

MIGRATION TO GREECE FROM THE BALKANS

JENNIFER CAVOUNIDIS

Athens University of Economics and Business, Greece*
 Employment Observatory Research Informatics, Greece

Abstract

In recent decades, Greece has been transformed from a sender to a receiver of migrants. This transformation is here examined with respect to historical background, theoretical framework and policy framework. While large-scale migration to Greece from the Balkans commenced only at the end of the 1980's, today the source countries of Albania, Bulgaria and Romania account for the vast majority of migrants in Greece. Newly available data allow examination of the characteristics of migrants from these countries and the recognition of important differences by nationality and gender in areas such as gender, age, marital status, the "family composition" of migration, the move to Greece and informal networks, occupations of employment, remittance behaviour, and intended length of stay.

JEL Classification: J61, J21, J15

Keywords: Migration, Balkans, Greece, Albania, Bulgaria, Romania

1. Introduction

In recent decades, Greece has been transformed from a major sender of migrants to a major receiver. The overwhelming majority of the migrants it has received are from the Balkans - specifically from Albania, Bulgaria and Romania. While other countries of southern Europe have also experienced transformation from sending to receiving countries over the last decades, in none have Balkan countries played such a decisive role in this transformation as in the case of Greece.

In the cases of Spain and Portugal, the migrant flows that increased in volume from the 1970's were largely from their former colonies in Latin America and Africa, while in the case of Italy, origins of migrants exhibited great variation in terms of

* *Corresponding address:* 76 Patision St., Athens 104 34, Greece
 e-mail: jcavounidis@paep.org.gr

geography and the nature of historical ties to Italy (Cavounidis 2002a). In the case of Greece, major flows commenced more recently and were closely connected to the demise of socialist regimes in Central and Eastern Europe.

According to the population census of 2001, there were 762,191 non-Greek citizens of all ages present in a total population of just under eleven million. Among the non-Greek citizens, there were 438,036 Albanians, accounting for 57.4% of the total foreign population. The second most numerous nationality was the Bulgarian, whose 35,104 citizens accounted for 4.6% of non-Greek citizens, followed by Georgia with 3.0%. Romania ranked fourth, with its 21,994 citizens forming 2.9% of the foreign population. It should be noted that in contrast to the migration experience of Italy, the former states of Yugoslavia play a limited role in migrant flows to Greece.

Thus, the Balkans constitute the main source of migrant flows to Greece. Unlike the experience of other southern European countries that have also been recently transformed from sending to receiving countries, Greece shares common borders with its major source countries. The sources of migration to Greece also differ in another important respect from those of other southern European countries: the predominance of a single source country. Given the relatively small total populations of Albania and Greece, the size of migration from Albania to Greece sets the stage for unique articulation of labour markets and economies of these countries (Cavounidis 2002a).

While it was clear from the early 1990's that Balkan countries were the main sources of the massive migration flows into Greece, little was known about the migrants from these countries. For the first time, data have become available which allow the profile of these migrants to come into focus, as well as allowing the recognition of important differences among the migrants from the three major Balkan countries. Before examining these data, the historical background of the Greek experience with migration will be presented, followed by a theoretical framework for the understanding of the migration experience of Greece and then an overview of the Greek policy framework.

2. Historical background

Since the end of the 19th century, Greece had been a major migrant-sending country. Among the major destinations of Greek emigrants during the first part of the 20th century were the United States and Australia. From the 1950's, European countries also became important destinations, while during the 1960's and 1970's, Germany was a magnet that attracted hundreds of thousands of Greek migrants. With the onset of recession in Germany and other countries of Western Europe in the mid-1970's, the tide turned and heavy return migration commenced (Fakiolas and King 1996).

It was in the mid-1970's that Greece acquired a positive migratory balance for the first time in recent history. This shift in balance was mainly due to declining emigration and return migration by Greeks from Germany and other European countries, but at the same time inflows of non-Greeks were observed. The main sources of immigration at the time were countries in Asia and Africa such as Pakistan, the Philippines and Egypt (Fakiolas and King 1996).

In the 1980's, countries of Central and Eastern Europe began to emerge as source countries. The first noteworthy flows from these areas were observed from the mid 1980's when some of the socialist countries there embarked on a course of liberalization. Migrants began to arrive from Poland and later from Bulgaria and Romania. The flows increased sharply, however, at the end of the decade with the collapse of the former Soviet Union and its allies in the region and then with the collapse of Albania at the beginning of the 1990's.

Significant segments of the flows from the former Soviet Union and from Albania were of Greek origin and were accorded special status. However, until the inauguration of Greece's first programme of regularisation of unauthorized migrants in 1998, the vast majority of the migrants originating from former socialist countries of central and eastern Europe were in Greece illegally. Most of these unauthorized migrants from former socialist countries were from the Balkans. In the 1998 regularisation programme, Albania was the number one source country of applicants, greatly outdistancing all others. In the first stage of the programme, a remarkable 65% of the more than 370,000 applicants were from Albania. Bulgaria figured second, accounting for 7% of the applicants and Romania third, with 4% of the applicants.

3. Theoretical framework

The context of migration into Greece and other countries of Southern Europe over the last few decades appears to differ in important respects from the context of migration from these areas into northern Europe in the previous decades. According to the southern European model of immigration put forward by King (2000), the two flows were governed by different types of labour demand. In the decades after World War II, migration from southern to northern Europe was driven by industrial labour demand and southern European peasants were recruited to become industrial workers in a formal, so-called "Fordist economy". In contrast, present-day migration into southern Europe corresponds to a type of labour demand resulting from the different trajectory of economic development observed in countries of southern Europe.

The South experienced industrialization later and to a lesser extent, with the highly seasonal activities of agriculture and tourism figuring as major economic activities.

Small-scale enterprises continued to abound, and a large proportion of the activities in these enterprises was carried out informally, concealed from the state and its regulatory framework. In King's model, present-day migration into the South is fanned by the demand for flexible labour in the highly seasonal economic activities which are characteristic of these countries: agriculture, fishing, construction and tourism, as well as by labour demand in personal services such as domestic and care work. All these sectors have a long tradition of informality in southern Europe, rendering them prime sites for the use of illegal migrant labour. As noted (Reyneri 1998), the informal economy predated the migrant presence in these countries of southern Europe; migrants were inserted into an already long flourishing sector of the economy.

The economic features identified by King as giving rise to a certain type of migrant labour demand in southern Europe – the predominance of small enterprises, the seasonality of much economic activity and widespread informality of economic activity – are indeed characteristic of Greece. As will be seen, the employment patterns observed of migrants from the Balkans in Greece appear to coincide with King's model of migrant labour demand in southern Europe.

