate damages to property. In addition, participants reported that incidents of racist insults or attacks increased by the year 2012. Last, there was a substantial increase in the number of participants who reported living in neighbourhoods where they were exposed to drug dealing activities and prostitution (see Appendix 26). So, overall, a significant deterioration of immigrants’ neighbourhood environment occurred in the aftermath of the economic recession.

Neighbourhood satisfaction

As anticipated, the increase in occurrence of neighbourhood related problems was accompanied by a drop in participants’ aggregate levels of neighbourhood satisfaction. A graphical representation of this finding is given in Figure 24. A further breakdown of this findings based on participants’ gender and region of origin reveals only a few noteworthy observations. Those are the following: Women expressed, on average, higher levels of neighbourhood satisfaction than men, particularly in 2012 (see Appendix 24). Participants from the Balkans constitute the only group with higher levels of neighbourhood satisfaction in respect to 2012 than in reference to their first year of immigration to Greece. Participants from all other regions of origin reported feeling less satisfied with their neighbourhoods in the aftermath of the economic crisis. The highest drop in neighbourhood satisfaction levels was observed among participants from the Middle East, followed by participants from Africa and Asia. As a final note, it is alarming that more than 50% of Africans reported not feeling satisfied with their neighbourhood environment in 2012 (see Appendix 25).
6.3.4. Measuring accommodation hardship using Mixed ANOVA methods

Main effects of time, gender and origin

As discussed in section 3.2.1, an accommodation hardship scale was developed in order to assess changes in participants’ accommodation hardships before and during the crisis, taking into account participants’ background and using Mixed ANOVA methods (the higher the scores on the scale the worse the accommodation hardships). Analysis revealed that, there was a significant effect of time on accommodation hardship scores $F(1,309) = 158.85, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .34$. More precisely, accommodation hardship total scores were significantly lower before ($M = 14.70, SD = 4.47$) than during 2012 ($M = 18.78, SD = 5.44$). This shows an overall increase of accommodation difficulties during the crisis. Statistically significant between-subjects main effects were found for origin $F(5,309) = 12.47, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .16$ whereas nonsignificant between-subjects main effects were found for gender $F(1,309) = .65, p > .05, \eta^2_p = .002$. Particularly, overall accommodation hardship scores were not significantly different for male participants ($M = 17.29, SD = $...
5.01) and female participants (\( M = 15.91, SD = 4.74 \)) (see Figure 25). This shows that, overall, women and men encountered similarly severe accommodation hardships throughout their period of stay in Greece.

**Figure 25.** Female and male accommodation hardship mean scores

![Figure 25](image)

Source: Own survey

Note: N = 320

To ascertain further the effects of participants’ origin on accommodation hardship scores, post-hoc comparisons between the 5 origin groups were conducted. Between subjects t-tests analyses showed that participants from Eastern Europe (\( M = 14.99, SD = 3.86 \)) had overall significantly lower accommodation hardship scores than participants from Africa (\( M = 20.44, SD = 4.98, p < .001 \)) and the Middle East (\( M = 18.28, SD = 5.90, p < .001 \)). The same applies for participants from the Balkans (\( M = 15.94, SD = 4.03 \)) who also had overall significantly lower accommodation hardship scores than participants from Africa (\( M = 20.44, SD = 4.98, p < .001 \)) and the Middle East (\( M = 18.28, SD = 5.90, p < .05 \)).

And, similarly, participants from Asia (\( M = 15.29, SD = 4.46 \)) had overall significantly lower accommodation hardship scores than participants from Africa (\( M = 20.44, SD = 4.98, p < .001 \)) and the Middle East (\( M = 18.28, SD = 5.90, p < .05 \)). No other group differences were found. Overall, participants from Eastern Europe had the lowest accommodation hardship scores and participants from Africa had the highest
accommodation hardship scores. Finally, the above findings show that in hierarchical order of increasing accommodation hardship severity Eastern Europeans experienced overall less severe accommodation hardships followed by participants from the Balkans, Asians, Middle Easterners and Africans.

**Interaction effects between variables**

There was a significant interaction between time and origin of participants $F(5,309) = 20.12, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .24$. This finding shows that accommodation hardship scores were highly influenced by the background of participants as shown in Figure 26. It is of interest that, even though, there was an overall increase in accommodation hardship scores during the crisis as noted above, post-hoc analysis using within-subjects t-tests showed that participants from Balkans displayed non-significant changes in their accommodation hardship scores between their first year of immigration and 2012 ($p > .05$). In contrast, the accommodation hardship scores of all other groups were statistically higher during 2012 than before ($p < .001$). Nevertheless, the above changes in accommodation hardship scores varied between groups as shown in Figure 26. No other interaction effects were found.

**Figure 26.** Accommodation hardship mean scores for participants from different regions of origin

Source: Own survey

Note: N = 320
Summarizing, the use of descriptive analysis revealed the occurrence of considerable alterations in participants’ economic status. These alterations occurred between participants’ first year of immigration in Greece and the year of the interview (i.e. 2012) and they were linked with four main aspects of their economic life. In particular, participants’ financial ability (i) to provide themselves and their families with enough food, (ii) to afford the cost of child rearing, (iii) to pay their rents and/or debts and (iv) to pay their utility bills had been severely compromised by the year 2012. Hence, participants had, on average, higher economic status during their first year of stay in Greece than during the recession year 2012. Furthermore, the use of Mixed ANOVA methods revealed that men had overall significantly lower economic hardship scores than women. Also, participants from Eastern Europe had overall the lowest economic hardship scores whereas participants from Africa had overall the highest economic hardship scores. Moreover, there was a significant increase in participants’ economic hardships by 2012. Nonetheless, this finding does not apply in the case of participants from the Balkans as they were the only group who did not witness an increase in their economic hardship scores following the 2009 crisis eruption.

Additionally, descriptive analysis was used for the assessment of participants’ housing and neighbourhood conditions in Greece. Analysis showed that the majority of participants lived in rented or shared accommodations and they often experienced housing related problems (i.e. shortage of space, lack of lighting, etc.). Neighbourhood related problems (i.e. insufficient transport, burglaries/deliberate damage to properties, etc.) were also reported as occurring on a frequent basis. As anticipated, the levels of housing and neighbourhood satisfaction among participants were found to be low. Those findings apply to both periods under consideration (i.e. participants’ first year of immigration to Greece and 2012) but, they were more apparent in respect with the year 2012. Hence, on the aggregate level, participants’ accommodation conditions deteriorated in the post 2009 economic crisis period.

Nonetheless, the use of Mixed ANOVA methods revealed significantly different trajectories when controlling for the factor of participants’ origin. It is revealing that, participants from Africa had overall the highest accommodation hardship scores whereas
participants from Eastern Europe had overall the lowest accommodation hardship scores. Finally, participants from the Balkans were the only group whose accommodation hardship scores did not alter significantly following the 2009 economic recession outbreak whereas all other groups experienced a significant increase in their accommodation hardship scores following the 2009 economic crisis eruption.

6.4. Evidence from the qualitative interviews

To reiterate, one of the prime objectives of the semi structured interviews in which 42 immigrants were interviewed (for a detailed discussion on the semi structured interviews see sections 3.2.3 and 3.2.4) was to examine their living conditions in Greece with special focus on the years following the 2009 crisis outbreak. Given that all interviewees were living in Greece for at least one year before the crisis and up until 2013 (i.e. until the date of the interviews), they had a first-hand experience of the impact of the economic turmoil on their living conditions.

The following section overviews and analyses the transition in interviewees’ living conditions during the crisis. The context of this transition, as noted in the previous chapter, was characterised by a settled working life involving a satisfying income. With this in mind, interviewees’ responses about their living conditions before the crisis were equally favourable. Particularly, they expressed satisfaction about their economic situation and admitted that they were in position to support themselves and their families:

“Until three to four years ago it was good... I have eight children back in Pakistan and I could feed them and dress them all with my work.” (Interview 35).

Interviewees’ financial ability to support their families was also commonly reported as a means of family re-unification in Greece. Particularly women from Eastern Europe would recall immigrating to Greece, becoming employed, earning an adequate income and then using their work savings to bring their families to live with them in Greece: “I gathered enough money and I brought my husband here [in Greece] and my children to live all together.” (Interview 17).
So, moving the focus of analysis on the crisis period, interviewees expressed a “struggle to meet ends” in relation to their living conditions. In detail, their perceived state of growing uncertainty about their economic situation was immense enough to the point of feeling unable to meet their family needs:

*My family waits from me to send them money. I try to find somewhere else to work but there is nothing for me. What can I do?*” (Interview 10).

The ongoing struggles to meet family needs affected negatively how interviewees felt about their life efforts:

“These are very difficult times. I have stopped sending money back to my family now. I feel very sad for that and disappointed; [I feel] like all I’ve done all these years have no value.” (Interview 33).

Besides their inability to support financially their families, interviewees reported being financially unable to cover their own needs. Taking, also, into consideration the collective scale of the struggle amongst the immigrant groups, interviewees had no one to turn to for financial assistance:

“I don’t know if they are going to give me my money…but if they don’t pay me how am I going to pay for my rent, for my food? How am I going to live? ...No one can help me. My friends don’t have money to help me.” (Interview 10).

In some cases, interviewees reported that financial constraints were bringing them in the brink of homelessness:

“I don’t have a house. A friend of mine lets me sleep at his place but, he and his friends who live together haven’t paid the rent for five months. They don’t have much work too. The woman who has the house told them to pay the rent or go. She doesn’t like that I live there too, so I will have to go soon... Things are so bad that everyone is in trouble and everyone wants help from the other; but, no one can offer help anymore. And I have nowhere else to go. I am afraid to live on the streets.” (Interview 36)
Their struggle was taking over their life so as their very basic needs were at risk: “Sometimes I go to bed without having eaten. And how can you sleep if you have not eaten?” (Interview 20). Ultimately, their living conditions can be characterised as a fight for survival: “…all I do here is trying to survive.” (Interview 2).

Although peripheral to “the struggle to meet ends” theme explained above and despite it cannot stand alone as a theme by itself, it was deemed important to highlight that neighbourhood conditions have also deteriorated in the city centre of Athens (a popular residence base of immigrants). Dealing with the struggle to meet basic needs, some of the interviewees needed to also deal with increasingly challenging neighbourhood conditions. They recalled that their neighbourhood conditions in the city centre of Athens have deteriorated notably in recent years making people cautious of walking in the streets: “…people are now afraid to come to the city centre. It is like a dead city.” (Interview 16).

Consequently, economic activity has declined in this part of Athens, leading many shops to close:

“The neighbourhood changed a lot… Now you are more afraid to walk around here and this has affected my business as well. You see so many things every day... If you speak with other shop owners they will tell you the same thing. You see how many shops have closed down.” (Interview 9).

Nonetheless, interviewees who were residents of suburban areas of Athens did not report similar levels of neighbourhood degradation following the 2009 economic crisis. On the contrary, they described positively their neighbourhood environment:

“And now in the summer all kids and the parents as well are on the streets and everyone knows everyone. We are a nice and quiet area here, we don’t have any problems. We are very happy with our life here.” (Interview 28).

As a final note, domestic live-in workers did not experience changes in their accommodation conditions on the account of the 2009 economic recession. Under the condition that they were in employment, their accommodation was provided by their employers and in all reported cases their accommodation conditions were satisfactory:
"Two years now I am working with an old lady [as a domestic worker... I live with her in her apartment in Kifissia [an area on the outskirts of Athens... I have my own bedroom and my own bathroom. The house is very big and very beautiful." (Interview 18).

***

Overall, interviewees “struggle[d] to meet ends” in the crisis aftermath with regards to their ability to secure accommodation and support financially themselves and their families. In addition, interviewees reported that neighbourhood conditions in the Athenian city centre have deteriorated in recent years, transforming central neighbourhoods into inhospitable and dangerous areas. Nonetheless, exceptions should be kept in mind. Interviewees employed as domestic live-in workers as well as interviewees living outside the city centre of Athens did not experience similar hardships following the crisis eruption while they expressed satisfaction from their neighbourhood conditions in Greece.

6.5. Conclusions

Under challenging economic conditions, the consideration of the housing integration of immigrants in a country seems most appropriate (Drydakis, 2010). In Greece, though, the scarcity of official statistical data as well as the small number of relevant academic studies make this task particularly challenging. What can be argued, however, is that racial discrimination in the Greek housing market does exist as immigrants are, on average, confronted with more stringent contract terms, restricted availability of above ground, high-quality dwellings in nice residential areas and relatively higher rental prices than natives (Drydakis, 2010; Kandylis and Kavoulakos, 2011). Still, there is evidence that discrimination in the housing market against immigrants becomes gradually less acute particularly in the case of immigrants from the Balkans (Hatziprokopiou, 2003; Kandylis et al., 2012).

The findings of the quantitative survey presented in section 6.3 also distinguish the case of immigrants from the Balkans. More precisely, immigrants from the Balkans reported a considerable improvement of their housing and neighbourhood conditions since their first year of stay in Greece; also, their accommodation conditions did not alter on the account of the crisis effects. This finding places immigrants from the Balkans in a distinctive
category, considering that the rest immigrant groups expressed: (i) an increase in their housing and neighbourhood related problems during the crisis and thus, (ii) a drop in their levels of housing and neighbourhood satisfaction.

Furthermore, quantitative analysis also showed that immigrants’ economic status deteriorated notably in the crisis aftermath. In particular, immigrants’ financial ability to (i) to provide themselves and their families with enough food (ii) to afford the cost of child rearing, (iii) to pay their rent and/or debts and (iv) to pay their utility bills, had been, on average, severely compromised by the year 2012. Nevertheless, controlling for the factor of region of origin, it becomes apparent that immigrants from Africa and the Middle East were the worst affected by the outbreak of the 2009 economic recession in terms of their economic status compared to the rest immigrant groups.

Immigrants’ weakening economic situation resulting in increasing “struggles to meet ends” also emerged in the qualitative analysis presented in section 6.4. In contrast to the pre-crisis years, interviewees reported experiencing economic and accommodation hardships during the crisis while feeling that no one can offer them help in case of need. Interviewees living in the Athenian city centre also reported deteriorating neighbourhood conditions as central neighbourhoods have become dangerous and inhospitable. Nonetheless, interviewees living outside the Athenian city centre as well as domestic live-in employees expressed satisfaction from their neighbourhood conditions in Greece even in the crisis years.

