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ABSTRACT

This thesis explores the social phenomenon of mixed marriage between foreign nationals and natives in the Republic of Cyprus focusing on the mate selection process. It presents three distinct research phases and their statistical data (population statistics), quantitative and qualitative findings. The analysis of the population statistics data from official Demographic Reports (on marriage, mixed marriage and immigration in Cyprus) quantifies the increasing tendency of native Cypriots to marry foreigners during the period 1989-2004. The statistical data findings reveal a typology of mixed marriage in Cyprus which accounts for (1) gender specific differences in Cypriot men’s and women’s preferences in foreign mate selection process and (2) a regional pattern in Cypriots’ marital choices for foreign spouses. These primary findings constituted the starting point for an empirical investigation that employed a combined-methods approach: quantitative (a questionnaire survey about Cypriots’ perceptions, opinions and attitudes towards mixed marriage in Cyprus) and qualitative (in-depth, semi-structured interviews with spouses from mixed marriages about motives that determined their marital choices).

The goal of the study was to identify main reasons that led people to enter mixed marital relationships in Cyprus. This task was undertaken by conducting exploratory research and monitoring the partner choice formation at each of the levels of the individual-group-society model, namely: individual motivations (preferences), third party agents (constraints) and marriage market mechanism (or the opportunity for matching).

The research findings describe three major topics when accounting for mixed marriage in Cyprus: (1) a hierarchy of desirability for foreign spouses that coincides with a perceived hierarchy of foreign nationalities in Cyprus as identified at the level of local public opinion; (2) Opposed marital choices of native men and women for foreign spouses and contrasting attitudes of Cypriot men and women towards mixed marriage; (3) Two ways of conceptualizing mixed marriage and their equivalent patterns of mate selection in Cyprus.

This study is original in relation to previous studies of mixed-marriage mate selection in that it:

- Challenges the classical exchange perspective on mate selection process in the specific case of mixed marriage, proposing an aesthetic sociology perspective that relies on Bourdieu’s concept of ‘taste’ to understand people’s marital choices;
- Manages to adapt exchange theory and aesthetic sociology perspectives to the sociological model of individual-group-society levels in the mate selection process in order to construct the investigation tools;
• Succeeds in combining three sets of research findings obtained by using a combined-methods approach (or multi-strategy strategy research), namely: statistical, quantitative and qualitative that coincide into a large extent, thus being "cross-checked";

• Accounts for a factor that was not found in the literature review as having been previously investigated quantitatively and qualitatively in the same study. This is the exposure to foreign influence: of Cypriot respondents representing Cypriot public opinion, of foreign spouses married to Cypriots and of Cypriot spouses married to foreigners;

• Undertakes a pioneering task in the field of research on mixed marriage in Cyprus, revealing many aspects that help in understanding this new, but increasingly frequent phenomenon in Cypriot society;

• Identifies new areas that need consideration in any future research wishing to reach a better understanding of mixed marriage in Cyprus and considers the policy implications of the findings reported at a societal level (see issues regarding integration, assimilation and acculturation).
Η παρούσα διδακτορική διατριβή έρευνα το κοινωνικό φαινόμενο των μικτών γάμων μεταξύ ξένων υπηκόων και ιθαγενών της Κυπριακής Δημοκρατίας. Η έρευνα επικεντρώνεται στη διαδικασία της επιλογής συντρόφου. Παρουσιάζει τρεις ξεχωριστές φάσεις έρευνας και τα ευρήματά τους: στατιστική (στατιστικές πληθυσμού), ποσοτική και ποιοτική. Η ανάλυση των στατιστικών στοιχείων του πληθυσμού που δημοσιεύονται από την Στατιστική Υπηρεσία Κύπρου (για γάμους, μικτούς γάμους και μετανάστευση στην Κύπρο) ποσολογεί την συζύγωνη έννοια των Κυπρίων να παντρεύονται ξένους και ξένες υπηκόους κατά την περίοδο 1989-2004. Το πρώτο σύνολο των ευρημάτων αποκαλύπτει: μια τυπολογία των μικτών γάμων στην Κύπρο η οποία καταγράφει (1) διαφορές φύλου στις προτιμήσεις Κυπρίων ανδρών και γυναικών όσον αφορά τη διαδικασία επιλογής αλλοδαπών συντρόφων και (2) ένα τοπικό μοντέλο (ανά περιοχή) όσον αφορά τις επιλογές των Κυπρίων για ξένους συζύγους. Αυτά τα πρώτα ευρήματα αποτέλεσαν το σημείο εκκίνησης για μια εμπειρική διερεύνηση με χρήση μιας προσέγγισης με συνδυασμό διαφόρων μεθόδων: ποσοτικής (έρευνα με χρήση ερωτηματολογίου σχετικά με τις αντιλήψεις των Κυπρίων, τις γνώμες και τις στάσεις τους απέναντι στους μικτούς γάμους) και ποιοτικής (συνεντεύξεις με ξένους υπηκόους-συζύγους μικτών γάμων- σχετικά με τα κίνητρα που τους ώθησαν στις επιλογές των συντρόφων τους).

Σκοπός της διατριβής ήταν να διαπιστώσει κύριους λόγους που οδήγησαν ανθρώπους να συνάψουν μικτούς γάμους στην Κύπρο. Η εργασία αυτή έγινε με διερεύνηση της διαδικασίας επιλογής συντρόφου σε κάθε επίπεδο του μοντέλου άτομο–ομάδα – κοινωνία, δηλαδή: ατομικά κίνητρα (προτιμήσεις) /Individual motivations (preferences); τρίτες ομάδες (εξαναγκασμοί)/Third-party agents (constraints), και μηχανισμός αγοράς γάμου/Marriage market mechanism (opportunities ή η δυνατότητα για εύρεση συντρόφου).

Τα ευρήματα της έρευνας περιγράφουν τρία κύρια θέματα όσον αφορά τους μικτούς γάμους στην Κύπρο: (1) μια ιεραρχία προτίμησης για ξένους συζύγους που συμπίπτει με την αντιλαμβανόμενη ιεραρχία ξένων καταγράφηκε στην Κύπρο όπως καταγράφονται στο επίπεδο της κοινής γνώμης, (2) Αντιπέπεμπεις επιλογές γάμου μεταξύ Κυπρίων ανδρών και γυναικών για ξένους συζύγους αντίστοιχα και αντιπέπεμπεις αντίστασες Κυπρίων ανδρών και γυναικών απέναντι στο μικτό γάμο, (3) Δύο τρόπους εννοιολογίας μικτών γάμων και οι αντίστοιχοι τρόποι επιλογής συντρόφου στην Κύπρο.

Αυτή η έρευνα είναι πρωτότυπη σε σχέση με άλλες μελέτες επιλογής συντρόφων μικτών γάμων καθότι:

- Προκαλεί την κλασική ανταλλαγή άποψης (προοπτικής) στην διαδικασία επιλογής συντρόφου σε μικτό γάμο, προτείνοντας μια προοπτική της κοινωνιολογίας της
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αισθητικής που βασίζεται στη θεωρία του Bourdieu περί «γούστου» για να κατανοήσουμε τις γαμήλιες επιλογές των ανθρώπων,

- Κατορθώνει να προσαρμόσει τις δύο θεωρητικές προοπτικές που χρησιμοποιήθηκαν στο κοινωνιολογικό μοντέλο άτομο – ομάδα – κοινωνία στη διαδικασία επιλογής συντρόφου με σκοπό να κατασκευάσει τα εργαλεία εμπειρικής διερεύνησης,

- Επιτυγχάνει να συνδυάσει τρία σύνολα ευρημάτων έρευνας (που λήφθηκαν συνδυάζοντας μια προσέγγιση μικτών μεθόδων): στατιστική, ποσοτική και ποιοτική που συμπίπτουν σε μεγάλο βαθμό, και έτσι τα αποτελέσματα τους εξακριβώνονται διασταυρούμενα,

- Αναφέρεται σε ένα παράγοντα ο οποίος δεν βρέθηκε να έχει διερευνηθεί προηγούμενα ποσοτικά και ποιοτικά σε παρόμοια μελέτη στην βιβλιογραφία. Αυτός είναι η έκθεση στις ξένες επιδράσεις (foreign influence exposure) : Κυπρίων που απάντησαν το ερωτηματολόγιο και αντιπροσωπεύουν το κυπριακό κοινό, ξένων συζύγων που παντρεύτηκαν Κυπρίους και Κυπρίων συζύγων που παντρεύτηκαν ξένους,

- Αναλαμβάνει μια πρωτοποριακή εργασία στο πεδίο της έρευνας για μικτούς γάμους στην Κύπρο, αποκαλύπτοντας πολλές πτυχές που βοηθούν στην κατανόηση αυτού του νέου, αλλά αυξανόμενου φαινόμενου στην Κυπριακή κοινωνία,

- Διαπιστώνει νέες περιοχές που χρειάζεται να εξετασθούν σε μια μελλοντική μελέτη με την επιθυμία να φθάσουμε σε καλύτερη κατανόηση των μικτών γάμων στην Κύπρο λαμβάνοντας υπόψη τις συνέπειες τους σε επίπεδο κοινωνίας (βλέπε θέματα που αφορούν την ενσωμάτωση, αφομοίωση και πολιτισμική ομοιογένεια).
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INTRODUCTION

This is a thesis about mixed marriage (i.e. intersocietal marriage) between Greek-Cypriots and foreigners in the Republic of Cyprus. Its focus is on the process of mate selection in mixed marriages. The main aim has been to determine foreign spouses' rationales for entering into mixed marriages with Greek Cypriots. The study of the background to people’s marital choice was centred on sociology of family perspectives about partner choice issues.

The thesis has approached the phenomenon in question both theoretically and empirically. Consequently, a theoretical framework about mate selection in mixed marriage was constructed which combined: (1) a multilayered sociological perspective about partner choice formation at three levels: individual, group and society; (2) central factors about the propensity for exogamy: attitudes, opportunities, exchange and taste; and (3) exchange theory and aesthetic sociology's theories about taste.

A distinction was made between factors that play a role in mate selection at the structural level (the wider environment), the socio-cultural level (the immediate environment) and the personal level. The idea was that the choice of a life partner is the result of a personal judgment which is influenced by factors in the wider and immediate environment.

Theoreticians have emphasized three factors as central to the propensity for exogamy: attitudes, opportunity and exchange (Lieberson and Waters, 1988). But how could one measure “propensity” for mixed marriage? In addition to favourable attitudes and opportunity for contact, there is the importance of taste, need and pleasure in spouse selection, as the present study proposed.

The empirical research process includes three research stages. The two main research questions concerned mixed marriage as a changing marriage pattern. Does mixed marriage constitute a ‘threat’ to Cypriot intramarriage values and customs? To what extent does mixed marriage provide a shifting model of marriage partner selection? In order to answer these questions, there was need to examine the extent of mixed marriage and immigration as two interconnected phenomena in the particular case of Cyprus. In this sense, the analysis of statistical data (for the period 1989-2004), as a first research stage, revealed patterns of preference (out-marriage groups for Cypriot spouses) and patterns of opportunity (groups of immigrant nationalities in Cyprus) - see Chapter two.

Taking into account that marriage patterns simply show which groups interact with each other and they do not give an idea about why (Kalmijn, 1998), this study further explored two large reason categories in mate selection: reasons invoked by foreigners who married Cypriots (as subjects’ arguments) and those reasons given by Cypriot
nationals (as third parties' opinions) in general. Because each of the two sets of arguments required different methods of investigation, a combined methodological approach or multi-strategy research was adopted in the second and third research stages. The whole research process was accompanied by a critique of the categories, reliability and sociological significance of the results, as discussed in Chapter three.

The thesis is structured into six chapters grouped into two main parts: ‘Marriage and mixed marriage: the conceptual framework’ and ‘Mixed marriage in Cyprus: research and findings’. The content of each of the chapters is as follows:

Chapter One reviews the relevant international literature on exogamy and endogamy as considered both in intrasocietal and intersocietal contexts. The main corpus of this literature focuses on intermarriage (mostly in the U.S. societal context) which has been primarily studied as an indicator of wider social processes, such as assimilation and integration, rather than a topic of intrinsic interest. This chapter also deals with some theoretical issues in relation to the concept of ‘mixed marriage’ and its theoretical construction as being specific to a particular societal context (i.e. it is always defined in a country-specific context). Moreover, the difficulty in giving an uncontested definition of the term ‘mixed marriage’ is emphasised.

In general, the studies about mixed couples/marriages at an intersocietal level are very isolated in the specialised literature and, as a result, the phenomenon lacks a strong explanatory theory. The working definition adopted in this study considers ‘nationality’ as a marker of difference between spouses, as it determines a veritable cascade of identities: linguistic, religious, cultural, ethnic and so forth.

Chapter Two has two main sections on: (1) marriage and family in Cyprus and (2) mixed marriage and immigration in Cyprus. The first section reviews an anthropological discourse about family and marriage in Cyprus, aiming at identifying some patterns of mate selection in marriages between two Greek-Cypriot partners. The focus here is both on traditional Cypriot family and marriage as well as on discourses emphasizing dualism and change with regard to family and marriage processes in contemporary Cyprus. By reviewing this literature, the following question emerged and was investigated: to what extent does mixed marriage constitute a changing marriage pattern? A first answer was given by an analysis of statistical data that quantified the increasing tendency of native Cypriots to marry foreign nationals for the years between 1989 and 2004, with available statistical data. The raw percentage analysis resulted in a typology of mixed marriage in Cyprus that accounts for (a) gender-specific differences in Cypriot men’s and women’s preferences in the process of foreign mate selection (Cypriot men entered more mixed marriages than their female counterparts) and (b) a gender-differentiated regional pattern in choosing foreign spouses (i.e. Cypriot men chose mainly spouses from the Eastern-

---

1 All appendices corresponding to the chapters are displayed in a separate volume.
European group of countries and Cypriot women chose mostly grooms from the Euro-American group of countries). Moreover, three main sources of foreign spouses for Cypriots were identified. The chapter ends by formulating some empirical research hypotheses based on patterns and tendencies revealed by the statistical data analysis.

Chapter Three addresses methodological questions in relation to the empirical research process. The research design combined different methods in order to reveal diverse dimensions of the phenomenon, to strengthen shortcomings of each method, and/or to double-check findings by examining them from several vantage points. The integration of different methods makes it possible to weave back and forth between different levels of meaning. In this particular case, the study captured a subjective meaning (experiences and understandings) of a sample of female subjects who entered into mixed marriages to Cypriots (through twenty semi-structured interviews) and also, a kind of objective meaning of Cypriot public opinion (N=400) who perceive mixed marriage from ‘outside’ (without neglecting the bias of this point of view, due to the widespread preconceived ideas/stereotypes regarding mixed marriage).

Chapter Four presents and analyses the findings of a questionnaire survey on ‘Cypriots’ perceptions, opinions and attitudes towards mixed marriage in Cyprus’ (the findings are summarized in Appendix H). Generally, the questionnaire findings confirm the following working hypotheses which had been formulated on the basis of statistical data findings and literature review: (a) Higher exposure to foreign influence heightens tolerance towards foreigners; (b) Social distance plays a certain role in terms of mate selection. Foreign nationalities are perceived as arranged in a hierarchy reflecting their desirability as marriage mates; (c) Cypriot men prefer East-European brides and Cypriot women prefer Euro-American grooms (Down-up or hypergamy hypothesis).

Chapter Five presents and analyses the findings of twenty semi-structured interviews with foreign spouses living in mixed marriages with Greek Cypriots (the interview findings are summarized in Appendix H). The exploratory research questions used for the interviews were developed based on social exchange theory and aesthetic sociology assumptions in relation to mate selection and also, on patterns revealed by the statistical data analysis. The hypotheses envisaged here are three: (a) Exchange hypothesis; (b) Hypergamy/hypogamy hypothesis; and (c) Similarity hypothesis. The main research question was whether foreign spouses chose to marry Cypriots under the condition of bilateral exchanges of personal characteristics and resources or on the basis of pure taste dispositions.

Chapter Six presents a synthesis of the whole research process and its findings and formulates three general conclusions about mixed marriage mate selection in Cyprus: (1) There was identified a hierarchy of desirability for foreign spouses; (2) Cypriot men
and women show opposed marital choices; (3) There were identified two patterns of mixed marriage mate selection or two ways of conceptualising mixed marriage in Cyprus.

(1) The hierarchy of foreigners as Cypriots’ spouses accounts for religious, racial and economic lines of segregation and is given by the Cypriots’ mate choices mainly from the Eastern-European and Euro-American groups of countries (as identified by the population statistics analysis). Quantitative and qualitative findings confirm the statistical findings and show that, according to existing prejudices and stereotypes (positive and negative) about each nationality, the Cypriots are likely to perceive mixed-marriage foreign spouses either as favourably or unfavourably. The general criteria are: religion, economic standing and such racial characteristics as skin colour. A nationality that has many similarities with the Cypriots on these markers is most likely to be perceived as closer in terms of social distance and it is implicitly more likely to be accepted.

(2) The research findings picture two opposite and gendered stands of Cypriots on mixed marriage: (a) one of Cypriot women who have entered proportionately less marriages to foreigners and showed more unfavorable attitude towards them and (b) one of Cypriot men who have entered significantly more mixed marriages and are more approving of them.

(3) The quantitative and qualitative findings about foreign spouses’ reasons for Cypriot mate selection suggest two patterns of mate selection or two ways of conceptualizing mixed marriage in Cyprus: (a) a pattern of mixed marriage mate selection where the partners have made their marital choices based on reasons regarding an ideal combination of cultural, physical and psychological characteristics overarched by love. This undermines any perception of the marriage partner as a foreigner (as shown by the qualitative findings); and (b) another pattern of mixed-marriage mate selection where it is understood that the partners would made their marital choices by exchanging mainly non-material assets (such as physical attractiveness) and material resources (as shown by quantitative data and interview narratives).

Chapter six also discusses questions on the implementation of results, additional research needed, contribution to knowledge and limitations of the present study. Practical suggestions for the implementation of findings results from analysing the influence of the Cypriot State on the choice of mixed marriage partners. Also, the interview findings may go some way in providing guidance on marital counselling for spouses entering mixed marriages.

