

Guide for management of discriminations in employment

Contents

Introduction

Despite the fact that the actual phenomenon of mass migration towards Greece already completes more than 15 years, it's only nowadays that the special subject of discriminations' management in employment is comprehended in the researches of the scientific community.

In our country, the studies comprising only the treatment of discriminations against immigrants in the employment or the work place are minimal, while the analyses or the descriptions of the partial subjects that form the particular field, are superficially approached or scattered within texts of broader subjects

The relatively poor bibliography certainly reflects the general social reaction towards the phenomenon of discriminations. The contribution of a series of particular financial, social and employment factors which will be developed in detail subsequently, resulted to the fact that, until now, the discriminations in employment due to ethnic or racial origin, have not alarming dimensions.

Due to the absence of major, or at least, particularly evident instances of social exclusion and marginalisation within the Greek society, apparently the issue has not seriously troubled the individuals responsible for the immigration policy, does not attract the interest of the Media too often and also has not particularly perturbed the social partners.

However, it is from the part of the employers' and employees' unions that the first methodical and corporate attempts to record the dimensions of racial discriminations accrue, in order to be countered effectively. Moreover, the attempts are common and coordinated, based on the core of solicitude and necessity for timely prevention of generalized discriminative attitudes against immigrants

Therefore, this guide is composed, within the frame of the community initiative Equal, by a development partnership in which, for the first time, participate –among others - as partners, employers' and employees' agencies such as KEK GSVEE and INE GSEE, the Labor Centers of Athens and Piraeus or the department of scientific support of the Labor Center of Thessalonica.

The Guide for management of discriminations in employment is mainly addressed to the employers – members of GSVEE and individual employers, natural or legal persons, either as potential contracting parties with salaried immigrants or even as partners of immigrants practicing liberal vocation. Principal target of the guide is the information and sensitization of the total of employers, as a social partner in our country, about the dimensions and the particular traits of the phenomenon of discriminations against immigrants in employment and work places.

In every country, the selection of the appropriate solutions and initiatives against discriminations is usually the capstone of a period of fermentations, discussions and researches from the part of the employers (as well). In the case of Greece, however, it does not seem to be feasible the transaction – as a priority – of such a long term process, without the danger to consolidate permanently the well known amiss consequences in social level, that the countries with tradition in the reception of immigrants in Europe face.

However the present text does not aim at the submission of specific propositions for the total of the employers about the alleviation of discriminations, but at the

inspiration of a more general brainstorming about the necessity for the formation of an appropriate frame of action and subsequently, of the methods for its materialization.

Within this notion, it is not literally a guide such as i.e. the French Charter of dissimilarity or the English Code of good practices, but a text for brainstorming and discussion about the perspective of the composition of a relative “binding” text (Guide, Code or Charter) of good practices in Greece as well.

Even by the representatives of the civil agencies for the promotion of the principal of equal treatment in the usual European countries that receive immigrants, is publicly accepted the following reality:

The assumption of one or another national policy or initiative is decided on the occasion or on account of the important and undeniable findings of one¹ broad and independent scientific research of national range with principal subject the discriminations against immigrant in employment.

In Greece this necessary first “phase” is not yet completed, if of course we assume that it has at least begun. Consequently, based on the above – mentioned it is necessary that the structure of the particular Guide comprises the following three units:

The **first unit** will be a brief review of the integration and discriminations’ alleviation policies in European level with emphasis, where possible, on models or initiatives where the involvement of employers’ unions is direct. Particular gravity will be given to the practices of discriminations’ management in France, a country which experiences more intense than any other the symptoms of a widespread situation of exclusion.

The **second unit** is dedicated to the Greek case and comprises a complete delineation of the phenomenon of discriminations against immigrants. The fields in which discriminative behaviors are spotted, are analyzed and it is attempted a first approach to attitudes and perceptions of the employers concerning the immigrant workers

Finally, the **third unit** suggests some actions that could be immediately undertaken by the employers’ side in Greece, in order to seek the achievement of a double target: the close observation and total understanding of the problem of discriminations and exclusion in employment, and the conclusion in the formation of more specialized measures and prevention / alleviation policies concerning the discriminations in the enterprises in national level.

¹ Or more

I. Developments in European level

The European experience is rich in activities for equality and alleviation of discriminations and concerns mostly guidelines or even more, complete interventions in community level (A)

It is the same with the initiatives materialized within the member – states. Some of them are memorable and particularly important – even pioneer, in the degree that they emerge completely from the part of the employers or presuppose their contribution and agreement a priori. (B)

A. Modern tendencies for the alleviation of discriminations, based on the ethnic or racial origin, in employment: from the combat against illegal immigration to the promotion of equal opportunities.

The year 2007 is the European Year of Equality in opportunities for everyone. In the official web page of the European Union, a web page which was created within the frame of the particular European year, are clearly described all the intended targets, as well as the reasons that led to the proclamation of the year 2007 as the year of equal opportunities.

The reader – visitor of the web page² will read that the principal target is the sensitization of all the citizens of the European Union about the perspective of a Europe, where everybody can live a life without discriminations, through a complete respect of his fundamental right to equal treatment in all fields of activity.

Additionally, there is reference to the rich legislative work, which was produced the last years, concerning the alleviation of discriminations and must not remain unutilized. Finally there is reference to the fact that, in any case the common law is not sufficient to guarantee the fulfillment of the targets set during its adoption within a European space, which is characterized more and more intensively by the element of **diversity**.

For the above-mentioned reasons and during 2007 the strategy of the Committee is concentrated in three axis of intervention

- a) The awareness from the part of the citizens of the total of their rights for equal treatment and a life without discrimination – irrespective of sex, racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age and sexual orientation
- b) The promotion of equal opportunities for all
- c) The promotion of a major debate on the benefits of diversity for European societies and individuals

For the understanding, of both the necessity for a European year dedicated to equal opportunities and the particular content of this initiative, a brief retrospect in the course of the European policy against discriminations with emphasis on the qualitative characteristics is necessary.

² http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/eyeq/index.cfm?&

Despite the fact that discriminative treatments may practically emerge from any of the above – mentioned factors, from gender and age to sexual orientation, the criterion that is usually behind every step of the contemporary European policy for the promotion of equal treatment, is the racial or ethnic origin.

This criterion, at least for the European Union of the 15 member-states (until May 2004) deals mainly with the recent immigrant flows in Europe after the collapse of the regimes of the Eastern Europe countries but also with issues of integration of the immigrants of 2nd and 3rd generation, that is the descendants of immigrant workers from previous mass migrations in ‘60s and ‘70s

While the discriminations against women or incapacitated citizens exist since the formation of the European Union, the community laws and policies against all forms of discrimination “coincide” with the mass and uncontrolled installation of citizens of third countries within the member states with principal target the employment.

The first coordinated effort for a common policy for equal treatment – within the frame of the European Year against racism and xenophobia – took place in 1997. The same year the Amsterdam convention is voted, and the article 13 of the respective convention still is the foundation stone of the community policy against discriminations

But the most fundamental legal texts founded in this provision, the directives 2000/43³ and 2000/78⁴ owe their adoption – and in record time – to the success in the 1999 elections in Austria of the Nazi party of Heinder, which clearly reflects a developing fear of “new” and “old” immigrants in almost every country of the Europe of the 15.