In conclusion, Chapter 6 covered the implications of the 2009 crisis on immigrants’ living conditions in Greece. As in Chapter 5, where it became evident that the crisis had differentiated effects on the labour market integration and income of the immigrant population, Chapter 6 discussed the similarly varied crisis impact on the living conditions of different immigrant groups. Particularly, setting aside the case of immigrants from the Balkans, who reported gradually mitigating economic and accommodation hardships, immigrants experienced deteriorating living conditions in the aftermath of the 2009 crisis. Moreover, immigrants from Africa and the Middle East expressed the greatest struggles to meet ends in the crisis years. Furthermore, having ascertained in Chapter 5 the negative crisis impact on immigrants’ labour market integration and income (i.e. on the first thematic area synthesizing immigrants’ welfare in the thesis context), Chapter 6
established the negative crisis repercussions on the second thematic area of immigrants’ welfare (i.e. on their living conditions). So, the focus of analysis will now shift to the third and final thematic area of immigrants’ welfare examined in this thesis, namely, immigrants’ social integration.
Chapter 7
Economic recession and immigrants’ social integration

7.1. Introduction

The social integration of immigrants in Europe has always been a sensitive and recurrent political topic. In addition, the nature of public policies on immigrants’ social integration (such policies may include for example government services for communities with linguistic diversity) provokes fierce debates and deep considerations in the public domain. Arguably, in order for those policies to be effective they need to be directed at respecting and embracing cultural and linguistic diversity, particularly in countries, like Greece, that have been recently transformed to net immigration countries (Eurydice, 2004). Furthermore, the school integration as well as the future labour market integration of immigrants’ children depends on the public policies which determine the structural and organizational arrangements of a country’s educational system (Crul and Schneider, 2009). The impact of the 2007/2008 international financial crisis added even more complexity to the already complex social process of integration of immigrants and immigrants’ children into the European societies. Indeed, financial constraints have provoked significant cuts in public spending on integration policies and thus, they have placed more obstacles in the process of enhancing the social integration of immigrants in Europe (OECD, 2013).

At the same time, harsh economic conditions -particularly high unemployment rates which result in fierce competition in the labour market- have fuelled anti-immigrant sentiments in the European societies hindering immigrants’ social integration (Awad, 2009). Greece, in particular, has been one of the most severely affected EU countries by the 2007/2008 international financial downturn and so, the ground for racist attitudes has become even more fertile than it might have been in the past. Hence, the need for social policies which would at least mitigate the intensification of discriminatory attitudes against immigrants by promoting social solidarity and cohesion has become imperative. The irony is though that the post 2010 austerity program in Greece and further pressures for austerity have allowed limited space for investing in such policies (Papadopoulos and Fratsea, 2013).
In general, immigrants’ integration may be considered by looking into three broad dimensions of immigrants’ life in their host country: economic/housing integration, political integration (mainly the right to elect and be elected) and social/cultural integration (Boswell, 2003). Having previously discussed the conditions of immigrants’ integration in the Greek labour market and housing market (see Chapters 5 and 6) as well as their political rights in Greece (see section 4.4), this chapter starts with an analysis of immigrants’ integration in the Greek society. Particularly, Chapter 7 looks into how the issue of immigrants’ integration is perceived and treated by the state legislature, the police, certain political parties (most notably the Golden Dawn party) and the general public. The issue of integration of pupils with immigrant background in Greek schools is also briefly examined and discussed.

Additionally, the present chapter utilizes quantitative and qualitative methods in order to: (i) examine the degree of immigrants’ integration in the native society; (ii) detect changes in the conditions of immigrants’ social integration in Greece since their first year of immigration; and (iii) assess whether the effects of the 2009 economic recession influenced immigrants’ integration in the Greek society. The accomplishment of those objectives will enrich our understanding of the issue of immigrants’ social integration in Greece in the aftermath of the 2009 economic crisis and it will allow an assessment of the recent challenges that need to be addressed in order to increase natives’ levels of tolerance towards ethnic diversity.

Similarly to the previous two chapters, the present chapter is structured as follows: section 7.2 offers some contextual background on the issue of immigrants’ social integration in Greece through the review of relevant literature. Section 7.3 looks into the conditions of social integration of immigrants in Greece by utilizing the findings of the quantitative survey (for more details on the quantitative survey see Chapter 3). Section 7.4 uses interview material in order to present immigrants’ personal stories regarding the process of their social integration in Greece throughout their period of stay in Greece (for more details on the semi structured interviews see Chapter 3). Finally, section 7.5 discusses the theoretical and empirical insights of this chapter in the wake of the currently unfolding European refugee crisis in Greece.
7.2. Social integration of immigrants in Greece: insights from the literature

Since the sudden transformation of Greece from a traditional country of emigration to an immigration country in the beginning of the 1990s, Greeks are witnessing a constant movement of immigrants towards Greece; a movement which varies in intensity but, remains continuous. Besides several steps of improvement, Greece is still lacking the official structures for receiving and integrating effectively the waves of immigrants arriving daily in the country (see sections 4.3 and 4.4). Under those conditions, the social integration of immigrants and immigrants’ children in Greece has been a challenging task, heating endless debates between politicians, academics, the media and the public. The aim of the following section is to analyse by means of literature review the Greek society’s levels of tolerance and acceptance towards immigrants and immigrants’ levels of social integration in Greece. With this in mind, this review focuses on the period from the early 1990s (when the first major outbreak of xenophobia and racism in the Greek society during the last decades took place) and extends until the present day.

7.2.1 Immigrants’ social integration in Greece from the early 1990s until the early 2010s

Arguably, the outbreak of xenophobia and racism back in the early 1990s -targeting mainly Albanians- can be attributed to a plethora of reasons the most prevalent of which include the following: most evidently, Albanians’ sudden and unexpected entrance in the highly homogenous Greek society (see section 4.3). Indeed, Albanians’ immigration to Greece in the beginning of the 1990s has contributed more than any other population movement towards Greece in the transformation of the country into a net receiver of immigrants (Iosifides et al., 2007). Also, during this period, the xenophobic propaganda in the media was indirectly framing Albanians as criminals, fuelling anti-immigrant feelings and attitudes (Nikas and Aspasios, 2011). Albanians’ immigration to Greece was narrated in the media as the movement of people who were living in severe poverty in their home country and who came to Greece in order to take advantage of work opportunities (more often than not against natives’ benefit). Hence, their exploitative employment by Greeks under clandestine and/or precarious conditions was considered an act of philanthropy (Antonopoulos, 2006; Koiiliari, 1997). In addition, undocumented Albanian immigrants were not legally protected against discrimination due to their employment in great numbers in the shadow economy (Lazaridis and Wickens, 1999).
In the early 2000s the National Committee for Human Rights would point out the need for the introduction and implementation of new and comprehensive legislation for the elimination of racial discrimination. This need had been generated by particularly violent and unprecedented (for the Modern Greek society) actions of Greek citizens and public/police servants against undocumented immigrants (UNCHR, 2001). Indeed, up to this point, the direction of the Greek legislation on migration was rather focused on issues of migration flow management due to the unprecedented nature of immigration movements towards Greece during the 1990s and the lack at the time of a legal framework suitable to address and handle these movements. It is revealing that the Law 3304/2005 “Application of equal treatment irrespective of racial or ethnic origin, religious beliefs, disability, age or sexual orientation” (passed by the Greek government in 2005) was the first significant initiative targeting discrimination against immigrants particularly on issues of employment in the Greek labour market. Also, the Law 3838/2010 on Naturalization and Citizenship (passed by the Greek government in 2010) was the first major step towards promoting immigrants’ social integration in the Greek society by simplifying and facilitating the naturalization process of immigrants in Greece (National Centre for Social Research, 2012) (for further details see section 4.4).

Anti-immigrant feelings targeting not only Albanians but also immigrants from other regions of origin have been often attributed by Greeks to immigrants’ cultural diversity (which is in turn perceived as immigrants’ origin, language, dress code, religion, etc.) (Lazaridis and Wickens, 1999). In this respect, it is revealing that many immigrants (particularly Albanians) have made efforts to become more “culturally compatible” to Greeks by, for example, adopting Greek names and christening their children. Immigrants’ efforts to socially assimilate and natives’ efforts to accept them as “one of their own” have generated various outcomes throughout the years. On the one hand, the cases where these efforts were fruitless gave birth to a paradox. That is, immigrants being included in the native labour market -with certain sectors of the economy being dependent on cheap and flexible immigrant labour (see section 5.2)- and, at the same time, them being excluded from the native society (Lawrence, 2010). As an indicative example, Gidarakou (2011) analysed Greek farmers’ perceptions regarding immigration to reach the following finding: farmers were to their majority in favour of employing immigrants in the fields but, they were not in favour of their local communities becoming multicultural due to the
presence of immigrants. On the other hand, the cases where immigrants’ efforts to socially mingle and natives’ efforts to socially accept them were fruitful led to the gradual assimilation of immigrants in the native society (Lawrence, 2010). According to Hatziprokopiou (2004), immigrants’ gradual integration in the Greek society shows that social integration in Greece is a dynamic process influenced by place and time specific factors which eventually equip immigrants with the necessary tools in order to build their lives in Greece and integrate in the Greek society.

In recent days and particularly since the eruption of the Greek economic crisis in 2009, the process of immigrant integration in the Greek society remains challenging. According to the European Social Survey outcomes referring to the year 2009, the Greek society (having experienced unparalleled immigration flows for almost two decades) was still showing high rates of rejection of foreigners. However, even though the total rejection rate was found to be high (i.e. 60.1%), it was at the same time lower than the corresponding rate in the previous rounds of the European Social Survey, standing at 66.1% in 2005 and at 68.1% in 2003 (National Centre for Social Research, 2012). Furthermore, in a study conducted by Kadianaki (2013) immigrants in Greece reflected on how they believed Greeks perceived them. First, according to immigrants’ views, Greeks regarded them as a foreign body not belonging to the Greek society and as intruders whose aim was to take advantage of the welfare system in Greece. Second, immigrants from Africa in particular believed that most Greeks were associating them with poverty and diseases (Kadianaki, 2013).

As the 2009 economic recession continued to unfold in the following years, the obstacles in achieving immigrant integration in the Greek society continued to accumulate. In particular, within this timeframe, the welfare of people in Greece was notably hindered with mass unemployment at 23.3% in 2016 (from 27.7% in 2013 and 10.6% in 2009) and youth unemployment at 47.4% (from 59% in 2013 and 27.8% in 2009). In addition, the share of population being at risk of poverty after social transfers was at 21.4% in 2015 (from 23.1% in 2012 and 19.7% in 2009) (Eurostat, 2016; Hellenic Statistical Authority, 2016; Hellenic Statistical Authority, 2010) while a severe decline took place in peoples’ physical and mental health (Economou et al., 2013; Karanikolos and Kentikelenis, 2016). As anticipated, harsh economic conditions spread pessimism across the population (Manchin, 2013) with increasing suicide rates shaping a new reality in contemporary
Greece. More precisely, there was a 35% increase in suicides between 2010 and 2012; during the same period, a strong correlation was asserted between suicide mortality and unemployment (particularly among men in working age) (Economou et al. 2016; Rachiotis et al., 2015). Under these conditions, extreme right-wing rhetoric found fertile ground capitalizing on peoples’ anger, fear and anxiety and fueling xenophobic and racist feelings and attitudes (Angouri and Wodak, 2014).

The relative electoral success of the neo-Nazi party Golden Dawn in the 2012 elections (wining the 6.92% of the public vote as compared to its 0.29% percentage in 2009) “sealed” the political radicalization of parts of the Greek society and exposed immigrants in Greece to tangible danger (Koronaiou and Sakellariou, 2013). Indeed, the rhetoric of the Golden Dawn party has been openly and indiscriminately anti-immigrant. In the party’s electoral campaign leading to the 2012 national elections, it was clearly stated that the act of immigrating to Greece is illegal and that all immigrants will be expelled from Greece in the event of the party’s electoral success (Golden Dawn, 2012a). In addition, it was argued that granting political rights to non-Greeks is unacceptable as it “disturbs” the continuity of the Greek nation and thus, of the Greek state (the state is equated with ethnicity in the party’s rhetoric) (Golden Dawn, 2012b).

Golden Dawn is not a new formation in Greece. Of course, before the 2012 elections the party had negligent electoral percentages but still, its violent rhetoric and acts were present at the street-level. In fact, Golden Dawn has been a part of the Greek society since the beginning of the 1980s and since then it has been involved in several crimes against not only immigrants but also left-wing students and academics, trade union members, members of anti-racist, Marxist and pro-immigration organizations (Vasilopoulou and Halikiopoulou, 2015).

Arguably, the turning point for the development of racist violence in Greece was the year 2013. This year was stigmatized by the preliminary arrest of the founder, members and supporters of the Golden Dawn party who were allegedly involved in the murder of Pavlos Fussas (a Greek anti-fascist rapper who identified George Roupakias, a supporter of the Golden Dawn party, as his perpetrator before he died). A plethora of racist crimes allegedly conducted by people associated (directly or indirectly) with Golden Dawn were brought to Justice since then. Many of these criminal cases would go back many years
piling up to the most serious indictment against Golden Dawn; that is that Golden Dawn is a criminal organization. Following these developments, there was a notable drop in the incidents of racist violence in Greece signifying the delay and often ineffectiveness of the Greek state in tackling racist violence through the criminal justice system (Angouri and Wodak, 2014).

Certainly, a major issue in the fight against discrimination has been the handling of cases of discrimination reported by the public to the designated Authorities. Particularly, the Law 3304/2005 attributes to the Ombudsman of the Citizen (which constitutes a constitutionally enshrined independent authority) the responsibility of following up reports from citizens and investigating cases of alleged discrimination with the purpose of asserting whether there has been an infringement of the principle of equal treatment. In regards to the police force, the Ombudsman of the Citizen reported in 2013 prolonged delays in internal investigations by the police when assessing complaints for police members’ misconduct with potentially racist motivation. These delays create a sense of police immunity to the public. Also, the superficial investigation of reported incidents of police misconduct with potentially racist motivation and the interruption of the investigation at the preliminary stage undermine the credibility of the police force and generate further disincentives to the public for reporting cases of similar nature. The victims’ reluctance to report discriminatory treatment by the police against them is being stated by the Ombudsman of the Citizen since 2005 (Sarris, 2014).

Considering the future, the process of immigrants’ integration in Greece may be notably facilitated through the efficient integration of immigrants’ children in the school environments of Greece (for the purposes of this section as immigrants’ children are defined those children who have been born either in Greece or abroad to at least one foreign parent). Educating the citizens of tomorrow on issues of equality and harmonious co-existence of people irrespective of their origin and racial background is a positive first step for the social integration of immigrants in Greece in the years to come (Papanis and Giavrimis, 2007).

Currently, though, Greece is encountering difficulties in relation to the integration process of pupils with immigrant background. This may be attributed to a variety of reasons. Most notably, immigrants usually have stronger ethnic identities than natives and the strength
of their ethnic identities may hinder their integration prospects. Greece was only recently transformed into an immigration country and thus, it lacks a solid legislative framework on immigrant integration; accordingly, long-term integration policies and practices (that would facilitate, among others, the integration of immigrant pupils) are still absent (Bisin et al., 2011) (for further details see section 4.4).