Additional research on the topic of mixed marriage in Cyprus may be developed by drawing on the current findings in relation to the issues concerning each of the social forces influencing the processes of mate selection in mixed marriages at the individual, group and societal levels.
The study contributes to knowledge at the level of both theory and methodology by: (a) employing three types of data that are cross-checked; (b) using of a multi-strategy approach in studying mixed marriage; and (c) taking into consideration the exposure to foreign influence (which was not previously investigated both quantitatively and qualitatively in the same study-as far as it is possible to ascertain).

Making the most of such commonly-used instruments of research as the survey questionnaire and semi-structured interviewing, the study is not without its limitations and therefore the hypotheses could be verified only through indicative findings. A main limitation is provided by the sensitive aspect of the topic, a fact that introduces possible biases in interview findings and partly in the questionnaire findings. However, the methodological tools employed proved to be well-suited to the aims of this descriptive and exploratory study, as there is no previous sociological research in the field of mixed marriage in Cyprus. Another limitation concerns (a) the lack of detailed statistical data on the demographic characteristics of spouses entering mixed marriages and (b) the fact that the official population statistics are deficient in tabulating data on more than fourteen nationalities entering marriages with Cypriots.
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ANALYTICAL AND CONCEPTUAL CONSIDERATIONS:
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A conceptual framework is a vocabulary of defined terms. The aim of this chapter is to define and explain the concepts that are necessary in order to provide operational definitions for the present research design. The main issues under discussion are: family, marriage, mixed marriage, social mobility and migration. Each of these issues is going to be approached separately, in order to construct a theoretical framework for the empirical investigation.

What is the context of the debate over these issues? Central to all five of these themes is the notion of change. Although social change is normal in contemporary society, it appears to be occurring at a very fast rate today (Giddens, 2000a). People often hold contradictory attitudes towards change, wanting flexibility and freedom but, also clinging to the presumed stability of the past. They tend to blame the disruptions of change on the social groups who are most known for challenging the status quo. One of these influencing social groups is the family. People react especially strongly to perceived threats to the family because they expect strong families to save society from breakdown. The family provides a metaphor for many things people value, such as love, nurture and dependability. However, family responds to and reflects general social change. It is often the site of change: the arena in which shifts occur through changes in the behaviour of individuals, particularly in the area of intimate relationships between family members. The family composition is subject to constant change through events which mark transitions in individual lives (births, partnering, divorce, re-partnering, and death) and less predictable events such as migration, war, political upheaval and general geographic mobility (Giddens, 2000). Family mobility has a central place in world history. Settles (1993) suggests that while there is a tendency to emphasize stability as a “moral good and characteristic of family life in general” the reality is that movement (within and outside national boundaries) and change in family life is more the typical experience than the exception.

Therefore, the broad and complex phenomenon of social change affecting family and marriage processes encompasses both social mobility and migration. The movement of individuals between different positions within the system of social stratification (i.e. social mobility) and across symbolic or political boundaries into new residential areas and communities (i.e. migration) is a factor that affects family and marriage.

Mixed marriage\(^1\) (the term used in the European tradition of research in this domain) or intermarriage (the term used by American theoreticians)\(^2\) is one of the effects of social interaction involving structural changes and mobility processes.

---

\(^1\) The study presented here uses the term ‘mixed marriage’ instead of ‘intermarriage’.

\(^2\) The study presented here uses the term ‘intermarriage’ instead of ‘mixed marriage’.
Classical theories explaining intermarriage (studied in the American context) stress mobility processes: Merton (1941) and Davis (1941) developed a status theory showing that the successful black men exchange their socioeconomic status for the higher caste status of white women (i.e. upward social mobility). More recently, Tucker and Mitchell-Kernan (1990) argued that intermarriage (in American society) results from a weakening of traditional social control, and that such control is weaker for black men and for geographically mobile individuals (i.e. geographical mobility).

The brief outline of this chapter pictures the conceptual network on which the study framework is based. A conceptual framework is one of the possible approaches, which can suit the description and explanation of the mixed marriage phenomenon in Cypriot society.

Chapter Outline:

1.1. MARRIAGE AND FAMILY PROCESSES

1.1.1. KEY CONCEPTS. DEFINITIONS

Just as there is no universal and enduring form of the family, there is no single way of defining “family”. Rather, there are perspectives related to different disciplines of thought: for example, in broad terms sociologists see family as a primary agent for socialization, social control and transmission of cultural values; economists see family (partly) as a unit of consumption; anthropologists see family as a unit that takes different forms across cultures and societies; and psychologists see family as a primary unit in which children are reared and individual personalities develop. Nevertheless, families are commonly expected to care for and nurture children, to provide financially for their members and to transmit cultural and moral traditions and values.

This study adopts conventional definitions of the concept of family and family-related terms (see the construction of a theoretical framework to be employed in this analysis). First of all, it is necessary to define some basic concepts, particularly those of family and marriage.

A ‘family’ is a group of persons directly linked by kin connections, the adult members of which assume responsibility for caring for children (Giddens, 2000:140). In other words, the family is a social group formed by a married couple and its children.

2 ‘Mixed marriage’ or ‘intermarriage’ refers to the unions that cross barriers of race, religion, nationality, ethnicity, class, language and caste. To some extent, what constitutes mixed marriage for those involved is determined by the socially meaningful commonalities and differences which they perceive as such.
Moreover, the family is an intimate domestic group made up of people related to one another by bonds of blood, sexual mating, or legal ties (Marshall, 1989:222). Therefore, the keyword in defining family is that of relation. Family relationships are always recognized within wider kinship groups. In virtually all societies what sociologists and anthropologists call the ‘nuclear family’ can be identified (i.e. two adults living together in a household with their own or adopted children). The family becomes extended when close relatives other than a married couple and children live either in the same household or in a close and continuous relationship with one another. An extended family may include grandparents, brothers and their wives, sisters and their husbands, aunts and nephews (Giddens, 2000:141).

In postmodern and post-industrial society, the nuclear family generates a diversity of new kin ties associated, for example, with a so-called ‘recombinant family’. The nature of these ties changes as they are now subject to greater negotiation (of trust and commitment) than before (Giddens, 1992).

As a conventional definition, the ‘marriage’ can be defined as a socially acknowledged and approved sexual union between two adult individuals. When two people marry, they become kin to one another. However, the marriage bond also connects together a wider range of kin people. Parents, brothers, sisters and other blood relatives become relatives of the partner through marriage (Giddens, 2000:140).

Marriage is traditionally conceived to be a legally recognized relationship, between an adult male and female that carries certain rights and obligations. However, in contemporary societies, marriage is sometimes interpreted more liberally and the phrase ‘living as married’ indicates that for many purposes it makes no sense to exclude cohabitation. Cohabitation is an arrangement whereby couples who are not legally married live together as husband and wife. Frequent in previous eras, cohabitation has increased markedly in Western societies since the 1960s. It is now common before marriage and is sometimes an alternative to marriage (Marshall, 1989:83). Although cohabitation is increasingly accepted, and is now the normal prelude to marriage, people continue to distinguish between living together and a ‘proper’ wedding and marriage.

It is also necessary to define the concepts involved in the mate selection process. ‘Homogamy’ means the pairing of two people who have similar social characteristics and ‘heterogamy’ is the pairing of two people who belong to different social groups and categories. ‘Hypergamy’ is the tendency to marry slightly upward in social status, including education and social class and hypogamy is the tendency to marry slightly downward in different social characteristics.
‘Endogamy’ is a marriage partner selection rule requiring that marriage be to someone within a defined social group such as an extended family, religious community, economic class, ethnic or age group. Selection is always further restricted by exogamy rules. ‘Exogamy’ is a marriage partner selection rule requiring that marriage be with someone outside of a defined social group such as one’s nuclear family. Selection is usually further restricted by endogamy rules (Coltrane, 1998:49-51).

1.1.2. MAPPING THE MATE SELECTION PROCESS

1.1.2.1. Marriage Partner Selection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MATE SELECTION.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Preferences:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOMOGAMY AND HETEROGAMY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Who marries whom? One of the most consistent findings from research into social relationships is the tendency towards ‘homophily’ or association with similar and equal-status others. People tend to initiate and maintain relationships with people who possess comparable social characteristics, such as: social class, age, race, education, and religion (Laumann, 1973; Marsden, 1988). In sexual relationships, this is especially the case. Researchers have found that most sexual partners are introduced by friends or family, and most partners meet through school or work (Laumann, Gagnon, Michael, & Michaels, 1994). Because of residential and occupational segregation, this means that people get together with people like them.

Even if the tendency for people of similar backgrounds to marry (i.e. marital homogamy) is strong, there is no clear understanding of why it occurs, or whether the degree of rigidity in mate selection differs among different social groups. However, some American research suggests that the higher the class position, the less the homogamy. The same study also indicates that homogamy is a poor predictor of marital success (Marshall, 1998).

Although people tend to marry those who resemble them in age, social class background, race, religion, education, and even personal traits such as body type or personality, this certainly does not mean that everyone follows the pattern. The proof consists of counterexamples: a tall person married to someone short, a black man with a white woman, a Catholic with a Protestant, or an older man with a younger woman (Coltrane, 1998:49). In this sense, this study examines such a counterexample given by the marriage between a foreigner and a native in Cyprus (i.e. a mixed or cross-cultural marriage).

3 In some countries (e.g. Australia), after X number of years such cohabitation arrangement gains legal status and is called a common law marriage.
1.1.2.2. Marriage Decision

In contemporary society it seems that there is no more room for the traditional pattern of meeting-dating-marrying. The partner choice process is getting more relaxed since people in search of a partner do not have to make their decision for a marriage partner selection. In other words, partners enter typical short-term relationships (i.e. “dating someone more than once” without an expectation of a short- or long-term relationship) or long-term relationships (i.e. “dating someone for a long time” with the possibility, but not certainty, of marriage). Nevertheless, even if in contemporary Western societies the decision to get married is being delayed, people do get married.

Why do people marry? Which is the motivation behind the matrimonial decision? In Western societies, the emotional aspects of marriage are stressed, and what is called “affective individualism” or “the formation of marriage ties on the basis of personal attraction, guided by norms of romantic attachment” (Marshall, 1998: 8) prevails. Choice of a mate is influenced primarily by the desire for a relationship offering affection and love although “the lightning shaft of Cupid seems to be guided rather strongly within very definite channels of class, income, education, racial and religious background” (Berger, 1966:48).

Therefore, most people assume that love and marriage have always gone together- as the song says, “Like a horse and a carriage”. However, putting the two together is probably a relatively recent invention (Murstein, 1974). In most societies throughout history, and in many societies throughout the world today, people marry out of obligation to parents and family. In the typical case, a strong sense of family duty and obligation to parents is symbolically transferred on marriage to a spouse who is chosen by one’s parents or grandparents (Coltrane, 1998:35).

In various societies around the world, older family members have followed elaborate cultural customs in selecting mates for younger people, whose choice in the matter has often been severely constrained. This does not mean that young people do not develop affectionate bonds or have some influence over the selection of a mate, but the idea of marrying solely on the basis of love was practically unheard of.

Although the decision to marry is in part a pragmatic one, within the Western cultural tradition today, being ‘in love’ is seen as an essential precondition for marriage. Marrying other than on the basis of free choice and romantic love, particularly the practice of arranged marriage within Asian communities, for example, may be judged very negatively from the standpoint of Western culture. Yet Asian parents usually select their children’s spouses with considerable care, and young people have varying degrees of choice in the matter. The ideal is that love should develop within marriage. While the
reality does not always match the ideal, this is equally true of marriage founded on romantic love (Jackson, 1988).

There is a tendency to think that something is wrong with people if they are not in love when they get married. But what is love, and when does it occur? According to various theories and literary traditions, love can involve sexual passion, romantic idealization, affection, companionship, altruism, dependence, attachment, and shared experiences (Cancian, 1994; Hendrick & Hendrick, 1996). Social science theories about love focus on how similar (or different) potential mates are, what they get from the relationship, whether the relationship seems fair or equitable to them, and how ritual interaction promotes intense feelings of love and attachment. But regardless of the type of love predicted or the stages that the love relationship is supposed to go through, most theories assume that love involves a market exchange. In most cases, the market does not involve a product being exchanged for money but, instead, entails bartering between two people. Each prospective partner offers a set of physical attributes, personality traits, and so on that are exchanged for those of a partner who seems interesting. This type of rating and ranking is not always acknowledged and usually does not seem as cold and calculating as the market metaphor makes it sound. But virtually every romantic encounter involves an implicit comparison: How attractive is the other person, and how confident are you that you can “strike a deal”? Many things go into such calculations, but the filtering and sorting process that occurs is part of the overall marriage market. Of course, it is understandable that those possessing the more desirable personal traits can do better on the market or, at least, are able to “catch” someone who is their equal (Coltrane, 1998:47-48).

Having dealt with key terms in the literature of marriage partner selection let us next to reflect about the concept of ‘mixed marriage’ as it appears in the European tradition of research in this domain.

1.1.3. PRELIMINARY REFLECTIONS ABOUT THE CONCEPT OF MIXED MARRIAGE

A) MIXED MARRIAGE: Reality and Perception

B) NATIONALITY as a marker of mixed marriage

A) Mixed marriage: reality and perception. Modern societies are based on the value of “generalized exchange” or, more precisely, on the possibility of a generalized exchange
between equal individuals. In a society which ignores differences in political and juridical statuses and values the equality of its members, it is difficult to explain why certain marriages are perceived as “mixed”. In this sense, the sociologist is confronted with a dilemma: how to study ‘mixed marriages’? Should he/she consider them as a reality or should she/he consider the fact that these marriages are perceived as ‘mixed’ (Philippe, 1991).

Around these questions, this study proposes some reflections about the behaviours and representations that determine even a new way of thinking about homogamy and heterogamy. The term “mixed” is relative to a certain time, society, and a specific social context. In times of religious wars, the marriage between a Catholic and a Protestant was considered as mixed. Nowadays, it is still considered so in those social environments where religious conscience is still strong.

In Europe nowadays, the ‘mixed’ characteristic is perceived whenever marriage partners have different nationalities. In the case of the Republic of Cyprus, a marriage is perceived as mixed when Greek Cypriots enter into marriages with non-Greek Cypriots.

The term ‘mixed’ is used less in connection with social classes; it means that class identity is becoming, throughout the effect of democratization, weaker than the conscience of belonging to a historical, ethnic or religious community.

It is not sufficient to analyze only the historical and social construction of the notion of ‘mixed marriage’; the term implies, also, a relation to norms. In everyday life, one speaks about ‘mixed marriage’ when there is a feeling that the norm of social proximity is, in one way or another, crossed. It happens whenever, for example, the distinction between Catholics and Protestants has significance and value; it means that the Catholic or the Protestant communities have to be perpetuated and the marriage between those who belong to these communities is perceived as a form of transgression. As a result, what is considered in social life as ‘mixed marriage’ reveals social norms, one of these being the homogamy (Phillipe, 1991).

Merton (1941) put forward a sociological definition of ‘intermarriage’ as “a marriage between persons belonging to different groups”. In fact, the first generation of sociologists who studied mixed marriage, defined the notion in terms of deviance from the norm of homogamy. Why should one pass from the statistical rule to the norm? Why is homogamy a value in our modern society that refuses the inequalities of social status? Why is it “good” to marry someone similar and why do people show reticence to marry handicappers or stigmatize spouses having very different ages? Is it a kind of surveillance, renewed and justified by those sociological works that support a strong social homogamy? These perspectives sustain a vague idea of social order, despite the proclaimed equality and freedom of individuals as citizens.
Having these ideas in mind, one could consider that mixed marriage as object of a sociological analysis is double-faced: to study what is considered ‘mixed’ in a certain society, at a given moment in time, or to study ‘mixed’ marriage in order to contribute to the understanding of family life cycle development, to comprehend foreigners’ integration processes and the way social norms change. If one is to study the concept of ‘mixed marriage’, he/she does not have to find another term in order to sustain that “mixed” is not something given as an objective reality; in fact, every couple is mixed since it involves two individuals who are not identical – it is a social construction. If one is to find a term for explaining this social construction of mixed marriage, one could propose the term “mixogamy” (fr.”mixogamie”). It could present the advantage of an exclusively sociological concept that describes a spontaneous notion of social life throughout the discourse of a constructed sociological reality.

The tendency to mixed marriage was used as the best indicator to evaluate the degree of integration for different populations. The idea and the ideal of democracy suppose that the differences are overridden in order to reach a community of equal citizens where all exchanges can be possible and desirable. Mixed marriage appears as the best indicator of this possibility. It also constitutes a very efficient way for the integration of different populations and the elimination of prejudices and racism (Philippe et al, 1998).

B) Nationality as a marker of mixed marriage. It seems that the only way to define ‘mixed marriage’ objectively is to use the criterion of ‘nationality’ (considering the sociological limitations of this definition). The main reason is that almost always culture (religion, traditions) can be deducted from nationality, but not from citizenship (which can be obtained by foreigners). Therefore, ethnicity and nationality can be considered as relevant criteria in considering a marriage as mixed. Anyway, how meaningful could these criteria be since the individuals are not the product of their membership to a particular community? On the other hand, the employment of mixed marriage as an indicator for integration must be used with caution.

Another issue in discussing mixed marriage is the way in which sociologists in the United States use the term “intermarriage”. It defines the marriages between American nationals belonging to different ethnic communities. This indicator is based on ‘blank’ statistics, which suppose that the membership of a Polish-American, Italian-American, and African-American, etc. “community” has a precise and objective meaning. Or, in the case that the law does not define a community, every membership of a certain community is ambiguous and provisional. The individuals do not “belong” to any form of social association or to a particular culture, as is the case of a thing or an institution; instead,

individuals create cultures, every time different ones. Therefore, to think in terms of two-cultures membership means to think in terms of the contemporary way of life.

The ambiguity of the term “mixed marriage” imposes the utilization of complex interpretation models. The number of the variables to be taken into account is very large because mixed marriages are marked by diversity or, more precisely, they are the place of diversity. The study of mixed marriage reveals ways in which the forms of couple’s life are influenced by social norms in their host society (Philippe et al, 1998:6).