The immigration and especially the issues concerning the integration of financial immigrants in employment, in fact act as fuel for the community engine, which works up and materializes actions and policies against any form of discriminations. In the same conclusion we may arrive, if we observe the course of priorities set within the frame of the effort for a common immigration policy.

In 1992 (Maastricht Convention) the priority is the guard of the outer frontiers of the Union and the formation of a common frame for the admission and residence of citizens of third countries. In 1995 (Barcelona Council) and 1997 (Amsterdam Convention) principal concern is the gradual foundation of a space of freedom, security and justice within the Union, as well as the fortification of its outer borders (Schengen agreement)

In 1999 (Tampere Council) and 2000 (Seville Council), in parallel with the necessity to fight against the illegal migration, the expansion of the readmission pacts with the last countries of origin and the management – fortification of the common borders, the provision for equal treatment of foreign citizens is accentuated,

In 2001 (Laachen Council) is mentioned for the first time the complete approach of social exclusion and the European Migration Network is formed. In 2003 (Thessalonica Council) the dipole which comprises the social integration of the legal immigrants in member states and the fight against illegal immigration in the European Union, is definitively formal.

³ About the implementation of the principal of equal treatment of individuals despite racial or ethnic origin.

⁴ About the formation of a general frame for equal treatment in employment and job.

It is though a fact that the **priority** of the **European policy** gradually distances from the initial targets of the fight against the illegal migration, the guard of the borders and the common regulation for the reception of immigrants.

The political initiative concerns now mostly an approach based on the protection of the fundamental rights of the immigrants, the combat against of social exclusion and the effort of management of financial immigrations

Even in the subjects of formal texts the replacement of terms such as “combat” and “guard” with others such as “integration” and “discreet treatment” or “approach / management” signals this radical turn in the treatment of immigration. From direct threat, the translocation of third countries’ citizens is gradually considered a new reality that the member – states and the union must manage, not with the standard of their societies’ security, but on the basis of the respect for the immigrants’ fundamental rights.

Consequently, the most basic community texts about immigration are already, since 2003, among others, the pronouncement of the Committee titled Immigration, Integration and Employment (2003), the First annual Report for immigration and integration (2004) and the Green Bible for a community’s approach for the management of financial immigrants (2004)

The Green Bible enriches the mosaic of the relative texts about immigration for Equality and non-discriminative treatment within the Expanded European Union (2005) as well as the Announcement of the Committee titled Non - discrimination and equal opportunities for all, where a large portion is dedicated to immigrants and minorities in member - states

This evolution is justified in a considerable degree by the social pathogenesis and the instances of social exclusion, marginalization and poverty that made an intense and rapid apparition in many member states, due mostly to the anti – immigration policy they followed in harmonization with the community’s treatment of immigration.

A dramatic confirmation of the relation between cause and determinable is the uprising in the suburbs – ghetto of “immigrants” in major cities in France and other countries the autumn of 2005 with protagonists young aboriginal citizens of emigrational family origin.

As for the possible logical question why 2007 is selected to be a European year for the promotion of equal opportunities, the answer seems self evident: because the facts that transformed for weeks Paris, Brussels and other cities into war zones, occurred in the end of 2005 and it was too late to withdraw the proclamation of 2006 as a year dedicated to the mobility of workers.

So, the efforts for explanation of the causes of the particular social malfunctions and agitations arrived to a determinative conclusion: According to it, the **discriminations** that, “immigrants” of second or third generation or members of certain minorities face in **employment**, are almost exclusively responsible for the generalized phenomena of social exclusion in European societies.

Namely, the field with the gravest problems is the access in a job, that is the phase of employment for young individuals belonging to those “vulnerable” population groups. In this part, the discussion arrives inevitably to the factor **employers** due to the fact that, normally the beginning of a labor relation depends exclusively on them.

It is true that this discovery has begun to be clear within these European countries since 1997, where the first signs of racism, xenophobia and discriminations begun to be more and more visible.

B. The case of European countries that receive immigrants: from the discovery and ascertainment of the problem, to the first efforts to face it.

In all the cases – without exception – of the European Union’s member – states, the percentages of unemployment of the population’s sensitive social groups remain, from the mid ‘90s until now, much higher than the ones of the national averages and of course higher than the ones of the citizens that do not belong in the respective population groups.

In certain countries, the determination of those groups is done on the basis of the parents’ origin, the race or skin color, while in the cases where the “ethnic surveys” are prohibited, the statistic categorization of the citizens is carried out with the elements of their social or geographic origin.

But in any case the finding is the same: **the danger for someone to remain unemployed and generally, to suffer the consequences of discriminative behaviors in employment, is greater if he belongs in a certain category of citizens than if he did not.**

This conclusion, no matter how unanimous and solid, was not sufficient in order to establish incontrovertible evidence (not in a legal sense, but in political level) related to the function of mechanisms of systematic discriminations against immigrants in employment and especially to the most crucial point, the employment in a job. Therefore, the certification of this generalized social imbalance should be performed with independent scientific means.

With the initiative of the International Labor Bureau and with tool, the method of “certification of the materialized behaviors”⁵, the common method of “testing”, during the second part of the ‘90s and in several countries of the world, there was an attempt to record the possibility – danger of discriminative treatment, faced by young citizens belonging in fragile social groups, in three phases of job seeking:

- a) The phase of the first communication with the enterprise
- b) The phase of the interview
- c) The phase of job offer

In **Nederland**, the study⁶ compared the treatment of employers to young individuals with Moroccan origin and young Dutchmen (always with the same qualifications), during the access to employment. The research concluded in discriminations in 23% of the cases, against the individuals with Moroccan origin. The percentage is higher when we examine the subsequent phases, and reaches the 36% in the end of the process

⁵ Test des pratiques effectives.

⁶ Bovenkerk F. Discrimination against migrant workers and ethnic minorities in access to employment in Netherlands, Geneva, ILO, 1995.

In **Belgium** the comparison concerned the reception they had of the young Moroccans compared to the respective reception of the natives⁷, in 3 different regions of the country, Brussels, Flanders and Vallony. The discriminations afflicted the 19% of the Moroccan candidates in the first phase and the 33% in the final stage.

In **Spain**, the respective research⁸ in the areas of Barcelona, Madrid and Malaga concerned young Moroccans as well with discriminations against them 25% in the first phase and over 36% in the final phase

In **Germany**, in the state of North Rhine-Westphalia, the researchers recorded a 13% in the first and a 19% in the last phase against young Turks

In Switzerland the research comprised comparative results as well for the sub – categories of community and non – community foreigners. The young Portuguese faced a behavior not much worse than their Swiss colleagues did. On the other hand, the Turks and the Albanian-speaking Yugoslavs faced discriminations in much higher percentages.

The following chart comprises the comparison of the minimum percentages that occurred from the researches⁹ in the special stage of interview.

Citizen Category	Country	Discriminations' percentage
Portuguese	French-speaking Switzerland	9%
Turks	Germany	13%
Moroccans	Belgium	19%
Moroccans	Nederland	23%
Moroccans	Spain	25%
Turks	German-speaking Switzerland	30%
Albanian – speaking Yugoslavs	German-speaking Switzerland	48%

Πίνακας 1, Πηγή: Fibi, Kaya, Piguet, 2003.