According to the Eurydice Network (2009) enhancing communication between schools and parents is vital for immigrant pupils’ success in school. Yet, there are often linguistic and cultural barriers that hinder the communication between schools and parents with immigrant background. In Greece, the percentage of immigrant pupils who speak a foreign language at home (i.e. a language other than Greek) is 7%; hence, linguistic and cultural barriers between immigrant pupils’ parents and schools may be present. With the purpose of surpassing those barriers, the following steps have been made by the Greek state: (i) the establishment of 26 multi-cultural schools in residential areas with high percentage of immigrant pupils; (ii) the prioritization of efforts to recruit teachers that can speak in the native language of immigrant students; and (iii) the assignment to these multi-language teachers of the role to offer, whenever needed, counselling and interpretation services to immigrant pupils. Furthermore, according to Dustmann et al. (2012) immigrant pupils’ success in school is also greatly influenced by the educational level of their parents. In fact, the authors argue that the educational level of parents with immigrant background is most influential for their pupils’ success in school. According to the Eurydice Network (2009) the educational level of immigrants in Greece is, on average, lower than the educational level of the native population. So, overall, immigrant pupils in Greece are in need of state support in order to ensure that their school studies are not significantly hindered by external factors (i.e. parental educational level and linguistic and cultural barriers)

In general, schools are key agents of socialization and they offer the ground where both the cultural beliefs and values of the society and the content of the official political rhetoric are reflected and asserted. In Greece, the majority of state officials have openly declared their opposition to any expression of xenophobia and racism against immigrants and ethnic minorities and they have embraced (wherever applicable) the multi-cultural character of Greek schools (Dimitrakopoulos, 2004). However, the national identity in
Greek schools is mainly constructed through the affirmation of the common (Greek) language, history and Christian religion. Also, one can find in schoolbooks evaluative distinctions between the “Greeks” and the “ethnic others” (who in most cases are represented by the Turks); the latter are often described with negative characteristics which contrast with the “superior” characteristics of Greeks. Of great significance is also the nonreference or very rare reference to particular population groups, like the Greek-Jews or the Greek-Muslims, who lack certain “ethnic” characteristics (i.e. either common language, history or religion). Hence, Greek schoolbooks may create in an elusive and maybe unintentional- way an invisible “wall” between Greeks and foreigners (Hodolidou et al. 2003; Zachos, 2009).

School textbooks frame students’ discourse, their self-perception and most importantly, their national and personal identity (Zachos, 2009). A sociolinguistic study conducted by the Aristotelian University of Thessalonica offers an illustrative example. The study showed that the majority of Greek students in primary and secondary schools hold negative views about the Turks and they regard them as “a wild and warlike people”. Also, approximately half of higher secondary school students praise peace between Greece and Turkey but, almost 80% of them define Turks as the “enemy” of their country. Last, the vast majority of students justify their negative views of the Turks based on historical events that they have been taught at school (To Vima, 2001).

The subtle distinction between “us” and “the others” may be expressed in various ways in the school environment. One of the most devastating expressions of this distinction is incidents of racial discrimination, xenophobia and racism. Such incidents have a shattering impact on the harmonious integration of immigrant pupils in the school environment and later in the Greek society. Yet, the magnitude of this greatly significant matter is difficult to be assessed due to the scarcity of reliable official statistical evidence. The reliability of official statistical data may be questioned for three main reasons: Racist attacks in Greek schools are often (i) not reported to the police; (ii) reported to the police but, not recorded by the police; (iii) reported to the police but, the police do not record them as racist attacks. The roots of this situation are not difficult to be traced. Police reluctance to arrest perpetrators and to record incidents of racial violence as well as victims’ fear of becoming stigmatised and their disbelief that justice will be served are
mainly responsible for the lack of reliable official statistical data regarding racist violence in Greek schools (The Greek Ombudsmen, 2013).

As a final note, academic studies offering insights on the issue of racist violence in Greek schools have reached contradictory conclusions. Certain studies indicate that prejudice, xenophobia and racism are indeed present in Greek schools (e.g. see Dimakos and Tasioglou, 2003; Dimitrakopoulos, 2004; Dimopoulou, 2007; European Commission 2001; Makraki, 2006) whereas several other studies indicate the absence of such behavioural expressions among pupils in the school environments (e.g. see Palaiologou, 2007; Papanis and Giavrimis, 2007). So, the difficulties in investigating this crucial matter are further enhanced by the scarcity of relevant academic studies. Yet, one thing can be said with certainty: Greek schools have still a long way to go before becoming efficient enough in addressing, promoting and achieving the integration of immigrant children in their environments.

***

In recent years, the Greek society has become more multicultural, predominantly due to the sharp increase of immigration since the beginning of the 1990s. Accordingly, a great increase has occurred in the number immigrants’ children attending Greek schools. The Greek society is still trying to adjust to this relatively new phenomenon (i.e. transforming from a mono-cultural society to a multicultural society) and incidents of xenophobia and racism are still occurring on a frequent basis (Angouri and Wodak, 2014; Kalantzi, 2010). Arguably, there is still a long way to go before immigrants in Greece become fully integrated in the native society. In this dynamic process, improvements in relevant legislation promoting immigrants’ social integration as well as in the authorities’ system of monitoring and handling cases of racial discrimination will be of significant assistance. Also, adaptation difficulties are evident in the school environments and they result in immigrant pupils being less involved and engaged in school activities than their indigenous fellow students (Dimitrakopoulos, 2004; Makraki, 2006). In the long-run, this may create a weaker sense of belonging in the Greek society as the school environment represents the host culture for immigrant youth (Motti-Stefanidi, 2014). Furthermore, assessing the intensity and frequency of expressions of racism, xenophobia and discrimination in Greece is a challenging task. The low availability of reliable official data (e.g. police records) in combination with often contrasting evidence from academic
studies creates barriers for the assessment of this highly significant issue. Hence, in the following sections an attempt is made for the examination of immigrants’ social integration in Greece through the utilization of quantitative and qualitative research findings.

7.3. Evidence from the quantitative interviews

The brief literature review conducted in the previous section showed that increasing incidents of racism and xenophobia in Greece (particularly since the outbreak of the 2009 crisis and the electoral success of the neo-Nazi Golden Dawn party in the 2012 national elections) have hindered immigrants’ social integration in the Greek society in recent years. The key purpose of this section is to further examine this aspect of immigrants’ life in Greece by means of quantitative analysis findings (for further details on the quantitative survey see Chapter 3). Importantly, this section will closely examine the changes in immigrants’ social integration in the Greek society in the aftermath of the 2009 economic recession.

7.3.1. Measuring social integration using descriptive analysis

Initially, participants were asked to report twice their level of agreement with the statement “I feel that most people here can be trusted”. First, in regards to their first year of immigration in Greece and second, in reference to the date of the interview (i.e. the third quarter of 2012) (for questionnaire see Appendix 1). Descriptive analysis of collected data showed that more than 50% of participants expressed agreement with the statement during both periods under consideration. Nonetheless, the total number of participants with feelings of trust towards people in Greece had fallen significantly in 2012 while the number of respondents who agreed to the above statement were reduced (see Figure 27).
When participants’ gender was taken into consideration it was revealed that female participants expressed higher levels of trust compared to male participants during both periods under analysis. In addition, the trust reduction for the year 2012 was roughly equal for male and female participants (see Appendix 28). Furthermore, participants’ origin was an additional influential factor when assessing their levels of trust towards people in Greece. Eastern Europeans expressed the highest levels of trust compared to all other groups while their trust in people in Greece has been only slightly shaken in the aftermath of the 2009 economic recession. On the contrary, respondents from Asia, Africa and the Middle East reported a significant loss of trust by 2012. Last, interestingly, the percentage of participants from the Balkans who expressed feelings of mistrust during their first year of immigration to Greece (i.e. 9.8%) was more than three times lower in 2012 (i.e. 2.9%) revealing an increase in their levels of trust towards people in Greece throughout the years (see Appendix 29).

Second, participants were asked twice to express their degree of agreement with the statement “Most people here treat me with respect”; first, in reference to their first year of stay in Greece and second, in reference to the year 2012 (for questionnaire see...
Appendix 1). Descriptive analysis of collected data revealed that 64% of participants reported being treated with respect in their first year of immigration to Greece while only 49.4% of participants agreed to the statement in reference to 2012 (see Appendix 28). A graphical representation of these findings is given in Figure 28.

*Figure 28.* Participants’ perception of treatment by people in Greece, 1st year of stay and 2012

![Graph showing perception of treatment by people in Greece](image)

Source: Own survey
Note: N = 320

Gender had certainly had a considerable impact on participants’ responses. More precisely, a greater number of female participants than male participants evaluated the behaviour of people in Greece as respectful towards them in reference to both periods under study. Nonetheless, there was a similar reduction (i.e. of about 15%) in the percentage of male and female participants characterizing the treatment of people in Greece towards them as respectful in the crisis aftermath (i.e. from 58.6% to 43.6% for male participants and from 72.4% to 58.2% for female participants) (see Appendix 28). Additionally, participants’ origin was an additional decisive factor in the analysis of their perception of treatment by the people in Greece. Most notably, the share of Eastern Europeans describing as respectful the treatment of people in Greece towards them during their first year of stay in Greece was 91.5% while the corresponding share of participants from the Balkans was only 42.2%. Interestingly, though, participants from the Balkans
were the only group whose perception of treatment by the people in Greece improved throughout the years (i.e. the share of participants from the Balkans characterizing the treatment of people in Greece as respectful towards them increased to 45.9% in 2012). On the contrary, in the crisis aftermath, the share of participants reporting that people in Greece were treating them respectfully was substantially reduced amongst Asians (i.e. from 83.4% to 51.3%), Middle Easterners (i.e. 70% to 40%) and Africans (i.e. from 44.9% to 16.3%). Finally, the share of Eastern Europeans reporting that people in Greece were treating them with respect was only slightly decreased in the post 2009 crisis period (i.e. from 91.5% to 86.5%).

Third, participants were asked to express twice their levels of agreement with the following statement: “I am worried of being verbally assaulted due to my race or colour”. First, in reference to their first year of stay in Greece and second, in reference to 2012 (for questionnaire see Appendix 1). As shown in Figure 29, a share of participants were feeling more worried of verbal assaults in the recession year 2012 than during their first year of stay in Greece. In fact, by 2012, the percentage of participants who were feeling worried of verbal assaults had reached nearly 40% of the sample increasing by approximately 15% since the pre-crisis period (see Appendix 28).
Figure 29. Participants’ anxiety levels of racially motivated verbal victimization, 1st year of stay and 2012

In comparison to women, men were experiencing higher levels of worry of being verbally assaulted due to their race or colour during both periods under analysis. There was a 10% higher percentage of male participants than female participants reporting feeling worried of racially motivated verbal victimization during their first year of stay in Greece. Also, a 17% higher percentage of male participants than female participants reported feeling worried of verbal assaults due to their race or colour in the recession year 2012 (see Appendix 28).

Considerable differences were also observed among participants from different regions of origin. More precisely, a notably lower share of participants from the Balkans reported feeling worried of racially motivated verbal assaults during 2012 (i.e. 12.8%) than during their first year of stay in Greece (i.e. 33.3%). The opposite trend was detected among participants from the rest regions of origin (i.e. they reported feelings of anxiety of racially motivated verbal assaults in higher percentages in the post-2009 crisis period than in the pre-2009 crisis period). Even Eastern Europeans, who reported the lowest levels of
concern of being verbally assaulted compared to all other groups and in regards to both periods under consideration, reported feeling slightly more worried of verbal assaults during 2012 than during their first year of immigration to Greece (see Appendix 29). Moreover, the highest percentage of participants feeling anxiety of being verbally assaulted was found among participants from Africa in respect to both their first year of arrival in Greece (i.e. 38.8%) and 2012 (i.e. 81.6%). Also, Asians’ responses constitute a case of great interest. The percentage of participants from Asia who reported feeling worried of verbal assaults during their first year of stay in Greece was relatively low (i.e. 7%; the second lowest percentage in the sample following the corresponding percentage of Eastern Europeans) but it skyrocketed to 53.1% in 2012 (see Appendix 29).

Fourth and last, participants were asked to express twice their degree of agreement with the following statement: “I am worried of being physically assaulted due to my race or colour”; first, in reference to their first year of stay in Greece and second, in reference to the year 2012 (for questionnaire see Appendix 1). Figure 30 shows that the share of participants who reported feeling worried of being physically assaulted due to their race or colour has more than doubled in recent years. As an outcome of this increase, more than 20% of participants reported feeling worried of physical assaults during the year 2012 (see Appendix 28).
Figure 30. Participants’ anxiety levels of racially motivated physical victimization, 1st year of stay and 2012

The levels of worry of being physically assaulted were higher among male participants than among female participants in reference to both periods under consideration. In addition, by 2012, the percentage of male participants feeling worried of racially motivated physical assaults had increased at a higher rate compared to the rate of increase for the percentage of female participants sharing equivalent feelings of anxiety (i.e. from 11.9% to 28% for male participants and from 7.1% to 13.4% for female participants) (see Appendix 28).

As far as the factor of origin is concerned, participants from the Balkans did not follow the general tendency of the sample as the more time they were spending in Greece the less worried they were feeling of being physically assaulted due to their race or colour (i.e. the share of participants from the Balkans who reported such feelings of worry dropped from 9.8% to 2% by 2012). Furthermore, Eastern Europeans’ reported the lowest levels of anxiety of racially motivated physical assaults both in the pre-2009 crisis period (i.e. 3.4%) and in the post-2009 period (i.e. 3.4%)

Source: Own survey
Note: N = 320
3.5%) (see Appendix 29). However, the remaining groups reported increasing levels of anxiety of being physically assaulted due to their race or colour since their first year of arrival to Greece. It is indicative that 22.4% of African participants reported feeling worried of racially motivated physical assaults during their first year of stay in Greece but, as many as 59.1% reported so in 2012. Responses of participants from the Middle East followed a similar pattern. Finally, the case of Asian participants is noteworthy. The reason is that the percentage of Asian participants who reported feeling worried of physical assaults due to their race or colour during their first year of stay in Greece was trivial (i.e. less than 1%). Nonetheless, the percentage of Asian participants who reported feeling worried of racially motivated physical assaults in 2012 was 26.4% (see Appendix 29).