The nature of this domain of research does not encourage the antinomy between quantitative and qualitative methods. Every research approach has to be accompanied by a critique of the categories, reliability and sociological significance of the results. The reflection about significance is based almost exclusively on qualitative surveys results. Also, it is important to analyse population statistics data on mixed marriage. The case of mixed marriage is well-suited to the approach that takes into account both types of investigation methods: qualitative and quantitative (the point of view adopted in the present thesis). Another way to ensure more objectivity in studying mixed marriage is to rely on statistical data, which reveal general characteristics of the phenomenon. This is of particular importance as long as the discourse about mixed marriage is strongly value-marked in a Europe where the ethical and national identities are still prominent.

1.1.3.1. General Reflections about the Terminology of “Mixed marriage”

What does “non-mixed couple” mean? Some early authors would have said that it is a homogamous couple. Many American studies in the ’50s demonstrated that marriage partner choice is regulated by strong social norms and by opportunities for spouses to get encountered. “Like marries like” is the English expression that describes how homogamy indicated at that time all the social elements that make spouses to resemble: “race, religion, social class, profession, residence, income, age, education, intelligence, etc.’ (Winch, 1958:14). Even if the general tendency to homogamy has never been contested, in the ’60s most studies were concentrated on personal features of marriage partner choice. The purpose here was to determine what marriage market meant for each participant: a market of available partners or one of desirable partners. In the case where this personal marital choice had not been in accordance to the general rule, it was associated with the idea of deviance (Philippe et al., 1998:2).

A French study “Le Choix du conjoint” (“Marriage partner choice”) by Girard (1964) established that the homogamous marriage is the rule; it also introduced a distinction between heterogamy (the marriage of two spouses from different social classes) and mixed marriage (couples that differ as regards race, nationality or religion). Based on a significant survey, Girard’s study reinforced the idea that heterogamy and mixed marriage
breach the norm (i.e. are deviant). This kind of interpretation had an impact on the perception and acceptance of such a couple, its conjugal relationship and, finally, their decision to transmit (or not) to the offspring their double cultural patrimony.

A) Mixed Couples. Heterogamy

Whether a couple is mixed or not, the rule “like marries like” seems to largely apply so that the couples are generally speaking socially homogamous (yet culturally they are mixed). The specialized literature shows that the “veritable” mixed marriage is constituted through social ascending mobility of one of the spouses, accompanied by the acquisition of material or symbolic resources more valorised socially of the other spouse. For example, Hollingshead (1950) analysed the marriages between Jewish psychiatrics and their Catholic secretaries or nurses. This type of unions supposed a kind of ‘exchange’ between the prestige of a doctor status and the status of Christians, more tolerated at that time in the “WASP”5 United States. Moreover, this kind of union allowed the reaching of a balance between spouses, finding a sort of social equality and compensating the “minority” aspects of each other. Another typical example is given by Merton (1941) who theorized the notion of “compensatory intermarriage” in his discourse about intermarriage. The example he gave was that of a Black man and a White woman “exchanging” a high economic status for a high social status.

B) Misalliance and Mixed Marriage

Excluding the differences of “racial caste” (where the social effects might be destroying), a marriage of a doctor to his nurse, or in general the marriage between people who have different positions on the social hierarchy (so that they have a feeling of belonging to different “worlds”), is an inter-classes union which has been disregarded especially by the dominant classes, in the past. It has been considered a deviation from the norm and termed ‘misalliance’ (Philippe et al., 1998:5).

The theory of “compensatory intermarriage” mentioned earlier is specific for the modern democracies that “normalized” these kinds of “unequal” unions. Even if the term ‘misalliance’ might sound obsolescent in our times, it is somehow improved in a new adapted form through the word “mixed” which inherited its negative connotations. According to different backgrounds, whatever factor of differentiation can be conceived as a discriminator factor so that the contemporary term ‘mixed couple’ arouses the same type of value judgment as misalliance did in older times: “they are not well matched”, “they wouldn’t have to meet each other”. The idea that a mixed couple has less statistical chances to meet is false; different studies have shown that they meet as all people meet,

5 It means White Anglo-Saxon Protestant, the dominant class.
in their everyday social relationships or inside limited sociability networks (Bozon & Heran, 1987; Philippe, 1991; Lesbet, 1995).

The representation of an improper marriage, because it is “unbalanced” or “unequal”, even nowadays continues to have social and political effects in all of Europe, the United States and Asia (Philippe et al., 1998). If the number of legally mixed couples is everywhere on the rise (and it is countable), the number of “cultural” or “social” mixed couples is not countable. They are always perceived as deviant from the general accepted norm, transcending the sense of ‘commonality’. Some of these couples and their children become the victims of suspicion and stigmatization that mark them profoundly.

C) The concepts of “mixed” and “mixed marriage”. Cultural melting pot, Integration and Assimilation

As has already been pointed out, the term ‘mixed marriage’ is employed in the European tradition of research in this domain. The term has also an administrative and legal usage where it denotes a union between people of different nationalities. The social usage of the term encompasses all the “other differences” of the couples, because ‘nationality’ is supposed to cause a veritable cascade of identities: linguistic, religious, cultural and ethnic which are in fact some of the euphemistic denotations of the idea of “race”.

Demographers, sociologists and historians have interpreted mixed marriage as a strategy for foreigners' integration. If this type of marriage is studied mainly in the domain of migration studies, its consequences are considered in relation to the foreign spouses, their children and very rarely to the society as a whole. Mixed marital unions as a social phenomenon modifies significantly the composition of a national population, introducing new lifestyles, and new ways of sociability, different cultural traits that change the sociological profile of native family. This is why, sometimes throughout history, the mixed marriage was racist treated.6

It is very difficult to find in our times (mostly in urban areas) non-mixed environments. Because of intensified communication and globalization, the movements of populations determine an increasing number of couples legally mixed (it means spouses with different nationalities). From this point of view, the notion might seem to be historically old-fashioned, because mixed couples appear to be “majorities”. This affirmation is a paradox only in appearance: even if the legally mixed marriages are numerically minorities, they are markers of “difference” and indicate that practically it is impossible to delimit the area of what is so-called “mixed”. Even if the spouses have the same nationality, there are many parameters (such as: language, religions, classes,

---

6 The law forbade mixed marriages in many European countries in the period of Nazism. This is why the term ‘mixed marriage’ is not used in Germany where the term “binational” (in German, ‘binational Ehe’) is used instead (Philippe, C et al, 1998).
personal traits, familial history, etc.) that can interfere so that any couple can be considered as ‘mixed’.

The different variations and gradations of the mixed marriage phenomenon can constitute a source for the construction of a homogeneous sociological category based on the notion of ‘mixed’; on the other hand, the social representations cut up the reality into distinct and hierarchical categories. The concern with immigration and integration, where the study of mixed marriage is subordinated, is a case in point.

D) Different Types of “Mixed”

The interest that researchers have shown for different types of "mixed" has varied according to the country and the period of time concerned. A particular look at the studies published in English-speaking countries about the cross-cultural marriages, in the twenties, shows that the authors took into account the marriages where more dimensions intervened (Cottrell, 1990). Before the thirties, the studies were concerned with “inter-racial” and “inter-religious” couples so that they did not take into account the unions with foreigners. The “international” couples became a subject of study in the fifties. From the sixties, the “inter-religious” couples preoccupied again the researchers. Finally, in the seventies, the majority of Anglo-Saxon studies were concerned with “inter-ethnic” marriages and “multiple mixed” couples.

Whatever type of “mixed” is considered, there are two dimensions of the term “mixed couple”, namely: an official usage (legal and administrative) and a social and mediated usage (based on the representations of ‘otherness’). The last dimension of “mixed” is the most susceptible to different variations, also being the most prominent in everyday life. It poses the delicate problem of prescribed identity and attributed identity together with categorizations, which are not always neutral. There are different senses of the notion “mixed” (is it about nationalities, religions, languages or cultures?) that denote an entity, historically and politically determined. This fact exposes the reality of mixed couple life to mystification, so that a prescribed identity can turn into a “prescribed mixed marriage” (Philippe et al. 1998).

1.1.3.2. Conclusions: Mixed Marriages, Mixed Couples and Mixed Families
Theoretically speaking, the “mixed” contexts interrupt certain traditions of the family of origin and develop others that are new. On the one hand, even if the individuals as foreigners in one country stay in touch with their groups of origin, they adapt and transform themselves according to the contexts where they live in, ending by resembling the people of their country of residence. On the other hand, the children from mixed marriages are often described as being caught in a cultural conflict, because their mother and father are bearers of different cultures.

The transformation of familial environment constitutes one of the most important objects of research today, appropriate to describe modern societies. For most of the researchers it is a problem of method: instead of postulating the category of “mixed couple” (i.e. to investigate a subject which is pre-defined), one could analyze a sample of couples and families from the general population in order to understand their environment. If from that discourse results the category of “mixed couple”, the next step could be to indicate how much influence the social representations have in defining it. Are the “mixed” markers suitable to analyze conjugal relations? In fact, this task can be reversed: it is about finding out not how couples or families labelled as mixed respond to the norm, but how the norm is redefined through the multiplication of different cultural traits. There are many families who have more than one language, religion, cultural tradition, values system and this plurality occupies the first place in their discourse of interests, even when they speak about their own couple (Phillipe et al., 1998).

Therefore, the main dilemma in analyzing this subject is how to avoid the polarization in the opposition ‘national-foreigner’ that translates the obsession of a society in crisis analysing everything in terms of in-group-out-group. Following the general movement toward globalization and individualization, the marriage partner choice process seems to promote nowadays the delimitation of interests (professional, ideological etc) so that the traditional parameters of “well matched” couple (i.e. the homogamy) become of second importance. However, the mixed markers are not taken into account as long as couples are doing well; when the reverse applies, they are invoked as causes of divorce. Thus, an analyst could interpret the conflicts of a mixed couple in terms of their membership to different national, religious, ethnic or cultural communities, and not in terms of personal incompatibility.

In a context of mixing populations, the bi-categorization “mixed-non-mixed” becomes more difficult to be sustained. In some instances, the term “mixed couple” is used as a designation, opportunistic sometimes, mostly a category of a socio-political discourse, and not a specific sociological category. Instead of distinguishing these couples as being deviant from the norm, it is necessary to analyze them from the perspective concerning marriage and family in order to determine how these two institutions are transformed.
through their contact. This constitutes also the principle followed by the study presented in this thesis.

1.2. MARRIAGE PATTERNS. HOMOGAMY and HETEROGAMY.

A Literature Review

Getting married is one of the most individualistic choices people can make. This is how things look like at first glance. In fact, choosing a spouse is a process where social forces occupy the central place. People often hesitate to accept the notion that they do not have complete freedom of choice in the mate selection process. However, people want to believe that inter-ethnic, inter-racial or inter-faith marriages are quite common nowadays. The truth is, however, that few marriages cross ethnic, racial or religious lines as far as the mate selection process is concerned. In the United States, where heterogamy domain research is very popular, data are relevant: about 97 percent of all marriages are racially homogamous (Crester and Leon, 1982; Tucker and Mitchell-Kernan 1990), approximately 90 percent of marriages are between partners who have similar religious backgrounds (Glenn, 1982; Shenan, Bock, and Lee 1990), and most people tend to marry someone from the same socioeconomic background (Kalmijn, 1994). Most people also have a tendency to marry someone similar to themselves in terms of age (Atkinson and Glass, 1985), education (Kalmijn, 1991; Mare, 1991), weight (Schafer and Keith, 1990), and physical appearance (Chambers, Christiansen, and Kunz, 1983).

Why are people homogamous or heterogamous in the mating and matching process? According to the filter theory, people begin with a pool of eligible “others” and then engage in a process of filtering out, or narrowing, based on certain criteria such as: geographical proximity, age, social networks, values, and so on (Kerckhoff and Davis, 1962; Klimek, 1979). Therefore, individuals are presumed to be outside each other’s “field of eligible” as potential relationship partners unless they share external (i.e. demographic) characteristics and remain unlikely to become relationship partners unless they also share internal (i.e. psychological) characteristics. This subchapter envisages different patterns of homogamy-endogamy, heterogamy-exogamy and hypergamy-hypogamy, offering an overview of theory and research in this field.
1.2.1. HOMOGAMY and ENDOGAMY

Social scientists call the tendency to marry those with similar social characteristics ‘homogamy’ or ‘assortative mating’ (literally “same-marriage” or intra-marriage). ‘Endogamy’ is defined as the preferred or prescribed practice of marrying within the defined kin-group, be it clan, lineage, village, or social class. Since the beginning of the last century, sociologists have described patterns of partner selection and have tried to explain why people marry within their group (endogamy/in-marriage) and why people marry persons close in status (homogamy/intra-marriage). The opposite principle is ‘exogamy’: the preferred or prescribed practice of marriage outside the kin-group (i.e. out-marriage). Similarly, the tendency to marry those with different social or ethnical characteristics is called ‘heterogamy’ (intermarriage or mixed marriage).

The research literature on homogamy can be divided into four traditions, depending on which type of characteristic is considered, namely: religious homogamy, ethnic homogamy, socioeconomic homogamy and age homogamy. Although the underlying issues are diverse, one common theme is that all four above-mentioned traditions (of studying religious, ethnic, socio-economic and age homogamy) characterize social differentiation and respectively, social similarity by describing patterns of social interaction. Building on the Weberian notion of ‘status group closure’, some authors have argued that interaction between social groups provides a fundamental way to describe the group boundaries that make up the social structure. Because marriage is an intimate and often long-term relationship, intermarriage/mixed marriage or heterogamy not only reveals the existence of interaction across group boundaries, but also shows that members of different groups accept each other as social equals. Mixed marriage can thus be regarded as an intimate link between social groups; conversely, endogamy or homogamy can be regarded as a form of group closure (Kalmijn, 1998).

What makes homogamy sociologically relevant lies in its inherent dynamic: it is not just a reflection of the boundaries that currently separate groups in society; it also bears the potential of cultural and socioeconomic change. In this sense, marriage patterns are social indicators, which cannot tell us everything. Two reasons will be considered in this
context. First, if members of two groups do not marry one another, it does not necessarily mean that both groups are closed. It takes two to marry, and if one group is closed while the other is open, endogamy may still prevail. Second, marriage patterns result from both preference and opportunity. Opportunity to marry within the group depends on many factors, such as residential segregation, the composition of local marriage markets, group size and so on.

As a result, endogamy does not necessarily point to a personally felt social distance towards a certain group (i.e. preference). Such preferences play a role, but to what extent they determine the actual choices people make is an empirical question. Marriage patterns simply show which groups interact with whom and, while this is an important piece of information, they do not give an idea about why (Kalmijn, 1998).

Theoretical and empirical studies have developed hypotheses about why people marry within their group and why some do while others do not. This topic is the next focus of our discussion.

1.2.2. HETEROGAMY and EXOGAMY

Exogamy’ and ‘endogamy’ are concepts that originate in empirical research conducted by anthropologists. In this sense, ‘exogamy’ is defined as ‘the preferred or prescribed practice of marriage outside the kin group, the boundaries of which are often defined by incest taboo’ (Haviland 1989:415). Sociologists’ works employ more refined concepts such as those of ‘mixed marriage’ /’intermarriage’ and ‘homogamy’ to describe marriage patterns existing in society. According to different lines that are crossed by those involved, there is a range of mixed marriage types; they are described by different labels or “mixed” markers: ethnicity-interethnic; faith-interfaith; race-interracial; country-intercountry; culture-intercultural or national-international and transnational. The terminology of ‘inter-mixed marriage’/intermarriage is very rich and suggestive, revealing the line/lines partners cross. Here are some of the terms in use: out-marriage; Interethnic marriage, interracial marriage; Bilingual marriage; Interfaith marriage, mixed blessings; Inter-country marriage, cross-national marriage, international marriage, cross-border marriage and transnational marriage; Cross-cultural marriage, intercultural marriage. As the terms simply state, mixed-marriage spouses come from different social, ethnic, linguistic, religious, national or cultural groups. Anyhow, things are not as clear as they would appear so that the concept of ‘mixed marriage’ still lacks a strong explanatory theory.
The terminology envisaged by the present study addresses the above-mentioned two last sets of terms that emphasise country/nationality and culture as markers for difference in mixed marriage between foreign nationals and native Cypriots in Cyprus.

The theoretical tradition in studying mixed marriage goes back to Robert K. Merton, the first sociologist who built a theory of structural components in intermarriage⁷, which “can contribute to the analysis of interpersonal relations”.⁸ Merton's theory is based on data ('statistical materials') on 'Negro-white intermarriage'. Merton observed that all marriage is intermarriage in the sense that the contractants derive from different social groups of one sort or another. This follows immediately from the universal incest taboo that forbids marriage at least between members of the same elementary family unit and derivatively restricts marriage to members of different family groups (Merton, 1941:362). He specified that intermarriage happens when differences in group-affiliation of the spouses are defined as relevant for mate selection and defined intermarriage as: “marriage of persons deriving from those different in-groups and out-groups other than the family which are culturally conceived as relevant to the choice of a spouse. Thus, a given marriage may be, within one frame of reference- for example, the caste - in-marriage, and within another frame of reference- for example, social class- intermarriage. The distinction is analytical.” (ibid, p.362)

Merton introduced the terms of ‘hypergamy’ and ‘hypogamy’, in order to show that intermarriage does not occur at random, but according to more or less clearly describable patterns. Therefore, hypergamy is a “term which we adapt from its usage in connection with the Hindu caste system to denote institutionalized or non-institutionalized patterns of intermarriage wherein the female marries into a higher social stratum, in a system of caste, class or estate- Stande.
We may introduce the term hypogamy to denote those instances wherein the female marries into a lower social stratum. Institutionalized hypergamy or hypogamy denote those instances where the practice conforms to a norm contained in the law or mores; non-institutionalized hypergamy or hypogamy denote statistical uniformities of a hypergamous or hypogamous nature that are not, however, explicitly governed by a norm. Thus, Hindu hypergamy is an institutionalized pattern; American caste-hypogamy is a non-institutionalized pattern or a statistical uniformity but not a normatively prescribed arrangement” (ibid, p.364).