4. Policy framework

Like other countries of southern Europe that witnessed transformation from migrant –senders to migrant-receivers in past decades, Greece was ill-prepared from a policy point of view for its new status as a significant destination country. In the case of Greece, the onset of heavy flows was particularly abrupt, fanned by the collapse of the socialist regimes of the Soviet Union and its allies and then of Albania. The rapid expansion of the unauthorized migrant population that was observed from the end of the 1980's led to great alarm and concern. The first major policy response was adoption of a hastily prepared new migration law in 1991. The law met widespread criticism for its restrictiveness and the burdens it placed on employers who sought to legally recruit migrants from abroad. It soon became apparent that the law failed to stem illegal migration and new policy measures were discussed. The second major response to the expansion of the unauthorised migrant population was the approval in 1997 of the policy of regularization, whose implementation began in 1998. Of the four southern European countries that had been transformed from senders to receivers of migrants, Greece was the last to adopt the policy of regularisation of undocumented migrants (Cavounidis 2002a).

In 2001, a new immigration law was passed. One of its main goals was to curtail illegal immigration, to be achieved by measures such as the strengthening of border controls and the imposition of harsh penalties for the transport, accommodation and

employment of illegal immigrants. Annual migration quotas were to be set by prefecture and region according to the needs of the labour market. The law provided for a new regularization programme, which commenced in June 2001 and attracted applications from approximately 350,000 migrants. The extent of overlap of the migrant population regularised in this programme with that regularised in the previous programme remains unknown but is no doubt substantial. Likewise, the extent of coverage of the programmes is unknown, but most probably a significant proportion of the unauthorised migrants present in Greece did not participate. Some of the factors which appear to have played an important role in inhibiting participation were first, the difficulty of securing legal work and the requisite social security contributions, and second, administrative and organizational deficiencies which meant that migrants were required to wait in long queues and devote inordinate amounts of time to the attempt to become regularised, thereby jeopardizing work opportunities and income (Cavounidis forthcoming).

5. Data sources

The new data sources that will be used below in order to examine the characteristics of migrants from the Balkans and discern differences among migrants from the three major Balkan countries are: 1) the 2001 population census, 2) the 1998 programme for regularization of unauthorised migrants, the first of its kind conducted in Greece,¹ and 3) a representative sample survey of the newly legalized migrant population which was carried out in 2000. These three sources of data will be briefly described and compared.

The data from the 2001 population census concern all those enumerated in the census, including of course authorized and unauthorized migrants. As is well known, unauthorized migrants are particularly likely to remain undetected, not only because they sometimes evade enumeration for fear they may come to the attention of authorities but also because they often do not reside in "typical" dwellings. However, it appears that the 2001 census was quite successful with respect to coverage,² due in part to the preceding advertising campaign which attempted to assuage the fears of unauthorised migrants. While the census can be considered "superior" as a data source in that it approaches near total coverage of the population, it has several drawbacks for the study of migrants. First, its division into Greek nationals and

1. At the time of writing, data on characteristics of migrants who participated in the second programme for regularization of unauthorised migrants (which began in 2001) were not yet available.

2. In comparison, in the quarterly Labour Force Surveys of the recent past, migrants appear to have been under-represented among the households sampled.

foreigners means that migrants who have acquired Greek citizenship cannot be discerned. Second, the data on "foreigners" are often not broken down by nationality, making it impossible to examine and compare the characteristics of migrants of different nationalities, as attempted here for countries of the Balkans.

The data from the 1998 regularisation programme derive from the applications submitted in the two stages of the procedure (Cavounidis 2002b). In the first or "white card" stage, 371,641 unauthorised migrants participated, rendering it the largest regularization programme ever carried out in Europe up to that point in time, surpassing the three Italian programmes, the three Spanish programmes and the two Portuguese programmes that had been carried out hitherto. However, only 212,860 of these migrants continued to the second or "green card" stage of the programme, which resulted in regularization and the issue of a work permit. The large dropout rate between the two stages of the programme is mainly due to the fact that in the second stage migrants were required to present proof of legal employment with social security contributions, while many employers refused to formalize their work relations with migrants. It should be noted that while the overall percentage of continuation to the second stage was 57%, the corresponding percentage for the Albanians was 55%, for the Bulgarians 65% and for the Romanians 49%.

The data from the regularization programme obviously cover a subset of the migrant population, namely those who 1) either entered Greece illegally or entered legally but subsequently became illegal and 2) applied for regularization. As mentioned previously, the extent of coverage of the programme remains unknown but undoubtedly a very substantial proportion of the unauthorised population did not participate. The data could be considered, however, to give some indication of the composition of the unauthorized migrant population present in Greece at a particular period, although it is not possible to ascertain the extent to which the participation rates by various nationalities, gender, or other characteristics, were similar.

The sample survey that will be drawn on below (Cavounidis 2003b) was carried out among the newly regularised migrant population who had successfully submitted applications for the "green card" mentioned above. In order to ensure that the sample would be representative of the legalized migrant population as a whole, quotas were set by nationality and gender on the basis of the data concerning applications for the "green card" (Cavounidis 2002b). Specifically, quotas were set by gender for the ten most numerous nationalities, and for an eleventh category which included the remaining nationalities.

Interviews were carried out in the summer of 2000 with 1074 migrants in the Athens area at local offices of the Labour Force Employment Organisation, which had been charged with the administration of the 1998 regularisation programme as

well as with the renewal of the permits granted in the programme.³ Some of the interviewers employed in the study were native speakers of Albanian, Russian, and Ukrainian and conducted interviews in these languages in order to minimize language problems. Of the migrants who were interviewed, 624 or 58.1% were Albanian, 80 or 7.4% were Bulgarian and 43 or 4.0% were Romanian. Their corresponding percentages in the “green card” population as a whole were 61.8%, 7.7% and 3.9%.⁴

6. Gender, age, marital status and “family composition” of migration

The data on gender, age, marital status, and the “family composition” of migration reveal important variations in the profile of migrants from the different Balkan countries. While most of the migrants from the Balkans are men, differences are observed in the gender composition by source country. Men form the majority of migrants from Albania and Romania while women form the majority of migrants from Bulgaria. Of the “white card” applicants in the 1998 regularisation programme, 83% of the Albanians were men as were 69% of the Romanians, but women accounted for 57% of the Bulgarian applicants. A more “balanced” gender composition of Albanians is exhibited in the census data, which include foreigners of all ages, whether in school, active or inactive in the labour force.