7.3.2. Measuring social integration using Mixed ANOVA methods

*Main effects of time, gender and origin*

As discussed in section 3.2.1, a social integration scale was devised with the aim of assessing changes in participants’ social integration before and during the crisis, using Mixed ANOVA methods (the higher the scores on the scale, the higher the social integration). Analysis showed that, there was a significant effect of time on participants’ social integration scores $F(1,309) = 39.54, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .11$. Indeed, social integration total scores were significantly higher before ($M = 14.61, SD = 3.50$) than during 2012 ($M = 13.32, SD = 3.72$). This shows an overall decrease in participants’ social integration during the economic crisis. Statistically significant between-subjects main effects were found for gender $F(1,309) = 4.76, p < .05, \eta^2_p = .02$ and origin $F(1,309) = 14.70, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .19$. Particularly, female integration scores were overall higher ($M = 14.60, SD = 3.51$) than male integration scores ($M = 13.41, SD = 3.60$; see Figure 31) showing that women were overall more socially included than men throughout their period of stay in Greece.
Figure 31. Female and male social integration mean scores

To ascertain further the effects of participants’ origin on integration scores, post-hoc comparisons between the 5 origin groups were conducted. Between-subjects t-tests analyses showed that participants from Eastern Europe had overall higher social integration scores ($M = 16.40$, $SD = 2.23$) than participants from Asia ($M = 14.75$, $SD = 3.10$, $p < .05$), the Balkans ($M = 13.52$, $SD = 3.15$, $p < .001$), the Middle East ($M = 13.08$, $SD = 3.91$, $p < .001$) and Africa ($M = 11.67$, $SD = 3.71$, $p < .001$). Similarly, integration scores reported by Asian participants ($M = 14.75$, $SD = 3.10$) were overall higher than integration scores reported by African participants ($M = 11.67$, $SD = 3.71$, $p < .001$). Also, integration scores reported by participants from the Balkans ($M = 13.52$, $SD = 3.15$) were overall higher than integration scores reported by participants from Africa ($M = 11.67$, $SD = 3.71$, $p < .001$). No other group differences were found. Overall, the highest social integration scores were reported by Eastern Europeans whereas the lowest social integration scores were reported by Africans. The above observations show that in hierarchical order of increasing social integration degree Eastern Europeans experienced overall higher social integration followed by participants from Asia, the Balkans, the Middle East and Africa.
Interaction effects between variables

There was a significant interaction between time and origin of participants $F(1,309) = 18.92, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .23$. This finding shows that social integration changes were highly influenced by the background of participants as shown in Figure 32. Remarkably, although there was an overall reduction on social integration scores during the crisis, post-hoc analysis using within-subjects t-tests showed that participants from Balkans displayed higher integration scores during 2012 than before ($p < .001$) in contrast to all other groups whose integration scores were significantly lower during 2012 than before ($p < .05$). Nevertheless, the above reductions varied between groups as shown in Figure 32. No other interaction effects were found.

Figure 32. Social integration mean scores for participants from different regions of origin

Source: Own survey

Note: N = 320

***

Descriptive analysis was utilized with the purpose of deepening our understanding of immigrants' integration in the Greek society. On average, participants reported low levels of trust towards people in Greece, they perceived their behaviour towards them as lacking respect and they expressed anxiety of being verbally or/and physically assaulted due to their race or colour. Additional notable trends were detected by using Mixed ANOVA
methods for the investigation of changes in participants’ social integration in Greece in the post-2009 crisis period controlling for participants’ background characteristics (i.e. gender and origin). Particularly, male participants reported experiencing greater social exclusion than female participants during both periods (i.e. before and during the crisis). Also, participants from Asia, Africa and the Middle East had overall lower social integration scores than participants from Eastern Europe and the Balkans. In fact, participants from Africa had overall the lowest social integration scores while participants from Eastern Europe had overall the highest social integration scores. Finally, a unique trend was detected among participants from the Balkans as they were the only group who had higher social integration scores during the crisis than before.

7.4. Evidence from the qualitative interviews

To reiterate, one of the main purposes of the semi structured interviews in which 42 immigrants were interviewed (for a detailed discussion on the semi structured interviews see sections 3.2.3 and 3.2.4) was to research on their integration in the Greek society with emphasis on the post-2009 crisis period. Particularly, interviewees were asked to describe the conditions of their social integration in Greece and to comment on whether/how these conditions altered in the aftermath of the crisis.

In line with the qualitative findings of the previous two chapters, conditions of living were generally better before the crisis and worsened after the crisis. Similarly, interviewees expressed feelings of belongingness in the native society in the pre-crisis period and they recalled feeling integrated and welcomed by the Greeks:

“We built our life here. We have our roots here. We loved Greece for the things that gave us. We never had any problems with racism or anything. We were happy with our lives here.” (Interview 7).

Particularly domestic workers reported regarding their employers in Greece as their own family: “I left a family and I found a family, I love them very much.” (Interview 4). Interviewees also expressed satisfaction from their lives in Greece as well as from the relations they have built with the Greek people over their period of stay in the country: “And the people were good here, I had no complaints.” (Interview 17). Similarly:
“We never had any problems with the people here, we had a good life here.” (Interview 27).

Ultimately, they felt that one could not distinguish between people based on their country of origin:

“No, I cannot complain for the people here, we live from the people here first of all. People come to our restaurant and they trust us and they give us their money. And both I and my husband have worked in many places where we had the opportunity to get to know many people and now with the restaurant of course and after so many years in Greece you know that people are the same everywhere.” (Interview 37).

So, overall, interviewees reported that building relationships with natives used to be as possible in Greece as anywhere else around the world:

“The people here are good and bad, like everywhere. We have been treated well and we have been treated badly. But the people who put us in their houses regard us family, like we do.” (Interview 12).

So, with all the above as the context of the following section and moving the focus of analysis on the crisis period, interviewees experienced “escalating exclusion” in Greece in the crisis aftermath. This theme manifested itself in progressively finding harder to build or to retain friendships with natives and escalated to represent fear of own safety due to violent attacks from members of the Golden Dawn party and the police.

The analysis of the extracts has specifically shown that interviewees were gradually excluded from the natives, thus making progressively harder the development of friendships between them:

“The first years I lived very well here. I had many friends. People were treating me well. Back then there was no difference if you were different. Now there is a difference. People look at you in a different way now.” (Interview 8).

Indeed, the view that natives kept a distance from the immigrants was commonly expressed by the interviewees:
“I wanted to have Greek friends but people don’t speak to me. I don’t understand why. They don’t treat me badly but, they keep me in distance. There is always a distance.” (Interview 2).

Ultimately, natives’ attitude, although not aggressive, isolated the immigrants:

“I don’t have Greek friends. Greek people don’t want to have any contact with me.” (Interview 3).

Interviewees attributed their “escalating exclusion” by the natives to the racist rhetoric of the Golden Dawn party. They specifically claimed that natives have been overall respectful towards immigrants but, in recent times, they have gradually become influenced by the racist rhetoric of the Golden Dawn party and thus, attitudes of the native population towards immigrants have accordingly changed:

“Except from Golden Dawn and the police, people respect us. But as time goes by more and more people are getting influenced by Golden Dawn and things are getting worse and worse.” (Interview 16).

The change in natives’ attitudes occurred gradually and natives’ tolerance and acceptance towards immigrant groups was replaced by discrimination and intolerance during the recession years:

“When I came I didn’t speak the language. I knew nothing; nothing for the place, for the people, for the jobs, nothing. But I was going to houses and I was saying “please work” and people were taking care of me. They were giving me work and they were putting me into their houses. They were giving me food and clothes and everything. Back then people used to understand how difficult life was for me; how difficult it was to be away from my family, my home, my people and they were taking care of me...people has changed, they treat me in a different way now. Although now I speak Greek, I have my house, I have my shop, I am legal; people treat me in a very bad way, in a humiliating way. It is very bad, very bad. Now it is not how it used to be.” (Interview 19).

Importantly, although racism was not expressed by the majority of the native population, hence being small in scale, it had a substantial impact sufficient to make immigrants feel cautious and fearful:
“Things didn’t used to be so bad. Now things have gone out of hand. I have been living here for fourteen years and the last two, two and a half years I started feeling afraid to walk alone in the streets even in the daytime. You know what is happening. If you look like a foreigner you are not safe. (Interview 24).

Social exclusion escalated to such levels to involve police and Golden Dawn members treating immigrants in an unjustifiably discriminatory, racist and even violent manner. Analysis has particularly showed that incidents of verbal and physical violence against immigrants have increased during the crisis:

“We have big problem with Golden Dawn. One day they found me and they started beating me. They were using the brush that I have for my work [cleaning the windows of cars that stop at traffic lights] and they were hitting me with it on my legs and on my back until the brush broke.” (Interview 1)

Incidents of criminally abusive display of police power against immigrants were also reported:

“Once the police stopped me and they took my papers. They tore them and they took all the money I had on me and they left. What could I do? I didn’t say anything, I was afraid. I am a 38 years old man and I couldn’t say anything. This is not right, not to have my pride.” (Interview 3).

Incidents of maltreatment by the police were not just sporadic, according to the interviewees, but described to occur on a routine-basis:

“The police check us all the time. Do you know how many times they stop me? And how they speak to me? It is not a crime to be black, to have dark skin. I just have dark skin; this does not make me a terrorist. I am not a terrorist; I am a human, a human like anyone else. Why do they treat me like that?… Police treat us like animals…like animals.” (Interview 15).

“Escalated exclusion” taking the form of verbal and physical violence instigated by the Golden Dawn members was reportedly widespread. However, even in alleged murderous attacks, victims and/or witnesses were reluctant to report to the police:
“I have very big problem with Golden Dawn. Not only me, all of us. They find us on the streets and they attack us. The other day they killed a man from Pakistan, twenty nine years old. And they never arrest anyone. And if you go and tell someone about it, who will listen to you? No one will listen to you. No one is ever arrested. And you are afraid to go to the police. The police stops us to look at our papers and they keep us in the police station or in the police buses for hours; five to six hours. Without any reason. And then they let us go. They swear at us, they make fun of us and they beat us. Why do they treat us like that? Why? We never hurt anyone. I am afraid to go and take the bus because many bad things happen at the bus stops. They beat us at the bus stops. They treat us worse than if we were animals.” (Interview 20).

In line with the quantitative findings showing that the social integration of people from the Balkans was increased, thematic analysis demonstrated that Albanians were unaffected by the reported general increase of racism. Thus, Albanians acknowledged the increases in racial violence but, expressed the view that the recent increase in racism has not been targeted against them. As a matter of fact, they were feeling more integrated in the native society during the crisis than they used to feel when they first arrived in Greece:

“People are more racists now but not against us [against Albanians]. When we first came here it was much more common for someone to say something bad to us because we are Albanians. Now you don’t see that. We are still foreigners but we don’t have any problems. We have many friends and our kids too. Now we have the same life with the Greek people.” (Interview 38).

***

The cross-interview theme “escalating exclusion” was extracted by interviewees’ responses regarding their social integration in Greece. In the aftermath of the crisis, interviewees reported that natives were gradually distancing themselves from them. They also reported being exposed and vulnerable to discriminatory and abusive treatment, as crimes against them -provoked mainly by police and Golden Dawn members- increased notably. Last, highlighting the diversity of the social integration conditions experienced by immigrants in Greece, interviewees from Albania, reported becoming progressively integrated in the Greek society and thus, during the crisis years experiencing no racism against them.

7.5. Conclusions
Greece constitutes a recently transformed immigration country (see section 4.3.2) still being challenged with immigrants’ social integration issues. Since the beginning of the 1990s when the first massive immigration wave towards Greece occurred (mainly from neighbouring Albania) incidents of racism, xenophobia and discrimination have been disturbing the harmonious co-existence of people in Greece (e.g. see Angouri and Wodak, 2014; Kalantzi, 2010). Particularly during the 1990s and the 2000s, immigrants were included in the native labour market (although under worse employment terms and conditions compared to Greeks) but, excluded from the native society (e.g. see Lawrence, 2010). Albanians, in particular, were the main victims of the first major outbreak of xenophobia in recent times primarily due to their unexpected entrance in great numbers in a highly homogenous and mono-cultural Greece during the early 1990s (e.g. see Iosifides et al. 2007). Interestingly, though, the empirical analysis showed that Albanians were also the only immigrant group who experienced improving conditions of social integration throughout their period of stay in Greece.

Arguably, one of the means to facilitate the dynamic process of immigrants’ social integration in Greece is through the educational integration of their children. Considering this sensitive issue, relevant empirical studies appear to emerge in controversy but, there are a few observations that seem to be less controversial and debated. First, the increased co-existence between different nationality students in Greek schools has increased the possibilities of xenophobic and racist attitudes amongst pupils (e.g. see Dimopoulou, 2007). Second, the longer native pupils study in the same school environment with foreign pupils the more tolerant and receptive they become towards them (e.g. see Diamantopoulou, 2013). Third, appropriate policy measures can potentially promote the successful integration of foreign pupils in Greek schools and thus, in the Greek society (e.g. see Motti-Stefanidi, 2014). These measures may include the official monitoring and recording of discriminatory, xenophobic and racist behaviours against foreign students and, whenever needed, the restoration of justice through efficient legal channels as well as the adjustment of schoolbooks to recent developments and challenges with the aim to promote multiculturalism and tolerance towards diversity.

Moreover, throughout their life stages in Greece, immigrants might feel discriminated against by natives; also, they might feel that natives regard them as “a foreign body” (e.g. see Kadianaki, 2013). The attitude/stance of the state legislature, the police and certain
political parties (most notably the Golden Dawn party) may further reinforce those feelings. Predominantly, the delay of the state legislature to address issues of discrimination against immigrants, to promote their equal treatment (particularly in the labour market) and to facilitate and rationalise their naturalization process has been notably prolonged (National Centre for Social Research, 2012). Also, the process of reporting cases of racist abuse has been remarkably inefficient; and, the justice system has proved inadequate to protect victims of racist crimes. Consequently, victims of racist violence often feel deterred to address to the Ombudsman of the State and to the police and report crimes against them. In addition, when crimes of this nature are being committed by members of the Police force, the reluctance of victims to report them is even greater (Sarris, 2014).

This situation is particularly worrying when considering one of the key empirical findings of this chapter; that is, that since the 2009 crisis eruption, discriminatory, racist and humiliating incidents instigated by police and Golden Dawn members against immigrants have been on the rise. At the same time, the victims of such treatment feel reluctant to report their perpetrators to the designated authorities due to their belief that justice will not be served. Furthermore, the empirical findings of this chapter also show that, in contrast to the rest of the immigrant groups, immigrants from the Balkans feel more socially included during the crisis than during their first period of stay in the country. At the same time, though, they believe that the general levels of intolerance against immigrants have been increasing following the crisis outbreak. Indeed, immigrants reported, on average, that natives were gradually distancing themselves from them in the crisis aftermath.

Hence, overall, Chapter 7 demonstrated the effects of the crisis on immigrants’ social integration in Greece and thus, it completed the pre- and during-crisis assessment of immigrants’ welfare conducted in this thesis. More precisely, it became apparent that all areas synthesizing immigrants’ welfare in the thesis context, namely, labour market integration and income (see Chapter 5), living conditions (see Chapter 6) and social integration (see Chapter 7) were negatively affected by the crisis outbreak. Yet, the crisis had differentiated effects on different immigrant groups, affecting to a lesser or greater extent the three different aspects of their welfare. The identification and understanding of these differences helps strengthen the knowledge basis for policy planning as well as for
future academic explorations of issues of immigration and welfare, particularly in times of economic and political uncertainty.