Merton's structural-functionalist theory remains the classical fundamental contribution into the field of intermarriage research. Nowadays, empirical studies build on the concepts used by Merton’s theoretical framework - see ‘hypogamy’ and ‘hypergamy’. In this sense,

---

⁷ R. Merton was the first American sociologist who used the term “intermarriage” as an equivalent of mixed marriage in an American environment.

Merton proposed an exchange theory explaining gender differences in interracial marriage. Given that most marriages between whites and blacks (African Americans) involve African-American men and white women, Merton postulated that the African-American man who intermarries exchanges his higher achieved socioeconomic position for the white woman’s higher ascribed racial status position. Although Merton’s theory pertains only to marriages between Whites and African-Americans, his argument about racial differences in status implies that interracial marriage should occur more often between men with higher socioeconomic status from a ‘lower’-status racial group and women with lower socioeconomic status from a ‘higher’-status racial group. This is only one example of a hypothesis provided by Merton’s theory. It has been tested many times over the years. A study by Kalmijn (1993) on interracial marriage between whites and African-Americans supports the findings that in the 1970s and early 1980s White women tended to marry African-American men who were more highly educated than themselves, with a higher socioeconomic status (Kalmijn, 1993).

On the other hand, Merton’s theory was criticized by feminist researchers who called it a “sexist model of compensatory hypogamy which looked at how female social ‘failures’, such as ‘ugly’, ‘unwanted’ White women, would marry out and socially down in a compensatory exchange: she gets the husband she so desperately wants, possibly with higher qualifications, and he gets a higher status wife. [...] The problems with this model, besides its sexism, is that it assumes firstly that all women want to get married; that women are chosen and men choose; there is no reason given why a man of high standing within his own group would marry someone of low standing within her own, especially if the couple were not going to be accepted into her group” (Breger and Hill, 1998:16). Feminist criticism ought to be cautious with regards to Merton’s theory about intermarriage that should always be judged considering the political and social context of the 40s’ in the United States. This is a theory that focuses on racial and class segregation, an important trait of American society in that period. Moreover, it is a theory that does not take into account women’s emancipation and the tendency to lessen inequality between women’s and men’s opportunities to enter labour market, due to women’s greater access to education (processes that peaked in the last decades).

1.2.3. MIXED MARRIAGE and HOMOGAMY:
An Overview of THEORY and RESEARCH
According to recent empirical studies, various kinds of mixed marriage have become more common over the course of the twentieth century. Also, together with the increase in the frequency and types of mixed marriage, there is an increase in studies concerned with this phenomenon. In this sense, researchers have described patterns of mixed marriage, examined individual variations in mixed marriage, and assessed changes in mixed marriage over time. In addition, both theoretical and empirical studies have developed hypotheses about why people marry within their group and why some do while others do not.

This subchapter aims at providing an overview of these hypotheses, divided into a theoretical and an empirical section. The goal of the theoretical section is to review micro- and macro-level hypotheses about the determinants of mixed marriage and homogamy and to put these into a general theoretical framework. The goal of the empirical section is to summarize patterns, variations, and trends in mixed marriage. The subchapter focuses on the three main sociological group characteristics (i.e. race, nationality and ethnicity, religion, and socioeconomic status), covers Western societies and discusses mostly studies conducted in the last decade of twentieth century (each group is illustrated with studies cited in the following sections).

1.2.3.1. Theoretical Work on the Determinants of Mixed marriage and Homogamy

The main reference of this subchapter is Matthijs Kalmijn’s article “Interrmarriage and Homogamy: causes, patterns,
The literature on the determinants of exogamy and homogamy has suggested various hypotheses that can be distinguished as arguments about three more general factors:

(a) The preferences of marriage candidates for certain characteristics in a spouse;
(b) The interference of “third parties” in the selection process;
(c) The constraints of the marriage market in which candidates are searching for a spouse.

In other words, marriage patterns arise from the interplay between three social forces: preferences of individuals for certain characteristics in a spouse, the influence of the social group of which they are members, and the constraints of the marriage market in which they are searching for a spouse (Kalmijn, 1991b). Although these factors represent analytically distinct hypotheses, they have most often been regarded as complementary elements of a single theory, and that is what distinguishes the sociological perspective from economic or psychological theories on partner choice.

A. Preferences of Marriage Candidates. The individual-level factors

In order to understand aggregate patterns of marriage selection, researchers use the concept of ‘marriage market’. Unmarried men and women operate within a marriage market where each individual considers a set of potential spouses. Potential spouses are
evaluated on the basis of the resources they have to offer and individuals compete with each other for the spouses they want most by offering their own resources in return. Several kinds of resources obviously play a role in the choice of a spouse, but sociologists have mostly focused on socioeconomic and cultural resources.

A1) Socioeconomic Resources

Socioeconomic resources are defined as resources that produce economic well-being and status. Economic well-being is shared by the family members and status is granted to the family as a unit rather than to its individual members. As a result, the income and status of one spouse contribute to the income and status of the other by raising the income and status of the family.

People maximize their income and status by searching for a spouse with attractive socioeconomic resources. The outcome of this competition is that the most attractive candidates select among themselves while the least attractive candidates rely on one another. Competition for socioeconomic resources on the marriage market thus leads to an aggregate pattern of homogamy. The nature of this competition varies with the role women play in society. When marriage is based on the benefits that stem from the division of paid and domestic labour in the household, prevailing gender differences in earning give men a relative advantage in productive labour so that the wife’s time is used more productively when is spent on household labour. As a result, men and women exchange paid and domestic labour resources.

A similar argument has been made with regard to status and prestige. When the status of the family depends primarily on the occupation of the husband, there will be an exchange of male prestige and female qualities in other respects, such as class background and physical attractiveness (Jacobs & Furstenberg, 1986; Stevens et al., 1990).

Both types of exchange suggest that men, unlike women, do not compete among themselves for female socioeconomic resources in the marriage market. However, there are good reasons to believe that this has changed. An increasing number of married women participate in the labour market and married women’s work is sometimes less motivated by temporary economic needs of the family (in Western societies). Several authors believe that these changes have made women’s socioeconomic resources increasingly attractive to men. The wife’s human capital may facilitate the husband’s access to networks that are helpful in his career, her earnings may subsidize his human capital investments, and the economic security she provides may lessen his need to settle for short-term career benefits, thus increasing his opportunity to choose more attractive, long-term career objectives. In Western societies, female labour is sometimes the reflection of women’s desire to work outside the home, rather than a reflection of the
economic needs of the family, so that the wife’s socioeconomic resources may also become increasingly important for the status of the family (Davis, 1984).

**A2) Cultural Resources**

While the importance of socioeconomic resources is based on a preference to marry a resourceful spouse, independent of one’s own resources, the role of cultural resources is based on a preference to marry someone who is similar. Preferences for cultural similarity have been addressed most extensively in the social psychological literature on personal attraction (Byrne, 1971). Similarity of values and opinions leads to mutual confirmation of each other’s behaviour and worldviews, similarity of taste is attractive because it enlarges opportunities to participate in joint activities, and similarity of knowledge creates a common basis for conversation, which enhances mutual understanding.

Although originally developed to explain attraction between strangers in day-to-day interaction, these notions have also been applied to marriage (DiMaggio & Mohr, 1985; Kalmijn, 1994). Because cultural similarity leads to personal attraction, it is a prerequisite for getting involved with someone. Because of its instrumental effects, cultural similarity also encourages people to establish a long-term relationship. Since many activities in marriage are jointly undertaken, such as the raising of children, the purchase of a house and the spending of leisure time, dissimilarity in taste would complicate these shared activities. More generally, people prefer to marry someone who has similar cultural resources because this enables them to develop a common lifestyle in marriage that produces social confirmation and affection.

**A3) Preferences and Homogamy**

Preferences for socioeconomic and cultural resources do not by themselves translate into homogamy and endogamy with respect to social characteristics. Some authors argue that social characteristics are correlated with such resources, and that homogamy or endogamy is the unintended by-product of individual preferences for resources in a partner. This argument has often been made for educational homogamy, because education is not only strongly related to income and status, but also to taste, values, and lifestyles (Kalmijn, 1991a).

Similar arguments could be formulated for horizontally differentiated groups, such as ethnic groups, although in this case, endogamy is probably more the result of preferences for cultural similarity and not so much the result of competition for economically attractive spouses.

Other authors have argued that social characteristics are more than simply correlates of the resources partners bring to the marriage market. Characteristics such as education,
occupation, race, and ethnicity are also seen as badges that individuals wear to show others what kind of person they are. In this perspective, spouse selection is regarded as a filter process. In the first step, people develop a network of friends, acquaintances, and possibly marriage candidates with whom they share some objective social characteristics. In the second step, people find their spouse by interacting within these homogeneous networks. The second step is also the phase in which psychological characteristics come into play, but at that time, homogamy with respect to objective social characteristics is already insured (Murstein, 1976).

All these individual-level factors that interplay in the mate selection process have been investigated empirically, through a qualitative research about foreign spouses' reasons to enter into mixed marriages with native Cypriots (see Chapter V).

B. Third Parties. The group-level factors

A second hypothesis about why people marry within their group focuses on people who are not directly involved in the marriage. Because mixed marriages may threaten the internal cohesion and homogeneity of the group, “third parties” have an incentive to discourage new generations from marrying exogamously. There are two ways in which third parties prevent exogamy: by group identification and by group sanctions.

B1) Group Identification

Children are typically brought up with a sense of group identification. Identification either takes the form of an awareness of common social history, what is sometimes called a “sense of people-hood” (Gordon, 1964), or it can take the form of a more psychological sense of being different from others. The stronger such feelings of group identification, the more people have internalized norms of endogamy, and the more likely it is that they marry homogamously or endogamously.

The notion of group identification has been especially important for racial and ethnic groups, where norms of endogamy are believed to be firmly internalized (Merton, 1941). Such norms, however, may also apply to other kinds of groups such as social classes and educational groups.
How strongly younger generation identify themselves with the group depends to a great extent on the homogeneity of the networks in which they are embedded. When adolescents live in neighbourhoods that are homogenous with respect to social and cultural characteristics of their parents, they are more likely to develop a sense of belonging to that group.

Identification with the origin group is believed to be weakened by higher education. Owing to the emphasis on individual achievement and universalistic principles in higher education, the college-educated may be less likely to identify themselves with their social and cultural roots (Hwang et al., 1995).

B2) Group Sanctions

Even if people have not internalized norms of endogamy, they may still refrain from marrying exogamously because of the sanctions third parties apply. The three most important examples of parties that sanction mixed marriage are: the family, the church, and the state. Although in Western societies parental control over children’s marriage decisions is limited, there are still ways in which parents can interfere. They set up meetings with potential spouses, play the role of matchmaker, give advice and opinions about the candidates, and they may withdraw support in the early years of the child’s marriage. Nevertheless, they generally do not have strong sanctions when children decide against their will (in contrary, as this study showed, some Cypriot mothers do have strong sanctions).

Somewhat stronger sanctions are provided by the church. For example, both the Catholic Church and various Protestant denominations have denounced religious mixed marriages for centuries, although the nature and strength of their disapproval have changed over time. In general, religious institutions attempt to control mixed marriage because they are competing for members. Religious mixed marriage entails the risk of losing members and may weaken church attachment in future generations. If interfaith marriages occur anyway, it is not always in the interest of the church to apply sanctions because the competing church may accept the marriage and hence gain members. This helps explain why the Roman Catholic Church, for example, has often accepted interfaith marriages on the condition that the children will be raised as Catholics. Because of competing pressures, however, spouses in interfaith marriages often decide not to raise their children in a religious fashion. If this occurs, both religious institutions stand to lose strength in society.

The state, and its laws regarding what constitutes a marriage, who can marry whom, and its immigration policies also play a great, but often overlooked, role in limiting choice of spouse. Public discourses about different groups of foreigners may also find their way into how immigration officials interpret discretionary laws. For example in Germany, some
years ago, the state could restrict entry and residence visa, and work permits of some foreign spouses, or even refuse mixed couples permission to marry in Germany (Breger and Hill, 1998:129).

The study to be reported below will ascertain, through an empirical investigation (quantitative and qualitative), the influence of these three group-level factors (of mixed couples’ families, the Orthodox Church, and the Cypriot State) on mate selection in mixed marriage between foreigners and Cypriots.

C. Marriage Markets. The Structural Arrangements

Besides the preferences of the partners and their families, the outcomes of marital decisions are also influenced by structural characteristics of the marriage market (Kalmijn, 1998). In other words, endogamy and homogamy are not only governed by individual- and group-level factors, but also by structural arrangements. The chances to marry endogamously are higher the more often one meets people within the group and the more often one interacts with group members on a day-to-day basis.

Contact opportunities are shaped by several structural arrangements. Some studies focus on the demographic composition of the population as a whole, other studies examine regional distributions of groups, and yet other studies analyze smaller, functional settings, such as the school and the workplace.

C1) The Demography of Groups: Group Size

Previous research revealed that members of a small group will have lower chances of marrying endogamously than members of a larger group. This is the effect of group size which implies that endogamy is negatively related to the degree of heterogeneity of a population. In other words, the probability of a coincidental meeting with somebody from a large group is higher than the probability of such a meeting with somebody from a small group (Blau & Schwartz, 1984).

Furthermore, the size of the smallest groups is a restrictive factor. The number of mixed marriages cannot be higher than the number of persons in the smallest group. If there are differences in group size, there will always be a number of persons in the largest group for
whom no partner in the smallest group is available. For this reason, the proportions of mixed marriages between the members of two groups do not give a good indication of the preferences for (or aversion against) a partner from the other group (Kalmijn, 1998).

C2) The Geography of Groups: Spatial Segregation

The chance to encounter a member of one’s own group does not depend on group size alone but also on the way a group is dispersed geographically (Blau & Schwartz, 1984). One cannot expect many marriages between the members of groups which are concentrated in different parts of a country. Groups that are concentrated in specific regions of a country generally have more opportunity to marry endogamously than groups that are not (Lieberson & Waters, 1988). Examples are common in the literature of ethnic groups, e.g. Asian-Americans in California, Jewish-Americans in New York City. An additional reason why it is important to consider the geography of groups is that isolation may be correlated with group size. Smaller groups are often more isolated.

In this case, while it is difficult to make a precise distinction between preferences and constraints, it is generally true that the smaller the marriage market one studies, the more the structure of the market is affected by preferences and less by constraints (Kalmijn, 1998). On the other hand, the boundaries of ethnic groups can persist even if the members of one group live side by side with other groups and share the same geographical, political, economic, and social environment. This is the case of the “cultural boundaries” between ethnic groups, a factor that should be taken into account when one studies these relations among spatial segregation, homogamy and heterogamy.

C3) Local Marriage Markets

Unmarried people do not just wander around a region looking for a spouse; they spend most of their life in small and functional places, such as neighbourhoods, schools, workplaces, bars, and clubs. Such “local marriage markets” are often socially segregated, and this is why they are important for explaining marriage patterns. In the sociological literature, three local markets have been considered most frequently: the school, the neighbourhood, and the workplace. Of these three, schools are considered the most efficient markets because they are homogeneous with respect to age and heterogenous with respect to sex.

Workplaces are considered less efficient, but increased participation of women in the labour market and declining occupational sex segregation suggest that this may have changed (Davis, 1984). Although it has not often been studied where couples meet, a French study shows that the settings sociologists analyze are not the most common meeting places. Among young French couples, fewer than 5% met in the neighbourhood,
fewer than 10% met at school, and just over 10% met at work; the remaining percentage of couples met in other settings (Bozon & Heran, 1987).

To clarify how local marriage markets affect homogamy, authors have looked at the composition of these markets with respect to social characteristics. What distinguishes the neighbourhood from the school and the workplace is that it is homogenous with respect to factors such as ethnicity, race, religion, and family background, i.e. characteristics transmitted by parents (Lieberson, 1980). Schools are less homogenous in ascribed characteristics, although there are exceptions (e.g. Catholic colleges and black colleges). In general, it is expected that colleges promote educational homogamy more than neighbourhoods do, while the latter promote ethnic endogamy and homogamy of family background more than schools. Whether workplaces encourage homogamy, it is highly dependent on the type of work.

1.2.3.2. Empirical Work on Mixed Marriage and Homogamy

Empirical work on mixed marriage and homogamy has addressed four questions:
A. To what extent are groups endogamous or homogamous, and how do groups differ in these respects?
B. How have exogamy and homogamy changed over time?
C. Which factors are related to endogamy and homogamy, and in particular, what is the role of gender, education, and geographic regions and local marriage markets?
D. How do various dimensions of partner choice coincide?

A. Patterns of Mixed Marriage and Homogamy

Appendix A for Chapter I discusses how the specialized research has tackled these issues methodologically.
In describing patterns of mixed marriage and homogamy, scholars have addressed three questions:

1) To what extent do subgroups marry endogamously?
2) If subgroups marry out, with what groups are they most likely to marry?
3) How do subgroups compare in their degree of endogamy?

A1) Race/Ethnicity

Most American studies of ethnic intermarriage have analyzed data from the perspective of the minority group and focused on specific types of subgroups. Several decades ago, the interest largely focused on European immigrant subgroups and their children. More recently, new immigrant subgroups such as Asian Americans and Hispanic Americans are being studied, though there is a resurgent interest in the descendants of the older immigrants, sometimes referred to as ‘white ethnic groups’. Intermarriage of Blacks has always been studied frequently.

In the United States, national estimates of the percentage of persons who are married endogamously vary around 95% for Blacks, 75% for Asian subgroups, 65% for Hispanic subgroups, 45% for American Indians, and 25% for (unmixed) European subgroups (Kalmijn, 1998). Although these percentages are high, they do not indicate whether groups are endogamous. Loglinear models and harmonic mean analyses are more informative in this respect and show that virtually all ethnic subgroups marry within their group more often than can be expected under random mating (Jiobu, 1988; Schoen & Thomas, 1989; Alba & Golden, 1986).

