



---

# Migrant incorporation in small towns and rural areas of Crete and Sardinia: a comparative analysis

*Dimitrios Rafail Tservenis (Danube University Krems)*

## ABSTRACT

How does the place of living impact the socioeconomic integration and perceived well-being of migrants residing in different urban and rural spatial typologies of Crete and Sardinia? Drawing from survey data collected between March 2019 and May 2020 and in-depth face-to-face interviews with key informants and migrants, this empirical research combined elements of both qualitative and quantitative methods of analysis to respond to this research question. Cross-national and within-region comparisons gave interesting insights into the interplay between the place of settlement and the well-being of migrants. The analysis of the findings suggests that: a) migrant incorporation outcomes varied only slightly between urban and rural areas in both objective and subjective terms; b) migrant incorporation in rural areas was not homogeneous across the various rural typologies examined (intermediate, remote, coastal); worth noting variations emerged in various domains such as employment, housing, financial conditions and the attitudes of the local society towards migration; and c) personal characteristics (rural/urban background, nationality, educational level,

religious affiliation, adaptive capacity) and aspirations influenced the initial settlement and migrant incorporation outcomes significantly.

## Introduction

International migration to small towns and rural areas of Southern Europe has been taking place since the late 1980s, having a significant demographic and economic impact on these areas. Many migrants have settled there for over three decades, but we know little about their experiences, perceptions, needs, living conditions and aspirations. Their incorporation into these places has been influenced both by *objective* factors, i.e., the actual conditions in terms of access to fundamental realms of life such as work, home, school, health, etc. and *subjective* factors such as their aspirations, expectations, quality of social relations between them and the locals of each setting. The objective factors are mainly influenced by the structural factors of the host place, such as the institutional capacity and quality of public administration, the labour market structure, housing opportunities, etc. and vary significantly from one area to another. By examining both types of factors, this paper aims to shed light on spatial trends, patterns, and determinants of migrant incorporation based on the typology of the place of living (urban-rural) in the regions of Crete (Greece) and Sardinia (Italy).

Stemming from the assumption that the place of residence can play a key role in the whole integration process (Kordel, Membretti 2020), the main objective guiding this cross-case empirical study was twofold: on the one hand, to examine to what extent the place of residence has influenced the socioeconomic and socio-cultural integration of two long-term settled migrant communities (i.e., Albanians and Moroccans) in these two regions objectively, while on the other hand, to illustrate the influence of the place of living on the perceived well-being subjectively. Thus, the two working axes are the

spatial typology as the independent variable on the one hand, while on the other, migrant integration outcomes and migrants' well-being were the dependent ones.

The entire regional territory was examined in both Crete and Sardinia, opting for comparisons between the rural and urban spatial typologies (i.e. primary and secondary urban poles, intermediate, remote and coastal rural areas) of the same region. The rationale behind this choice was that several strengths and weaknesses pointed out in the rural areas of a region could be spotted in the urban areas, too, and vice versa, thus qualifying them as structural features/problems of the whole regional territory and not particular to a specific urban/rural area. Based on the above objectives, a three-level spatial comparison emerged: a) within-region comparisons between urban and rural areas, b) within-region comparisons between different rural typologies, and c) cross-regional comparisons between Crete and Sardinia.

## Methodology & Data Sources

Combining elements of both qualitative and quantitative methods of analysis was fruitful. On the one hand, the qualitative analysis was fundamental in examining the experiences, practices and needs of the migrants living in the two regions, allowing for a wider exploration of the factors that influenced their incorporation. On the other hand, collecting quantitative data through a sample-based survey, apart from permitting to avoid hasty generalisations, allowed to clarify findings better and be specific: to what spatial typology, gender, age group, family status, educational level, generational cohort, employment status, duration of stay, or life-course phase do results refer to? To what extent were these findings relevant to others living in the same typology?

Fieldwork was divided into two stages. In the first stage (January 2018 - January 2020), insights on local government policies and

integration-related programmes, non-state actors' role at the local level, local society's attitudes towards migration, migrant living conditions, as well as migrant integration prospects in that locality, were gained through semi-structured face-to-face interviews with heads of local public offices, street-level bureaucrats, academics, civil society stakeholders, labour unions', NGOs' and migrant associations' representatives.