As a final note, the devastating effects of the 2009 economic recession and the currently befalling European refugee crisis have generated an unprecedented social situation in Greece whose evolution remains to be seen. At present, racially motivated crimes in Greece are in decline following the arrest and prosecution of the founder and of members and supporters of the Golden Dawn party in 2013. In addition, the unfolding European refugee crisis in Greece has met notable generosity and solidarity by Greeks. So, besides the fact that Greeks have been poverty stricken, plenty of volunteers are trying daily to provide assistance to the thousands of refugees who risk their lives to cross the Turkish-Greek borders with the hope of a safer and better life for themselves and their children (e.g. see Guardian, 2016). Peoples’ solidarity towards refugees is giving birth to hopes for the future harmonious coexistence of natives, immigrants and refugees not only in Greece but also across Europe. However, turbulent times generate unexpected developments and, as it became evident in this thesis, Greece has been through particularly turbulent times in its recent history, thus contriving unforeseen future developments.
8.1. Introduction

The main objective of this thesis was to examine the welfare of immigrants in Greece. A predominantly emigration country, Greece was transformed to an immigration country in the beginning of the 1990s and is currently one of the most important gateways to Europe for people fleeing war, poverty and political suppression in Africa, Asia and the Middle East. Also, since 2009 the Greek economy is sunk in deep recession bringing about considerable socio-political uncertainty and instability. Greece was chosen as a case study on the account that it constitutes a critical case in the EU allowing for the study of immigrants’ welfare under extreme socio-political and economic circumstances. In addition, Greece allows for the empirical testing of the effects of the financial crisis on welfare state outsiders given that the majority of immigrants in Greece live in the shadows of the welfare state. Finally, the matter of immigrants’ welfare in Greece -particularly in light of the recent economic downturn- has been so far relatively understudied. In this thesis, therefore, immigrants’ welfare in Greece was investigated through five subsidiary aims:

1. The examination of the legal framework on migration to Greece and the analysis of immigrants’ position in the Greek welfare state.
2. The investigation of immigrants’ welfare by considering immigrants’ labour market and housing market integration as well as the conditions of their integration in the Greek society.
3. The study of the effects of the recession on immigrants’ welfare by analysing self-collected quantitative and qualitative data measuring their welfare (i.e. labour market integration and income; living conditions; social integration) prior and during the economic crisis.
4. The analysis of the nature of those welfare effects and of the reasons for which they occurred.
5. The examination of whether the economic crisis had varied effects on different immigrant groups (focusing on immigrants’ gender and region of origin), the
identification of the nature of these varied effects and of the reasons for which they existed.

The purpose of this final chapter is to discuss the key findings of the thesis in light of the above-mentioned aims. Possible implications of the thesis findings regarding the welfare of immigrants in Greece are further discussed bearing in mind the ongoing European refugee crisis and the continuation of the severe economic hardship and socio-political turbulence for seven consecutive years since the 2009 economic crisis. In this context, some policy recommendations deriving from the insights of this thesis are offered and discussed. Furthermore, this chapter discusses the theoretical relevance and the methodological innovation of the thesis and finishes with a consideration of possible directions for future research and the implications of the thesis findings for future academic explorations.

8.2. Summary of the thesis findings

Labour market integration
The descriptive analysis of quantitative data showed that, on average, the position of immigrants in the labour market deteriorated on the account of the 2009 economic crisis. More precisely, analysis indicated that by 2012 immigrants’ unemployment and underemployment had increased considerably. In addition, more than half of those immigrants who remained employed after the outbreak of the crisis reported having moved to a different sector of the economy. On multiple occasions, this movement entailed, among others, a shift from skilled to unskilled occupations. As a result, immigrants’ monthly income levels notably dropped, with male immigrants suffering the biggest income losses. As anticipated, income losses were accompanied with an increase in the number of immigrants earning a non-sufficient income for the coverage of their basic needs and with a consequent drop in immigrants’ levels of remittances. Finally, immigrants’ levels of work satisfaction decreased notably during the recession years (for a detailed discussion see Chapter 5).

Immigrants working in different sectors of the economy prior to the crisis were affected to a different degree by the effects of the economic downturn. Given that economic sectors
in Greece have been notably gender and origin specific long before the crisis, immigrants of different gender and region of origin were absorbed in different economic sectors in the pre-crisis years. Indeed, the majority of female immigrants reported working as domestic workers prior to the crisis outbreak while the majority of male immigrants reported working in building/construction occupations. Also, most of female domestic workers were of Eastern European origin while most of male workers in the building/construction sector were of Balkan and/or Eastern European origin. Analysis showed that, domestic workers were the least affected by the crisis, whereas, building/construction workers were the worst affected by the crisis. Hence, immigrants’ gender and region of origin influenced their allocation in different economic sectors in the pre-crisis years and thus, defined to a degree their levels of vulnerability to the effects of the crisis (for a detailed discussion see Chapter 5).

These findings are in accordance with the recent developments in the Greek economy as well as with the nature of the Greek welfare state. In detail, according to the Labour Institute GSEE-ADEDY (2012), the building/construction sector was harshly hit by the recent economic downturn with employment levels dropping by 22.7% between 2008 and 2009 and by 73.2% between 2009 and 2010. By contrast, employment rates in the domestic services sector increased by 11.5% between 2008 and 2009 and decreased only slightly (i.e. by 5.5%) between 2009 and 2010 (see Chapter 5 and 6).

A plausible explanation for the resilience of the domestic services sector to the crisis repercussions is that it serves as a “substitute” to the insufficiently developed Greek welfare state. More precisely, the underdeveloped welfare state model of Greece which allows for its’ categorization in the Southern European welfare regime- is characterized by residual welfare provision for the majority of the population and underdeveloped family related benefits and services, such as child care. So, the absent welfare state is often “substituted” by family members (to the majority women) who provide informal (i.e. unpaid) care to their relatives in need; besides family members, domestic workers also “substitute” the absent welfare state as they provide paid support for individuals and families who are not in receipt of welfare provision even though they are in need of welfare assistance. Moreover, the recent economic crisis has further augmented the inefficiency and incapacity of the Greek welfare state to provide adequate social assistance and thus, currently, the importance of the domestic services sector is equally (if not more)
significant than it was in the past (for further details see Chapter 2). So, even though, natives’ economic welfare (and their consequent ability to afford domestic help) has deteriorated on the account of the crisis effects (for further details see Chapter 5), the domestic services sector remains resilient because it “substitutes” the augmenting incapability of Greek welfare state to provide adequate welfare support.

Finally, the analysis of qualitative data revealed that immigrants’ employment conditions following the 2009 crisis compared unfavourably with their employment situation in the years before the crisis. Correspondingly, the theme “from settled to hopeless” was deemed appropriate to characterise the transition. In accordance, immigrants expressed feelings of hopelessness regarding the deterioration of their position in the labour market and their employment prospects during the crisis (for a detailed discussion see Chapter 5).

*Living conditions*

The empirical findings of the thesis demonstrated that the negative effects of the economic crisis undermined immigrants’ living conditions. In particular, according to Mixed ANOVA findings, immigrants had, overall, higher economic hardship scores as well as higher accommodation hardship scores in the post-2009 crisis period than in the pre-2009 crisis period.

Considering immigrants’ region of origin, immigrants from Eastern Europe had the lowest economic hardship scores in the pre-crisis period (together with immigrants from Asia) as well as the lowest accommodation hardship scores. They also experienced an improvement in their economic status throughout their period of stay in Greece. However, the standards of their accommodation slightly deteriorated following the crisis outbreak and thus, they had the second lowest accommodation hardship scores in the sample (after immigrants from the Balkans) during the crisis period.

A notable case is, furthermore, that of immigrants from Asia as before the economic downturn they had the lowest economic hardship scores in the sample (together with immigrants from Eastern Europe); in the crisis aftermath, though, their economic status deteriorated significantly and their standards of accommodation also declined considerably. Finally, immigrants from the Middle East experienced a great increase in their (already significant) economic and accommodation hardships during the crisis while
immigrants from Africa had the highest economic and accommodation hardship scores during both periods under analysis (i.e. both in the pre-crisis and during the crisis period) (for a detailed discussion see Chapter 6).

Descriptive analysis equally showed that immigrants’ economic status and their ability to financially support themselves and their families (i.e. to provide themselves and their families with enough food, to afford the cost of child rearing and to pay utility bills, rent and/or debts) were considerably compromised by 2012. In addition, immigrants witnessed an increase in their accommodation related problems (i.e. shortage of space, lack of adequate lighting and absence of sufficient heating or cooling facilities) and in their neighbourhood related problems (i.e. insufficient transport, rubbish lying around, burglaries/deliberate damage to properties, racist insults/attacks and drugs/prostitution) which caused a drop in their levels of housing and neighbourhood satisfaction during the economic downturn.

Nonetheless, according to Mixed ANOVA findings, immigrants from the Balkans form a unique group in the sample as they were the only group who experienced a considerable improvement of their living conditions throughout their period of stay in Greece. In fact, they notably mitigated the economic and accommodation hardships they confronted during their first period of stay in Greece and they ended up having the second highest economic status and the highest standards of accommodation among all other immigrant groups during the crisis period. They were also only marginally affected by the economic recession in terms of their conditions of accommodation and their financial ability to support themselves and their families (for further details see Chapter 6). A possible explanation of the improvement of the economic status of immigrants from the Balkans may be described as follows: According to descriptive analysis, immigrants from the Balkans increased notably their representation in skilled occupations since their first year of stay in Greece (and skilled jobs are commonly associated with higher earnings than unskilled jobs). This was not, however, the case for the remaining immigrant groups as - particularly since the crisis- their representation in skilled occupations dropped considerably (for further details see Chapter 5). In addition, the improvement in the conditions of accommodation for immigrants from the Balkans maybe be explained as follows: Several academic studies indicate that immigrants have been traditionally exposed to racial discrimination in the housing market of Greece. Immigrants have been
confronted with more stringent contract terms, restricted availability of above ground, high-quality dwellings in nice residential areas and relatively higher rental prices than natives. Nonetheless, in the case of immigrants from the Balkans, racial discrimination in the Greek housing market became gradually less acute in recent years (for a detailed discussion see Chapter 6). Arguably, the gradual mitigation of housing discrimination against immigrants from the Balkans is one of the core contributing factors for the improvement of their accommodation conditions in Greece. Also, in support of this argument, the major immigration movement from the Balkans to Greece took place in the early 1990s (for further details see Chapter 4). Hence, immigrants from the Balkans had many years in their disposal in order assimilate in the housing market of Greece before the 2009 crisis.

Finally, the cross-interview theme “struggle to meet ends” was extracted by interviewees’ responses regarding their economic status and living conditions in Greece. So, the theme affirmed immigrants’ weakening economic status, worsening accommodation situation and their increasing -and often insurmountable- struggles to support themselves and their families in the crisis aftermath (for a detailed discussion see Chapter 6).

Social integration
According to the empirical findings of this thesis, it was shown that immigrants had higher social integration scores in the pre-2009 crisis period than in the post-2009 crisis period. In addition, male immigrants reported experiencing greater social exclusion than female immigrants during both periods (i.e. before and during the crisis) while immigrants from Asia, Africa and the Middle East had overall lower social integration scores than immigrants from Eastern Europe and the Balkans (for a detailed discussion see Chapter 7).

Immigrants from the Balkans, in particular, constitute a unique case in the sample as they increased their levels of social integration throughout their period of stay in Greece and, even in the crisis years, they were feeling more socially included than they reportedly felt during their first period of stay in Greece. In comparison to the rest of the immigrant groups, immigrants from the Balkans had the lowest social integration scores in the pre-crisis period; but, during the recession years they reported the second highest social integration scores in the sample (after immigrants from Eastern Europe). In fact,
immigrants from Eastern Europe had the highest social integration scores not only during the recession period but, also during the pre-crisis period. Furthermore, the remaining immigrant groups (i.e. immigrants from Asia, Africa and the Middle East) witnessed a significant drop in their social integration scores following the crisis. Last, immigrants from Africa, in particular, had the second lowest social integration scores in the sample in the pre-crisis period and the lowest social integration scores in the crisis period (for a detailed discussion see Chapter 7).

Descriptive analysis, also, showed that the degree of intolerance towards immigrants in Greece increased following the outbreak of the 2009 economic crisis with a drop in the share of immigrants feeling that people in Greece can be trusted and that people in Greece treat them with respect. In addition, there was an increase in the share of immigrants feeling worried of becoming victims of verbal or physical assaults due to their race or colour. In line with these findings, the recent economic downturn was accompanied by the electoral success of the neo-Nazi Golden Dawn party (receiving 7% of the popular vote at the May 2012 national elections) and the general increase in racism in Greece. And, the long-standing ineffectiveness of the Greek state to tackle racism through the courts notably increased the risk of discriminative, xenophobic and racist behaviours against immigrants (for a detailed discussion see Chapter 7).

Last, interviews’ analysis extracted the cross-interview theme “escalating exclusion” which encapsulated immigrants’ feelings of detachment from the Greek society after 2009. So, interviewees reported feeling that natives were progressively distancing themselves from them during the crisis and that they were exposed to discriminatory, racist and humiliating treatment by the police and Golden Dawn members. Interestingly, though, Albanian immigrants reported that this general increase in racism in Greece was not targeted against them and thus, they were feeling increasingly integrated in the Greek society even in the post-2009 period. Considering the Mixed ANOVA results, this finding complements the reported higher social integration scores for immigrants from the Balkans in the post-2009 crisis period by comparison to the pre-2009 crisis period given that Albania is geographically counted as part of the Balkans (for a detailed discussion see Chapter 7).
The theoretical relevance of this thesis lies in confirming the gaps in the social security system for immigrants in Greece. So, it reinforces the notion that the Southern European welfare regime is inefficient in providing adequate welfare support for people in need. The thesis findings underline that such inefficiencies are further augmented by the long-standing weakness of the Greek public policy on immigration which was further exacerbated by the 2009 crisis as a result of diminishing resources and job cuts in frontline services. Taking also into account the unfitting legal and regulatory framework within which immigrants seek their rights to live and work in Greece, it is evident that the Greek state is incapable of protecting some of the most vulnerable parts of the population.