How do subgroups compare in their degree of endogamy? The main conclusion of a study presenting odds ratios for more than 20 groups (Lieberson and Water, 1988) is that groups who are more recent to the host society have higher degree of closure, a regularity that fits well into assimilation theories (Blacks being the prime exception to this pattern). A similar relationship between the newness of a group and its level of endogamy is found in Australia (Jones & Luijkkx, 1996).

A2) Religion

Religious mixed marriage has primarily been studied in religiously heterogenous societies. Some authors use current religious affiliation to measure mixed marriage, while others use the religion in which spouses were raised. Endogamy is higher when current
religious affiliation is used, because spouses often switch faith or give away their religion after having a mixed marriage (Glenn, 1982).

Which religious groups are most endogamous? The findings are consistent with the notion of third-party control: denominations and religions that are more traditional in their doctrine and have higher degrees of church involvement among their members; also have the highest degree of endogamy (Johnson, 1980; Hayes, 1991).

Furthermore, the decrease in the importance of religion in regulating lives, that is, the growth of the process of secularization, in Europe and North America is cited in secularization models as a reason why people may marry out (see, for example, Spickard 1989).

A3) Socioeconomic Status

The literature on socioeconomic homogamy can be distinguished into studies of ascribed status and studies of achieved status. Ascribed status positions are traditionally measured by the occupational class of the father and the father-in-law. Achieved status positions are measured by education and occupation. Education is used more often because it is a convenient status indicator of women and changes little after marriage. In most countries, educational homogamy is quite strong (about 0.55), occupational homogamy is somewhat weaker (about 0.44), while the correlation between husbands’ and wives’ class origins is the weakest, about 0.30 (Kalmijn, 1991a).

Loglinear analyses provide additional insights in the association between partners’ status positions. Such analyses first show that people marry within rather than outside socioeconomic groups, although some groups are more closed than others. Groups at the top and the bottom of the educational hierarchy are more closed than groups in the middle. Next to a tendency to marry within the group, there is a tendency for marriage to become less common the farther away the two status positions are. Some status boundaries are harder to cross than others, however. For education, the strongest boundary is that between college graduates in the United States and lesser-educated persons (Mare, 1991; Kalmijn, 1991a). A common interpretation of this finding is that colleges function as local marriage markets that are physically separated from settings in which lesser-educated persons are involved. Patterns of occupational homogamy, like patterns of intergenerational occupational mobility, are dominated by the line that divides blue-collar and white-collar occupations (Hout, 1982).

B. Trends in Mixed Marriage and Homogamy
B1) Race/Ethnicity

Analyses of marriage records generally revealed an increase in mixed marriage of ethnic groups in the last decades, a general trend for Western societies. The decline in ethnic endogamy has typically been interpreted from an assimilation perspective: through generational replacement, ethnic groups gradually integrate in the host society. Consistent with this perspective, most analyses have found that the children of immigrants marry out more often than the immigrants themselves (Lee & Yamanaka, 1990). Because trends also occur within generations of immigrants, individual assimilation to the host society is not a sufficient explanation (Sung, 1990). An additional interpretation is that assimilation is a process at the macro level: when more and more members of an ethnic group are of the second or third generation (i.e. when an ethnic group becomes “older”) all generations find it easier to adapt to the host society. Another interpretation is more general in nature and points to the weakening influence of third parties in marriage choice and the declining importance of ascription as a basis of evaluating other people.

B2) Religion

In the United States, trends in religious intermarriage have been documented by analyzing national surveys (Kalmijn, 1991b), by comparing subsequent surveys and by comparing marriage cohorts within a single survey (Kosmin et al, 1991) - because the census is not allowed to ask questions on religious affiliation. Most studies show that religious mixed marriage has considerably increased over the last decades.

In many other Western societies, questions on religion are included in marriage records so that long-term trends can be documented there more easily. A loglinear trend analysis of annual Dutch marriage records since the 1930s shows that religious endogamy of Catholics and the conservative Re-Reformed Protestants has declined (Hendrickx et al, 1991).

That the boundaries between religious groups in Europe and United States have weakened during the twentieth century is consistent with the notion of declining third-party control and matches long-term processes such as secularization.

B3) Socioeconomic Status
Trends in socioeconomic homogamy are most frequently studied by analyzing class background and education. In most industrialized countries, there has been a decline in the importance of social background for marriage choice. This has been found in the United States, the Netherlands, Hungary, and France (Kalmijn, 1998). The most common interpretation of this trend lies in the role of third parties and opportunity. Young adults have become increasingly independent of parents so that parents have less direct or indirect control over the choices their children make. People also spend more time in school settings, which are more heterogeneous with respect to social class background than the parental neighbourhood.

Trends in educational homogamy do not point in one direction. A loglinear analysis of 18 post-war industrial nations by Ultee & Luijkx (1990) revealed that five countries experienced a decline in educational homogamy, three countries experienced an increase, while the remaining ten revealed no meaningful trend. Several hypotheses have been suggested to explain these trends. Some authors argued that opportunities for matching in education have increased. People marry later and spend more time in school, but the time interval between leaving school and marriage has narrowed. As a result, it is now more likely that unmarried people, especially the college-educated, meet their spouse in school (Mare, 1991). Others point to the role of preferences. Education has become an increasingly important proxy for both cultural taste and socioeconomic success, and competition among men for socioeconomic resources in women may have increased (Kalmijn, 1991a).

There are also hypotheses predicting a decrease in educational homogamy. Some authors argue that marriage choice has become increasingly based on emotional or affective considerations. Because romantic considerations often overrule status concerns, one would expect a decline in all forms of status homogamy (Ultee & Luijkx, 1990).

An attempt to reconcile these hypotheses was made by Smits et al (1998), who argued that educational homogamy will initially increase with levels of industrialization because in this phase, education becomes the dominant criterion for socioeconomic success and cultural norms and values. Romantic considerations and individualism gain importance in later stages of the industrialization process when high standards of living are guaranteed for everyone. As a result, educational homogamy will first increase with level of industrialization, but will eventually decrease.
C. Variations in Mixed Marriage and Homogamy

Factors that contribute to mixed marriage

C1) Gender Differences

C2) Educational Effects

C3) Differences between Regions and Settings

In addition to describing patterns and trends, authors have analyzed variations in mixed marriage and have examined what factors contribute to out-marriage. Recurring themes in the literature are differences by sex, by education, and by region. Although these factors are generally studied in an exploratory fashion, they also offer clues about the causes of endogamy.

C1) Gender Differences

Gender differences have most often been studied in the literature on the racial and ethnic mixed marriage. Studies on black-white intermarriage in the United States consistently show that black men marry white women more often than black women marry white men (Kalmijn, 1993b). A traditional interpretation of this finding is that minority men are able to compensate for their lower “ethnic prestige” by offering white women a high occupational status or income. Although in principle one could reverse the exchange (i.e. high-status minority women could marry white men of lower status) under conditions of traditional gender-roles, this type of marriage is believed to be uncommon because the status of the family is largely dependent on the status of the husband. Although the interpretation is plausible, findings for other ethnic groups provide a counterpoint. Asian-American women, for example, and in particular Japanese-American women, marry whites more often than their male counterparts (Sung, 1990). A speculative interpretation of this exception is that Asian-American women are attractive marriage candidates for white men because of their physical appearance and presumed acceptance of a more traditional power relationship in marriage. A more-plausible interpretation lies in the role of opportunity: the presence of American soldiers in Japan, Korea and Vietnam. Another analysis showed that excluding such war brides leads to a substantial reduction in the sex differential in Asian-American intermarriage (Kalmijn, 1998).

Gender differences have also been studied in the analysis of socioeconomic homogamy. A common finding is that highly educated men and men in professional and technical occupations marry down more often than up (Mare, 1991; Kalmijn, 1994).
On average, women have traditionally been less educated and have had high-status occupations than men less often. Once such differences are taken into account through loglinear analyses, researchers generally find little evidence of asymmetry (Mare, 1991). Similar conclusions apply to trends: educational down-marrying among men has become less common, but this is largely due to the increased educational attainment of women (Mare, 1991).

C2) Educational Effects

Another frequently examined factor in mixed marriage is education. Many studies have found that more highly educated members of ethnic or racial minority groups marry exogamously more often than their lesser educated peers. This applies to white ethnic groups (Lieberson & Waters, 1988) and blacks (Kalmijn, 1993b).

Educational effects have been interpreted in terms of both opportunity and preference. The former interpretation states that better educated minority members are more often exposed to setting such as colleges and high-status occupations where they form a relatively smaller group than in the population at large. Another interpretation states that more highly educated persons, of both majority and minority groups, have a more individualistic attitude, are less attached to their family and community origin, and have a more universalistic view on life than lesser-educated persons. As a result, they would find ascribed characteristics less relevant in deciding whom to marry.

C3) Differences between Regions and Settings

Virtually all studies find large regional differences in mixed marriage. Such patterns point to the role of opportunity: the smaller the group, the more difficult is to marry within the group. Some studies, employing hypotheses about the group size and heterogeneity, found that relative group size is negatively correlated with black out-marriage and ethnic out-marriage; similarly, racial, ethnic, and occupational heterogeneity have positive effects on the respective types of mixed marriage (Hwang et al, 1994).

The role of opportunity has also been analyzed by considering local marriage markets. In a classic study, Ramsoy (1966) analyzed marriage licenses in a Norwegian city and found that husbands and wives lived close to each other before marriage, and in fact closer than one would expect under conditions of random mating in a city. While this confirms that neighbourhoods are marriage markets, Ramsoy also showed that people who lived close to one another before marriage did not marry more homogamously with respect to occupation than people who lived far apart. Hence, it appeared that the neighbourhood did not by itself promote occupational homogamy.
The school is another local marriage market, but its role in promoting educational homogamy has only been studied indirectly. Mare (1991) found that people who marry closer to finishing school, or while in school, marry people who are more similar in education than people who marry long after finishing school. This relationship was found to be present only for higher levels of education. These findings provide indirect evidence that schools function as marriage markets that favour educational homogamy. Schools, and in particular colleges, are educationally homogenous, while the settings people face when they search for a partner at a later stage, such as work settings and public places, tend to be less homogeneous.

D. Multiple Dimensions

Most early studies analysed a single sociological characteristic at a time or analysed several characteristics one-by-one. Since partners choose each other on the basis of multiple characteristics, it is important to analyse more than one factor in marriage choice. In the last decades, several such multidimensional analyses have been done, although most are limited to two dimensions. Research on multiple dimensions has been guided by two hypotheses: the ‘by-product hypothesis’ and the ‘exchange hypothesis’.

D1) By-Product Hypothesis

There is a considerable overlap between social groups in society. Ethnic groups, for example, differ in educational level, religion and ethnicity often coincide, and education with social background is correlated. Because the various social dimensions on which individuals select one another are correlated, and because people are believed to take all these dimensions into account when choosing a spouse, the questions arise if and to what extent homogamy in one group dimension is the by-product of selection in another group dimension.

An early attempt to examine this issue empirically showed that the correlation between the spouses’ fathers’ occupations is reduced substantially when controlling for spouses’ education. This result led to the conclusion that social class homogamy is largely a by-product of educational homogamy. More recent analyses confirmed this and show in addition that educational homogamy is in part a by-product of matching of social origins (Kalmijn, 1991a). Hence, both forms of homogamy appear to be weaker when a
multidimensional analysis is used, although even then, educational homogamy remains stronger than homogamy of social origins.

The by-product hypothesis has also been a theme in the study of ethnic mixed marriage. A classic study of New Haven (in the U.S.) in the first half of the last century by Kennedy (1944) showed that intermarriage is more common between groups who have the same faith, such as between Italians and Poles on the one hand (both largely Catholic) and between Hungarians and Russians on the other (both being largely of Jewish faith). Kennedy used the now classic term “triple melting pot” to describe this pattern. Kennedy’s triple melting pot confirms the by-product hypothesis because it reveals that marriage boundaries between certain ethnic groups are in part the result of differences with respect to religion. More sophisticated loglinear analyses confirm that there are strong marriage boundaries between ethnic groups who have a dissimilar faith (Alba & Golden, 1986), but no studies have simultaneously analyzed individual, ethnic and religious characteristics of husbands and wives.

D2) Exchange Hypothesis

A second theme in multidimensional analyses is the question of whether people trade characteristics when choosing a spouse. Several examples of exchange have been considered, but the most debated case was introduced by Davis (1941) and Merton (1941), who argued that members of ethnic groups whose prestige in society is low would have better chances of marrying outside their group if they offered high socioeconomic status in return.

The Davis-Merton hypothesis is most frequently examined in research on ethnic and racial intermarriage in the U.S. Loglinear and harmonic mean analyses of black-white intermarriage by Kalmijn (1993a) and Schoen & Wooldredge (1989) showed that with respect to education, white women marry up more often when marrying a black man than when marrying a white man; similarly, black men marry down more often when marrying a white woman than when marrying a black woman. Similar conclusions apply when examining the marriage choices of white men and black women. White men marry down less often when marrying exogenously and black women marry up less often in mixed marriages. These asymmetries in spouses’ educational characteristics are assessed after controlling for the marginal educational distributions of race-sex groups and thereby support the hypothesis that majority men and women marry a minority spouse in part under the condition of socioeconomic status gains.

While the pattern of black-white marriage provides support for the Davis-Merton hypothesis, studies of other types of ethnic homogamy are less consistent. In a harmonic mean analysis of Asian mixed marriage in Hawaii, Schoen & Thomas (1989) showed that after controlling for differences in educational distributions, white women marry up more
often when they marry Filipino and Japanese men, consistent with the notion of exchange. The reverse is true, however, when white women marry Hawaiian or Chinese men.

The exchange hypothesis has also been applied to other dimensions of partner choice, such as physical attractiveness and cultural participation. To examine exchanges, studies generally rely on correlation analyses in which socioeconomic characteristics of the husband are regressed on socioeconomic and non-economic characteristics of the wife. Effects of the wife’s non-economic characteristics on the husband’s socioeconomic characteristics are usually called *crossing effects* and are considered evidence for exchange.

In an early analysis of physical attractiveness of women and occupational prestige of men, Taylor & Glenn (1976) showed that female attractiveness has a positive effect on the occupational prestige of the man she marries, even when controlling for her own socioeconomic characteristics. A drawback of this analysis is that husband’s attractiveness was not included in the model. If occupational prestige and attractiveness are correlated within individuals, and if people match in attractiveness, part of the effect of female attractiveness on male prestige may be spurious. A further analysis which also controls for the physical attractiveness of the husband confirms this. Stevens et al (1990) found no effect of female attractiveness on husbands’ education, suggesting that no exchanges are being made.

Another example of exchange is that between socioeconomic status and participation in high culture. DiMaggio & Mohr (1985) found that participation of the wife in high culture has a positive effect on the educational level of the husband. Because no measures of the husband’s cultural participation were included in this model, the exchange effect might again be due to homogamy with respect to cultural participation.

### 1.3. SOCIAL MOBILITY and MIGRATION related to Mixed Marriage

The movement of individuals between different positions within the system of social stratification (i.e. social mobility) and across symbolic or political boundaries into new residential areas and communities (i.e. migration) constitutes a factor that affects family and marriage.

The discussion about marriage patterns has shown, for example, how married men and women benefit from the status/social class characteristics of their spouse, i.e. the social exchange perspective. In this case, the upwardly mobile spouse “marries up” in status. Upward mobility through marriage is called “status hypergamy” and in racial/ethnic mixed marriage it has traditionally been interpreted as a sign that crossing the racial/ethnic boundary is conditional on an exchange of racial/ethnic caste prestige and socioeconomic prestige (See for details the Literature Review under the section 1.1. and 1.2).
In fact, patterns of exogamy or mixed marriage could be an example to show how social mobility works at the level of the individual moving up/down within the system of social stratification (e.g. the case of marital mobility).

On the other hand, the movement of individuals across political boundaries changes the geography and demography of groups. Immigration flows shape contact opportunities among people. Opportunity is certainly a factor in mate selection. The number of potential non-nationals eligible for a marriage partner depends to some extent on the rate of immigration and the immigration law in one country. Therefore, the link between immigration flow and marriage market composition could be a factor of changes in ethnic mixed marriage rates.

In the following sections, both concepts of social mobility and migration need to be clarified since they are useful in the construction of the conceptual framework of the study.

A) SOCIAL MOBILITY

Social mobility is the movement, usually of individuals but sometimes of whole groups, between different positions within the system of social stratification in any society. It is conventional to distinguish upward and downward mobility (that is, movement up or down a hierarchy of privilege), and intergenerational from intra-generational or career mobility (the former referring to mobility between a family of origin and one’s own class or status position, the latter to the mobility experienced during an individual career), (Marshall, 1998).

There is, however, a third form of mobility that applies solely to immigrants. Those who have worked prior to their migration experience migratory occupational mobility, which is a comparison of the migrant’s occupation prior to leaving the donor society with his or her first occupation in the host society. Studies have shown that migratory mobility depresses occupational status since, averaged across all immigrants, the act of moving from one society to another results in considerable social, economic and cultural disruption (e.g. Cretser, 1999). Although the level of disruption varies from person to person depending upon individual circumstances as well as on the prevailing economic conditions, there is a significant decrease in the occupational status of all immigrants. This is the reason why some authors apply the notion of marital mobility to immigrant groups which tend to improve status by marrying out and up in their host society (Ibid.).

B) MIGRATION

Migration involves the (more or less) permanent movement of individuals or groups across symbolic or political boundaries into new residential areas or communities. Sociological studies of migration are diverse and usually form part of larger problems in (for example) research into kinship, social networks, or economic development. It is
conventional to distinguish ‘push’ from ‘pull’ factors in the analysis of migration. The former (for example, high rates of unemployment in the area of origin) are usually viewed as inducing migration of a conservative, security-maximizing nature, while the latter (economic expansion in the host country or region) are said to encourage risk-taking and income-maximizing migration.

A distinction is also made between external migration (between countries) and internal migration (between regions). The international migrations of people have always been complex (Marshall, 1998).