Table 1. Gender by Nationality

	Albanian	Bulgarian	Romanian
Men	257,149 (58.7%)	13,888 (39.6%)	12,447 (56.6%)
Women	180,887 (41.3%)	21,216 (60.4%)	9,547 (43.4%)
Total	438,036 (100%)	35,104 (100%)	21,994 (100%)

Source: Greek population census of 2001.

3. The study was conducted by the National Labour Institute and its successor organisation, the Employment Observatory Research-Informatics.

4. It should be noted that the data from the regularisation programme utilised in this paper concern not the “green card” population, but the larger “white card” population of which it forms a subset (see previous paragraph in this section about the regularisation data).

As for age, the Bulgarian migrants are notably older than the Albanians and Romanians. Unfortunately, available census data do not allow examination of age by gender as well as nationality. It should be noted that according to the data on migrants who applied for “white cards” in the 1998 regularization programme, which correspond of course to a more economically active population than do the data of the population census, women applicants from Albania and Bulgaria were much older than their male compatriots, while women applicants from Romania were slightly younger than their male counterparts.

Table 2. Age Group by Nationality

	Albanian	Bulgarian	Romanian
0-14	93,510 (21.3%)	3,068 (8.7%)	1,398 (6.4%)
15-19	40,616 (9.3%)	1,877 (5.3%)	1,050 (4.8%)
20-24	57,275 (13.1%)	3,522 (10.0%)	4,276 (19.4%)
25-29	61,847 (14.1%)	4,940 (14.1%)	5,574 (25.3%)
30-44	126,325 (28.8%)	13,097 (37.3%)	7,879 (35.8%)
45-64	47,954 (10.9%)	8,002 (22.8%)	1,587 (7.2%)
65+	10,509 (2.4%)	598 (1.7%)	230 (1.0%)
Total	438,036 (100%)	35,104 (100%)	21,994 (100%)

Source: Greek population census of 2001.

With regard to marital status, men and women from the Balkans appear to present very different profiles according to the data from the 1998 regularization programme. Nearly half of the Albanian men who applied for regularization were single, while almost all of the Albanian women were married (Table 3). In comparison, much smaller proportions of Bulgarian men and women were single, while noteworthy proportions of Bulgarian women were divorced and widowed. Unfortunately, data on marital status by nationality and gender are not available from the 2001 population census. As the census reflects the wider migrant population and not only the migrant population that was undocumented at some point in time and desired regularization mainly for work reasons, the picture presented by the census data would presumably differ from that presented by the regularization data.

The three Balkan nationalities appear to exhibit important differences in terms of the “family composition” of migration. In the sample survey of regularised migrants, interviewees who were married were asked about the location of their spouse and those who were parents were asked about the location of their children. For some groups of men and women, migration is almost always a “family affair” that in-

cludes spouse and children while for others it is often an experience of separation (Cavounidis 2003a, Cavounidis 2003b).

Table 3. Marital Status by Nationality and Gender

	Albanian		Bulgarian		Romanian	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Single	94,645 (49.1%)	6,194 (15.3%)	3,220 (30.9%)	3,058 (21.9%)	6,325 (55.9%)	2,668 (52.7%)
Married	97,073 (50.3%)	32,492 (80.4%)	6,808 (65.4%)	8,264 (59.2%)	4,777 (42.2%)	2,009 (39.7%)
Divorced	863 (0.4%)	1,114 (2.8%)	319 (3.1%)	1,867 (13.4%)	192 (1.7%)	315 (6.2%)
Widowed	218 (0.1%)	624 (1.5%)	60 (0.6%)	763 (5.5%)	26 (0.2%)	71 (1.4%)
Total	192,799 (100%)	40,424 (100%)	10,407 (100%)	13,952 (100%)	11,320 (100%)	5,063 (100%)

Source: Greek regularization programme of 1998 (Cavounidis 2002b).

It is particularly Bulgarian women who are prone to “solitary” migration. Only 33% of married Bulgarian women were together in Greece with their spouses. In comparison, 81% of the Bulgarian men had their spouses present in Greece. As for the Romanians, 75% of the married women and 64% of the married men were in Greece together with their spouses.

The Albanian nationality stands alone with respect to the family character of migration. There is no variation by gender: married men as well as married women are almost always in Greece together with the spouse. Specifically, for 93% of the married Albanian men and 94% of the married Albanian women, the spouse is present.

As for the presence of children, once again the Albanian nationality comes to the fore in terms of the family character of migration. Almost all Albanian women (92%) and Albanian men (86%) who are parents, have all of their children with them in Greece. This pattern lies in sharp contrast with the experience of the Bulgarians. Of Bulgarian women, only 14% had all their children in Greece with them, and only 33% of the Bulgarian men. As for Romanians, the corresponding proportions were 25% for women and 70% for men.

These very different patterns of migration according to gender, marital status, and accompanying members, are suggestive of different migration strategies and of different local contexts of decision-making in the country of origin. More information on local contexts in communities of origin would promote understanding of

why it is women and men of certain family situations or at certain stages of the family life cycle who are prone to migrate to Greece and why from some communities men and women invariably migrate as a family unit, as in the case of Albania, while from others men, and particularly women, are likely to migrate without spouses and children. Among the factors that would need to be examined by research into the local contexts that shape patterns of migration are first, attitudes and realities with respect to the gender division of labour inside and outside the home and second, the impact of economic restructuring and the introduction of market processes on employment opportunities for men as compared to women, on social welfare systems, and on the ways in which domestic and care work are performed and combined with employment.

7. The Move to Greece

Another aspect of the social context of migration that has drawn wide attention in recent decades is that of social networks and their role in facilitating migration flows. Informal networks of relatives, friends, and acquaintances connect potential migrants in communities of origin with locations in destination countries, and provide valuable goods and services to newcomers such as information about employment opportunities, temporary housing, help with adaptation to the new environment, emotional support, etc. (e.g. Boyd 1989, Portes 1995). As has been noted (Sassen 1995), members of informal networks sometimes even arrange a job for migrants prior to their arrival. Therefore, networks not only support new migrants after their arrival by providing important information and services, but their very existence emboldens potential migrants to make the move. Increasingly, social networks figure in the migration literature alongside “push” and “pull” factors, as a third, additional, factor shaping migration flows (e.g. Martin 2002).