In the **second stage** (Crete: June - August 2019 /Sardinia: March 2019 - May 2020), data were collected through a sample-based quantitative survey conducted with the survey target population through face-to-face interviews (mostly PAPI mode and some through CAPI mode). The sample consisted of 100 Albanians in Crete and 75 Moroccans in Sardinia. The lack of reliable sampling frames in Greece and Italy (see Sanguilinda *et al.*, 2017) determined that respondents would be recruited using snowball sampling. Some random interviews were also conducted at the offices of public services, with the assistance of staff working there, thus introducing some elements of random sampling in the survey. In the absence of population lists, a list of municipalities was set up in which a relevant number of Albanians and Moroccans were living and where efforts were made to establish some first contacts/"seeds" with local stakeholders through which I was able to gain access to the survey population. The many referral chains led to a highly diversified and geographically dispersed sample (25 localities in Crete and 41 localities in Sardinia). While the sampling unit was the individual, the questionnaire was designed so to allow for gathering information about the living conditions of the entire household. In any case, only one person per household was interviewed to provide a more diverse sample.

## Case studies selection

These two regions were selected based on several common migration, institutional (e.g. quality of governance at the local level), demographic, economic, social, cultural and geomorphologic features

also presented in other *coastal, predominantly rural or intermediate rural regions* (according to the OECD 2014 classification). That said, it should be stressed that the research findings mainly concern regions with similar features to those of the two regions selected. The author's view is in line with those of Hatziprokopiou (2006: 171) and Bijl & Verweij (2012:32-38), who suggest that migrant integration research must emphasise context specificity as integration into various receiving societies is contingent on specific conditions and contexts.

On the other side, the reason for examining only two national groups (i.e. Albanians and Moroccans) has been to better focus on the spatial dimension of migrant integration and how integration is influenced by the place of living, considering the limited sample size in each spatial typology. Several potential differences between different national groups living in the two regions could have strongly influenced integration outcomes in objective and subjective terms (e.g. access to the labour market due to very diverse individuals' characteristics such as the ethnic group, the colour of skin or religious affiliation; adaptive capacity due to similar customs between the host and the country of origin, etc.). That said, the Albanian and Moroccan communities were selected on various grounds, such as their important numerical presence in the small rural settlements of the two regions, their high dispersion and long-term stay in these areas, but also to common grounds in their migration trajectories and individual characteristics (e.g. rural background, low educational level, family settlement)<sup>1</sup>.

## Questionnaire

The questionnaire's thematic areas and sections were strongly inspired by the set of the 2010 Zaragoza indicators (which use as data sources EU-SILC and EU-LFS surveys), integrated by those further developed and elaborated in the two joint reports of EC and OECD

<sup>1</sup> A more detailed analysis of the case studies selection can be found in the author's PhD thesis (Tservenis 2021, pp. 33-36) here: <https://www.didaktorika.gr/eadd/handle/10442/50717?locale=en>

in 2015 and 2018, 'Settling In: Indicators of migrant integration'. The aforementioned indicators capture mainly the *structural* dimension of integration – namely, the acquisition of rights and access to them (e.g. legal status, education, housing, labour market, etc.) (Heckman 2004). Additional indicators from the 'Survey on the Social Conditions and Integration of Foreign Citizens (SCIF)' conducted by ISTAT in 2011-2012 were used in synergy with the indicators above. The empirical investigation followed a life-cycle approach, asking survey respondents about their life in their home country, the reasons for migration, retrospective information about their living conditions in the host country and finally, their future aspirations.

## **Classifying the urban/rural typologies**

Classifying and selecting the urban and rural settlements where fieldwork was conducted was also crucial. To guarantee the best possible comparability, the most recent and relevant classification at the EU level and the OECD – the Degree of Urbanisation (DEGURBA)- was used. It is based on a three-level area classification, identifying: a) cities (densely populated areas), b) towns and suburbs (intermediate density areas), and c) rural areas (thinly populated areas). While it is a very useful tool in creating a Europe-wide framework that supports comparative research between descriptively similar urban and rural areas in terms of population density, size and remoteness, unfortunately, it does not capture the particularities and wide diversity of rural settlements.