⁷ Arrijn P., Feld S., Nayer A., Discrimination in access to employment on grounds of foreign origin: the case of Belgium, Geneva, ILO, 1999.

⁸ Prada Angel M., Labour market discrimination against migrant workers in Spain, Geneva, ILO, 1996.

⁹ Περισσότερες πληροφορίες για όλες αυτές τις έρευνες του Διεθνούς Οργανισμού Εργασίας στο Fibi Rosita, « Discrimination dans l'accès à l'emploi des jeunes d'origine immigrée en Suisse », Revue Formation Emploi, No 94, Avril-Juin 2006, p.p. 45-58.

It is obvious that Moroccans face similar percentages in Belgium, Nederland and Spain, but higher than the respective ones of Portuguese in French- speaking Switzerland or lower than the Turks or Albanian – speaking Yugoslavs in German – speaking Switzerland

Additionally, not all minorities face the same problems of discriminations in every country and this fact is in direct function with stereotypes that dominate within a certain society and are affecting the employers during the selection of the appropriate employee for their enterprise.

The conclusions of those independent researches, especially after a large campaign for the propagation of the results (through each respective country's media) had immediate social and political impact.

For the first time the general and the abstract common impression for the discriminations of the disadvantaged in employment population groups is quantified, while the foundation of the connection of unemployment's high percentages (of the respective citizens) and the discriminative treatments they face in the phase of job employment, is facilitated.

It is not an exaggeration to say that since 1997, the total of policies adopted in Belgium, concerning the promotion of equal treatment, is a direct outcome of the certification research that was carried out¹⁰ and demolished the last objections about the function of prevalent discriminative behaviors in labor market. It is the same for the rest of the countries as well; for the countries that did not materialize a relative action for the identification of discriminations, the common outcomes of the previous ones, primed a similar process.

France could not be an exception. Recently, in March 14th 2007, the conclusions of a respective research (conducted with the standards of the model of the International Labor Of Employment in Lilles, Lyon, Marseilles, Nantes, Paris and Strasbourg on the basis of 2440 job announcements) were published

As the French press underlines, it is better to be called *Julien* than *Farid* if he wants to get a job. A non minority candidate was employed in the 4/5 of the cases, and particularly:

-
- Only the 11% of the employers followed during the entire process the principle of equal treatment.
- The 70% of the cases preferred a candidate of non African origin while
- 19% preferred a candidate who does not match with the model of French citizen

This time, the French employers did not wait for the publication of the research's results to take action. They knew in advance that in the French case also (if not mainly) the discriminations against immigrants of 2nd and 3rd generation is an everyday phenomenon.

¹⁰ Ilke Adam, « La discrimination ethnique à l'embauche à l'agenda politique belge », Revue Formation Emploi, No 94, Avril-Juin 2006, p.p. 11-25.

And this, despite the fact that in France the “ethnic surveys” are not allowed and the comparative measurements are carried out usually with the criterion of geographical origin, that is residence in sensitive suburbs which traditionally host minority families.

In the beginning of 2004 within the frame of a report titled “ The forgotten of the equality in opportunities”¹¹, the idea of a **Charter of Diversity** was formed, in order to encourage the enterprises to “impress” on their staff the different “components” of the French society and establish equal treatment and diversity as strategic axis of their policy.

Many individual employers responded immediately to that challenge and as a result, the French Union of Private Enterprises (AFEP) in a matter of months contributed actively to the composition and propagation of this Charter, which was prepared by the Ministry responsible for the Promotion of Equal Opportunities. In October 22nd 2004, 314 representatives of small, medium and big enterprises signed for the first time the Charter and covenanted to:

1. Sensitize and train their managers and partners involved in employment process, training and labor relation’s development, about non discrimination and diversity
2. Respect the implementation of the principle of non-discrimination in all fields of human resources’ management such as employment, training, vocational progress and promotion.
3. Seek ways to make their staff reflect the cultural and ethnic diversity of the French society.
4. Promulgate to all their partners this commitment of non-discrimination and diversity and inform them about the practical results of this commitment.
5. Establish the formation and implementation of the diversity policy a subject for brainstorming with the employees representatives
6. Comprehend in the annual progress report a chapter with the descriptions of this commitment: Implemented actions, practices and results.

In March of 2006 the new Law for equality in opportunities is voted and a few months later, during the publication of the first annual report of the Ministry for the period June 2005 – July 2006, the signing enterprises are 600 and by the end of the same year, more than 2000.

An initiative of such range could not leave indifferent the rest of the countries with tradition in the reception of immigrants, even if the discriminations in job employment were not quantitative defined. During the 7th interministerial French – German meeting in October 12 2006 in Paris, was decided the expansion of the Charter of Diversity and in Germany as well.

So, in January 23 2007, when the responsible French minister presented in Paris the Report for integration and equality in opportunities, four German enterprises had already signed the German Charter of diversity.

¹¹ Yazig Sebeg et Laurence Méhaignerie, *Les oubliés de l'égalité des chances*, Janvier 2004.

It is certain that independently of the commitment of the German presidency during 2007 for equality in opportunities, relative efforts will be developed autonomously within other member states of the European Union.

In many of them, the side of the employers has already taken action in the field of the alleviation of discriminations against immigrants and minorities, according the amplitude of discriminations

But what is happening in the Greek case as for the identification and record of discriminations?

II. The Greek Case

In Greece, the main characteristics of immigration are sometimes common and sometimes differ greatly from the ones we meet in the rest of the countries (either they received citizens of third countries as financial immigrants for the first time in '90s or had relative experiences in past decades) that receive immigrants.

The common trait of the last wave of immigrants to many member – states, is the spontaneous and non –organized drift of foreign citizens, combined with the absence of formal transnational agreement between the countries and of course without prior relative preparation of reception substructures

Millions of financial immigrants settled within those countries with sole target to seek a job and after a short usually period of time, begun to host the members of their families that stayed in their countries.

The integration of those workers in the national labor markets took place through the function of the mechanism “offer and demand”, while the level of success of such a procedure had to do with the specific needs of each economy, it's adaptation speed (to the new data) and the capability for immediate absorbance of the new labor force.

The attitude adopted by the governments of the reception countries accelerated or facilitated the procedures every time there was an effort to regulate and organize the changes in economy and employment, but it did not, in any case, stopped them, when there was an attempt to act this way.

Therefore, the degree of success of the immigrants' integration attempts differs for each society of reception. As we mentioned before, in all modern countries of settlement of non-community immigrants, the members of the population's minority groups face greater difficulties in access in the labor market than the rest of the population.

What's the situation in our country about the discriminations based on origin, in the phase of job employment (A)? In which other sectors of employment can we detect – through the available research studies already carried out - discriminative behaviors against immigrants (B)?

A. Discriminations against immigrants during job employment

In first, we must clarify that, as regards the knowledge of central axis of the examined in this chapter subject, Greece today is in the place where the North-European

countries were **before** the researches for the identification of discriminative behaviors, as they were presented in the first unit of this Guide.