More precisely, building on the body of literature on welfare state regimes, immigrants have for a long time found themselves in a vulnerable position in Southern Europe, where the division between welfare state insiders and outsiders is particularly evident (for a detailed discussion see, for example, Featherstone and Papadimitriou, 2008; Ferrera, 1996; Rhodes, 1997). So, irrespective of economic circumstances, immigrants in Southern Europe are deemed to be welfare state outsiders and thus, vulnerable to serious welfare risks. With the above in mind and considering the 2009 crisis in Greece, immigrants’ welfare was investigated to empirically assess the unmet need of immigrants for welfare support in this part of Southern Europe. It was shown that immigrants’ welfare was indeed negatively affected by the crisis while there has been no adequate provision for the mitigation of the crisis effects on immigrants’ welfare.

Moreover, given the undeveloped nature of the Southern European welfare model, immigrants’ employment has long been of major importance as a means of safeguarding their welfare. This observation is particularly applicable in Greece where the dualistic economic and social structures of the Southern European welfare model are particularly widespread. Indeed, the Greek state has displayed regulatory weakness with regards to the labour market, resulting in a large black market falling entirely outside the scope of the Law and higher levels of protection for standard forms of employment than for non-standard forms (for a detailed discussion see Chapters 4 and 5). The Greek state has also displayed ineffectiveness and prolonged delays in registering undocumented immigrants through regularization programs and thus, it has hindered their incorporation in the official
labour market. Not surprisingly, the thesis affirmed immigrants’ widespread employment in black-market and nonstandard occupations in Greece, depriving them the right to social insurance and labour legislation protection (for a detailed discussion see Chapters 4 and 5). As a final note, the legal requirement of being in employment as a precondition for obtaining and keep possessing a residence permit has made immigrants susceptible to exploitation by their employers since long before the crisis (for a detailed discussion see Chapter 4). The thesis ascertained the precarious nature of immigrants’ employment in Greece mainly in the form of informal labour with worse terms of employment in comparison to those for the native labourers (for a detailed discussion see Chapter 5 and 7).

So, the thesis affirms that immigrants, long before the crisis, have been poorly protected or unprotected by social insurance and labour legislation. Accordingly, their union representation has been limited, they are vulnerable to employment exploitation and their wages (commonly received in cash) are below those agreed in collective bargaining agreements. Ultimately, this situation increases their exposure and vulnerability to the effects of economic fluctuations which, as shown in this thesis, may take the form of serious deterioration of their welfare (for further details see Chapter 5).

Indeed, as confirmed by the thesis findings, the immigrants’ need for social assistance is today even more imperative than in the pre-crisis years on the account of the crisis repercussions on their welfare. Yet, more recent budgetary constraints have further augmented the incapacity of the Southern European welfare states to provide adequate support. This raises questions about the social consequences of the conditions imposed by EU institutions and the IMF in return for securing the solvency of the Greek state. The problematic anti-poverty provisions of the Greek welfare state, in particular, have been unsuccessful in reducing poverty while they have further affirmed the division between welfare state insiders and outsiders. It is revealing that only 3.8% of participants in the quantitative analysis reported being in receipt of social support in 2012 (for further details see Chapters 4 and 6). In line, the literature on welfare state regimes signposts three social groups being the most affected by the weak anti-poverty performance of the Greek welfare state. These are precarious employees, new entrants to the labour market and the long term unemployed (for a detailed discussion see, for example, Ioakimidis and Teloni, 2013; Matsaganis, 2012; Petmesidou and Guillén, 2014).
Taking into consideration the thesis findings regarding the further deterioration of immigrants’ position in the labour market (involving lower wages, delayed or nonreceipt of payments, uninsured employment and non-voluntary underemployment amongst others), one can confidently make the following claim: in agreement with the literature on welfare state regimes, immigrant employees -under increasingly precarious conditions- are one of the groups that were greatly affected by the inefficiencies of the anti-poverty mechanism in place. Similarly, although the focus of the thesis was not on assessing new entrants to the labour market and the long term unemployed per se, it was evident that the rapidly rising unemployment rates amongst immigrants, as shown in the pre-during crisis comparisons, would make it harder for immigrants to enter or re-enter employment.

With regards to methodology, the thesis constitutes the first academic study focusing on the 2009 crisis’ impact on the welfare of immigrants in Greece through the utilization of quantitative and qualitative data and the application of a novel mixed-methods data analysis approach; most notably, the construction of scales for the systematic and in-depth analysis of immigrants’ welfare and the examination of the 2009 crisis impact on their welfare, by taking into consideration their gender and region of origin.

More precisely, a mixed-methods approach was adopted for meeting the thesis objectives, combining quantitative and qualitative methodologies. This approach was adopted because it allowed a holistic assessment of the thesis aims while offering a good depth of understanding during all stages of the research process. Also, the construction of three scales (i.e. economic hardship, accommodation hardship and social integration scales) facilitated the production of grouped findings on immigrants’ welfare and the conduct of comparisons between the pre-crisis and during the crisis years as well as between different immigrant groups. 320 immigrants participated in the quantitative survey and 42 immigrants participated in the semi structured interviews. All empirical data were collected and analysed by the author of this thesis adding originality and coherence at all stages of the thesis research.

8.4. Policy recommendations
The study of peoples’ welfare is arguably of great socio-political and economic significance particularly in an EU-country with a rapidly increasing population of people in need of welfare support. In addition, the currently unfolding “double” crisis in Greece (i.e. sustained economic downturn and unfolding refugee crisis) increases the risk of spillover effects across Europe with unanticipated welfare consequences for all parties involved. Hence, the findings of this thesis, which depict and analyse the reduction of immigrants’ welfare following the 2009 Greek crisis eruption, are particularly relevant today. Gaining a better understanding of the economic and sociopolitical challenges currently confronted by the people of Europe increases the chances of mitigating those challenges in the future through well-informed policy measures and thus, it generates the hope of a better life for the future generations.

As discussed in Chapter 4, the Greek State has demonstrated notable bureaucratic delays in the past and it has implemented both unrealistic and ineffective policy measures in its efforts to handle the massive and unexpected immigration waves in the early 1990s. Indicatively, the lack of sufficient and functional social policies able to provide immigrants with a safety net in times of need has magnified the importance of immigrants’ employment as a means of protecting their welfare in Greece. In addition, the legal requirement of being in employment in order to obtain and keep possessing a residence permit has placed for a prolonged period immigrants in a vulnerable position vis-à-vis their employers. And, frequently, immigrants would apply for the issuance or the renewal of their residence permits but, enormous bureaucratic delays would result in them receiving their issued or renewed permits after their expiration date. So, suggested policy measures include the rationalization of the legal framework on immigration and its’ adjustment to the present conditions of economic recession. Particularly considering widespread unemployment, the decoupling of immigrants’ residence rights from their employment status (and thus, their dependence on their employees) is very important. So is the improving and accelerating of the process of residence permits issuance.

Furthermore, the current handling of the masses of people crossing the Turkish-Greek borders is even more challenging given the European dimensions and legal implications of the European refugee crisis and the relatively worse public finances of the Greek State. Hence, decisive policy measures are needed (at the EU and national level) with the purpose of tackling more effectively the welfare implications associated with the befalling
European refugee crisis; most importantly, the increase of EU humanitarian funding for emergency support schemes in Greece is essential in order to address the pressing humanitarian needs of the masses of immigrants and refugees entering Greece daily. Equally important is the improving of the use of EU funding by the Greek authorities and public institutions for registering the waves of immigrants and refugees crossing the Turkish-Greek borders and providing them with food, shelter and hygiene as well as with family re-unification assistance and humanitarian protection. Those actions are imperative for safeguarding social solidarity and political stability across Europe.

There is also a need for the protection of the economically vulnerable members of the Greek society. As shown in the thesis findings, the economic crisis deteriorated immigrants’ economic welfare and thus, it intensified the need for the introduction of decisive anti-poverty measures. In principle, such measures should guarantee the right to minimum income and the right to unrestricted access to public healthcare and education and they need to be implemented in an egalitarian and fair manner to avoid social tensions between receivers and non-receivers of social assistance (e.g. between immigrant and native populations). Certain difficulties are, however, in place for the development and implementation of such policy measures: First, the introduction of a minimum income support scheme requires means-testing procedures and thus, it presupposes effective state capacities in objectively registering immigrants’ income. Hence, it is technically challenging in respect of implementation. Second, as long as Greece continues to be subjected to strict external constraints on public budget, the sufficiency of public resources for the introduction of a minimum income support scheme is highly questionable. Third, the high numbers of incoming immigrants and refugees together with the costly and time-consuming process of their registration creates several challenges in guaranteeing their unrestricted access to public healthcare and education. Fourth and final, it is of great significance that the suggested anti-poverty measures are implemented in a timely and effective manner in order for their effects to influence the lives of those in need. However, in several cases, the effects of former policies targeting immigrants have been cancelled out by the inefficiency of the Greek bureaucracy (for further details see section 4.4).

Finally, policy measures are suggested to tackle the phenomenon of racism in Greece. As shown in the thesis findings, the 2009 crisis was accompanied by an increase of discriminative, xenophobic and racist incidents targeting immigrants. And, today,
following seven consecutive years of deep economic crisis, the widespread economic hardship in Greece is increasingly threatening to tear the social fabric apart and to further foster the growth of political extremism in the country (for a detailed discussion see Chapter 7). Suggested policy measures should aim at improving the process of monitoring and reporting crimes with racist and xenophobic motives, protecting the physical, psychological and mental health of victims of such crimes and servicing justice via the criminal justice system in a timely and effective manner\(^1\).

### 8.5. Suggestions for future research

Given the thesis findings, certain directions for future research may be suggested. More precisely, proposed follow-up research may examine, year-by-year, the welfare of immigrants in Greece during the recent prolonged period of deep economic recession and socio-political turbulence (i.e. from 2009 to 2016). The welfare dynamics associated with immigrants’ gender and region of origin in those consecutive hardship years may be also investigated and analysed together with an assessment the effects of the Greek crisis on recent migration flows and patterns.

In addition, directions for future research may include the comparative study of the welfare of immigrants and natives in Greece and the investigation of how the relative welfare of the two groups has been shaped by the years of the crisis. Such comparative study may focus on various aspects of immigrants’ and natives’ life (e.g. economic, social, political, etc.) with the purpose of tracing whether and how the welfare dynamics of the two groups intersect under conditions of deep economic recession and socio-political turmoil.

---

\(^1\) As an indicative example of the criminal justice system ineffectiveness, in March 2016, Golden Dawn supporter George Roupakias (who was arrested in September 2013 for the murder of the anti-fascist rapper Pavlos Fyssas) was set free under restrictive measures due to the passage of the maximum temporary detention time limit before the conclusion of his trial. Also, besides this still open murder case, George Roupakias was the last person charged in the same year (i.e. in 2013) with forming and participating in a criminal organisation (i.e. Golden Dawn) who remained in custody before being set free under restrictive measures following the end of the accepted detention period prior to the conclusion of the relevant trials (again due to prolonged court delays).
Moreover, in light of the ongoing European refugee crisis, future research directions may focus on whether the effects of the European refugee crisis have been affecting the welfare of immigrants in Greece. Economic, legal and socio-political implications of the on-going European refugee crisis may be examined in order to assess in depth their impact on immigrants’ welfare in Greece.

Finally, comparative research should ask to what extent the findings of this thesis are confirmed when examining other South European countries and to what extent the results differ in countries with distinct welfare state regimes. With respect to the Eurozone crisis it is also worthwhile to investigate how the conditions imposed by the EU and the IMF linked to bailing out states at risk of insolvency have affected the welfare provision for vulnerable sections of the population, such as immigrants.

In conclusion, those directions for future research may further expand and enrich knowledge in the area of immigrants’ welfare in Europe under challenging sociopolitical and economic circumstances. The study of immigrants’ welfare is of great importance even if it reveals the welfare situation of only a segment of the population in the European societies. Arguably, immigrants’ welfare is closely linked with the welfare of all people and, to some extent, it symbolizes how the Law and the welfare state treat the vulnerable members of our society. In accordance, understanding and addressing the needs of vulnerable people creates better life conditions for all citizens.

Academic explorations of this matter (i.e. immigrants’ welfare) are particularly relevant and necessary today that Europe is facing complex -and often extreme- social, political and economic challenges. Greece, in this context, may be a critical case (given the extent of its recent depression), but the lessons drawn from this study can travel much more widely. The welfare of immigrants in the European Union over the next decades will remain high on the agenda and will, to a large extent, shape the meaning and relevance of solidarity as a founding principle of the European integration process.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


Balabanidis, D. 2013. Housing conditions of immigrants in the municipality of Athens. [in Greek]. *Encounter Athens*, advance online publication May 18, doi: https://encounterathens.wordpress.com/2011/05/18/stegash-metanastvni/


Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y. 2011. The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research. 4th ed. USA: SAGE.


Lawrence, C. 2010. “Τώρα είμαστε όλοι ρατσιστές”: εργασία και ανισότητα στην αγροτική Ελλάδα = “we are all racists now”: labor and inequality in rural Greece. Panhellenic Geographical Congresses, Proceedings Collection, 3, 351-357.


Appendix 1. Self-designed, structured questionnaire

*** Start of Questionnaire ***

My name is Ismini Lefa and I work for the University of Manchester. We are conducting a survey in order to find out about the life and welfare of immigrants in Greece. Participation in the survey is anonymous and completely voluntary and it will take approximately 15 minutes to complete.

• Interview number:
• Language of the interview:
• Date of the interview:
• Region where the interview was conducted:

1. Please select your age group:
   a. 18-21   b. 22-29   c. 30-39   d. 40-49   e. 50-59   f. 60 & over

2. Please select your gender:
   a. Male     b. Female

3. Please select your place of origin:
   a. The Balkans
   b. Eastern Europe
   c. Africa
   d. The Middle East
   e. Asia
4. **What was the most significant reason for immigrating to Greece?**
   a. For economic reasons
   b. For political, religious or ethnic related reasons
   c. To escape from war, natural disaster or famine
   d. To join or follow someone (e.g. my husband or my wife)
   e. To try my luck
   f. To study
   g. Other

5. **Which year did you first come to Greece?**
   a. ...............  