Thus, considering that the research focused on integration in rural areas, classifying the various typologies of rural settlements further was deemed necessary to take their heterogeneity into account as best as possible. For doing that, the following national and regional spatial development plans were used that employ common EU criteria and that, in turn, are adapted to each local reality by the national and regional authorities: a) the EU Rural Development Programmes (RDP) 2014-2020; b) the EU Community-led Local Devel-

opment (CLLD) / LEADER programmes 2014-2020; c) the Regional Spatial Planning Framework 2017 (for Crete) and d) the 'National Inner Areas Strategy' (SNAI) 2013 (for Sardinia). After consulting all the above classification instruments, rurality was conceptualised based on: a) the accessibility to the principal public and private services and goods or, in other words, the remoteness dimension (based on driving distance using Google Maps web service), b) the physical distance of the settlements from the coast (within a distance of 10 km from the coastline), and, finally, c) their population size (based on the updated list of Local Administrative Units of 2019 by Eurostat).

Five different spatial typologies were conceptualised and examined to enable meaningful urban-rural and rural-rural comparisons:

1. *Cities*: Primary urban poles with more than 50,000 inhabitants, including the metropolitan areas' broader space and commuting zones;
2. *Towns and Suburbs*: Small and medium-sized towns with 5,000 - 35,000 inhabitants or municipalities located in the hinterland of the primary poles;
3. *Intermediate rural areas*: Rural settlements close to or along the main traffic corridors leading to the primary and secondary urban poles of the two regions (25 to 45 minutes driving time) with up to 5,000 inhabitants
4. *Remote rural areas*: Lagging remote rural areas far away from the primary or secondary urban poles (over 45 minutes driving time) with up to 5,000 inhabitants.
5. *Coastal rural areas*: Dynamic coastal and multi-functional rural areas with up to 5,000 inhabitants

## Fieldwork key findings

The empirical research in both regions has provided the following key insights<sup>2</sup>:

### Respondents' profile and settlement in rural areas

Findings showed that **personal characteristics and aspirations** matter a lot when it comes to integration outcomes and well-being in rural areas. In particular:

*Urban/rural background:* As emerged both in Crete and Sardinia, respondents with a rural background<sup>3</sup> were more likely to settle in small towns and rural settlements compared to those with an urban background. In addition, integration outcomes in rural areas were more positive for migrants with a *rural background* who possessed both intuitive knowledge and skills to work and live in rural areas.

*Educational level:* Respondents' *educational level* overwhelmingly drove settlement in urban/rural areas. In particular, respondents with a higher educational level were overrepresented in cities and towns compared to rural areas in both regions<sup>4</sup>.

*Family status:* Many key informants and respondents stressed that living with their family in rural areas significantly improved local society's attitudes towards them and, subsequently, their incorporation and living conditions.

---

2 A more detailed analysis of the survey findings can be found in the author's PhD thesis (pp. 216-265), here: <https://www.didaktorika.gr/eadd/handle/10442/50717?locale=en>

3 It refers to the urban/rural place where respondents lived most of their life before migration.

4 For instance, in Sardinia, of the 14 Moroccan respondents having attained tertiary education, ten lived in cities, three in towns and just one in coastal rural areas. None lived in intermediate or remote rural areas.

*Stage in life-course:* Migrants' personal needs fluctuate according to their life-course phase. Confirming previous insights from the literature (Papadopoulos, Fratsea 2021: 9), respondents' decision to settle or stay in rural areas depend highly on their family's needs, especially those of their offspring. This implies that while families with kids in their early childhood were likely to settle in rural areas due to the high level of safety and good environmental quality they offer, on the other hand, families with kids in their adolescence were less likely to settle or feel satisfied in such areas. Similarly, those already settled in rural areas were likely to move to the nearest large city due to the variety of cities' activities and opportunities they offer.

*Family and social networks:* The prior existence of family and social networks was central in shaping respondents' decision to settle in rural settlements. As also the literature suggests (Massey *et al.* 1993, Hatziprokopiou 2006; Migali *et al.* 2018), migration networks reduce the financial costs and natural risks of migration and integration significantly by providing immediate assistance or passing on useful survival information to the newly arrived migrants (e.g. easier access to employment, housing, etc.). Their decision to settle in rural settlements should also be linked to migrants' weak position in the housing market and the discrimination they face from local landlords. More to the point, in various cases, their social/family networks were the only way to find housing. Finally, several respondents reported that such presence was also a precondition for their overall well-being in the rural place of living (e.g. finding a job). In this regard, considering that the national groups under examination have been the most numerous migrant communities in each region (at the time of the case selection) and that the majority of the participants moved to the two islands mostly through migratory chains due to their prior presence of social networks in their place of settlement, it is assumed that the survey findings could differ significantly for other less numerous national groups living in the rural areas of the two islands.