Consequently, apart from certain dependable suspicions, outcome of experience and observation, the only reliable way to approach the subject field of the immigrants' accessibility in labor market¹², is the elaboration of the records of the Greek National Survey Service (GNSS)

According the GNSS data about the labor force (research carried out the first trimester of the calendar year) the immigrants and particularly the foreigner workers of the country have characteristics totally different fro any other national labor market.

The immigrants' unemployment percentages are lower than the ones of Greeks, according the gender:

UNEMPLOYMENT PERCENTAGE	YEAR		
	2006	2005	2001
TOTAL OF THE COUNTRY	8,8	9,6	10,4
GREEK NATIONALITY	8,8	9,7	10,4
FOREIGN NATIONALITY	7,5	8,1	11,4
MEN (TOTAL OF THE COUNTRY)			
GREEK NATIONALITY	5,7	5,9	6,9
FOREIGN NATIONALITY	4,0	4,4	7,5
WOMEN (TOTAL OF THE COUNTRY)			
GREEK NATIONALITY	13,4	15,3	15,8
FOREIGN NATIONALITY	12,9	14,2	17,9

Table 2, Source: EED of GNSS, 2nd trimester, Process INE/GSEE - ADEDY.

With exception the beginning of the decade, the percentages of (male and female) immigrants are today lower than the respective ones of Greeks (male an female). Additionally, the rhythm and the degree of unemployment percentages' diminution is greater in the case of the immigrant population than the ones for the native population.

Moreover, Greece holds the first place among the countries of the European Union as for the following proportion: immigrants' participation in the labor force / immigrants' unemployment. For example if the immigrants are the 5% of the labor force and the 5% of the unemployed, this proportion is 1.

¹² Many of the following elements are in a relative chapter of the author in 1st Issue – Report of the European program titled “Evaluation of the European Strategy for the employment in Greece, cases of active aging and immigrants' integration in the labor market” INE/GSEE – ADEDY 2006-2007, to be published.

The average during 2002-2003 this proportion is < 1 and according Eurostat data (which are included in a recent research¹³), Greece is the only case where this proportion is <1

The data from GNSS for 2006, point out the same result: immigrants represent the 6.5% of the labor force, but only the 5.5 % of the unemployed

PARTICIPATION (%) FOREIGN NATIONALITY	YEAR		
	2006	2005	2001
Both Genders			
Employed	6,5	6,7	4,1
Labor Force	6,4	6,6	4,2
Unemployed	5,5	5,6	4,5
Men	2006	2005	2001
Employed	6,7	7,0	4,3
Labor Force	6,6	6,9	4,3
Unemployed	4,8	5,2	4,7
Women	2006	2005	2001
Employed	6,2	6,4	3,8
Labor Force	6,2	6,3	3,9
Unemployed	5,9	5,9	4,4

Table 3, Source: EED of GNSS, 2nd trimester, Process INE/GSEE - ADEDY.

In simple words, in antithesis with the situation that prevails in the other countries that receive immigrants, the access in a job is easier for the financial immigrants than for Greeks

We must underline the fact that, according the above-mentioned data, the unfavorable prospects (formulated before 2004) do not seem to be verified. According to those prospects, the completion of the works for the Olympic Games, would launch unemployment, particularly the one of male immigrants, in immeasurable heights. The unemployment percentage of the last ones is very low, almost 50% lower than the percentage during the preparation of the Olympic facilities.

This image that renders Greece a country where the immigrants are absorbed particularly easy in the labor market is not without interpretation. It is related to a series of characteristics of the Greek economy and some particularities to the manifestation of the phenomenon of immigration in the Greek case

From the beginning of the '90s and the first drifts of immigrants, since today, Greece was marked from a raise in the demand of manual labor and generally, a demand for low – specification or low – educated workers, in many branches of the economy.

¹³ It is the research of mr Fotakis (General Administration of Employment, Social Cases and Equal Opportunities of the European Union) which was presented in his suggestion titled “Demographic developments, immigration and European social policy” during a conference of the Department of Social Policy of Panteion University in May 25th and 26th 2006 with subject “The social policy in a changing environment: challenges and perspectives” ».

Without any development strategy, oriented to innovation, research, work quality and product quality, the 70% of the country's workers are actually graduates of elementary school, junior high school and high school¹⁴.

In such conditions, the hundreds of thousands of immigrants have been, almost automatically, oriented to specific branches of the economy and not necessarily the ones with exponential development.

A great example is the branch of constructions, especially for the male foreign labor force. We must clarify that neither the mass entrance of immigrants in Greece nor the absorbance in employment of the male immigrants are indissolubly connected with the Olympic Games. For two reasons:

Firstly, because from the total of the related scientific researches¹⁵ occurs that, in their majority immigrants (male and female) settled in Greece until the first half of the '90s (1995), long before the assignment of the Olympic Games to Greece.

Secondarily, due to the fact that women (and the rest of the men) were easily absorbed (as easy as the first ones) by the rest of the branches, while the percentages of unemployment, especially after 2004, diminish.

The branches where immigrants are - primarily – employed are constructions, processing industry, tourism – catering and agriculture. Especially for the category of the female immigrants, the branch of domiciliary work is added.

For male immigrants the records are as follows:

BRANCHES OF ECONOMIC ACTIVITY	YEAR		
	2006	2005	2001
TOTAL MALE IMMIGRANTS	100	100	100
A. Agriculture, stock farming, hunting and forestry	7,8	7,6	2,4
B. Fishery	0,1	0,3	0,2
C. Mines and quarries	0,4	0,4	0,2
D. Processing industries	17,9	16,3	21,5
E. Provision of electric power etc	0,4	0,3	
F. Constructions	49,2	51,8	45,1
G. Wholesale and retail trade, vehicles	8,8	9,4	13,4
H. Hotels and Restaurants	7,2	6,7	6,4
I. Transportations, storage and communications	2,5	3,0	4,8
J. Intermediate financial organizations	*	*	0,5
K. Real estate management	2,3	1,4	2,3
L. Public Administration and Defense etc	0,6	0,1	0,3
M. Education	0,4	0,3	0,6

¹⁴ See Savvas Rombolis, Development and Private Universities, newspaper TA NEA 01/26/2007.

¹⁵ Study of INE/GSEE – ADEDY Immigrants, economy and employment. the necessity for "legalization" of the labor market in Greece, to be published.

N. Health and Social Care	0,5	0,4	0,9
O. Other activities of provision of services	1,0	1,1	1,0
P. Private households	0,9	0,7	0,6
Q. Extraterritorial organizations and organs	*	39,0	*

Table 4, Source: EED of GNSS, 2nd trimester, Process INE/GSEE - ADEDY.