It is sometimes popularly maintained that the end of the twentieth century has seen an unprecedented rise in the numbers of international marriages, because of the vast scale of population movements caused by refugees, wars, famine, work migration, tourism and so forth, which thus bring more peoples than ever before into contact with each other. However, just because people migrate to another area or country does not necessarily mean that they are able or want to form close relationships with other groups. There are many studies which show how migrant groups often have restricted access to relationships with host-society groups, either through their own excluding practices or, more often, through those of the dominant group (Breger and Hill, 1998). Other work has shown that the length of time migrants have lived within a new society is closely related to the degree with which they marry out; that is, first-generation migrants tend to have low out-marriage rates, but more of their children will marry out, while the third generation will have a high out-marriage rate (Lee and Yamanaka, 1990). While statistics tend to support this model, what this empirically-based description does not indicate, however, is why some groups are chosen as potential spouses, whereas others are not. What factors create or lessen the social distance between groups? This is one of the questions to be answered in the research reported below about marriages between foreign nationals and natives, in the case of Cyprus.

Also, with regard to marriage market, the total number and sex ratio of immigrants, unmarried but of marriageable age, constitute a crude indicator of opportunity in mate selection. Moving from the aggregate level of partner choice to the individual factor, the issue of preference becomes relevant (Cretser, 1999). Comparing intra with inter-marriage rates over time and between immigrant groups provides some indication of preference for a spouse, in terms of nationality or other ethnic related differences. Moreover, when nationality is related to socioeconomic status, when members of the host nationality group tend to have higher levels of education, income and educational prestige than most immigrants, a status hypergamy pattern in mixed marriages will arise. In this case the assumption is that an immigrant group has a tendency to gain status through marriage into the host nationality group. Also, automatically the notion of marital mobility can be applied to immigrant groups.
The first years of this century brought to the attention of researchers the topic of marriage into a migratory context. In this sense, more emphasis is been giving to the phenomenon of marriage migration in the literature on women and transnational migration. In this literature, women are very often stereotyped as helpless victims in international marriage (marriage migration) and work (work/economic migration). More recent works share a common interest in countering these stereotypes, warning against simplistic views that present international migration, for work or marriage, as being universally disempowering of women (Constable, 2004; Piper and Races, 2003). In this respect, women are shown to have agency and desires that they pursue with varying degrees of success through transnational migration. For example, McKay’s study of Filipinas in Canada (in Piper and Races, 2003) shows how women can find marriage to be a way out of a humdrum existence they face in domestic worker occupations. Power is also found through solidarity among women, as is proven in the study of Filipinas in Queensland, Australia by Roces (in Piper and Races, 2003). Thus, these studies draw attention to how women consciously use their agency to improve their situations through work or marriage.

Moreover, Constable (2004) explains how, win or lose, women have power in the geometry of cross-border marriage, and how this power can be used to improve the position of women through marriage. This, of course, does not negate the view that many women are exploited in international marriage.

Migration has been discussed at some length because this perspective on the marriage migration-related issues is employed in the present thesis when accounting for one of the main sources of foreign spouses married to natives in Cyprus (i.e. the work migration flow to Cyprus).

1.4. CONCLUSIONS and RESEARCH PROPOSAL.

EXCHANGE and TASTE: Hypotheses in Studying Mixed Marriage

The literature considered in this section showed how sociological research on marriage choices has generated many insights in how modern society is differentiated. In general, social groups in society appear to be closed, in the sense that men and women more often choose partners within their group than one would expect under random
mating. Although some groups are more closed than others, examples of social groups who marry exclusively exogamously have not (yet) been found.

Research on mixed marriage reveals also how societies change. Overall, ascribed bases of group membership have become less important, while achieved bases of group membership, and especially those governed by education, have not lost salience. This is not to say that ascribed groups are mixing freely now. Ethnic, religious, and particularly racial boundaries still exist, but they are weaker than they used to be.

In a theoretical sense, there has also been progress in the field. There are many theories about mate selection, and such notions provide important clues about the causes of mixed marriage and homogamy. In general, marriage patterns arise from three social forces: the preference of individuals for resources in a partner, the influence of the social groups, and the constraints of the marriage market. The multifaceted (or layered) perspective (i.e. the sum of preferences + constraints + opportunities) that has been developed over the years gives sociological theorizing an edge over competing theories of marriage choice such as those developed by psychologists and economists (Kalmijn, 1998). This study also, draws on this perspective by monitoring the three-level partner choice formation at: individual, social group and societal levels.

The empirical research reported in following chapters has an exploratory character due to the lack of previous research on mixed marriage in Cypriot context. It uses a two-level analysis model: the societal and individual aggregate level model. At the societal level, the study tries to capture an image of mixed marriage in Cyprus, as it is perceived by local public opinion (through a questionnaire survey on a national sample, N=400). The findings of the questionnaire survey are interpreted through the lenses of an analysis of statistical data on mixed marriage reported in Chapter II. At the individual level, the practical investigation had as subjects, eighteen foreign individuals married to Cypriots and two offspring of mixed marriages (between Greek-Cypriots and foreign nationals) who are married to a foreign national and respectively, a native Cypriot. The purpose has been to analyze foreign spouses’ marriage choices and, considering both types of quantitative and qualitative findings, to provide a two-sided view of mixed marriage in Cyprus.

The theoretical support of the empirical research reported is constituted from the above-mentioned multifaceted perspective on mate selection adapted to the Cypriot context and then enriched with specific particularities. The originality of the present point of view is given by the modality through which this multifaceted perspective about partner choice is modelled on exchange theory assumptions and aesthetic sociology theories about “taste”, both outlooks being employed for explaining the process of partner choice in mixed marriage between foreign nationals and Greek Cypriots in Cyprus. The section that follows provides a discussion of the above-mentioned theoretical perspectives.
A) Exchange Theory: A Traditional Way of Approaching Spouse Selection

The multifaceted perspective about partner choice adopted in the present thesis is modelled on the exchange theory assumptions. The multidimensional perspective about partner choice supports the fact that since partners choose each other on the basis of multiple characteristics, it is important to analyze more than one factor in marriage choice. Exchange theory constitutes a popular framework in family studies. In this sense, theories about marriage tend to focus on exchanges, either between families (as in the past- the macro-exchange or structural exchange theories assume that individual choices are constrained by larger group such as mate exchanges between kin groups in complex kinship systems) or between individuals (as in today’s environment- micro-exchange theories).

Contemporary exchange theories use the concepts of rewards, resources, and costs as the foundation of interpersonal exchanges. Rewards include personal attraction, social acceptance, social approval, instrumental services, prestige, and power. When individuals receive rewards from participating in a relationship, they are more likely to engage in the interaction with the rewarding individual again. Resources are any “commodity”, such as “love, status, services, goods, information, and money” (Sabatelli and Shehan, 1993:398), that can be transferred interpersonally, enabling one person to reward another. Costs include punishments experienced as a result of a certain exchange, or rewards that have been forgone due to engaging in one behaviour or course of action rather than another. There are three types of costs: Direct costs are resources given to others in an exchange. Investment costs include the time people spend acquiring skills to reward others. Opportunity costs are rewards that are given up at least temporarily as a result of participating in a relationship (Ibid).

When assessing the value of the relationship, individuals evaluate its outcomes in comparison with certain standards, such as social norms of physical attractiveness and “style”, and personal preferences and aspirations regarding appearance, intelligence, personality, and friendship networks. This Comparison Level (CL) serves as a standard for evaluating the rewards and costs of a relationship in relation to what people feel they deserve or can obtain. Relationships that fall above the CL are evaluated as satisfying; those below the CL would be considered unsatisfying (Sabatelli and Shehan, 1993). When expectations regarding some highly valued aspect of the relationship are not met, the general assessment of the relationship will be low (ibid.).

---

11 Exchange theory is based on an economic metaphor that uses a profit motive as a basis of social interaction. As Smith (1995:21) shows “economists have used exchange principles to identify the use of resource in marital interactions in Third World settings (e.g. Jones, 1986). Early presentations of the theory formulated by anthropologists also demonstrated its applicability in various cultural contexts. Levi-Stauss(1969) emphasised that exchange behaviour is regulated by social norms and values; thus, exchange interactions are not restricted to direct interaction among individuals but include “complex networks of indirect exchange among various social groups” (Sabatelli & Shehan, 1993:404).
Even high levels of rewards do not ensure that a relationship will continue. Individuals compare available alternatives with their present relationship and these comparisons help the individual to decide whether to remain in or leave the relationship. The lowest acceptable level of outcomes relative to available alternatives is called *Comparison Level of Alternatives*. This does not mean that a better alternative actually exists. Rather, the person believes a more rewarding relationship can be found and can overcome barriers to leaving, such as emotional and financial dependence, religious or family pressures to stay together, and continued feelings of love and attraction. This individual is more likely to leave an unsatisfying relationship than is someone who believes that he/she will not find a better relationship (Sabatelli and Shenan, 1993).

Relationships are generally viewed as satisfying when partners make about equal contributions and receive about equal positive outcomes. Under these conditions, a relationship meets expectations of *fairness*. When individuals do not believe the relationship outcomes are fair, they can reduce their “investments” in the relationship or try to increase their “profits” by attempting to change the other person’s behaviour. Another major consideration is whether exchanges are considered mutually responsive, or “reciprocal”. *Reciprocity* refers to conditions in which individuals negotiate exchanges that not only benefit themselves but are mutually rewarding and take each others’ needs into account.

Essential terms in exchange theory have been described in detail to show how exchange theory gives us basic concepts with which to analyse the cognitive factors involved in the development, maintenance, and change of intimate relationships. In close relationships, the *relative* levels of partners’ resources, dependence, and attraction impact the interaction, including intimacy, satisfaction, and stability. Social relationships are considered “markets” in which individuals “act out of self-interest with the goal of maximising profits” (Sabatelli and Shehan, 1993:385). Regarding mate selection, the whole process of dating, courtship, and marrying is viewed as a giant sorting and matching marketplace: the marriage market (Coltrane, 1997:47).

There is a traditional gender pattern in marriage, which provides a strong confirmation of the exchange hypothesis. Women have tended to use marriage to improve their overall social standing, a practice referred to as *hypergamy* or “marrying up”. Also, the notion of marital mobility has traditionally been applied to women (e.g. Tyree & Treas, 1974). It is known that physical attractiveness is a major asset in sexual exchange and is associated with upward economic mobility in particular for women (Elder, 1969, 1974). In this sense, Coltrane (1998:31) explains how “women’s dependence on marriage has made it less likely they will impulsively fall in love and more likely that they will work on their own feelings to make them fit the practical aspects of relationship possibilities. In contrast, men have been able to follow their impulsive feelings and trade their wealth or
earning power to get a desirable wife, often marrying more attractive women slightly below them in social class”. Such marital bargains tend to reinforce power differences between men and women in the larger society (Cancian, 1987; Sattel, 1992). Women are still more practical about marriage than are men, but as women have gained more education and more earnings, they are less likely to rely on marriage to improve their social standing (Surra, 1991)

With regard to mixed marriages, the interpretation of status hypergamy concerns the assumption that people in migratory context (i.e. immigrants in host countries) due to their unequal status have an incentive to gain status through marriage (this aspect is considered as a hypothesis herein). Status gains in marriage can be purely monetary, but they also include more social characteristics, such as prestige in the community, a comfortable life style, and access to social and cultural capital. Recent feminist research shows that although the practice is weakening, women still tend to court and marry men with higher social standing and resources than themselves, using as an exchange their physical attractiveness (Coltrane 1998). In other words, some women (mostly in a migratory context where they lack individual resources and social status) still use marriage as a path to financial security and upward mobility. Even though, in the case of migrant women (and men) they are at a disadvantage in any exchange relationship (on the basis that the exchange relationship ought to be a rewarding one for both sides). This is one hypothesis investigated through empirical work, in the present study (by questioning foreign spouses married to Cypriots).

However, the theory’s contemporary individualistic orientation may not adequately capture the complex sets of relationships embedded in local cultural beliefs and social structure (e.g. the way exchange theory is used in mate selection within American context may be less applicable to other cultures). Indeed, exchange theory can be criticised for simplifying complex human interactions as a calculated give and take between individuals. The theory assumes that a rational, cost-benefit analysis drives their exchanges; rich, complicated, and varied social and cultural influences tend to be reduced to a cognitive process “mediated” by culture, race/ethnicity, class, and gender (see Sabatelli and Shehan, 1993:404).
B) Need, Taste and Pleasure in Spouse Selection:

Towards a New Perspective in Considering Mixed Marriage

This thesis proposes a new perception when looking at mixed marriage from an exchange theory perspective; it relies on the aesthetic sociology’s concept of “taste”. According to the exchange hypothesis, eventual spouses bargain subjective and objective (quantifiable or not) features or characteristics like wealth and social position, love or hatred. All these exchanges could be considered as based on the participants’ taste (as the concept of “taste” is defined in Bourdieu’s social theory of distinction). This is the point where the present study challenges previous research hypotheses on partner choice process. For example, physical attractiveness might be valued as an attribute of a potential partner in itself or it might be a “taste”. In exchange theory’s terms, simply interacting with a physically attractive person might be seen as a benefit, perhaps substantial enough to offset any costs anticipated from the interaction. Just why physical attractiveness might be such a widespread “taste” is sometimes explained in terms of cultural learning. Wolf (1991), for example, has proposed that the societal value placed on physical attractiveness reflects a peculiarly Western “culture of beauty”, fuelled by the capacity of the media to surround us with images of flawless (particularly female) beauty. In these terms, a preference for more attractive partners in “marital exchange” would be a straightforward consequence of what we have been taught to value.

According to the sociology of aesthetics, taste always refers to the preferences and choices of an individual and is totally private by its very nature. Everyone is supposed to choose what feels good, but this is relative. At the same time, the ideal of good taste is meant to be beyond the individual, and to be socially binding. It offers a universal standard, potentially applicable to all members of a society. It is an ideal that everyone is supposed to follow. Furthermore, it is a standard, which is communicable even though it can never be conceptually determined. According to the famous antinomy of taste formulated by Immanuel Kant in his *Critique of Judgment*, taste, or the judgment power, is both totally private and universal, both individual and social, subjective and objective. This is how Kant formulated the famous antinomy of taste which the tradition had not been able to solve and to which no possible conceptual solution could be found: the feeling of beauty requires that is shared universally, but how could something that was exclusively based on the subjective feeling of pleasure be universally valid, too.

Bourdieu (1984:56) adopted one possible empiricist solution to this antinomy of taste by claiming that the taste of the ruling class is always the legitimate taste of a society. Taste and legitimate or good taste are the basic concepts of Pierre Bourdieu’s social theory of distinction. By writing that “taste is the basis of all that one has- people and things- and all that one is for others, whereby one classifies oneself and is classified by others”, Bourdieu
(ibid.) could be echoing the classical tradition. In other words, according to Bourdieu the choices one makes are also strategies of distinction.

‘Taste’, ‘aesthetic dispositions’ and ‘habitus’ are key concepts of Pierre Bourdieu’s social theory of distinction (see Bourdieu, 1984:56). To Bourdieu, taste is always a disposition forming part of the habitus of any person. Some clarification is needed here for Bourdieu’s definitions of the concepts.

“The aesthetic disposition is one dimension of a distant, self-assured relation to the world and to others which presupposes assurance and distance” (ibid., p.56). It is both a “manifestation of the system of dispositions produced by the social conditionings” (i.e. the latter are ‘conditions of existence’ and freedom of constraints of economic necessity) and “a distinctive expression of a privileged position in social space”.

“Tastes (i.e., manifested preferences) are the practical affirmation of an inevitable difference. It is no accident that, when they have to be justified, they are asserted purely negatively, by the refusal of other tastes. In matters of taste, more than anywhere else, all determination is negation” (ibid., p.56). Bourdieu explains further that “each taste feels itself to be natural- and so it almost is, being a habitus- which amounts to rejecting others as unnatural and therefore vicious” (ibid., p.56).

Moreover, Bourdieu defines the ‘habitus’ as “necessity internalized and converted into a disposition that generates meaningful practices and meaning-giving perceptions; it is a general, transposable disposition which carries out a systematic, universal application—beyond the limits of what has been directly learnt—of the necessity inherent in the learning conditions”(ibid, p.170). Then, he gives the habitus, the power of an organising principle inasmuch ‘different conditions of existence produce different habitus—systems of generative schemes applicable, by simple transfer, to the most varied areas of practice’ (ibid., p.170). In this study, such an “area of practice” is the mate selection process in mixed marriage.

The old saying that one cannot dispute over matters of taste (De gustibus disputandum non est!) did not originally refer to the fact that taste is a private matter for every individual. The meaning was rather the opposite. Because taste was something self-evident and shared by all, it was both futile and unnecessary to argue about it (Gronow, 1997:9). On the other hand, taste was always understood to be a reflection of genuinely individual preferences alone: something was tasteful and good because it really felt good (Burke, 1987). More importantly, matters of taste were beyond dispute because there could not in principle be any general rules governing them. If they were to be disputed, there would have to be presuppositions that there were some general standards, which could be criticized, questioned or defended (cf. Kant 1987:§18).

According to the understanding of representatives of the moral sense theory, taste was based on a sense of feeling about the goodness or badness of objects or forms of
conduct. This could not be reflected upon conceptually. It was, in principle, impossible to formulate any general maxims of good taste (Gronow, 1997). As Gadamer (1988) pointed out, taste was basically a *Bildungsbegriff*, and as such an ideal of education and emancipation. In this tradition of thought, good taste was increasingly understood not to be predetermined by the privilege of birth or social origins. It was something that could be adopted by learning, regardless of one’s social standing. Anyone who showed good taste in his or her choices and conduct was gentleman (or gentlewoman). Good taste, thus, was both an indicator of belonging to ‘good society” and the main criterion of entry into it.

Sole reliance on one’s sense or ‘instinct’ of good and bad, tasteful and tasteless, precluded distinction between beauty, goodness and virtue: ‘sense of beauty’ and ‘sense of right and wrong’ were inseparable. Taste was essentially both an aesthetic and a moral category; in other words, these senses could not be separated from each other. Thus, decent conduct, dress and decorum were all indicators of an individual’s moral and aesthetic value, or good taste. What was tasteful was both decent and virtuous, too. In this sense, too, Bourdieu shared the basic postulates of this tradition. As previously mentioned, both food preferences and table manners are important indicators of lifestyles and class tastes in Bourdieu’s study, because all such choices (like dressing, eating, furnishing one’s home, etc.) fall largely outside the formal schooling and education system. They are made on the basis of pure taste dispositions rather than following any explicit rules and norms of conduct.