*Reason for migration:* Respondents were likely to settle in rural areas when their migration project was *driven by labour*, especially

when their skills or professional aspirations matched the rural labour market of the host place.

*Personal preferences and aspirations:* People who preferred a simpler and slower pace of life, loved nature and wide spaces were more likely to settle in rural areas.

*Ethnic background / Country of origin / Religious affiliation:* In line with the findings of Koutsouris *et al.* (2009) and MacKrell & Pemberton (2018), different ethnic groups show different potential for integration in rural areas. Many respondents and key informants reported the importance of similar customs, religious affiliation and social norms for successful integration, while others believed that certain national groups would face important difficulties in integrating into rural societies. Cultural (e.g. social norms, habits) or religious distance proved to be a particularly important factor influencing migrant integration in rural areas in both regions. In any case, it should be stressed that variations among rural areas were notable (i.e. coastal versus intermediate & remote areas), too.

*Driving ability:* As it emerged, especially in Sardinia, many women living in places other than the island's large cities highlighted their inability to drive (i.e. not possessing a driving license) as a reason for being excluded from various social and economic opportunities.

*Adaptation-assimilation capacity/will:* Albanians' high capacity and/or will to adapt to the local society (e.g. agreement with values and habits of their settlement, strong social networks and long-term relationships with the local population, baptism, name change, learning the local dialect) appeared to be highly relevant for their successful integration in the rural areas of Crete. These findings confirm what literature (Jentsch, de Lima & Macdonald 2007) suggested about the assimilation into rural societies as a necessary precondition to successful integration. At the same time, this also implies that cultural and religious diversity is likely better accommodated in urban areas than rural ones.

---

## Structural features of the place of residence

*Local housing market:* Moroccans were more likely to settle in rural settlements of Sardinia due to the wide differences in the rent prices between urban and rural areas, which are not that pronounced in Crete.

*Local labour market:* Areas that combined agricultural and non-agricultural activities, where diversification of the rural economy has been most marked by tourism, offered a more favourable economic environment for migrant integration. Moreover, in line with the findings of Papadopoulos (2012: 178), the specificities of the local rural labour markets guided, to a large extent, the possible professional trajectories for respondents' mobility. Indeed, comparing migrants' previous and current jobs showed that Albanians living in rural areas where intensive agriculture is dominant (e.g. Tybaki in Crete) mostly continued to work in this sector, even though their work position and conditions significantly improved. On the other hand, those who lived in coastal rural areas or closer to cities had the opportunity to "switch" to different sectors of activity (e.g. from construction to catering or tourism activities).

*Legislation and national/local policies:* Various Moroccans settled in rural areas to fulfil the legal housing requirements for family reunification. Moreover, as we witnessed in the case of Sardinia, smaller municipalities' welfare policies and capacity influenced or better incentivised Moroccans' settlement in such places, too.

*Local culture and social norms:* Various respondents settled in rural areas (or used them as a stepping stone before moving to towns or cities) due to the fewer risks, informality and 'invisibility' that such settlements offered both for stay and work in the local underground economy. In fact, in both regions, the local societies are rather tolerant of irregular migration status and informal work conditions, features which shape in different ways migrant integration trajectories.

## **Integration outcomes and well-being at the place of residence**

Respondents living in small towns and rural areas of Crete did extremely well in terms of employment, self-employment and activity<sup>5</sup>, while in Sardinia, they did similarly (poorly) to those living in urban areas.

As it emerged in the case of Sardinia, particularly high levels of self-employment (20% of the economically active respondents) might indicate difficulties in accessing decent, well-paid and stable employment and subsequent problems in retaining a regular status rather than a strong tendency to entrepreneurship.

Great differences were observed between the two islands and national groups regarding respondents' working conditions and job quality. In Crete, all salaried workers declared to work full-time and to have a quite stable job, despite most working on a daily wage without a long-term contract. Respondents living in rural areas reported a medium-to-high level of satisfaction with their employment or self-employment conditions. In any case, only a small number reported labour exploitation issues. Overall, as discussed earlier, the working conditions for Albanians in Crete improved significantly over the years. Comparing respondents' previous and current occupations, we see that many Albanians achieved upward socioeconomic mobility in both rural and urban areas and found or started themselves a more skilled, secure, better quality and better-paid employment. On the other hand, Moroccans in Sardinia reported low to average satisfaction with their working conditions regardless of their place of settlement. However, important variations emerged among rural areas. Moreover, negative economic trends were witnessed regarding their employment all over the island. To sum up, over time, the quality of Albanians' employment improved; that of Moroccans did not, except for those who were highly educated.