BRANCHES OF ECONOMIC ACTIVITY	YEAR		
	2006 PARTICIPATION (%)	2005 PARTICIPATION (%)	2001 PARTICIPATION (%)
PARTICIPATION OF MALE IMMIGRANTS			
IN THE TOTAL OF EMPLOYED MEN	6,7	7,0	4,3
A. Agriculture, stock farming, hunting and forestry	4,8	4,8	0,7
B. Fishery	0,9	4,2	1,6
C. Mines and quarries	4,6	5,1	1,0
D. Processing industries	8,0	7,6	5,7
E. Provision of electric power etc	2,0	1,6	*
F. Constructions	25,7	27,1	16,5
G. Wholesale and retail trade, vehicles	3,5	3,8	3,5
H. Hotels and Restaurants	7,8	7,6	4,7
I. Transportations, storage and communications	2,0	2,6	2,4
J. Intermediate financial organizations	*	0,8	0,9
K. Real estate management	2,8	1,7	2,1
L. Public Administration and Defense etc	0,4	0,0	0,2
M. Education	0,6	0,5	0,6
N. Health and Social Care	1,2	1,0	1,6
O. Other activities of provision of services	2,3	2,6	1,6
P. Private households	48,3	48,4	26,6
Q. Extraterritorial organizations and organs	*	39,0	*

Table 5, Source: EED of GNSS, 2nd trimester, Process INE/GSEE - ADEDY.

For the female immigrants the data are as follows:

BRANCHES OF ECONOMIC ACTIVITY	YEAR		
	2006	2005	2001
TOTAL FEMALE IMMIGRANTS	100%	100%	100%
A. Agriculture, stock farming, hunting and forestry	5,9	7,6	3,0
B. Fishery	*	*	*
C. Mines and quarries	*	*	*
D. Processing industries	8,7	8,1	10,6
E. Provision of electric power etc	*	*	*
F. Constructions	0,9	1,0	1,6
G. Wholesale and retail trade, vehicles	7,1	9,6	6,4
H. Hotels and Restaurants	16,2	15,8	19,9
I. Transportations, storage and communications	0,6	0,6	0,8

J. Intermediate financial organizations	0,7	0,4	*
K. Real estate management	5,2	7,5	4,8
L. Public Administration and Defense etc	0,0	0,4	0,4
M. Education	1,8	1,0	1,9
N. Health and Social Care	3,5	3,1	2,1
O. Other activities of provision of services	2,9	4,3	2,1
P. Private households	46,5	40,8	46,5
Q. Extraterritorial organizations and organs	0,2	*	*

Table 6, Source: EED of GNSS, 2nd trimester, Process INE/GSEE - ADEDY.

BRANCHES OF ECONOMIC ACTIVITY	YEARS		
	2006 PARTICIPATION (%)	2005 PARTICIPATION (%)	2001 PARTICIPATION (%)
PARTICIPATION OF FEMALE IMMIGRANTS			
IN THE TOTAL OF EMPLOYED WOMEN	6,2	6,4	3,8
A. Agriculture, stock farming, hunting and forestry	2,8	3,5	0,7
B. Fishery	*	*	*
C. Mines and quarries	*	*	*
D. Processing industries	6,1	5,6	3,7
E. Provision of electric power etc	*	*	*
F. Constructions	11,7	17,0	16,9
G. Wholesale and retail trade, vehicles	2,3	3,2	1,4
H. Hotels and Restaurants	13,1	12,4	9,3
I. Transportations, storage and communications	1,2	1,2	1,2
J. Intermediate financial organizations	1,3	0,7	*
K. Real estate management	4,1	5,9	2,8
L. Public Administration and Defense etc	*	0,4	0,2
M. Education	0,9	0,6	0,7
N. Health and Social Care	2,5	2,3	1,0
O. Other activities of provision of services	4,3	6,1	2,2
P. Private households	71,0	67	58,2
Q. Extraterritorial organizations and organs	34,5	*	*

Table 7, Source: EED of GNSS, 2nd trimester, Process INE/GSEE - ADEDY.

The dominance of small and small – medium enterprises and the tendency of the young native employees to seek higher payrolls and socially established professions in order to utilize their educational level, act as factors that render the necessity for cheap and unspecialized labor force, permanent, constant and highly possible for the immediate future in our country

The high percentage of the total of female immigrant workers employed in private households (almost 50%) and the fact that 7 out of 10 women of the branch are immigrants, must be combined with the gradually increasing introduction of Greek

women in secondary and tertiary education (a phenomenon of the last 20 years and is the outcome of general developments in Greece, at social -at least- level)

Due to the fact that the immigration towards Greece never took the form of organized drifts on the basis of special transnational agreements with the countries of origin, the immigrants accepted by definition the perspective of a job that appertain to the international definition “3D” (Dirty, dangerous, demeaning). This means that they abandoned from the beginning any effort to utilize their knowledge and experiences and tried to cover professions that – in any case – the Greek workers avoid.

Apart from the above-mentioned reasons the big access’ percentages of the immigrants in employment are additionally explained by the geographical and ethnic particularity that characterizes, even in our days, the phenomenon of immigration in Greece. The elements that form the situation are three:

a) From 1990 since very recently, Greece was the only member-state of the European Union that had borders exclusively with third countries and especially with countries of the former soviet block. The greater percentage of immigrants in modern European history of immigration came from these countries.

b) As a consequence of the previous factor, 65% of the immigrants in Greece are from three neighboring countries and

c) Greece remains the only reception country in which the 58% of the total of immigrants are from a sole country, Albania.

Consequently, the family and friendly networks that – either way – are developed in such cases, functioned as informal channels of interconnection with the labor market, particularly for the immigrants that followed a little later the first “waves” of their compatriots or relatives, in the beginning of the ‘90s

The speed and the easiness in the translocation of new immigrants from their country of origin to Greece through these networks, constituted a factor that “guaranteed” in advance the increased possibility of access in a certain branch of employment and not rarely, even in the employment in a specific job within the environment of their – already settled – compatriot.

The same applies vice versa. The short duration of the translocation to the country permitted, during the whole duration of the last 15 years, the permanent or temporary return in the country of origin in case of long-term exit from the labor market or short periods of unemployment.

In other words the geographical vicinity of the countries functioned and stills function up to now beneficially for the selection of informal ways of seasonal or even circular immigration, due to the absence – usually – of any relevant state care and organization of those particularly common in practice, forms of translocation of foreign labor force.

So, in relation with the capability of a job employment for the financial immigrants of the country, the available data are sufficient in order to found the necessary indications as for the non – prevalent discriminative treatment against them.

Nevertheless, it is of grave importance the effort for the detection of traces of discriminative behavior and sentiments from the part of the employers in other levels of the labor relation or totally in attitudes and prejudices against immigrants.

B. Discriminative behaviors against immigrants during the development of the labor relation

For the branches of the Greek economy where there was a mass orientation of the financial immigrants, without regard to their educational level and vocational experience and for the reasons previously developed, there is not a serious issue of discriminative behavior during the effort for a job employment

However, in many countries the immigrants are often victims of violation of the principal of equal treatment in regards of wages, insurance or promotions. Furthermore, on the level of employers' views, the tendencies and the prevalent stereotypes for a series of issues consist – under circumstances – elements capable to result in discriminative behaviors within the enterprise

As we already mentioned, in this particular field the researches in Greece are very few and the available data are part of general researches about the phenomenon of immigration. A first field of research is the salaries of immigrants in comparison to the ones of their Greek colleagues.

Certainly, in order to have safe comparative result, it is necessary the simultaneous knowledge of the wages of the Greek employees in the same branch, profession or enterprise, and in fact, of all the crucial factors that form the final salary or wage

The criteria are, indicatively, the established triennials, the accredited educational level, the appointed duties and the specialty. Consequently many efforts of research are based, mainly on the subjective element of estimation, which is formed personally by the immigrants themselves through discussions with their Greek colleagues.