6. **Can you please tell me if you have spent any time here as an undocumented immigrant?**
   a. No, I have not  
   b. Yes, 1 year or less  
   c. Yes, 1 - 3 years  
   d. Yes, 4 - 6 years  
   e. Yes, 7 - 9 years  
   f. Yes, 10 years or more  
   g. I don’t know  
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7. Can you please tell me if you currently have any of the following?
   a. Visa (e.g. Work Visa, National Visa, Schengen Visa, etc.)
   b. Residence/Work Permit
   c. Permanent Residence/Work Permit
   d. Greek citizenship
   e. Registration certificate (for EU citizens)
   f. Political asylum
   g. None of the above
   h. I don’t know

8. How many years of education do you have?
   a. 0     b. 1-3     c. 4-6     d. 7-9     e. 10-12     f. 13-15     g. 16 & more

9. Please select your marital status:
   a. Single
   b. Living with partner
   c. Married

10. Can you please tell me how many dependent children do you have, if any?
    a. None          b. 1          c. 2           d. 3           e. 4         f. More than 4

   The following section includes questions about when you first came to Greece (i.e. about your first year in Greece):

11. What best described your employment status during your first year in Greece?
    a. Self employed
    b. Employed in the private sector
    c. Employed in the public sector
    d. Employed in public enterprises
    e. Fixed-term employee (e.g. seasonal worker, employed in short-term contracts, etc.)
    f. Domestic worker
    g. Retired
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h. Student
i. Unemployed
j. Housekeeping and/or parenting (unpaid work)
k. Other

12. During your first year in Greece, in which sector did you mostly worked?
a. Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing
b. Tourism
c. Building, Construction
d. Domestic services
e. Skilled work
f. Unskilled work
g. Other
h. n/a

13. On average, how many days did you used to work per month?
a. 6 days or less
b. 7 - 14 days
c. 15 - 21 days
d. 22 days
e. 23 - 31 days
f. n/a

14. During these working days, how many hours did you used to work on average per day?
a. 4 hours or less
b. 5 - 8 hours
c. 8 hours
d. 9 hours or more
e. n/a

15. On average, what was your income per month (after taxes)?
a. I had no income
b. 200 € or less
c. 201 € - 500 €
d. 501 € - 800 €
e. 801 € - 1100 €
f. 1100 € or more

16. How much money did you used to send back home per month, if any?
a. I didn’t used to send money back home
b. 50 € or less
c. 51 € - 150 €
d. 151 € - 300 €
e. 301 € - 500 €
f. 501 € or more

17. How satisfied were you with your working conditions during your first year in Greece?
• Very satisfied......Satisfied......Neutral......Dissatisfied......Very Dissatisfied
• n/a

18. Thinking about your income, how sufficient do you think it was to meet your basic needs?
a. More than enough
b. Just enough
c. Not enough

19. Who you had to rely in case of financial difficulties?
a. Family and/or friends
b. Personal savings
c. Welfare state
d. Charity
e. Church
f. I had no one to rely on
g. n/a
20. If applicable, can you please tell me how often did any of these used to occur to you?
   a. Being financially unable to pay rent and/or debts (e.g. towards banks)?
      Never/Rarely/Often/Always
   b. Having too little money to buy enough food for you and your family?
      Never/Rarely/Often/Always
   c. Being financially unable to have access to childcare?
      Never/Rarely/Often/Always
   d. Get disconnected or use less than you need in relation to water, gas, electricity and telephone because you can’t afford it?
      Never/Rarely/Often/Always

21. Can you please state the type of accommodation you used to live in?
   a. Owned accommodation
   b. Rented accommodation
   c. Shared accommodation
   d. Short stay shelter (hotel, shelter for homeless people, etc.)
   e. I had nowhere to live in

22. Did you used to experience any of the following problems with your accommodation? (cycle all that apply to you)
   a. Shortage of space
      Never/Rarely/Often/Always
   b. Too dark, not enough light
      Never/Rarely/Often/Always
   c. Lack of adequate heating or cooling facilities
      Never/Rarely/Often/Always

23. Can you please tell me how often did any of these occur in your neighbourhood? (cycle all that apply to you)
   a. Insufficient transport
      Never/Rarely/Often/Always
   b. Rubbish lying around
      Never/Rarely/Often/Always
c. Burglaries, deliberate damage to property
   Never/Rarely/Often/Always

d. Insults or attacks to do with one’s race or colour
   Never/Rarely/Often/Always

e. Drug trade and drug use and/or prostitution
   Never/Rarely/Often/Always

24. How satisfied were you with your accommodation?
Very satisfied........Satisfied........Neutral........Dissatisfied........Very dissatisfied

25. How satisfied were you with your neighbourhood as a place to live?
Very satisfied........Satisfied........Neutral........dissatisfied........Very dissatisfied

26. Did you receive any welfare or public assistance benefits from the Greek state during your first year in Greece?
   a. Yes
   b. No

27. Generally speaking, which were the greatest challenges for you during your first year in Greece? (cycle all that apply to you)
   a. Meeting basic needs (food, housing, transportation, etc.)
   b. Understanding a new culture (Greek customs and ways of doing things)
   c. Overcoming the language barrier
   d. Prejudice/Discrimination
   e. Lack of freedom to do what you want (e.g. practice my religion)
   f. Medical care services
   g. Other

28. Please state whether you agree or disagree with the following statement:
I was feeling that most people here can be trusted.
Strongly agree...........Agree..............Neutral..............Disagree..............Strongly disagree

29. Please state whether you agree or disagree with the following statement:
Most people here were treating me with respect.
30. Please state whether you agree or disagree with the following statement:
I was worried of being verbally assaulted due to our race or colour.
Strongly agree.............Agree.............Neutral..............Disagree...........Strongly disagree

31. Please state whether you agree or disagree with the following statement:
I was worried of being physically assaulted due to our race or colour.
Strongly agree.............Agree.............Neutral..............Disagree...........Strongly disagree

The following section includes questions about your present life:

32. What best describes your current employment status?
   a. Self employed
   b. Employed in the private sector
   c. Employed in the public sector
   d. Employed in public enterprises
   e. Fixed-term employee (e.g. seasonal worker, employed in short-term contracts, etc.)
   f. Domestic worker
   g. Unemployed
   h. Retired
   i. Student
   j. Housekeeping and/or parenting (unpaid work)
   k. Other

33. Can you please tell me the sector you currently work in?
   a. Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing
   b. Tourism
   c. Building, Construction
   d. Domestic services
   e. Unskilled work
   f. Skilled work
   g. Other
34. How many days did you work during the last month?
   a. 6 days or less
   b. 7 - 14 days
   c. 15 - 21 days
   d. 22 days
   e. 23 - 31 days
   f. n/a

35. During these working days, how many hours did you work on average per day?
   a. 4 hours or less
   b. 5 - 8 hours
   c. 8 hours
   d. 9 hours or more
   e. n/a

36. Can you please tell me how long you have been out of work in total (not even working for one hour per day) since you came here?
   a. I have never been out of work
   b. For up to 6 months
   c. For 6 months - 1 year
   d. For 1 year - 2 years
   e. For 2 years - 3 years
   f. For more than 3 years
   g. I never tried to find a job in Greece

37. What is your current income per month (after taxes)
   a. I have no income
   b. 200 € or less
   c. 201 € - 500 €
   d. 501 € - 800 €
   e. 801 € - 1100 €
   f. 1100 € or more
38. How much money do you currently send back home per month, if any?
   a. I don’t send money back home
   b. 50 € or less
   c. 51 € – 150 €
   d. 151 € – 300 €
   e. 301 € – 500 €
   f. 501 € or more

39. How satisfied are you with your working conditions?
   • Very satisfied.....Satisfied.......Neutral......Dissatisfied.....Very Dissatisfied
   • n/a

40. Do you have employment insurance?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. n/a

41. If yes, can you tell me what type of employment insurance do you have?
   a. Social Insurance Institute (ΙΚΑ)
   b. Agricultural Insurance Fund (ΟΓΑ)
   c. Freelancer Insurance Organization (OAEE)
   d. Private Sector Welfare Fund (ΤΑΠΙΤ)
   e. Public Employees Welfare Fund (ΤΑΕΔΥ)
   f. Other

42. If applicable, can you please tell me why did you leave your last job?
   a. Salary was too low
   b. Working conditions were unsatisfactory
   c. Health or family reasons
   d. I was receiving bad treatment due to my race or colour
   e. Termination of contract
   f. I was fired
   g. I closed or sold my business
h. I never managed to find a job in Greece
i. Other
j. n/a

43. Please state whether you agree or disagree with the following statement:
I am likely to become unemployed or remain unemployed for a long period (i.e. for more than 6 months).
• Strongly agree.......Agree.......Neutral.......Disagree.......Strongly disagree
• n/a

44. Thinking about your income, how sufficient do you think it is to meet your basic needs?
 a. More than enough
 b. Just enough
 c. Not enough

45. Do you have someone to rely on in case of financial difficulties?
 a. Family and/or friends
 b. Personal savings
 c. Welfare state
 d. Charity
 e. Church
 f. I have no one to rely on
 g. n/a

46. If applicable, can you please tell me how often do any of these occur to you?
   a. Being financially unable to pay rent and/or debts (e.g. towards banks)?
      Never/Rarely/Often/Always
   b. Having too little money to buy enough food for you and your family?
      Never/Rarely/Often/Always
   c. Being financially unable to have access to childcare?
      Never/Rarely/Often/Always
   d. Get disconnected or use less than you need in relation to water, gas, electricity and telephone because you can’t afford it?
47. Can you please state the type of accommodation you currently live in?
   a. Owned accommodation
   b. Rented accommodation
   c. Shared accommodation
   d. Short stay shelter (hotel, shelter for homeless people, etc.)
   e. I have nowhere to live in

48. Do you currently experience any of the following problems with your accommodation? (cycle all that apply to you)
   a. Shortage of space
      Never/Rarely/Often/Always
   b. Too dark, not enough light
      Never/Rarely/Often/Always
   c. Lack of adequate heating or cooling facilities
      Never/Rarely/Often/Always

49. Overall, how satisfied are you with your accommodation?
    Very satisfied............Satisfied............Neutral............Dissatisfied............Very dissatisfied

50. Can you please tell me how often do any of these occur in your neighbourhood? (cycle all that apply to you)
    a. Insufficient transport
       Never/Rarely/Often/Always
    b. Rubbish lying around
       Never/Rarely/Often/Always
    c. Burglaries, deliberate damage to property
       Never/Rarely/Often/Always
    d. Insults or attacks to do with one’s race or colour
       Never/Rarely/Often/Always
    e. Drug trade and drug use and/or prostitution
       Never/Rarely/Often/Always
51. How satisfied are you with your neighbourhood as a place to live?

52. Please state whether you agree or disagree with the following statement:
Since I came here I had a medical problem but put off, postponed or did not seek medical care when I needed to.
• Strongly agree......Agree........Neutral.......Disagree......Strongly disagree
• n/a

53. Which was the main difficulty for you when trying to access health services since you came here?
 a. I never tried to access health care services
 b. I never had any difficulty
 c. Medical consultation or treatment is too expensive
 d. I didn’t have the time, or had more important problems (housing, food, etc.)
 e. Serious administrative problems or delays
 f. Language barriers
 g. Fear of being reported or arrested
 h. Other

54. Do you have access to public education?
 a. Yes
 b. No
 c. n/a

55. Do your children have access to public education?
 a. Yes
 b. No
 c. n/a

56. Do you currently receive any welfare or public assistance benefits from the Greek state?
 a. Yes
 b. No
57. Which are the greatest challenges for you now? (cycle all that apply to you)
   a. Meeting basic needs (food, housing, transportation, etc.)
   b. Understanding the Greek culture (Greek customs and ways of doing things)
   c. Overcoming the language barrier
   d. Prejudice/Discrimination
   e. Lack of freedom to do what you want (e.g. practice my religion)
   f. Medical care services
   g. Other

58. Please state whether you agree or disagree with the following statement:
    Most people here can be trusted.
    Strongly agree..............Agree..............Neutral..............Disagree..............Strongly disagree

59. Please state whether you agree or disagree with the following statement:
    Most people here treat me with respect.
    Strongly agree..............Agree..............Neutral..............Disagree..............Strongly disagree

60. Please state whether you agree or disagree with the following statement:
    I am worried of being verbally assaulted due to our race or colour.
    Strongly agree..............Agree..............Neutral..............Disagree..............Strongly disagree

61. Please state whether you agree or disagree with the following statement:
    I am worried of being physically assaulted due to our race or colour.
    Strongly agree..............Agree..............Neutral..............Disagree..............Strongly disagree

62. Please tell me how often any of these occur to you?
   a. Thinking about repatriation
      Always/Often/Rarely/Never
   b. Thinking about migrating again to another country
      Always/Often/Rarely/Never
63. Which are the reasons for that? (if applicable, you can choose more than one answer)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I don’t have an adequate income</td>
<td>I do have an adequate income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad working conditions</td>
<td>Good working conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor housing conditions</td>
<td>Good housing conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor access to public health-care and education</td>
<td>Good access to public health care and education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prejudice/discrimination</td>
<td>Absence of prejudice/discrimination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I now believe that my life will be better back home or in another country</td>
<td>I now believe that my life will be Worse back home or in another country</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

64. Can you please tell me how many of your co-patriots have gone back to your homeland or have migrated again to another country?
   a. None
   b. 1-5
   c. 6-10
   d. 11-20
   e. 21-30
   f. 31-40
   g. 40 or more

65. Please state whether you agree or disagree with the following statement:
   Provided that I will stay in Greece for at least 1 more year, my life will be better.
   Strongly agree..........Agree.........Neutral..........Disagree.........Strongly disagree

*** End of Questionnaire ***
Appendix 2. Self-designed, semi-structured interviews’ guide

Interviewer’s introduction:
My name is Ismini Lefa and I work for the University of Manchester. We are conducting interviews in order to find out about the life and welfare of immigrants in Greece. So, during the interviews, I would like to hear your opinion on your work situation, your living conditions and your social integration in Greece throughout your period of stay in the country. Interviews are anonymous, completely voluntary and they require approximately 1 hour to complete.