<sup>5</sup> All economically active respondents declared to be employed or self-employed at the time of the survey.

Both in Crete and Sardinia, most respondents reported enjoying decent to good housing conditions all over the region. In Sardinia, no important differences were observed between the different spatial typologies, while in Crete, worth noting variations were observed among rural areas. Moreover, in Crete, great difficulty finding affordable and decent housing was recorded in all typologies examined, especially those living in cities and coastal rural settlements, where 33% and 38% of respondents reported living in overcrowded dwellings.

An intriguing pattern in Crete and Sardinia was observed regarding respondents' financial conditions. Respondents who lived in rural areas assessed their satisfaction with their household income with a slightly higher score (Crete: 6.49; Sardinia: 6.09) than those living in urban areas (Crete: 6.39; Sardinia: 5.41). This finding is considered particularly interesting as it highlights the importance of the subjective assessment of financial conditions, which is strongly related to the personal needs and aspirations of each person, while it can also capture, to an extent, important differences in the cost of living in each place of living or the satisfaction with the income derived by informal economic activity. In Sardinia, strong variations were also observed among rural and urban areas alike (Table 1).

**Table 1. Satisfaction with the household financial conditions**

<b>Spatial Typology</b>	<b>Cities</b>	<b>Towns &amp; Suburbs</b>	<b>Intermediate rural areas</b>	<b>Remote areas</b>	<b>Coastal rural areas</b>
<b>Albanians in Crete: Degree of satisfaction (0-10)</b>	6.43	6.18	6.54	6.55	6.38
<b>Moroccans in Sardinia: Degree of satisfaction (0-10)</b>	5.91	4.76	6.61	5.1	6.25

*Source: Author's own elaboration*

As shown in Table 2 below, findings from both Crete and Sardinia suggest that satisfaction with the place of residence reduces as we move further from the islands' large cities. However, it is important to stress that the differences between the different typologies are not significant. In addition, as we move further from the islands' large cities, there is a higher will to move elsewhere in the following years. It is also important to stress that, most often, those who would like to move elsewhere reported their preference to move to the regional or provincial capital city. Most of them justified this choice on the better services, activities and personal growth opportunities that cities offer for them and their offspring, particularly once the latter arrive in their teens. Furthermore, respondents' aspirations for moving elsewhere also had a strong age component, with most respondents under 29 years old preferring to move to urban areas due to the lack of job opportunities and cultural offers in the rural settlements in which they lived.

**Table 2. Satisfaction with the place of residence and staying preferences**

<b>Spatial Typology</b>	<b>Cities</b>	<b>Towns &amp; Suburbs</b>	<b>Intermediate rural areas</b>	<b>Remote areas</b>	<b>Coastal rural areas</b>
<b>Albanians in Crete: Degree of satisfaction (0-10)</b>	9.18	8.73	8.38	8	7.92
<b>Albanians in Crete: Will to stay at current place of residence (% of respondents)</b>	84.62	81.82	76.92	54.55	61.54
<b>Moroccans in Sardinia: Degree of satisfaction(0-10)</b>	7.79	6.65	6.7	6.4	8.93
<b>Moroccans in Sardinia Will to stay at current place of residence (% of respondents)</b>	58.33	36.84	55.56	30.00	25.00

*Source: Author's own elaboration*

The above findings could also be linked with both Albanians' and Moroccans' similar views regarding the prospects for migrant integration in rural areas of the two regions, which appear to decline. An exception to this might be the coastal rural areas and some intermediate areas with multi-functional dynamic economies. In any case, it is beyond any doubt that remote rural areas show extremely poor prospects for migrant integration, especially compared to the intermediate or coastal ones.