In the representative survey of the regularised population in Greece, migrants were asked about the relatives, friends and acquaintances they had in Greece prior to their own arrival. The results indicate that the vast majority of Albanians – 75% – had someone they knew in Greece before they migrated. More specifically, a remarkable 60% had a relative already there while an additional 15% had a friend or acquaintance there but not a relative (Cavounidis 2003b). This is perhaps not surprising given the exceptionally large proportion of the total population of Albania that has migrated to Greece at some point in time. According to a field study carried out in Albania in 1995 by the International Organisation for Migration, which examined the profile and motives of potential migrants from Albania, it was found that two-thirds of Albanians had relatives who had departed in recent years and were living outside Albania. Half of these had relatives living in Greece, compared to one-fifth who had relatives living in Italy (International Organisation for Migration 1995).

Compared to the Albanians, fewer Bulgarians had someone already in Greece at the time of their arrival. Specifically, 28% had a relative, and an additional 31% a friend or acquaintance but not a relative. Of the Romanians, 46% had a relative and 35% a friend or acquaintance.

The existence of relatives, friends and acquaintances already in Greece was indeed reported by migrants of the study as being one of the main reasons for their choice of Greece as country of destination. With respect to the reasons cited for the choice of Greece, it should be noted that in the pilot interviews that preceded the survey, the question "Why did you choose to migrate to Greece?" drew only very general answers and thus for the full-fledged survey the question was rephrased as follows: "Why did you choose to migrate to Greece and not to another country, for example, Italy?"

The reasons most often cited by Albanians and Bulgarians for their choice of Greece were its proximity and the fact that they already had relatives, friends and acquaintances there. The former was mentioned by 39% of the Albanians and 43% of the Bulgarians while the latter by 37% of the Albanians and 42% of the Bulgarians.⁵ In comparison, 65% of the Romanians cited the existence of relatives, friends and acquaintances, and only 5% proximity. While Romania lies close, it does not share a border with Greece as do Albania and Bulgaria.

It should be noted with respect to proximity that Albanians often referred to the economic advantages entailed in proximity. Proximity decreased the cost, time and difficulty involved in the move. Many Albanians mentioned that they could get to Greece on foot, thereby avoiding various expenses. For example, one Albanian stated, "In order to get to Italy you need lots of money because you go by boat. I came here on foot". Or, as another said, "To go to Italy, you need money. To come to Greece you only need feet". In this regard, it is worth comparing remarks made by Albanian migrants to Italy. As noted in a field study (Reyneri 1998), very few of the Albanian migrants to Italy had chosen Italy because it was the cheapest or easiest country to get to, although many did mention that once inside Italy, it was easy to remain there and work illegally because there was little internal control. According to the study, many of the Albanian migrants in Italy believed that it was also easy in Greece to find work without having proper papers, but they preferred the Italian underground economy to the Greek because wages were better.

5. It should be noted that the reasons for choice of Greece as country of destination were solicited in an open-ended question. There is little doubt that the proportions citing proximity and the existence of relatives, friends and acquaintances, would have been much greater if migrants had been directly asked if these had played a role in their decision.

With respect to the choice of destination country, it is interesting to note the findings of studies conducted by the International Organisation for Migration (1995, 1997) in Albania and Bulgaria in an attempt to assess migration potential from those countries. In the 1995 Albanian study, 44% of the respondents of the "focus groups" studied considered it likely that they would migrate to another country to work for a few years. Most of those who had migrated and returned, had lived in Greece. Of those who had relatives who had left Albania after 1992, Greece was the most common destination country of these relatives: 47% had relatives in Greece, 21% in Italy and 9% in Germany. Despite all the above, Greece was not among the destination countries that figured as most desirable, which were the U.S.A., Germany and Italy. As for the study assessing migration potential from Bulgaria (International Organisation for Migration 1997), it is interesting that Greece was the most common answer given in response to the question posed to Bulgarians about where they would go if they were to go abroad to work for a few months but not a frequent response as to where they would go if they were to migrate for the rest of their lives.

From these studies about migration potential from Albania and Bulgaria, it appears that for many potential migrants, Greece is not a particularly desirable destination but rather a feasible destination. This would seem to be due to the factors previously mentioned, namely the existence of relatives, friends, and acquaintances already in Greece, and proximity, given that both Albanian and Bulgaria share borders with Greece.

8. Employment

With respect to employment, it should be noted first that the vast majority of migrants in Greece perform manual work, whatever their educational and technical qualifications. According to a report by the OECD (2002), a comparison of 25 OECD member-countries indicates that Greece exhibits the most extreme concentration of migrants in manual occupations. Specifically, only 10% of foreigners in Greece worked in non-manual occupations, while the second smallest percentage, that of Austria, was 22%, considerably greater. Of course, it should be noted that among the OECD countries studied, the smallest proportions of the total work force in non-manual occupations were those of Greece and Hungary, with 40%. However, it should also be noted that the greatest divergence between the percentage of foreigners in non-manual occupations and the percentage of the total labour force in such occupations was that of Greece (10% as compared to 40%). The divergence noted for Greece was much larger than that observed for other countries of southern Europe that also underwent transformation from migrant-sending countries to migrant-receiving countries in recent decades. Specifically, in Italy 26% of foreigners compared to 43% of the total employed population were in non-manual occupations while in Spain and

Portugal there was little divergence. The very different distribution of migrants in Greece to occupations and branches of economic activity as compared to the distribution of the total labour force was highlighted in an analysis (Lianos 2003) of data from the Greek Labour Force Survey of 2001.

Nearly all migrants to Greece from the Balkans, just as those from other countries of origin, are engaged in manual work. The examination of the 2001 census data on the employment of foreigners shows that the overwhelming majority of employed Albanians, Bulgarians and Romanians were classified in one of three manual groups:⁶ 1) craft and related workers, 2) plant and machine operators or 3) “elementary occupations” which include unskilled occupations in agriculture, industry and services. When the data are examined by gender, it is revealed that Romanian women differ markedly from other groups, exhibiting a lesser degree of concentration in these manual occupations and a notable presence in some non-manual occupations (Table 4).

Table 4. Occupational Group by Nationality and Gender*

	Albanian		Bulgarian		Romanian	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Managers and senior officials	1,437 (0.8%)	361 (0.7%)	97 (1.0%)	87 (0.7%)	91 (0.9%)	57 (1.3%)
Professional occupations and artists	1,219 (0.7%)	495 (0.9%)	101 (1.0%)	178 (1.4%)	111 (1.1%)	147 (3.4%)
Associate professional + technical	1,031 (0.6%)	593 (1.1%)	121 (1.2%)	206 (1.7%)	70 (0.7%)	115 (2.6%)
Office workers	1,661 (1.0%)	744 (1.4%)	86 (0.9%)	128 (1.0%)	89 (0.9%)	91 (2.1%)
Service workers + salesworkers	10,696 (6.5%)	8,709 (16.7%)	491 (5.0%)	2,159 (17.4%)	419 (4.3%)	1,011 (23.1%)
Skilled agric. and related occupations	13,690 (8.3%)	4,340 (8.3%)	1,111 (11.4%)	1,099 (8.9%)	736 (7.6%)	428 (9.8%)
Skilled trades occupations, Machine operatives, Elementary Occupations	134,906 (81.9%)	36,934 (70.8%)	7,718 (79.4%)	8,546 (68.9%)	8,150 (84.3%)	2,525 (57.7%)
Total	164,640 (100%)	52,176 (100%)	9,725 (100%)	12,931 (100%)	9,666 (100%)	4,374 (100%)

Source: Greek population census of 2001.