In a study about the Albanian immigrants in Thessalonica¹⁶ the researchers reach two conclusions: on one hand, the 69.5% of the immigrants have lower salaries than their colleagues in the same enterprise, but on the other hand *“despite the particularly prevalent idea that Albanians have significantly smaller salaries than the Greeks, even in the same employer, this particular fact does not seem to apply in absolute manner any more”*. In fact there is a remarkable percentage of immigrants (13,2%) that is paid more than the Greeks doing the same job in the same employer.

Besides, the immigrants work mainly in one job and they are paid with salaries that permit them to support their families. This fact pleads for the conclusion that their salaries in total cannot be much lower than the ones of the Greek employees.

According a 2002¹⁷ research: During September of 2000, interviews with 1074 participants who participated in the legalization program of 1998 were carried out. The vast majority of the immigrants (84%) have only one job. Additionally, according the elements concerning the sole or primal employment of the immigrants, occur that their incomes are not in total unequivocally low. About half of them had an income of 200.000 drch and the other half above 200.000, while a significant percentage (21%) declared an income of more than 250.000 drch.

¹⁶ Lambrianidis Lois and Limberaki Antigoni, Albanian immigrants in Thessalonica, Ed, Paratiritis, Thessalonica 2001. The material is 500 completed questionnaires.

¹⁷ Cavounidou Jenny, Research for the financial and social integration of the immigrants, Employment Observatory, 2002

In the same picture results a more recent research¹⁸ that includes interviews as well. The 82% has only one job. Moreover, in the question whether the (total) annual income is enough for the immigrant, the 2/3 evaluated their income medium or sufficient.

In a research of the Worker-Employee Center of Athens¹⁹ was attempted an exploration of the salaries of 494 financial immigrants in comparison with the respective one of their Greek colleagues, by the combination of the subjective estimations with the objective records. In general, the wage of the interviewees fluctuates between 12 and 60 Euros, with an average of 35 Euros for the three branches.

About the objective elements, with the exception of some specialties in the branch of constructions, the immigrant wage earners of all three branches have wages superior than the legal minimum for each branch and specialty. In cases where the wages were lower, the difference from the lowest limit was very small.

According the subjective factor and the question if their Greek colleagues have a better salary, the answers were divided: 43% answered yes, 42% no and a significant percentage did not answer at all.

The most reliable data about the income of Greeks and immigrant wage earners could emerge from the official elements of IKA surveys, the insurance agency of the majority of the financial immigrants. Unfortunately the available data concerning the immigrants are incomplete and do not permit the extraction of incontestable results about the discriminative treatment, in issues of wages and salaries, against the foreign labor force of Greece.

It is a fact though that the immigrants are less paid than the Greeks in absolute measures, according the recent elaboration of the elements²⁰ recorded by the Administration of Actuarial Studies and Surveys of IKA for the year 2003. For the common enterprises the total wage per day is 41.28 Euros for the Greeks and 26.7 for the foreigners. The difference is smaller in constructions, 48.98 for the Greeks and 41.09 for the foreigners. Additionally the social contribution for the Greeks is the 37.8% of their wage and for the foreigners 43.1%. In other words foreigners pay more contributions than the Greeks, according their wages.

An equivalent conclusion is reached through the study of INE/GSEE – ADEDY for the particular insurance agency²¹. In relation to immigrants the researchers conclude that “the supported opinion, that the financial contribution of the insured immigrants to the incomes of *IKA-ETAM* is proportional to their number, does not reflect the real situation”. This result is based on two reasons:

- The lower wages of the immigrants compared to the ones of their Greek colleagues and

¹⁸ INE/GSEEE - ADEDY, Research about the forms of social integration of financial immigrants in the District of Attica. Athens 2004

¹⁹ Kapsalis Apostolos, Presentation of results from interviews with members of the target groups of immigrants in the branches of construction, gas station and clothing EKA 2004. the research was materialized within the framework of the initiative Equal.

²⁰ Maratou – Alipranti Laura and Gazon Eric, Immigration and Health- Care EKKE 2005.

²¹ INE/GSEE – ADEDY Actuarial Study for IKA-ETAM, 2005

- The immigrants work fewer days than the Greeks (all ages)

True, the above – mentioned research of EKKE cites that the relative average for the immigrants is much lower than the one of the Greeks insured in IKA:

<i>Number of days of insurance for each insured</i>			
Nationality	Men	Women	Total
Greek	220,11	201,38	211,42
Foreign	190,40	186,45	188,77
Albanian	192,46	164,51	182,59
Total	216,78	199,99	209,08

Table 3 , IKA Administration of Actuarial Studies and Surveys, Annual Data for Employment, year 2003, common enterprises

The data that could permit the formation of a first estimation according the other fields (where usually discriminative behaviors - in terms of promotion and job placement – are more evident) are even more dissipate and descriptive. At this point, only the exploration of attitudes and views of the employers could produce utilizable outcomes.

The only known relevant work was carried out within the frame of Equal in 2004 and concerned the record of the opinions of the employers (personal interviews with 400 Greek employers of Athens²²). The branches of employment were constructions, clothing crafts, gas stations and cleaning crews, comprising “small” and “big” enterprises whether they employed immigrants or not.

The particular research and specifically its findings (with criterion the size of the enterprise, or the employment or not of immigrants) are extremely interesting, because the questions were not just a yes or no answer but also comprised different levels of stratification of the employers’ views and attitudes.

The editors of the research conclude by summarizing the results to the following general outcome: “the views of employers about foreign employees, according the various social and financial issues and also in terms of evaluation of various characteristics for specific nationalities, in most issues fluctuate between “negative” and “neutral” with very few exceptions” The more crucial qualitative conclusions, among others are summarily described below:

²² National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Research concerning the view of employers about foreign workers, 2004

- The presence of foreign workers in the labor market is characterized as a “problem” from half the employers of the research and more intensively from workers who do not employ immigrants
- Their necessity in the labor market is estimated above “average”
- The 56% believe that the salaries and the wages are not affected by the immigrants, while a 36.1% believes that the immigrants are responsible for the reduction of wages
- Balanced, symmetrical and homoeomorphous is the perception of the total of employers about productivity – performance of the work (reduction= 26,1%, neutral= 52,2% and raise = 26,1%).
- About jobs, the employers believe that the immigrants “take the jobs” from the Greeks instead of “creating new jobs” in a ratio of 3 to 1
- The total contribution of the immigrant workers to the Greek society is negative for the 43.2% and positive for the 16.6%

No matter how much contradictory and spontaneous might have been the reactions of the employers, it is obvious that they usually keep step with the general stereotypes that prevail in the Greek society, particularly towards certain nationalities or job categories, despite the fact that the reality in their own enterprise is often completely different.

On the occasion of this remark, we must note that in contradiction with the status in any other category of citizens, the general attitude about job employment or the evolution of the labor relation that the total of the employers of a country will finally adopt, will have a more direct and determinative impact on the sector of social integration of the population’s minority groups in national level.