Finally, reaffirming previous insights from the literature (Papadopoulos 2009; 2012), the *socioeconomic mobility* of respondents was likely to go hand-in-hand with *spatial mobility* (rural to urban movement). Moreover, regarding the spatial mobility within the country or region, evidence showed that respondents' movement had been unidirectional (i.e. rural-urban). Only a few Moroccans moved from urban to rural areas, in the case of Sardinia. When this happened, it was linked to the necessity to fulfil the preconditions for family reunification or to find better housing for their family. In a similar vein, the fact that many respondents lived in rural areas before moving to cities of the two regions underlines that the research findings concern those who stayed in such settlements in the long run. More to the point, the several Albanians and Moroccans who lived in the past in rural areas and later moved to urban centres already responded in a way to the main research question regarding their needs and aspirations with their feet.

## Conclusions

The empirical evidence confirmed that the character and direction of migrant integration processes reflected the wider set of economic, socio-cultural and political features and customs of each rural locality to an important extent. For instance, features such as

the local labour market, economic and demographic trends, infrastructure, local culture and attitudes (i.e. familism, parochialism, weak local culture of entrepreneurship in Sardinia), prior migration history and experience, and the welfare capacity of local municipalities strongly framed respondents' settlement and integration in the rural areas of the two regions.

Moreover, the fieldwork findings showed greater advantages for migrants living in urban areas than rural ones and conditions in the cities were more favourable for successful integration in all domains examined. Indeed, overall, migrants' living conditions have been "objectively" better in the cities of the two regions where labour markets are larger and infrastructure is better consolidated. Furthermore, additional "objective" downsides observed in rural areas imply that the settlement in such locations is more suitable for specific migrant profiles than others, as also analysed in the previous section. For instance, as Jentsch, de Lima & Macdonald (2007) also suggested, opportunities for social and economic mobility and growth in rural areas are fewer, and often, there is a lack of high-quality employment or employment opportunities in previous careers due to the small-scale rural economies. Subsequently, more highly-skilled migrants will likely be discouraged from settling or remaining in rural areas in the long run. Similarly, those who might settle in rural areas need to "enjoy" performing available jobs to continue staying in these. They must also possess specific skills that match the limited in-scale rural labour markets.

However, it also emerges that differences between urban and rural areas in subjective terms were less relevant than the literature suggested (OECD 2018a; Natale et al., 2019) when assessing integration outcomes only in objective terms. In fact, the survey findings showed that integration outcomes varied only slightly between urban and rural areas in subjective terms. Important assets in certain realms of life compensated significantly for drawbacks in others based on respondent's characteristics (gender, age, family status, length of residence, generational cohort, the reason for migration,

employment status, educational level, life-course stage) and aspirations, while “hidden” outcomes linked to the widespread informal economy of Southern Europe possibly surfaced, too.

Findings also showed that migrant integration in rural areas is not homogeneous across the various rural typologies examined (i.e., intermediate, remote, coastal). Worth noting variations emerged in various domains such as employment, housing, financial conditions as well as the attitudes of the local society towards migration. In addition, respondents living in each typology faced different challenges (e.g. cost of housing in coastal rural areas, lack of entertainment in intermediate and remote rural areas) or the same challenge in varying degrees (e.g. housing, employment). Overall, different rural typologies influenced migrant integration outcomes and well-being differently and drove migrants to very diverse professional trajectories.

Building on the findings of this research, some suggestions for future inquiry emerge. First, further harmonised, comparable and timely quantitative evidence is needed at the municipality level that will allow for a more geographically precise and richer analysis of migrant integration in rural areas of the EU Member States. In this respect, scholars should further exploit the under-utilised existing data produced by national and sub-national surveys that targeted directly or indirectly TCN or foreign-born populations<sup>6</sup>. Second, considering that migrant integration is highly complex and infinite variations in each case may occur both in terms of the rural typology and the migrants’ profiles, it could be extremely useful to explore further whether artificial intelligence software can contribute to generating meaningful matching between the structural features of the host rural settlements, on the one hand, and migrants’ skills, capabilities, needs and aspirations, on the other, thus optimising both their initial settlement and long-term incorporation prospects.

<sup>6</sup> In this regard, the Ethnic and Migrant Minorities (EMM) Survey Registry is a very useful free tool that allows users to search for and learn about existing quantitative surveys to EMM populations through survey-level metadata. You can access it here: <https://ethmigsurveydatahub.eu/emmregistry/>

## References

Bijl, R., Verweij, A. 2012. Measuring and monitoring immigrant integration in Europe Integration policies and monitoring efforts in 17 European countries. The Hague: The Netherlands Institute for Social Research.