* It should be noted that the totals and percentages were arrived at after the exclusion of the employed for whom there was not adequate information for occupation.

6. Unfortunately, these three major ISCO occupational groups are combined in the census data for the employment of foreigners.

The 2001 census data on employment by occupational groups are best seen in tandem with the data on employment by branch of economic activity, given that neither breakdown is detailed but instead consists of broad groupings. The data on branch of economic activity not only complement the picture given by data on occupations but also allow us to distinguish important differences in employment by nationality. Moreover, the gender dimension of employment comes to the fore. In the data on employment by occupational groups, on the other hand, gender differences were largely concealed due to the fact that all unskilled occupations – whether agricultural, industrial or service work, were all together in a single category which also included skilled industrial labour.

According to the data on employment by branch of economic activity, construction and agriculture are the main sectors of employment of men. Construction is the main sector of employment of Albanian and Romanian men, while agriculture is the main sector of employment for Bulgarian men. It should be noted that demand for migrant labour in Greek agriculture is highly seasonal (Lianos, Sarris and Katseli 1996; Kasimis, Papadopoulos and Zacopoulou 2003). As for the manufacturing sector, it employed much smaller percentages of men of all three nationalities.

Women of all three nationalities are concentrated in the aggregate category “remaining services”, apparently owing to the inclusion here of the branch “private households with employed persons”, which covers women employed as domestic workers. Approximately half of Albanian and Romanian women are classified here, and over one-third of Romanian women (Table 5). While these data on branch of economic activity give an indication of the concentration of migrant women in low level service work, the full extent of the employment of migrant women in such occupations is not apparent in the census statistics, first because women perform low level service occupations such as cleaning not only in private homes, of course, but in all branches of economic activity, and second because - as already seen in the occupational data of the census - unskilled occupations in agriculture, manufacturing and the services are grouped together with skilled industrial occupations.

Another assessment of the importance of cleaning and other low-level service work for migrant women is afforded by the aforementioned sample survey of the legalized population due to the detailed coding of occupations that was adopted. It must be borne in mind that all the migrants interviewed in the survey had applied for regularization in Athens and that therefore agriculture and other occupations prevalent in rural areas were absent or under-represented.

Table 5. Branch of Economic Activity by Nationality and Gender*

	Albanian		Bulgarian		Romanian	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Agriculture	162,655 (24.0%)	8,089 (15.6%)	4,291 (47.3%)	3,295 (26.8%)	2,574 (28.1%)	1,006 (23.2%)
Mining	429 (0.2%)	12 (0.0%)	29 (0.3%)	0	11 (0.1%)	1 (0.0%)
Manufacturing	18,962 (11.0%)	4,815 (9.3%)	917 (10.1%)	531 (4.3%)	1,421 (15.5%)	439 (10.1%)
Utilities	261 (0.1%)	12 (0.0%)	20 (0.2%)	0	42 (0.4%)	1 (0.0%)
Construction	72,098 (44.3%)	559 (1.1%)	2,376 (26.2%)	119 (1.0%)	3,839 (41.9%)	47 (1.1%)
Commerce, hotels, restaurants	20,339 (12.5%)	10,211 (19.7%)	996 (11.0%)	2,048 (16.6%)	957 (10.4%)	1,170 (26.9%)
Transport, storage, communications	4,029 (2.3%)	253 (0.5%)	360 (4.0%)	53 (0.4%)	209 (2.2%)	45 (1.0%)
Banking, insurance, finance	127 (0.1%)	138 (0.2%)	12 (0.1%)	19 (0.1%)	14 (0.1%)	13 (0.3%)
Remaining services	6,050 (3.5%)	27,712 (53.5%)	513 (5.7%)	6,246 (50.7%)	400 (3.9%)	1,613 (37.1%)
Total	162,655 (100%)	51,836 (100%)	9,066 (100%)	12,313 (100%)	9,154 (100%)	4,341 (100%)

Source: Greek population census of 2001.

* It should be noted that the totals and percentages were arrived at after the exclusion of the employed for whom there was not adequate information for branch of economic activity.

In the survey, 80% of all the legalized migrant women were classified as belonging to cleaning and personal service occupations, which are often combined in the same job, as in the case of domestic workers who both clean and care for children or the elderly. Specifically, occupations included in this group were domestic workers, cleaners of offices, hotels and premises other than homes, child-minders, minders of the elderly, waitresses, cooks, and dishwashers. The great majority of women of all Balkan nationalities did this kind of work: 86% of the Bulgarians, 76% of the

Albanians and 71% of the Romanians.⁷ It should be noted that in a 1996 study of 100 Bulgarian migrants in Greece, it was found that of the 75 women in the study, 47 cared for children or for the elderly, 18 were cleaners of homes and other premises, and 6 were waitresses, barwomen, cooks and dishwashers (Markova and Sarris 1997).

While women of all three Balkan nationalities were concentrated in this type of work, a very interesting distinction comes to the fore when household composition of the migrants is examined. Namely, it appears that Albanian women are particularly reluctant to take on work as live-in domestic workers. In the survey of the legalized population, only 2% of the Albanians, men and women, lived with their employer while the corresponding percentage for Bulgarians was 19% and for Romanians 5%. The apparent reluctance of Albanians to co-reside with employers makes sense given the very high incidence observed for Albanian women of presence of spouse and children, while as noted previously, Bulgarian women are likely to have left spouse and children behind in country of origin.

These patterns of employment of Balkan migrants to Greece are broadly consistent with the "Southern European model of immigration" put forward by King (2000) and outlined above, according to which migration into countries of southern Europe corresponds to the demand for flexible labour in the seasonal activities which are prominent in these economies, as well as in personal service activities such as domestic and care work. At least two-thirds of the men of each of the three Balkan nationalities were engaged in the seasonal activities of construction and agriculture. As for women, the overwhelming majority of each nationality was engaged in low-skilled service occupations such as cleaning and domestic work, which are characterized by lower seasonality (except when carried out in hotels and other tourism-related businesses) but are notorious for the extent of informality.