The role of the Greek employers is a leading role, particularly for the immediate future of the children of the first immigrants of the beginning of the ‘90s

III. Propositions for action from the part of Greek employers

It is a fact that the non-detection of generalized discriminative behaviors against immigrants during the access in labor market and especially in the phase of job employment in an enterprise, must not, in any case inspire a feeling of complacency and quiescence, for two basic reasons

- There are serious suspicions for the existence of mechanisms of unfavorable treatment in other fields of employment, such as equality in salaries or social security.
- Even in job employment the image that is formed until today it is possible to differ in the immediate future, particularly for the immigrants of second and third generation

So the action of the employers' unions concerning the management of discriminations in employment is expanded in a broader subject field. It comprises the immigrants' entrepreneurship, their independent financial activity and its terms of function, within the employers' unions as well as within the Greek labor market and society in general. (A)

The employers unions, as the respective trade unions of the employees or the immigrants' societies, are interest unions and precisely unions of natural and legal persons with common problems and aims

Independently of the tolerance limits of a country, the social antibodies developed against the virus of racism or the available means against stereotypes, the employers must realize a discussion about the benefits – social and financial – that occur from the management of discriminations in employment. (B)

Finally, the alleviation and - most of all - the prevention of discriminations in the enterprise, demands a more totalistic national strategy, similar to the one adopted in other countries that receive immigrants. It is not important whether it is about the responsibility from the part of the employers or a broader social agreement with other interest unions; the social debate and the mutual agreement in specific basic principles (C) actually, it is easier and at the same time urgent.

A. Immigrants Entrepreneurship

When immigration possesses structural characteristics and shows more intensively the element of permanency, it is normal that the financial immigrants, who are initially employed exclusively in a state of depended work, orientate gradually, to the independent financial activity. In such a logical and presumable development the reaction of the native employers towards their “new” colleagues is not self-evident.

As in any reception country it is possible to observe feelings of circumspection and disquietude from the part of the native workers towards immigrant workers, we cannot exclude the possibility that the employers' side may express a similar reaction to immigrant businessmen.

Frequently, a defensive behavior like this ends to the exertion of pressure on the people responsible for the immigration policy towards the enactment of strict rules for the access in entrepreneurship in order to deter the potential immigrant entrepreneurs.

It is widely spread that the relevant provisions of the last complete Law 3386/2005 for the immigration in our country are dictated by the above-mentioned fact.

Particularly, while the general terms for the access in the independent business activity are the same with the ones of the previous Law 2910/2001, in order to prove the sufficiency of funds, a new significant factor is introduced (L 3386/2005, art. 24): there must be a deposition of 60.000 Euros in the name of the applicant and in a recognized banking institute.

It is evident that, in one hand, it's extremely difficult for any citizen to put aside an amount this high (and much more for a financial immigrant) and on the other hand, if this was possible, such an amount could be utilized (in multiple degree) in the country of the immigrant instead of Greece.

At the same time, according the L. 3377/2005 it is henceforth prohibited for citizens of third countries to obtain a license of outdoor commerce, while the jurisdiction for the issue of relevant licenses is transferred from the local government to the Ministry of Development.

As it is characteristically underlined in a very recent research of the Institute of Immigration Policy²³ *“during the last years the legislative frame about the exertion of independent financial activity by the immigrants becomes more and more limitative. The 3386/2005 with the enactment of the 60.000 Euros as a lower limit of sufficient funds for independent financial activity as well as the 3377/2005 who prohibits the issue of license for outdoor commerce to citizens of third countries, are signs of a more strict legislative frame for the development of foreign entrepreneurship”*.

The questions that must trouble immediately the employers' collective agencies are the following two”

- First, if the respective new legislation about the access of immigrants in entrepreneurship is possible to found an unjustifiable unfavorable treatment against them and if yes, which must be the respective propositions of the employers to the government and
- Second, if finally an institutional blockage of the immigrants' entrepreneurship might benefit the native entrepreneurs or not, that is, if this measure respond to the need for protection of Greek entrepreneurs' financial interests.

For many reasons that obviously are not confined within the common legal status, the levels of self – employment of Greeks and foreigners are not unvarying. Within the frame of IMEPO's research and after the elaboration of the data of GNSS (EED, 2nd trimester 2006) we have the following results:

²³ Mavrommatis Giorgos, immigration and entrepreneurship in Greece, IMEPO 2007, under publication

- *The levels of the natives' self – employment rise to a 31.3% of the total of the Greek employed*
- *The percentage of self – employed citizens of other countries of the E.U. of 15 member – states was 31.5%*
- *The citizens of the 10 new member states of the E.U. are self – employed in a percentage of a mere 6.4% of the total of the employed*
- *Finally, the percentage of self - employment for citizens of third countries is 8%*

Data for the entrepreneurship of immigrants also emerge from the file system of the insured in Funds of Professionals and Craftsmen of Greece (TEVE) as well as from the Athens Chamber of Commerce and Industry (EBEA)

About TEVE, the 1st semester of 2005 the number of the insured foreigners was 13.725 while 12.017 or the 87.5% of total TEVE records (1965-2005) occurred after 2001. Moreover, the Albanian self-employed are the 34.2% of the insured, followed by other nationalities with very small percentages, such as United Kingdom (6.3%) and Germany (4.1%)

We must underline that according the above – mentioned research of EKKE²⁴ and a letter from the computerization of TEVE to the researchers, the registered immigrants were in 2003, 9.075 and the 34% of them were of Albanian origin

As for the qualitative characteristics of the immigrants' entrepreneurship, the data of TEVE are extremely incomplete but according empirical estimations of high - ranked executives of TEVE, as recorded in the research of IMEP *“the majority of the insured immigrants practice independent financial activities in the form of provision of services (constructions, craftsmen, cleaning etc). If some of the immigrant activate in the sector of commercial enterprises, the majority of them are forms of small enterprises related to the retail trade and housing (cafes, bars, clothing, footwear etc)”*

To summarize, an effort to record all the recent surveys concerning foreigner entrepreneurs and the direct or indirect impacts of the implementation of the new legislation to the access of immigrants in entrepreneurship, would be extremely interesting.

The entrepreneurship of immigrants, either as an outlet from the difficulties of social and insurance needs and subsequently the renewal of residence permits or as a self contained and conscious vocational choice, must be researched in our country from a different point of view as well: the equal treatment for both the possibility of undertaking an independent financial activity and its term of function.

²⁴ Maratou – Alipranti Laura and Gazon Eric, Immigration and Health- Care EKKE 2005.

B. Benefits and costs of the alleviation of discriminations

The success of the alleviation or of the prevention of discriminations in labor market cannot be achieved only by promoting the principles of equal treatment or the universal values of solidarity, equality and respect of diversity, in any country that receives immigrants. The xenophobic stereotypes, racist point of views and behaviors, discriminative treatment of immigrants are in fact founded on purely financial reasons.

In the case of the workers, the effort for the alleviation of xenophobia passes inevitably through the fight against theories of the so called “financial racism” and particularly, through the demolition of arguments about the unfavorable consequences of immigration in employment, income and quality of labor relations of the native workers.

As for the employers, the foundation of a climate of equal treatment during the job employment or the evolution of the labor relation, presupposes the sensitization and information of the employers for the benefits and the possible obstacles that might occur from the adoption of a model of business activity without discriminations.