Hatziprokopiou, P. A. 2006. Globalisation, migration and socioeconomic change in contemporary Greece: Processes of Social Incorporation of Balkan Immigrants in Thessaloniki. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Heckmann, F. 2004. Integration and integration policies. IMISCOE network feasibility study' (draft version, November 2004). 1<sup>st</sup> Annual IMISCOE Conference, Coimbra, 3-6 December 2004.

ISTAT 2011. Survey on the Social Conditions and Integration of Foreign Citizens (SCIF): Microdata for Research Purposes; <https://www.istat.it/en/archive/191097> (last checked 1<sup>st</sup> November 2023).

Jentsch, B., de Lima, P., MacDonald, B. 2007. Migrant workers in rural Scotland: Going to the middle of nowhere. In Migrant integration in rural areas. Evidence from new countries of immigration. International Journal of Multicultural Societies, Koenig, M. & Jentsch, B. (eds). 9,1: 35-53.

Kasimis, C., Papadopoulos, A. 2005. The Multi-functional Role of Migrants in the Greek Countryside: Implications for the Rural Economy and Society, "Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies" 31, 1: 99-127.

Kordel, S., Membretti, A. (eds.). 2020. Classification of MATILDE regions. Spatial specificities and third-country nationals distribution; [https://matilde-migration.eu/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/MATILDE\\_D21\\_Classification\\_on\\_spatial\\_specificities\\_and\\_TCNs\\_distribution\\_040820.pdf](https://matilde-migration.eu/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/MATILDE_D21_Classification_on_spatial_specificities_and_TCNs_distribution_040820.pdf) (last checked 1<sup>st</sup> November 2023)

Koutsouris A., Louloudis, L., Gidarakou, I. 2009. Economic Immigrants in the Greek Countryside: Socioeconomic Integration and Questions of Ethnic Exclusion. Paper presented at the XXIII European Society for Rural Sociology Conference.

---

Mackrell, P., Pemberton S. 2018. New representations of rural space: Eastern European migrants and the denial of poverty and deprivation in the English countryside, "Journal of Rural Studies" 59: 49-57.

Massey D. S., Arango, J., Hugo, G., Koouci, A., Pellegrino, A., Taylor J. E. 1993. Theories of international migration: a review and appraisal, "Population and Development Review" 19,3: 431-466.

Migali, S., Natale, F., Tintori, G., Kalantaryan, S., Grubanov-Boskovic, S., Scipioni, M., Farinosi, F., Cattaneo, C., Benandi, B., Follador, M., Bidoglio, G., McMahan, S., Barbas, T. 2018. International Migration Drivers: A quantitative assessment of the structural factor affecting migration. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

Natale, F., Kalantaryan, S., Scipioni, M., Alessandrini, A., Pasa, A. 2019. Migration in EU Rural Areas. Brussels: Publications Office of the European Union.

OECD, European Commission. 2015. 'Indicators of Immigrant Integration 2015 — Settling In'; <https://www.oecd.org/migration/indicators-of-immigrant-integration-2015-settling-in978926423402-4-en.htm> (last checked 11<sup>th</sup> May 2023).

OECD, European Commission 2018. 'Indicators of Immigrant Integration 2018 — Settling In'. Paris: OECD Publishing.

OECD 2018. Working Together for Local Integration of Migrants and Refugees. Paris: OECD Publishing.

Papadopoulos A.G., Fratsea L.M. 2021. Migrant and Refugee Impact on Well-Being in Rural Areas: Reframing Rural Development Challenges in Greece. "Frontiers in Sociology" 6.

Papadopoulos, A. G. 2012. Transnational Immigration in Rural Greece: Analysing the Different Mobilities of Albanian Immigrants, In Translocal Ruralism, Hedberg, C., do Carmo, M. (ed.). GeoJournal, 103: 163-183.

Papadopoulos, A.G. 2009. 'Begin from the bottom and move up': Social mobility of immigrant labour in rural Greece. "Méditerranée" 113: 25-39.

Sanguilinda, I. S., Barbiano di Belgiojoso, E., Ferrer, A. G., Rimoldi, S. M. L., Blangiardo, G. 2017. Surveying immigrants in Southern Europe: Spanish and Italian strategies in comparative perspective. "Comparative Migration Studies" 2017 5, 17: Published online: <https://comparativemigrationstudies.springeropen.com/articles/10.1186/s40878-017-0060-4> (last checked 1<sup>st</sup> November 2023).