To what extent mate selection in mixed marriage and implicitly in marital exchange occurs on the basis of pure taste dispositions and then reveals an aesthetic dimension, is a question to be answered through an empirical investigation utilising a mixed methodological approach, employing both qualitative (semi-structured interviews) and quantitative data (questionnaire survey).
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A. MARRIAGE AND FAMILY IN CYPRUS

Overview: TRADITION and MODERNITY in CYPRUS.
   An anthropological discourse

A discussion about family and marriage in Cyprus is almost impossible without a preliminary discussion of the Cypriot societal context. It is interesting to take into consideration an anthropological discourse when reviewing literature on marriage and family in Cyprus. The reason could be embedded in a particular characteristic of the society under discussion that fits anthropological interest: the attribute of a small-scale social universe. Both previous and contemporary anthropological debates about Cyprus have worked towards constructing and, respectively breaking down the divide between modernity and tradition. In this sense, one could distinguish three anthropological perspectives illustrated through corresponding community study generations carried out as ethnographies. These perspectives define ‘the context’ by picturing Cyprus as a modernizing Mediterranean society and are discussed below.

Cyprus as a modernizing Mediterranean society has been of interest to social anthropologists primarily as an example of how social change transformed the traditional culture of Cypriot local village communities after the Second World War. As Weltz mentions, Peristiany’s ethnography constituted the foundation for an entire area specialization on the Mediterranean. In one of his articles, he asserted that honour and shame serve as value orientations guiding social life in the small-scale societies of the circum-Mediterranean, where the evaluation of individual actions by village public opinion rather than by institutions and the state provides the basis of social integration (Weltz, 1999:11).

According to the perspective that insists on the traditional ethos of Mediterranean societies, contemporary Mediterranean images are recreated in the public discourses of Western Europe so that these can sell cultures as supposedly untouched by the “ravage of civilization”. If one follows such interpretations, contemporary Mediterranean societies may have reached modernity technologically and infrastructurally; but they are at the same time entangled in older patterns that obstruct the development of a productive and sustainable economy (ibid, p.13).

Community studies, which constitute the second-generation ethnographies, evoke a dual-manner in describing the same reality. On one hand it is the active manner, which has portrayed an environment where social actors are very capable in meeting the

---

13 See the ethnography of a Pitsilla village conducted in the 1950s by John Peristiany.
challenges of a changing society. On the other hand, there is the passive perspective that described modernization as a linear transition process, following conventional notions of social change, with modern values replacing traditional values.

The third-generation ethnographies could be exemplified by a more recent study, which asserts that modernity is “neither a destination to be reached nor an object to be appropriated” (Argyrou, 1996:157). According to Weltz (1999:12), Argyrou’s study reveals both “modernity”, in the sense of “Western attitudes and practices embraced by the Cypriot urban middle class, and the affirmation of ‘tradition’ that expresses working class resistance against bourgeois values to be foiled that mask the fact that both modernists and traditionalists merely enact the symbolic domination of their society by the West”. In other words, the author seems to accept tradition and modernity as pivotal points in the discussion of social change in Cypriot society, at the same time displacing the antagonistic view of traditional practices and discourses versus modernization threats.

In sum, what does modernization mean in a changing environment described as Mediterranean society? The answer might be given through a challenging anthropological perspective: both the scholarly concept of tradition and the empirical reality of what is being called ‘tradition’ are drifting apart. “Where before historical depth and the unbroken continuity of traditional patterns of thought and action were assumed, now it is increasingly understood- also by the carriers and keepers of tradition- as a construction originating from present needs of people living today, not a mindless reproduction of past habits, but instead a response to contemporary challenges” (Weltz, 1999:18).

In this perspective, Cypriot society should be analyzed according to matches between reflexive modernization and traditionalisation processes. Nowadays Cypriot society is a realm of highly diverse and often contradictory interests, influences, and confluences where a multiplicity of possible ways of acting and thinking modern are being invented, experimented and theorized so that it constitutes a focus for sociological research, as well. This perspective constitutes also, the context definition employed by the present study which aims at providing an image of spouse selection strategies encountered in the Cypriot matrimonial system. Because of analytical reasons, both traditional and modern patterns of practices and discourses in family and marriage processes are being identified.

According to this context definition framework, the discussion will focus on particular phenomena in relation to mixed marriage. In sum, this chapter provides an approach of family, marriage, mixed marriage and immigration in Cypriot society, by reference to the theoretical framework guiding the present research. In the first part of the chapter, theoretical sources concerning specialized literature on marriage and family in

---

14 Peristiany’s article “Honour and Shame in a Cypriot Highland Village” (1965).
15 The study of a Morphou district village by Peter Loizos, published as “The Greek Gift” in 1975.
16 The study conducted by Kyriakos Markides in Lysi village, in the early seventies.
Cyprus are presented. The second part contains an analysis of statistical data on, marriage, mixed marriage and immigration in Cyprus, from official Demographic Reports (1989-2004).

Chapter structure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marriage and Family in Cyprus. A Literature Review</th>
<th>Mixed marriage and Immigration in Cyprus. Statistical data Analysis.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2.1. MARRIAGE AND FAMILY IN CYPRUS. Dualism and Change

(A) Greek Cypriot nuclear family

(B) Extended kinship links

(C) Cypriot endogamous marriage

Traditional And Changing Contexts

It has been pointed out that "the three social categories with which a Greek identifies himself most readily are the family, the community of origin and the nation" (Peristiany, 1966). It evokes the symbolism of the Greek ‘Holy Trinity’ of pistis (faith), ikoyenia (family) and ethnos/patrida (nation/homeland), a theme that is likely to be encountered in every piece of sociological and anthropological literature about Ellenismos (i.e. the notion of a common or core Greek culture). As Bottomley (1979, p.78) mentioned, a discussion of the beliefs and values associated with the Greek family is central to an analysis of the core culture.

The Greek Cypriots seem to be no exception to this rule. In order to discuss patterns of mate selection, it is important to analyze some general characteristics of the Greek Cypriot family, as these appear both in traditional and contemporary family forms.

The Greek Cypriot family can be seen as a variant of a particular Mediterranean family type which itself presents a variety of nuclear and extended family forms. The particular form could be identified as the Eastern Mediterranean European type of family being encountered mostly in towns that fit the characterization of pre-industrial city and urbanized more recently. This type of recently urbanized environment stresses the common centrality of family life.

The ideal household is composed of an elementary or nuclear family, that is the father and mother with their unmarried children, living together in a separate house.
However, Cypriot family is nuclear in ideal form but may at times include cohabitation by other members of the family, especially widowed parents. The nuclear family orientation is concomitant with extensive kinship groups. Traditional Cypriot society conceived other people (o kosmos) or non-kin (kseen) as potentially untrustworthy and dangerous, outside of their community or extensive kinship group (as discussed in Markides et al., 1978). Therefore, the ‘other’ or the ksenos, becomes potentially graver in its urban consequences than in the village context where individuals know one another, unless mediated in the city by other forms of association such as common village ties. Kinship is bilateral and marriage is forbidden to the fifth degree, i.e. second cousins may not marry (Anthias F., 1992:80).

In traditional context, marriage tended to be village or town-based, various factors being responsible for this including the way in which marriage was arranged by intermediaries which made local based marriage more likely (Anthias, 1992:80). Therefore, traditional Cypriot marriage has been characterized as highly endogamous, with husband and wife being from the same town, village or region. There are statistical data, which prove that in traditional Cyprus, where the movement of people was difficult, most of marriages were between brides and grooms from the same village, same town and respectively, same region. Under the impact of urbanization and modernization the traditional endogamous model showed signs of change since marriage between spouses from different settings (villages, towns, and regions) have also been recorded (Markides et al, 1978).

However, in the 1980s things appeared not to have changed much, for people had the tendency to marry spouses from the same home-region. In this sense, it has been suggested that a reason could be the prejudices that had not been changed yet17. Social change would have primarily changed a conservative mentality reflected in sayings as ‘Παπούτσιν που τον τόπον σου τζι ας εν τζαι μπαλλωμένον’ (meaning literally “It is better to wear a shoe made in your own place even if it’s covered with patches”), ‘Κοπέλλα/ γαμπρός που τους τόπους μας’ (bride/groom from our place) or ‘Εν πλάσματα που τα ξέρουμεν’ (They are people we know) that used to govern the decision-making process in spouse selection.

If in the 1970s four in five marriages registered in a Cypriot village were endogamous (Loizos, 1976), in the 1990s traditional values are very evidently subject to a great deal of change given the increasing propensity for Cypriots to marry non nationals/foreigners (the traditional “inter-village” type of marriage became an inter-country marriage pattern- as statistical data analysis in this chapter shows, during the

---

17 As it was suggested by research findings about the Cypriot family from 1982, Η έρευνα ‘Η ΔΟΜΗ ΤΗΣ ΚΥΠΡΙΑΚΗΣ ΟΙΚΟΓΕΝΕΙΑΣ ΚΑΙ Η ΘΕΣΗ ΤΟΥ ΕΦΗΒΟΥ Σ’ΑΥΤΗ’, Εθνική Επιτροπή Δ.Ε.Π. Κύπρου, Λευκωσία, 1982, σ.13.
period 1989-2004, in average, from 100 marriages entered by Cypriots every year, 27 were marriages to foreign nationals).

Nowadays Cypriot society is changing rapidly and the destruction of old and cherished values, including the centrality of family and kinship together with the endogamous marriage, has begun. The Cypriot family seems to be exposed to external threats in the face of the effects of mass tourism, mass media, shifting social patterns and labour force immigration, which Cyprus cannot isolate itself against. There is, also, a prevalent assumption that despite the shifting and eroding values of the outside world, Cypriot family values will remain secure. There is remarkable optimism that the family will survive these social changes just as it has survived in the past (Hughes, 1999:69).

Family, kinship and marriage processes illustrate a dualism tradition-post-modernity that characterizes contemporary Greek-Cypriot society. Many aspects of change are welcomed, and, even if they are resisted, change is inevitable. The Greek Cypriot ability to maintain and integrate its traditions, while incorporating the conveniences and opportunities of a post-industrial society, is a precarious balance, which could prove increasingly hard to sustain (Hughes, 1999).

However, the picture of Cypriot family is somehow contrasting. It emerges at the crossroads of traditional rural family structures and changing values brought by post-industrial society. The dualism defined as a mixture between tradition and change describes a framework that was employed in the following sketchily analysis of family and marriage processes in Cyprus.

2.2. TRADITIONAL CYPRIOt FAMILY AND MARRIAGE

2.2.1 Traditional Family Structures and Characteristics

The traditional family in Cyprus typically consisted of a man and a wife and their unmarried offspring, living in their own household. The nuclei of the domestic unit were the parent-child and sibling relationships. The kinship system was bilateral in form with a stress on patrilateral affiliation (which includes father’s kin through female links), related to male dominance. Relationships within the family were authoritarian. Deference was paid to the male head of a household and to older siblings, as well. Older siblings were responsible for younger, and males were responsible for females. Traditionally, in a family girls will marry before boys and the older girls will have priority. First and second cousins were not allowed to marry but were encouraged to act as companions to each other (Markides et al., 1978).

Prior research that refers to relationships in the traditional Cypriot family focused on super ordination-subordination relations as a main characteristic with the father being the supreme authority (Peristiany, 1966). However, Markides et al (1978:88) identified as
a factor that determines the amount of the authority exercised by the husband (in both traditional and modern families), the woman's economic independence. "The father usually has the last word except in some very rare cases when the wife either works or has her own financial means and so she can take an effective part in decision making. In other words the husband's authority is directly affected by the financial status of his wife" (ibid, p.100). The more economically independent a wife is (via dowry or via employment) the less is the husband's authority exercised over her. This applies to both modern as well as traditional families.

What has been seen to characterise the traditional Cypriot family however has been the social importance of female sexual purity (Peristiany, 1966; Anthias, 1992). The discussion here highlights the necessary use of the concept of honour/'timi' and the ways it defines femininity and masculinity. Honour involves the gender-linked qualities of manliness in men and sexual shame in women. Women should be chaste and restrained; men should be assertive and courageous.

There are numbers of studies that identified some of the characteristics of the traditional Cypriot family: The authoritarian child-rearing methods / authoritarian parenting; the discrimination on the basis of gendered/ sexist attitudes; the neutral to unfavourable attitude towards the value of education (for daughters); the high grade of cohesiveness/ poor family differentiation. Also, the research in the domain indicates that the modern Cypriot family has retained some of the characteristics of the traditional one, especially in the rural areas (Christodoulides et al, 1982; Georgiou, 1991).

2.2.2. Traditional Family Formation: from Mate selection to Marriage

(A) Traditional endogamous system

(B) Arranged marriages
   - The matchmaker

(C) Marriages exchanges
   - The dowry system

In the traditional Cypriot family, marriages were arranged by families rather than by individuals themselves and included a careful calculation of the economic and social resources of both sets of kin. Through the dowry of the bride and the potential patrimony of the groom, both sides contributed towards the establishment of a new family in which they had a balanced interest.
The traditional marriage pattern was “one whereby arrangements were entered into by the respective parents and in which the children had not always have the right of veto. In these arrangement discussions concerning the transfer of property to the daughter through the dowry form were made, which (...) meant the provision by the girl’s parents of a house on marriage” (Anthias, 1992:80). Girls with no house found it difficult to marry through ‘normal’ channels and competition was great for prospective grooms who were able to demand exorbitant claims.

(A) Traditional Endogamous System

A connection between the traditional endogamous system and dowry house can be identified, since the latter could be provided easier in the bride’s own village. Therefore, the endogamous system was closely linked with the nature of the rural occupational and economic system of production. The majority of countrymen were farmers, shepherds, and craftsmen practicing their trades in their own villages. Consequently, they had few opportunities of coming into contact with outsiders. Furthermore, endogamy was sustained by the lack of transport facilities, which kept various villages in mutual isolation (Markides et al. 1978).

Looking beyond a pure economic motivation of the endogamous system in traditional Cyprus, one could take into account the basic peasant mistrust of non-kin/outsider or ‘ksení’. In this sense, Markides et al (1978:103) pointed out in the particular case of a Cypriot village: “It was considered shameful for any father to marry off his daughters to a xenochoritis, somebody from another village, since this implied that the daughters suffered from a moral or physical defect.[...] The villagers attributed very great importance to a full knowledge of the family background of their spouse. They also believed that only a fellow-villager would possess an outlook on life identical to their own- a factor that they considered necessary for a successful marriage”.

However, under the impact of urbanization and modernization on island economy, the structure of rural economy had undergone profound changes, which had weakened rural endogamous practices. In order to make a living under the new economic conditions many villagers began (in the 1950s) moving to towns. As countrymen began migrating to towns, and as they were adapting themselves to the realities and difficulties of urban living, some country values started changing (see the traditional suspicion of strangers). Therefore, the “inter-village” pattern of marriage inevitably became more frequent, eroding the traditional homogamous and endogamous matrimonial system.

(B) Arranged marriages and the matchmaker

It has been pointed out that the Greek word *gamos* (marriage) is polyvalent (Herzfeld, 1980). It can mean the two families’ celebration of the match; the engagement;
the religious ceremony itself that is the *stefanos* (literally meaning the ‘crowing’), and the word is also related to sexual intercourse. Herzfeld suggests that this polyvalence enabled villagers to assert that ‘no sex before *gamos*’ was practised without falling into contradiction and maintaining the semblance of following an honourable code. Indeed all marriage-related aspects were strictly controlled through a traditional matrimonial system that overemphasized arranged marriage or what was called marriage “*me prikosymbolon*” (through a matrimonial contract). This is the case of traditional Cyprus where marriage “*yia aghape*” (for love) or what is known as the ‘free choice’ modern marriage, was not obviously the rule. Thus, the entire process of selection was guided by certain guidelines: “Traditionally the bridegroom’s family would take the initiative in seeking a bride for their son” (Markides *et al.*, 1978:107). In order to secure a successful match, “The ideal partner would have ‘a good dowry and good property with good character’. The definition of the latter for the woman combined the element of sexual honour (which if lacking would put into question her domestic or personal worth) and ‘*prokomeni*’, that is obedient, domesticated and hard-working. If a woman was ‘*prokomeni*’ she was also by definition sexually beyond reproach” (Anthias, 1992:81).

Therefore, monetary and non-monetary factors such as honour (in Greek, *timi* or honour is significantly but deceptively the same word for ‘price’ or ‘cost’) came into play; in these conditions, the indices of a considered successful marital match were: The economic background of the girl; the status of her family in the village class hierarchy; and/or the moral reputation that she and her family enjoyed in the village (Markides *et al.*, 1978:107).

Furthermore, it is clear the enormous importance of the marriage transaction as an economic transaction, i.e. as a form of barter or an exchange (Anthias, 1992:81)). Even if the model of marriage as exchange is presented as a characteristic of traditional past, it appeared still alive in the 1970s: “our investigations proved that even today family interest counts decisively in mate selection” (Markides *et al.*, 1978:110). The observation may stimulate further questions about the influence of family interests (or *symferon*) in nowadays mate selection process, particularly in mixed marriage; it would suggest indices to measure the amount of traditionalism in contemporary Cypriot family, as well (task undertaken in the following chapters).

The whole process of spouse selection and matching in traditional Cypriot marriage constituted a far-reaching reality for those who were its main protagonists. Who was in charge with matching spouses? Claude Lévi-Strauss (1969) pointed out that “marriage is a very special type of exchange.” As in all exchange, there is an offer to be made. Nowadays, the procedure for asking a girl’s hand in marriage is accomplished by the groom. In the specific case of traditional Cyprus, the parents or their agents (the
matchmakers) commonly arranged marriages, for marriage was seen as principally unifying two families rather than just husband and wife.

As Anthias (1992:81) put it: “In previous times it was only the parents who went to make the marriage arrangements (proxenia) – that is to make an offer of marriage. The father and mother would go together to the parents of the girl and ask ‘Τούτον το πράμα γίνεται;’ (Is this thing possible?). If there was initial acceptance, then the economic details would be discussed.”