In some national contexts, the employment of migrant women in domestic and care work has been analysed with respect to the "dismantling" of the welfare state in recent decades. However, in the case of Greece, as in other countries of southern Europe, the welfare state did not develop to the extent observed in other European states to the North (Ferrera, 1996; Katrougalos 1996; Matsaganis 2000). Many of the service activities undertaken within the public sector in countries of the North, such as care of children and of the elderly, were in the South carried out in the

7. For sake of comparison, it should be mentioned that the highest percentage recorded for this occupational group among the ten nationalities included in the sample survey of the regularised population was that of Philippino women, of whom 96% did this kind of work while the lowest recorded was that of the Romanian women, of whom 71% did this type of work.

context of the family, almost always by women. Correspondingly, women's economic activity rates have been lower in southern countries of the European Union than those in most countries of the North. In Greece, as in Italy, Spain and Portugal, domestic work and care work are important areas of employment for the migrant flows to these new receiving countries (Anderson and Phizacklea 1997; Anthias and Lazaridis 2001; Kofman 2003). The increased employment of migrant women in domestic and care work in Greece as in other countries of southern Europe must be analyzed together with shifts in the economic activity of native women.

It should be noted that many of the legalized migrants in Greece from the Balkans, just as those from other source countries, work illegally even though they have acquired the prerequisites to work legally. It is often difficult to find legal employment because many employers who want to take on migrants refuse to formalize the work relationship by drawing up a contract and making social security contributions. Due to relatively lax control of the labour market, it appears that in most cases employers can use migrant labour illegally without serious fear of sanctions. Of course, it is not only migrants who are employed in the informal economy but native Greeks as well.

Although there are no data on which to base assessments of the extent of illegal employment among migrants, responses to some questions posed in the aforementioned survey of the legalized population are telling. In their interviews, migrants were asked about the problems they faced in Greece. A remarkable 44% of all migrants mentioned the difficulties they faced in finding legal work, in other words, work for which employers agreed to formal relations and social security contributions. Many of the legalized migrants had in fact acquired the social security "stamps" or contributions required for regularization by extra-ordinary means, such as their purchase on the "black market" (Cavounidis 2003b). In any case, according to data released by IKA, the largest Greek social security fund covering private sector employment, in June 2003 foreigners constituted 9.8% of those employed in "common enterprises" of all sizes who were insured with this fund.

It should be noted that in the above account of work done by migrants, activities in the sex industry have not been taken into consideration. Although of course no relevant data are available, substantial numbers of women migrants from Balkan countries appear to be involved (Emke-Poulopoulou 2001). According to one study of Albanians in Athens carried out in the early 1990's (Psimmenos 1994), large numbers of Albanian women and children in Athens were employed in the sex industry.

Another dimension of migrant employment that has attracted wide attention in the literature is that of entrepreneurship. In many destination countries it has been observed that migrants of certain nationalities are particularly likely to become self-

employed whereas migrants of other nationalities nearly always work for wages or salaries. In the case of Greece, the phenomenon of ethnic entrepreneurship appears to be relatively limited to date, especially when taking into consideration the exceptionally large proportion of the Greek labour force as a whole that is self-employed. According to the population census of 2001, 30% of the employed population in Greece was self-employed and 5% was classified as "unpaid family workers". Only 65% of the employed population worked for wages or salaries, which is a very low proportion relative to other countries of the European Union. Unfortunately, the census data do not provide information on work status by nationality. However, in the sample survey of the legalized migrant population, such information was collected. Compared to the proportion of the total Greek labour force that is self-employed, migrants exhibit very low levels. Among the factors that have served to limit the numbers of migrant entrepreneurs are no doubt the legal framework concerning the acquisition of business permits by foreigners as well as the bureaucracy entailed. With regard to these data on self-employment, once again the urban setting of the sample survey should be borne in mind: the proportions of self-employed migrants are likely to be even lower in rural areas, where many migrants work in agriculture but rarely own farmland.

Although the overall proportion of migrants in the survey who were self-employed was low, notable variation was observed among nationalities. As for Balkan migrants, 5% of the Albanians, 3% of the Bulgarians and 0% of the Romanians were self-employed, while other nationalities represented in the survey exhibited greater proportions: of the Egyptians, 13% were self-employed, as were 8% of the Indians and 7% of the Poles (Cavounidis 2003b). These differences are no doubt related to factors such as length of stay; the Egyptian and the Polish are among the older migrant communities in Greece.

9. Remittance behaviour

The sending of remittances by migrants is an issue of special interest to policymakers in both sending and receiving countries. For sending countries, remittances are important for development prospects and often surpass the amount of foreign direct investment and development assistance. In receiving countries, remittances are often considered a loss to the national economy and their levels are often taken into consideration when policymakers weigh the costs and benefits of migration.

In the survey of the legalized population carried out in Athens, migrants were asked about their remittance behaviour. Important differences were discerned among migrants from Albania, Bulgaria, and Romania.

Propensity to remit was ascertained to be lowest among Albanians and highest among Romanians (Table 6). The unexpectedly high proportion of Albanians who do not remit is no doubt related to the very different “family composition” of their migration. As seen previously, married Albanians are almost always in Greece together with spouse and children, while Romanians and particularly Bulgarians are likely to have left them behind. It would be logical to expect that migrants with spouses and children in the source country would be more likely to send remittances. It should be noted that a study of Albanians living in Thessaloniki, the major city in northern Greece, also found that a large proportion of Albanians – 52% - did not send remittances back to Albania (Lambrianidis and Lymberaki 2001). As for the monetary amount of the remittances sent home each month, Bulgarians were found to send the largest amounts, with 38% sending more than 60,000 drachmae a month.

Table 6. Monthly Remittances by Nationality (in drachmae)

	Albanian		Bulgarian		Romanian	
Not sending	361	(58.5%)	26	(32.5%)	6	(14.0%)
Less than 30,000	110	(17.8%)	6	(7.5%)	6	(14.0%)
30,000-59,000	93	(15.1%)	18	(22.5%)	18	(41.9%)
60,000-89,000	15	(2.4%)	12	(15.0%)	5	(11.6%)
90,000 or more	38	(6.2%)	18	(22.5%)	8	(18.6%)

Source: Sample survey of the regularised population (Cavounidis 2003b).