The employers cannot be classified by definition to xenophobic or non – xenophobic. The choice from the part of a Belgian employer between a Belgian, a German and a Moroccan is not made with the criterion of the superiority of a race, or because the color of the skin is a factor capable to guarantee greater efficiency on the job.

It is possible, though, the employment of a European instead of an Asian or an African to answer to previous financial “resolutions” that render “necessary” this discriminatory behavior. For example a) the estimation that the clients of a store prefer to be served by a compatriot employee b) the influence of stereotypes about the higher degree of productivity of one ore another nationality.

Usually in such cases we miss the basic detail, that the clients of an enterprise in the actual European societies do not form abstractly a compact total of native citizens, but they descent from various nationalities and races

So, in the Community’s level, in parallel with the actions against discriminations in employment, are already in route efforts for the dissemination of texts and researches about issues of advantages and disadvantages of the promotion of diversity in employment.

Probably, the most complete form of such a manual is the research²⁵ ***“The costs and benefits of diversity, a study on methods and indicators to measure the cost – effectiveness of diversity policies in the enterprises”***

The research comprised among others a record in 200 within the E.U., 8 case studies of programs for the promotion of diversity in 6 member – states and 48 interviews with companies, national governments, trade unions of employees and non – governmental organizations.

The main fields of research of this particular research are four. It would be extremely useful if its results were diffused and discussed by the total of employers in Greece.

²⁵ European Commission, directorate – general for employment, industrial relations and social affairs, October 2003

- 1) The companies who undertake a specific diversity policy for their employees notice considerable increase in long - term competitiveness and in some cases, a medium or short - term qualitative upgrade to their works.
- 2) It is necessary to count and certify the advantages for the enterprises that promote diversity, in order to advertise to the enterprises that do not consider an initiative like this necessary, the appropriate financial arguments
- 3) There are many obstacles of legal, administrative and social nature to the dissemination of the diversity programs, and the contribution of the State is necessary.
- 4) Finally, the financial arguments about the benefits of the promotion of the Principle of Equal treatment for the enterprises still in embryonic form.

But still, the organization of seminars and workshops in order to present and discuss the findings of the above – mentioned research, could be a great occasion to attempt in Greece as well to have a similar approach from the part of the employers, to the financial aspects of the promotion of diversity and equal treatment

An effort like this in the Greek case should focus on the study of the employment characteristics and the vocational orientations of the immigrants of second generation, as well as on the exploration of tendencies and attitudes (concerning this category of immigrants) of the employers.

F. Targeted actions for a common policy of discriminations' management

The statistics (presented in the second unit of this guide) for the access of immigrants in the Greek labor market are primarily about first generation immigrants, the first immigrants that settled in Greece the first half of the '90s.

It is not certain (for the reasons mentioned) that the conclusions, which describe a great degree of absorbance of immigrants in employment, will still apply for the descendants (who are gradually completing their education and are searching for a job) of the first financial immigrants, because the social and financial reasons that led to this positive Greek reality, will not apply in the future.

For the children of the immigrants, the 2nd generation immigrants, who are born and brought up in Greece, the access in the labor market is expected to be as difficult as the one of their Greek coevals. None of them will accept in advance a job out of his interests and inferior to his expectations according his educational level.

In other words, the issue of discriminations in employment and especially, job employment, concerns mainly the young immigrants, who will seek to utilize the educational or other qualifications that obtained in our country.

If, in the immediate future, the non – Greek origin or nationality, would be a disadvantage and a criterion for unfavorable treatment against them, then – in combination with their speculated unwillingness to work as domestics or in the branch of stock farming – their percentages of unemployment will not remain as low as the respective ones of their parents (who had accepted from the beginning the perspective

to work in any branch – no matter their educational level or their vocational experience)

Consequently, the fight against expanded and prevalent discriminative treatments should begin without delay. Due to the fact that there is not a large - scale introduction of this category of immigrants in the labor market (because of the young of their age on the average), the emphasis will be given inevitably on the prevention of such phenomena.

The employers' side has the chance to move on time and effectively, by deterring the creation of an unfair and hostile work environment for the young immigrants (in contrast with other countries, where the employers reacted with great delay). The respective action has three fields.

Firstly it is logical to emphasize on the detection and record of the lurking dangers. In the present phase, a work like this could not but comprise the detection of attitudes and stances of the employers to the perspective of employing immigrants, not in unskilled and manual works anymore, but in any position in the enterprise.

Training and questionnaires in order to discover attitudes and stances could provide the possibility to collect interesting material for brainstorming. In what degree, for example, the owners of foreign languages institutes would be willing to employ English or German teachers of Albanian or Pakistani origin?

Furthermore, the conduct of a pilot research for the certification of the predisposition of the employers of all branches, for discriminative behavior against immigrants during job employment, might have greater impact on the public opinion and by extension on the employers themselves, if this could be recorded by the means of a quantitative analysis?

The use of the method of testing, the control of discriminations through the *certification of realized behaviors*, which is followed in many European countries, might offer useful knowledge and experience, due to the fact that the search for employees through small ads is a practice widely spread in our country.

In a second level, probably, on the base of the findings that would occur from the previous researches, the sensitization of the employers is a major priority.

It is obvious that the stereotypes and the prejudices against one ore another minority group are not founded, except in complete and totally established racist and xenophobic ideologies.

It is also certain that the particular social factors that ensured until today a normal course in employment for the financial immigrants of the country are responsible for the fact that employers and employees express small interest about the discriminations in employment.

The global knowledge, though, of the dimensions of this socially dangerous phenomenon, it is almost certain that it would result to the following: the employers would include immediately in their agenda of priorities the study of appropriate ways to fight the problem.

Towards this particular direction, the appropriate actions are the organization of seminars or conferences with subjects such as the promotion of diversity and the principle of equal treatment, or the – by all means – information of the employers

about the community initiatives against discriminations and the Greek legislation about equal treatment (L. 3304/2005)

Finally, we must note that the phenomenon of immigration in our country is unique – probably the result of many historical, social and political factors: today, the opinions and the propositions of the organizations, from both employees and of the majority of employers (small and medium enterprises) are in general convergent.

The adoption of the L 3536/2007 that reforms the last basic law for immigration (3386/2005) and the phase of the debate of the social interlocutors in the frame of the Financial and Social Committee²⁶, resulted almost to coincidence of views of the representatives and experts of GSEE and GSVEE.

This fact does not concern only the partial provisions of the legislative text (under issuance at the time) but also the issues of basic principles and goals about a general structured immigration policy in Greece.

Particularly hopeful is the fact that there was a mutual agreement about the necessity to promote the integration of the 2nd generation immigrants in all the social procedures and particularly in employment. The particular tertiary organizations will have the opportunity to cooperate and to formulate unanimous opinions not only about the future of immigrants who will live and work in Greece, but also in general for the social and financial course of the country.

The National Committee for Social Integration of immigrants who is founded with the L. 3536/2007 is the appropriate occasion for a more coordinated and aimed action of employees and employers. But in order to achieve the desired target it is necessary to be undertaken consistently and within the organizations of employers and employees, the responsibility for the study and the practical promotion of the management of discriminations in employment.

²⁶ And in the frame of the formation of Opinion 165 of the Financial and Social Committee