Interviewer’s notes:
Interview number: …
Area where the interview was conducted: …
Date of the interview: …
Language of the interview: …
Interviewee’s gender: …
Interviewee’s age: …
Interviewee’s country of origin: …
Interviewee’s year of immigration to Greece: …
Interviewee’s legal status during the time of the interview: …
Additional comments: …

Interviewer’s question guide:
Indicative questions to be discussed with the interviewees; questions are categorized into the following three thematic areas synthesizing immigrants’ welfare in the thesis context (i.e. labour market integration and income; living conditions; social integration):

1) Labour market integration and income:
“Can you describe your employment situation and income level since your first year of immigration to Greece?”
“Were you feeling satisfied with your employment situation and income level during your first years of employment in Greece?”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Have you experienced changes in your employment situation and income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level in the post-2009 crisis period?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“How satisfied are you by your current employment situation and income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“How do you feel about your employment future in Greece?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Living conditions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Can you describe to me your economic status throughout your period of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stay in Greece?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Did you ever encounter financial difficulties in supporting your and/or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>your family’s needs?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Did you have someone (e.g. relative, friend, charity organisation,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public institution, etc.) to turn to in case of financial need during</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>your years of stay in Greece? Do you currently have someone to turn to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for financial assistance?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Has the development of your economic status in Greece affected your</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>housing and neighbourhood conditions throughout the years, and if yes,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“How would you compare your current housing and neighbourhood conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with your housing and neighbourhood conditions during your first years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of stay in Greece?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Social integration:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Have you seen changes in peoples’ attitude towards immigrants throughout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>your period of stay in the country?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“How do you currently feel about the attitude of the people in Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>towards immigrants?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Did you ever experience racism or discrimination in Greece; if yes, by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whom was it instigated?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Have your feelings about social integration (or exclusion) changed in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the post-2009 period?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Do you feel you have someone to turn to in case of racial discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>against you?”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 3. Semi-structured interviews’ features and interviewees’ characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview No</th>
<th>Place of the Interview</th>
<th>Date of the Interview</th>
<th>Language of the Interview</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Country of origin</th>
<th>Year of Immigration</th>
<th>Legal status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>01/04/2013</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Unauthorised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>01/04/2013</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Authorised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>01/04/2013</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Unauthorised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>02/04/2013</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Authorised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>02/04/2013</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Unauthorised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>03/04/2013</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Authorised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>04/04/2013</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Kurdistan</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Authorised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Authorised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>04/04/2013</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Authorised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>05/04/2013</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Authorised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>05/04/2013</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Authorised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>05/04/2013</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Authorised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>07/04/2013</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Authorised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Authorised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>08/04/2013</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Authorised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>08/04/2013</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Authorised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>08/04/2013</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Authorised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>08/04/2013</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Authorised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>09/04/2013</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Authorised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Authorised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>10/04/2013</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Authorised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>10/04/2013</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Authorised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>10/04/2013</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Unauthorised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Non-urban</td>
<td>05/08/2013</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Unauthorised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Non-urban</td>
<td>05/08/2013</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Authorised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Non-urban</td>
<td>05/08/2013</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Authorised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Non-urban</td>
<td>06/08/2013</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Unauthorised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Non-urban</td>
<td>06/08/2013</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Unauthorised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Non-urban</td>
<td>06/08/2013</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Authorised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Non-urban</td>
<td>07/08/2013</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Authorised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Country of Birth</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Non-urban</td>
<td>07/08/2013</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Authorised</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Non-urban</td>
<td>07/08/2013</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Authorised</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>08/08/2013</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Authorised</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>08/08/2013</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Authorised</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>09/08/2013</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Authorised</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>09/08/2013</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Authorised</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>11/08/2013</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Authorised</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Non-urban</td>
<td>11/08/2013</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Authorised</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Non-urban</td>
<td>11/08/2013</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Unauthorised</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>18/08/2013</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Unauthorised</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>18/08/2013</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Authorised</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Non-urban</td>
<td>19/08/2013</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Authorised</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Appendix 4.** Male and female unemployment, 1st year of stay and 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th></th>
<th>Women</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st year</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1st year</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1st year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own survey

Note: N = 320
Appendix 5. Unemployment for participants from different regions of origin, 1st year of stay and 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region of origin</th>
<th>1st year</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Balkans</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Middle East</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own survey
Note: N = 320
Appendix 6. Participants’ total length of unemployment in Greece

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of time spent out of employment in total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have never been out of employment</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For up to 6 months</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For 6 months - 1 year</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For 1 year – 2 years</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For 2 years – 3 years</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For more than 3 years</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I never managed to find a job in Greece</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own survey

Note: N = 320
Appendix 7. Participants’ views over their future employment in Greece, 2012

“I am likely to become unemployed or remain unemployed for a long period (i.e. for more than 6 months)”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of agreement</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own survey

Note: N = 320
**Appendix 8.** Work schedule and work duration for male and female participants, 1st year of stay and 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st year</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1st year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Working days</strong> per month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 days or less</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 – 14 days</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 – 21 days</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 days</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 – 31 days</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Working hours</strong> per day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 hours or less</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – 8 hours</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 hours</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 hours or more</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own survey

Note 1: N = 320

Note 2: The N/A answer indicates that participants were unemployed
### Region of Origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region of Origin</th>
<th>The Balkans</th>
<th>Eastern Europe</th>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>The Middle East</th>
<th>Asia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st year 2012</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st year 2012</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st year 2012</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st year 2012</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st year 2012</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st year 2012</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Working days per month

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days</th>
<th>6 days or less</th>
<th>7 - 14 days</th>
<th>15 - 21 days</th>
<th>22 days</th>
<th>23 - 31 days</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 days or less</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 14 days</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 21 days</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 days</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 - 31 days</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Working hours per day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>4 hours or less</th>
<th>5 - 8 hours</th>
<th>8 hours</th>
<th>9 hours or more</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 hours or less</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 8 hours</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 hours</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 hours or more</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own survey

Note 1: N = 320

Note 2: The N/A answer indicates that participants were unemployed
Appendix 10. Composition of employment and levels of work satisfaction for male and female participants, 1st year of stay and 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Economic sectors</th>
<th>Men 1st year</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>Women 1st year</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>Total 1st year</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building, Construction</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domestic services</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unskilled work</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skilled work</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work satisfaction</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own survey
Note 1: N = 320
Note 2: The N/A answer indicates that participants were unemployed
### Appendix 11
Composition of employment and levels of work satisfaction for participants from different regions of origin, 1st year of stay and 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region of Origin</th>
<th>The Balkans</th>
<th>Eastern Europe</th>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>The Middle East</th>
<th>Asia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st year</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1st year</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1st year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry, Fishing</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Services</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled work</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled work</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Work satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st year</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>1st year</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>1st year</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>1st year</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>1st year</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own survey
Note 1: N = 320
Note 2: The N/A answer indicates that participants were unemployed
**Appendix 12.** Income, perceived income sufficiency and level of remittances for male and female participants, 1st year of stay and 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st year</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1st year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income per month</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No income</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 € or less</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201 € – 500 €</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501 € - 800 €</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801 € - 1100 €</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100 € or more</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income sufficiency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than enough</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just enough</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of remittances</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>per month</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No remittances</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 € or less</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 € – 150 €</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151 € - 300 €</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301 € - 500 €</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 € or more</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own survey

Note 1: N = 320

Note 2: Income per month is calculated after taxes
### Appendix 13

Income, perceived income sufficiency and level of remittances for participants from different regions of origin, 1st year of stay and 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region of Origin</th>
<th>The Balkans</th>
<th>Eastern Europe</th>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>The Middle East</th>
<th>Asia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st year</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1st year</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1st year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income per month</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No income</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 € or less</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201 € - 500 €</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501 € - 800 €</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801 € - 1100 €</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100 € or more</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income sufficiency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than enough</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just enough</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Remittances</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No remittances</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 € or less</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 € - 150 €</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151 € - 300 €</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301 € - 500 €</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501 € or more</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own survey

Note 1: N = 320

Note 2: Income per month is calculated after taxes
**Appendix 14.** Qualitative analysis cross-interview themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From settled to hopeless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowballing uncertainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing exclusion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own survey

Note: N = 42
Appendix 15. Male and female economic status, 1st year of stay and 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st year</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1st year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having too little money to buy enough food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being financially unable to afford the cost of childrearing(^2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A(^3)</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being financially unable to pay rent and/or debts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never(^4)</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get disconnected or use less than needed in relation to utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A(^5)</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own survey

Note 2: In the context of the questionnaire interview the term “childrearing” was defined as the process of providing children with everything necessary for their physical, social, emotional and intellectual development (primarily food, clothing, housing, education, safety, etc.)

Note 3: The N/A answer indicates that participants had no children

Note 4: In the context of the questionnaire interview the answer “never” was not only chosen by those who never had any difficulty in paying their rent and/or debts but also by those who never had this type of financial obligations

Note 5: The N/A answer indicates that participants’ accommodation was provided by their employer who was also responsible for covering the cost of utilities
### Appendix 16. Economic status of participants from different regions of origin, 1st year of stay and 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region of Origin</th>
<th>The Balkans</th>
<th>Eastern Europe</th>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>The Middle East</th>
<th>Asia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st year</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1st year</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1st year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Having too little money to buy enough food</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>86.4%</td>
<td>89.8%</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Being unable to afford the cost of childrearing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A²</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Being unable to pay rent and/or debts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never³</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Get disconnected or use less than needed in relation to utilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A²</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own survey

Note 2: In the context of the questionnaire interview the term “childrearing” was defined as the process of providing children with everything necessary for their physical, social, emotional and intellectual development (primarily food, clothing, housing, education, safety, etc.)

Note 3: The N/A answer indicates that participants had no children

Note 4: In the context of the questionnaire interview the answer “never” was not only chosen by those who never had any difficulty in paying their rent and/or debts but also by those who never had this type of financial obligations

Note 5: The N/A answer indicates that participants’ accommodation was provided by their employer who was also responsible for covering the cost of utilities
Appendix 17. Support mechanisms in times of economic need

**Who to rely on in case of financial difficulties**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>1st year</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family and/or friends</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal savings</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare state</td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charity/Church</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had no one to rely on</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own survey

Note: N = 320
**Appendix 18.** Participants’ access to healthcare services

**Health care**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I never tried to access healthcare services</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I never had any difficulty accessing healthcare services</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical consultation or treatment is too expensive</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I didn’t have the time or I had more important problems (housing, food, etc.)</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious administration problems or delays</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language barriers</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of being deported or arrested</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own survey

Note: N = 320
**Appendix 19.** Accommodation type for male and female participants, 1st year of stay and 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Men 1st year</th>
<th>Women 1st year</th>
<th>Total 1st year</th>
<th>Men 2012</th>
<th>Women 2012</th>
<th>Total 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Accommodation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned accommodation</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented accommodation</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared accommodation</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short stay shelter</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>.8%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have nowhere to live in</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>.8%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation provided by my employer</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own survey

Note: N = 320
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region of Origin</th>
<th>The Balkans</th>
<th>Eastern Europe</th>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>The Middle East</th>
<th>Asia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st year</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1st year</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1st year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Accommodation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned accommodation</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented accommodation</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared accommodation</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short stay shelter</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have nowhere to live in</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation provided by my employer</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own survey
Note: N = 320
Appendix 21. Participants’ housing related problems, 1st year of stay and 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of occurrence</th>
<th>Shortage of space</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Too dark, not enough light</th>
<th>Lack of heating or cooling facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st year</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1st year</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own survey

Note 1: N = 320

Note 2: The N/A answer indicates that participants were either living in a short stay shelter or that they had nowhere to live in
Appendix 22. Housing related problems for male and female participants, 1st year of stay and 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st year</td>
<td></td>
<td>1st year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shortage of space</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lack of sufficient lighting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lack of adequate heating of cooling facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own survey

Note 1: N = 320

Note 2: The N/A answer indicates that participants were either living in a short stay shelter or that they had nowhere to live in
## Housing related problems for participants from different regions of origin, 1st year of stay and 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region of origin</th>
<th>The Balkans</th>
<th>Eastern Europe</th>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>The Middle East</th>
<th>Asia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st year</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1st year</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1st year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shortage of space</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lack of sufficient lighting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lack of adequate heating or cooling facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own survey

Note 1: N = 320

Note 2: The N/A answer indicates that participants were either living in a short stay shelter or that they had nowhere to live in
Appendix 24. Housing and neighbourhood satisfaction for male and female participants, 1st year of stay and 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st year 2012</td>
<td>1st year 2012</td>
<td>1st year 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbourhood Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own survey

Note: N = 320
### Housing Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region of Origin</th>
<th>The Balkans</th>
<th>Eastern Europe</th>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>The Middle East</th>
<th>Asia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st year</td>
<td>1st year</td>
<td>1st year</td>
<td>1st year</td>
<td>1st year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Satisfaction</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st year</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhood Satisfaction</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st year</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own survey

Note: N = 320
### Appendix 26. Participants’ neighbourhood related problems, 1st year of stay and 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of occurrence</th>
<th>Insufficient transport</th>
<th>Rubbish lying around</th>
<th>Deliberate damage to property</th>
<th>Racist insults/attacks</th>
<th>Drug trade/prostitution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own survey

Note: N = 320
### Appendix 27. Greatest challenges experienced by participants, 1st year of stay and 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greatest Challenges</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting basic needs (food, housing, etc.)</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding a new culture (Greek customs and ways of doing things)</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcoming the language barrier</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prejudice/Discrimination</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of freedom to do what I want (e.g. practice my religion)</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical care services</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own survey
Note: N = 320
### Appendix 28. Male and female social integration, 1st year of stay and 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I feel that most people here can be trusted</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>1st year</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>1st year</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Most people here treat me with respect     |        |          |      |          |      |       |      |
| Strongly agree                             |        | 10.4%    | 7.8% | 18.9%    | 11.0%| 13.7% | 9.1% |
| Agree                                      |        | 48.2%    | 35.8%| 53.5%    | 47.2%| 50.3% | 40.3%|
| Neutral                                    |        | 21.8%    | 23.3%| 13.4%    | 15.0%| 18.4% | 20.0%|
| Disagree                                   |        | 15.5%    | 28.0%| 11.0%    | 22.0%| 13.9% | 25.6%|
| Strongly disagree                          |        | 4.1%     | 5.2% | 3.1%     | 4.7% | 3.8%  | 5.0% |

| I am worried of being verbally assaulted due to my race or colour |        |          |      |          |      |       |      |
| Strongly agree                             |        | 2.6%     | 7.8% | 3.9%     | 4.7% | 3.2%  | 6.6% |
| Agree                                      |        | 24.4%    | 36.8%| 13.4%    | 22.8%| 20.0% | 31.3%|
| Neutral                                    |        | 19.7%    | 11.5%| 16.5%    | 13.4%| 18.4% | 12.5%|
| Disagree                                   |        | 44.0%    | 33.2%| 48.0%    | 46.5%| 45.6% | 38.4%|
| Strongly disagree                          |        | 9.3%     | 10.4%| 18.1%    | 12.6%| 12.8% | 11.3%|

| I am worried of being physically assaulted due to my race or colour |        |          |      |          |      |       |      |
| Strongly agree                             |        | 1.0%     | 4.7% | 0.8%     | 2.4% | 0.9%  | 3.8% |
| Agree                                      |        | 10.9%    | 23.3%| 6.3%     | 11.0%| 9.1%  | 18.4%|
| Neutral                                    |        | 17.1%    | 15.5%| 12.6%    | 15.0%| 15.3% | 15.3%|
| Disagree                                   |        | 43.0%    | 40.4%| 33.9%    | 40.9%| 39.4% | 40.6%|
| Strongly disagree                          |        | 28.0%    | 16.1%| 46.5%    | 30.7%| 35.3% | 21.9%|

Source: Own survey

Note: N = 320
**Appendix 29.** Social integration for participants from different regions of origin, 1st year of stay and 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region of Origin</th>
<th>The Balkans</th>
<th>Eastern Europe</th>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>The Middle East</th>
<th>Asia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st year</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1st year</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1st year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that most people here can be trusted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most people here treat me with respect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>67.8%</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am worried of being verbally assaulted due to my race or colour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am worried of being physically assaulted due to my race or colour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own survey

Note: N = 320