Migrants were furthermore asked if they were working and gathering money towards certain goals. Specifically, they were asked whether they were working in order to support a family back home, in order to purchase or build a home there, or in order to invest there, whether in farmland, a business, or something else. For all three Balkan nationalities, the greatest frequency of affirmative responses was recorded for the question about the goal of support for a family back home. Specifically, 79% of the Romanians, 62% of the Bulgarians and 37% of the Albanians declared this to be a goal of their working in Greece (Table 7). Once again, the divergence of the Albanian nationality can probably best be interpreted in terms of their different pattern of migration, in which married men and women migrate together with their spouses and children, contrary to the experience of many Bulgarians and Romanians. It should be noted that the type of kin relationship with “family” back home whose support was a goal of migration, was not explored in the study. With respect to the other goals enquired about, it is interesting that the Romanians recorded a particularly high proportion of affirmative responses for the goal of pur-

chase or construction of a residence back in their country of origin. As for the goal of investment in farmland, a business, etc. back home, Romanians again registered the highest proportion with affirmative responses.

Table 7. Reasons for Working in Greece by Nationality*

	Albanian		Bulgarian		Romanian	
Support of family back home	229	(37.1%)	49	(62.0%)	34	(79.1%)
Home purchase or construction	182	(29.5%)	15	(19.0%)	21	(48.8%)
Other investment	204	(33.3%)	22	(28.2%)	19	(44.2%)

Source: Sample survey of the regularised population (Cavounidis 2003b).

** The three columns represent affirmative answers to the three independent questions.*

10. Intended length of stay

While considerable proportions of migrants from all Balkan nationalities cited purchase or construction of a home in country of origin or another type of investment there as a reason for working in Greece, this cannot be taken as a proxy for intention to end their "career" as migrants in Greece and repatriate. Over the last decade, the "transnational" character of migration has been a primary focus in the international migration literature, which has highlighted the very complex and often unexpected (by researchers) ways in which migrants combine activities in sending and receiving countries. In the past, much of the literature saw migration as a one-way process of adaptation and assimilation in the host country, accompanied by the gradual weakening of ties with source country. Today, however, it is increasingly recognised that migrants continue to participate in economic, social and political activities in both places, facilitated by new communication and transportation technologies, and thereby demonstrate their identity as members of two different communities simultaneously (Portes 2000). It should be noted that, contrary to what might be expected, it has been observed that regularization programmes often have the effect of strengthening the ties of migrants with source countries. In a study of migrants legalized in the United States, it was ascertained that those who were legalized traveled back to the source country more often, while those who remained unauthorised did not travel because they feared they would be arrested if they attempted return (Hagan and Baker 1993). With respect to Bulgarian migrants in Greece, it has been observed that freedom to travel between Greece and Bulgaria was one of the main incentives for Bulgarians to participate in the regularization programme (Markova 2001).

Prediction of settlement outcomes of migrants is always a difficult venture, regardless of the sending and receiving countries involved. It would appear, however, to be particularly difficult in the case of Balkan migrants in Greece today, given that Greece's engagement with migration as a major receiving country is of limited historical depth, commencing only in the late 1980's, and given that the experience of the Balkan countries with migration after the opening of their borders is also of limited historical depth. Moreover, economic prospects in Albania, Bulgaria and Romania remain unknown.

Migrants' decisions as to remaining or returning are forever in the process of reassessment, as they hinge on a constellation of factors in host and source countries which are constantly subject to change. Therefore, declarations made by migrants at any point in time with respect to their intentions as to the time horizon of their stay in Greece cannot be taken as reliable indicators of settlement outcomes. However, it is worth examining the responses of migrants to Greece interviewed in the sample survey of the legalized population as to their predicted length of stay.

It should be noted first that important differences among the three Balkan nationalities were not observed. Similar proportions of each nationality placed themselves in the various time horizons with respect to length of stay. Roughly one-third of the migrants of each nationality estimated that they would remain in Greece for less than ten years, approximately 30% planned to be in Greece "forever", while another 30% responded that they didn't know or that it depended on certain factors (Table 8). It should be noted that many of the migrants who said they didn't know or that it depended on certain factors, reported that they intended to stay if they could find satisfactory work and arrange renewal of their permits.

Table 8. Intended Length of Stay by Nationality

	Albanian		Bulgarian		Romanian	
Less than one year	44	(7.2%)	6	(8.0%)	3	(7.0%)
1 – 4 years	97	(15.9%)	15	(20.0%)	9	(20.9%)
5 – 9 years	49	(8.0%)	5	(6.7%)	2	(4.7%)
At least ten years but not forever	51	(8.4%)	4	(5.3%)	4	(9.3%)
Forever	182	(29.8%)	22	(29.3%)	12	(27.9%)
Don't know, it depends	187	(30.7%)	23	(30.7%)	13	(30.2%)
Total	610	(100%)	75	(100%)	43	(100%)

Source: Sample survey of the regularised population (Cavounidis 2003b).

11. Conclusion

Large-scale migration to Greece from Albania, Bulgaria and Romania is a recent phenomenon, commencing upon the liberalization and collapse of their socialist regimes. Migrants from the Balkans form the vast majority of the migrant population in Greece today, while one Balkan country, Albania, accounts for over half of the total foreign population in Greece today.

Examination of marital status and “family composition” of migration reveals very different profiles of the three nationalities. According to the regularization data, which correspond to an economically active population and allow examination of marital status by nationality, nearly all the Albanian women who applied for regularization were married and hardly any were divorced or widowed, whereas among the Bulgarian nationality most women were married but noteworthy proportions were either divorced or widowed. In contrast to the Albanian and Bulgarian women, a large proportion of the Romanian women – more than half – were single. As for the men, approximately half of the Albanians and of the Romanians were single, compared to less than one-third of the Bulgarians.

The Albanian nationality is characterized as no other by a family pattern of migration. Nearly all married Albanians, men and women, are in Greece with their spouses, whereas the corresponding proportions of Bulgarians and Romanians are much smaller, particularly for Bulgarian women. Likewise, nearly all Albanians who are parents have their children with them in Greece. Romanian parents, and particularly Bulgarian parents, are prone to migrating without their children. Bulgarian mothers represent the extreme case, the overwhelming majority of whom leave behind children in Bulgaria.

These very different patterns of migration according to gender, marital status and accompanying members, may have important implications for future settlement patterns of migrants from the Balkans and modes of incorporation in Greek society. Of course the fact that some migrants have left spouses and children behind does not mean that they may not bring them in the future, just as those who are in Greece with family, may at some point return to their country of origin. However, the different patterns of migration shape different contexts and factors which must be taken into consideration with respect to future migration decisions. For example, the fact that in some groups of migrants, particularly the Albanian, large proportions have children attending Greek schools while in others, many have children back in their place of origin, would seem to lead to differences in future outcomes.

With regard to employment, there is little differentiation in the profiles of Albanian, Bulgarian, and Romanian migrants. Regardless of their educational qualifications, nearly all migrants from the Balkans perform manual work. Men of all three

nationalities are concentrated in construction and agriculture, highly seasonal activities. For Albanian and Romanian men, construction is the main sector of employment and agriculture second, whereas the reverse is the case for Romanian men. On the other hand, for women there is little differentiation in employment: most women of all three nationalities do low-skilled service work such as the cleaning of homes or other premises.

The future of Greece's engagement with migrants from the Balkans remains unknown. On the Greek side, authorities and public opinion in Greece have yet to come to terms with Greece's new status as a major migrant-receiving country. Even though the importance of migrants' work in various economic sectors has been acknowledged, the prospect of the long-term settlement of migrants appears to be another matter. There seems to be no consensus in policy circles, let alone with respect to public opinion, that Greece will remain a country of immigration, with a continuing migrant presence.

As for the migrant side, the fact that the flows to Greece from the Balkans are so recent renders evaluation of long-term patterns of settlement and return a difficult proposition. Migration from countries of central and eastern Europe where socialism collapsed and the processes of economic restructuring, and the creation of free markets are currently underway, is a new phenomenon. It is still early to draw conclusions about how local social and economic contexts in these countries, with their specific local employment and investment situations, social welfare systems and divisions of paid and unpaid work between the genders and generations, intertwine with economic opportunities in receiving countries to shape migration strategies.

In any case, the international migration experience suggests that once migration flows have begun, they are difficult to interrupt, regardless of policies adopted on the receiving end. This would appear to be the case for flows to Greece from Bulgaria and Romania and particularly so for the case of Albania, given the intensity of its migration engagement with Greece to date.

References

- Anderson, B. and A. Phizacklea, 1997, *Migrant Domestic Workers: A European Perspective*. Brussels: Equal Opportunities Directorate DG 5.
- Anthias, F. and G. Lazaridis (eds.), 2001, *Gender and Migration in Southern Europe*. Oxford: Berg.
- Boyd, M., 1989, "Family and Personal Networks in International Migration: Recent Developments and New Agendas", *International Migration Review* 23 (3).
- Cavounidis, J., 2002a, "Migration in Southern Europe and the Case of Greece", *International Migration*, 40 (1): 45-70.
- Cavounidis, J., 2002b, *Characteristics of Migrants: The Greek Regularisation Programme of*

- 1998, (in Greek), Athens: National Labour Institute and Sakkoulas Publishers.
- Cavounidis, J. 2003a, "Gendered Patterns of Migration to Greece", *Greek Review of Social Research* 110: 221- 238.
- Cavounidis, J., 2003b, *Study for the Economic and Social Integration of Migrants*, (in Greek), Athens: Employment Observatory.
- Cavounidis, J., forthcoming, "Migration and Policy Trends" in H. Mossialos and M. Petmesidou, (eds.), *Social Policy Developments in Greece*, Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Emke-Poulopoulou, I., 2001, "Trafficking in Women and Children: Greece, a Country of Destination and Transit", Athens: Institute for the Study of the Greek Economy (IMEO).
- Ferrera, M., 1996, "The 'Southern Model' of Welfare in Social Europe," *Journal of European Social Policy*, 6(1): 17-37.
- Hagan, J. and S. Baker, 1993, "Implementing the U.S. Legalisation Program: The Influence of Immigrant Communities and Local Agencies on Immigration Policy Reform," *International Migration Review* 27: 513-536.
- International Organisation for Migration, 1995, "Profiles and Motives of Potential Migrants from Albania".
- International Organisation for Migration, 1997, "Profiles and Motives of Potential Migrants from Bulgaria".
- Kasimis, C., A. Papadopoulou and E. Zacoboulou, 2003, "Migrants in Rural Greece," *Sociologia Ruralis* 43(2): 5-23.
- Katrougalos, G., 1996, "The South European Welfare Model: The Greek Welfare State, in Search of an Identity," *Journal of European Social Policy* 6(1): 39-60.
- King, R., 2000, "Southern Europe in the Changing Global Map of Migration", in R. King, G. Lazaridis and C. Tsardanidis, (eds.), *Eldorado or Fortress? Migration in Southern Europe*, London: Macmillan.
- Kofman, E., 2003, "Women Migrants in the European Union," Conference "The Economic and Social Aspects of Migration," organized by The European Commission and the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, Brussels.
- Lambrianidis, L. and A. Lymberaki, 2001, *Albanian Migrants in Salonika*, (in Greek), Athens: Paratiritis.
- Lianos, T., 2003, *Contemporary Migration to Greece: An Economic Examination*, (in Greek), Athens: Centre of Economic Planning and Research.
- Lianos, T., A. Sarris, and L. Katseli, 1996, "Illegal immigration and local labour markets: The case of northern Greece", *International Migration*, 34(3): 449-484.
- Markova, E., 2001, "Bulgarian Migrants in the Greek Labour Market and in Greek Society" (in Greek), in A. Marvakis, D. Parsanoglou, and M. Pavlou (eds.), *Migrants in Greece*, (in Greek), Athens: Ellenika Grammata.
- Markova, E. and A. Sarris, 1997, "The Performance of Bulgarian Illegal Immigrants in the Greek Labour Market", *South European Society and Politics*, 2(2): 57-77.
- Martin, P., 2002, "Economic Integration and Migration: The Mexico-U.S. Case", World Institute for Development Economics Research, United Nations.
- Matsaganis, M., 2000, "Social Assistance in Southern Europe: The Case of Greece Revisited," *Journal of European Social Policy* 10(1): 68-80.
- OECD, 2002, "The Economic Impact of International Migration: A Framework for EDRC Country Reviews", Paris.

- Portes, A., 1995, "Economic Sociology and the Sociology of Immigration: A Conceptual Overview," in A. Portes (ed.), *The Economic Sociology of Immigration: Essays on Networks, Ethnicity and Entrepreneurship*, New York: Russell Sage.
- Portes, A. (2000) "The Hidden Abode: Sociology as Analysis of the Unexpected", *American Sociological Review* 65: 1-18.
- Psimmenos, I. (1995), *Migration from the Balkans: Social Exclusion in Athens*, (in Greek), Athens: Papazisis.
- Reyneri, E. (1998), "The Mass legalisation of migrants in Italy: Permanent or temporary emergence from the underground economy?" *South European Society and Politics*, 3(3): 83-104.
- Sassen, S., 1995, "Immigration and Local Labor Markets", in A. Portes (ed.), *The Economic Sociology of Immigration: Essays on Networks, Ethnicity and Entrepreneurship*, New York: Russell Sage.