In more recent times, ‘proxenia’ were more often done through a third party, a ‘proxenitis’ or a matchmaker. Many villages had their known intermediaries who were not professionals and did not receive payments for their services, having a reputation for being successful and discrete ‘proxenitres’; female relatives were also used. The matchmaker was the one who prepared the ground and ‘scouted’ the potential of a match (Markides et al, 1978:111). This was a delicate role, for the honour of the family was at stake with a refusal, which often took the form of “We are not marrying this year”. If the answer was affirmative then the two contracting families would agree on the terms of the “dowry contract” (to prikosymfono) sanctioned and enforced by the religious authority and then would celebrate the engagement. In the traditional past, the interval between engagement and marriage could be anything from three to ten years, for marriage required the fulfilment of the ‘prikosymfono’ (dowry agreement), which usually entailed the building of a house.

(C) Marriage exchanges and the dowry system

Among the main characteristics of the traditional marital system in Cyprus, which have been already considered, the neolocal residence is considered a trademark of modernity as long as a newly married couple had the possibility of living apart from the groom’s or the bride’s family. Nevertheless, some caution is in order here, for neolocal residence has been provided as dowry house, symbolising the aid and support of kin, and therefore the dependence of the couple. The specialised discourse concerning the implications of a dowry house is contradictory in giving an explanation. However, the importance of the dowry house question is due to the fact that it continues to constitute a characteristic of the matrimonial system in contemporary Cyprus, as well. In contemporary Cyprus, the traditional “dowry” form involves the transference of a house/apartment to the woman on marriage. Anthias (1992:84) explains the pattern in terms of a patriarchal strategy of control and power: “Control is finally in the hands of the father who can not only continue to control his daughter through this means, but also his son-in-law who is forever in his debt”. This point requires more specification for the dowry house custom has implications that are somehow contradictory: it provides also a certain amount of economic independence for women who would have therefore full property
rights on their dowry; and also more financial power in case of a possible divorce. Of course, this is one possible explanation that does not take into consideration the influence exercised by the mother-in-law who plays a big role in Cypriot family.

According to Loizos’ (1976) explanation, the custom of dowry house is primarily a result of demographic factors in Cyprus since the 1930s when women in marriageable age-groups (partly through the migration of men but also due to other factors) existed in greater numbers than their male counterparts. The argument might not be a valid one since there were exceptions to the rule, i.e. until 1974 in Lysi village men were expected to build the house before marriage (Markides et al, 1978). Moreover, the custom of dowry house provided by the bride’s family has been validated by the passing of time and consequently it is still socially alive.

Other points about the dowry pattern were made also by Attalides (1981). He argued that it is a “pattern born of economic necessity, and is not merely a normative constraint”. Therefore, the contributions towards the new household’s home depended on the relative economic ability of the couple and the wife’s parents.

Apart from such arguments as parental power over women residing in property control or demographical imbalance among marriageable age groups, there is a more recent social anthropological point of view that shows how the dowry house is symbolically constructed as a representation of a married couple’s effort to equip their daughter(s) for life (Keller, 1997:46). In other words, the dowry house is the materialized success of a family: “The purpose of and the most important goal in life- the well being of one’s children- is at least partially fulfilled when a daughter can be given a house on marriage” (ibid.).

This explanation of dowry house custom is based on the assumption that house and family are central and crucial values to any understanding of Greek-Cypriot culture: “The house is much more than just accommodation for Greek-Cypriots. It is the materialized symbol of the success of a family. Having one’s own house is tantamount to having achieved the most central and highly valued goal in life.” (Keller, 1997)

The literature review previously exposed, attempted to illustrate the main traits of the traditional Cypriot family and marriage: arranged marriage as a rationalised partner choice process and dowry as materialised marriage exchange. In sum, the traditional matrimonial system in Cyprus illustrated a highly controlled marriage market functioning in accordance with precise market exchange rules.

2.3. CHANGING MARRIAGE PATTERNS IN CYPRUS

| Changing social patterns in Cyprus: Acceptance and Resistance | Changing marriage patterns in Cyprus: Non-Cypriot marriage partner selection |
As mentioned earlier, family, kinship and marriage processes illustrate a dualism (tradition-post-modernity) that characterizes contemporary Greek-Cypriot society. Social sciences discourses regarding Cypriot family conceive of it as a mix of traditional values and alternative lifestyles. Many aspects of social change are welcomed, and even if they are resisted, change is inevitable as Cypriot society is connected to an international changing context of globalisation. In fact, there is evidence in Cyprus that social patterns are changing, family bonds are loosening and generation gaps are widening. The result is that both Cypriot family and marriage are undergoing rapid pattern changes under the influencing challenges of mass tourism, mass media, transnational labour migration and internationally changing social patterns.

Social change has been rapid, and with each change the fabric of traditional family life is further weakened – see the change of endogamous matrimonial system into an exogamous one as long as with the growth of urbanization, peasants began to move to town. Nowadays, tourism, travel, education, migration, the mass and electronic media have inevitably changed social patterns, and this includes courtship, marriage and sexual behaviour. Also, these changes include higher divorce rates: between 1980 and 2002 the number of divorces increased by 1156. In 1996, 16% of total divorces were of mixed marriage and by 2004 this percent increased to 37% (with the top positions for ‘nationality of wife’ being Romanian (81), Russian (55) and Ukrainian (54) and for ‘nationality of husband’ being Greek (22) and Syrian (16). However, cohabitation does not follow the same trend (Hughes, 1999:65). It is the rate of marital fertility, which might prove that cohabitation as a phenomenon in Cypriot society is insignificant; i.e. every year in Cyprus is registered one of the lowest proportions of extramarital births in Europe and fertility is almost exclusively marital fertility. For example, in 2004 only 276 children were born out of wedlock constituting 3,3% (from 2,2% in 1999) of the total number of births (registered in 2004).

In these conditions of changing context, the analysis of marriage-related patterns poses supplementary challenges. As already mentioned in the first chapter, one of the factors influencing marriage pattern formation is the constraints of the marriage market in which individuals are searching for a spouse (Kalmijn, 1991b). According to this guiding perspective, the contact opportunities on marriage markets are shaped, among others, by the demographic composition of the population as a whole. In Cyprus, the local marriage market is greatly influenced by tourism and by the increased number of foreign women,
usually from the former Soviet Bloc and Eastern Europe who come to Cyprus through various employment agencies. “Many of these women enter prostitution under the thinly disguised description as <artistes>, and in a further variation of the <women beware of women> syndrome they are seen as a threat by many Cypriot women with, it must be admitted, some cause. Unlike the majority of tourists who regard sexual adventure as part of a package deal which ends with the holiday, these women are in search of security and therefore permanence” (Hughes, 1999:68). As statistical data (presented in following sections) show, there are more women then men coming from Eastern-European countries to work in Cyprus. They work in low-paying jobs, most of which are not wanted by local women.

The same author mentioned: “even in the rural areas many young men are overcoming, or ignoring, parental opposition entering in long-term relationships, or marriage, with women from the former Eastern block. Much of this family opposition is based on the loss of the opportunity to acquire suitable connections or possessions, and these alliances further diminish parental power and undermine the traditional family.” (ibid, 1999:69) This quotation illustrates a hypothesis about the third party opposition against mixed marriage (i.e. the marriage between a Cypriot and a foreigner) as a pattern of marriage settlements, which cannot play a vital role in cementing families through shared financial interest (see the custom of a dowry house).

A possible question to be investigated concerns mixed marriage as a changing marriage pattern. Does mixed marriage constitute a “threat” to traditional marriage values and customs? To what extent does mixed marriage provide a changing model of marriage partner selection? In order to answer these questions it is needed to find out which is the extent of mixed marriage and immigration (as a major source of foreign spouses entering marriages to Cypriots) as two interconnected phenomena in the particular case of Cyprus. This task is the concern of the second part of this chapter.

B. MIXED MARRIAGE AND IMMIGRATION IN CYPRUS

Overview: THE PARTICULAR CASE OF MIXED MARRIAGE IN CYPRUS

18 The data are from Population Statistics, Demographic Report 2004, Republic of Cyprus, Statistical Service, Report No.42,
This subchapter is an attempt to analyze mixed marriage in Cyprus over a sixteen-year period (1989-2004) and relate mixed marriage trends to the patterns of immigration in Cyprus during the period with data available in population statistics (1997-2004).

How is mixed marriage pictured in the international literature on the domain and how could it be conceived in the particular case of Cypriot society?

In a general sense, mixed marriage is the marriage between spouses of two different religions, races, ethnic groups or nationalities. At a macro level of analysis, mixed marriage rates have often been used as an indicator of the extent to which integration (the extent to which interaction and social relations between different groups are frequent) and assimilation (the process by means of which an individual or group is incorporated into society) have occurred (Aguilera, 1992). Also, among the scholars of the field, Price (1982:100) states (in the case of the United States): “intermarriage is still the best measure of ethnic intermixture because it breaks down ethnic exclusiveness and mixes the various ethnic populations more effectively than any other process”.

Gordon considers mixed marriage as definitive of marital assimilation and an “inevitable by-product of structural assimilation” (1964:80). Assimilation as used here, however, is not meant to necessarily imply the loss of ethnic identity through the blending of cultures or through conformity to any national culture.

Regarding Cypriot society, this perspective of considering mixed marriage at a large-scale societal level (i.e. through its implications, as a homogenization factor of the existing ethnic lines) is unsuitable. Instead of large ethnic groups, in Cypriot society co-exist only small ethnic communities, some of them ancient (like the Armenians or the Latins) and other ethnic groups consisting of relatively recent labour immigrants mainly from Eastern European countries and from Middle and Far East (according to the Joint Memorandum on Social Inclusion of Cyprus signed in 2003, foreign workers made up 10,1% of the active labour market). Besides, there are foreign spouses who came to Cyprus as wives (of Cypriot students abroad) or as tourists (who have married Cypriots and have settled in Cyprus)- the last three categories are counted by official statistics as ‘long-term immigrants’. The British immigration in Cyprus is in fact, largely re-migration, the old Cypriot migrants returning home and is of no concern for the present study.

Given the above-mentioned conditions, it seems reasonable to consider the trends in the rates of marriage between Cypriots and foreign nationalities as a crude indicator of a new pattern concerning mate selection. The analysis of statistical data both on mixed marriage (i.e. marriages between Cypriots and foreigners) and on immigration will reveal patterns of preference (out-marriage groups for Cypriot spouses) and patterns of opportunity (groups of immigrant nationalities in Cyprus).

p.70 and p.137 (for data calculated on the amount of divorces from mixed marriage).
Even if statistical data are available only for marital mixed relationships, it is necessary to take into account the non-marital relationships, as well. It is recognized that a good deal of interaction between potential spouses occurs prior to marriage, in most societies. This is especially true today with large numbers of people in many Western industrialized nations delaying marriage, and/or cohabiting outside of marriage. It seems that in Cyprus these trends are not so pronounced. However, it remains a presupposition since no data on interethnic cohabitation are available. It is the rate of marital fertility which might prove that cohabitation as phenomenon in Cypriot society is insignificant (as discussed in section 2.3).

Under these conditions of low cohabitation rates, the Cypriot marriage market seems to be one where most matches end by being marital. At a more micro level, Gray (1987:366) describes the marriage market-place as consisting of a “series of transient matches which in some cases result in the more permanent matches which are called marriages.” These transient matches may be the result of “meetings, friendships, one-night stands, courtships, moving in together, trial marriages, and so on (ibid.).” In Cyprus, these transient matches are increasingly likely to involve Cypriots with foreign partners, as the proportion of the non-native population increases and norms governing assortative (homogamous) mate selection are getting relaxed.

The local marriage market is greatly influenced by tourism and by the increased number of foreign women, mainly from the former Soviet Bloc and Eastern Europe, as well as Asia (Sri Lanka and Philippines) who come to Cyprus through various employment agencies or as a result of request made by employers. In sum, population data show an increasing propensity for Cypriots to marry non-nationals as a result of the rise in immigration to Cyprus starting with early nineties. The immigration flow to Cyprus includes the three main sources of foreign spouses for Cypriots: tourism, employment immigration flow and foreign countries where Cypriots study/studied. Concerning the last mentioned source, on average, every year three quarters of these Cypriots study in Greece, United Kingdom and the United States; and one quarter study in Bulgaria, Hungary, Russian Federation, Germany, France and other countries. 19

The subsequent analysis will measure and compare rates of mixed marriage and immigration in Cyprus, searching to identify possible patterns in the existing statistical data.

2.4. STATISTICAL DATA on MIXED MARRIAGE in CYPRUS

19 According to data from Statistics of Education (Report No. 36/2004) for the year 2003/2004, the first group of countries registered 90%(15,882) of total Cypriot students abroad and the second group of countries made only 10% (1,749) of total Cypriot students abroad.
The data used in this analysis are from the Demographic Reports published yearly by the Statistical Service (Στατιστική Υπηρεσία), Republic of Cyprus. These reports contain Population Statistics (Πληθυσμιακές Στατιστικές). Data on marriages registered in Cyprus are tabulated yearly and cross-tabulated by sex and nationality of the newly married. Only for six foreign nationalities there are available data on the type of marriage, whether it is ecclesiastical and/or civil (for the entire period under the study). When interpreting these data, it is important to consider the prescriptions/regulations imposed by the Cypriot law on marriage. A case in point is the great amount of marriage between Israeli nationals registered in Cyprus. This is a particular case when people from abroad (both non-residents and non-nationals of Cyprus) come to Cyprus in order to have a civil marriage. The reason is often the impossibility of having a civil marriage in their country because of certain regulations of the local law on marriage. Therefore, when considering the total number of marriages in Cyprus, one needs to take into account the relatively great number of marriage between people of Israeli nationality (i.e. biases are introduced). In this sense, for the first time in 2004, the Demographic Report reads “In the last few years a large number of foreigners who married in Cyprus by civil marriage were not residing in Cyprus” (p.16, Report no.42). When considering mixed marriage in Cyprus, it is also necessary to take into account only marriages between a Cypriot spouse (bride or groom) and a non-Cypriot (other nationality bride or groom). Mixed marriages between two different non-natives of Cyprus are excluded from the present analysis.

2.4.1. Findings on Marriage and Mixed marriage*

| A) Total Marriage in Cyprus by Year and Type- see Table 2.1. |

A) The number of total marriages recorded in Cyprus between 1989 and 2004 ranged from a low of 4,857 (from which 70% ecclesiastical and 30% civil) in 1992 (leap year) to a high of 10,931 (from which 31% ecclesiastical and 69% civil) in 2004 (see Table 2.1.). When the type of marriage is considered, the range for ecclesiastical marriage is from 3,000 (52%) in 1996 to 5,196 (84%) in 1991 and for civil marriage is from 739 (13%) in 1989 to 7,572 (69%) in 2004. The increase in ecclesiastical marriage is 32 per cent, and for the civil unions is 56 per cent.

*All tables with statistical data on marriage, mixed marriage and immigration in Cyprus are available in APPENDIX B.

Marriages registered in Cyprus are of two types: ecclesiastical (mainly between Cypriots or Cypriots and natives of Greece and between Cypriots and foreign Orthodox
spouses) and civil (mostly between Cypriots and non-Cypriots or between foreign nationals).

The data on both types of marriage are available for six nationalities (including the Cypriot one): Greek, British, Israeli, American, and Lebanese. The Cypriot Statistical Service considered them as the main nationalities that had civil marriage in Cyprus.

Starting in 1994, the statistical authority added data for another six nationalities (i.e. Romanian, Bulgarian, Russian, German, Iranian, and Filipino) that entered into civil marriages with Cypriot nationals. Another change occurred in 2002 when the Demographic Report contains data on civil marriages for three new nationalities: Irish, Moldavian and Ukrainian. On the other hand, the same report lacks data on the German and the Iranian nationalities that entered into civil marriages with Cypriots.

For the year 2004, the Demographic Report contains no data for ecclesiastical marriage; instead, it reports data for marriage by religion of spouses and marriages of residents by nationality of groom and bride for eight new nationalities: Belarusian, Sri Lankan, Chinese and Yugoslavian (for ‘nationality of bride’), and Syrian, Pakistani, Lebanese, Egyptian and Indian (for ‘nationality of groom’). No data for American, German, Irish, Iranian (for brides) and Filipino (for grooms) are registered, a presupposition being made that the frequency of these marital combinations would be low.

An important characteristic to note about marriage in Cyprus is the prejudice against marriages taking place during leap years. Thus, the marriages in Cyprus follow a four-year cycle with a trough during leap years and peaks in the years preceding and succeeding the leap year. Data show that for the leap years of the period under study, the values registered for the amount of ecclesiastical marriage are the lowest (for the year 1992 there were 3,422 marriages, for 1996-3,000 marriages, for 2000-3,272 marriages and for 2004-3,359 marriages). The explanation for this drop is that religious marriage (for leap years) is celebrated, almost only by Cypriot spouses who instead, usually don’t have a civil marriage celebration.

By contrast, the values for the civil marriages registered in Cyprus do not follow the four-year cycles delimited by leap years, so that the prejudice mentioned before does not influence the number of civil marriages (between Cypriots and foreigners) registered every year. As data show, the number of civil marriages increases by year, so that beginning with 1998 it exceeded the number of ecclesiastical marriage every year (see Table 2.1.).

The dynamic of civil marriage phenomenon in Cyprus is determined by two factors: the increase in mixed marriage (Cypriot-foreign national) and in the amount of marriage between foreigners, non-residents of Cyprus - aspects discussed in following sections. It

---

20 The pattern was identified for data contained in Population Statistics, Reports No. 27-42, Statistical Service, Republic of Cyprus, 1989-2004. This prejudice assumes that if a couple celebrate their marriage in a leap year, something bad will happen in their marital life.
is worth mentioning that civil marriage in Cyprus was recognized as legal and equal with religious marriage only starting in 1989.

The average number of marriages recorded in Cyprus every year during the period under investigation was 7,663. The average number for ecclesiastical marriage was 3,948 (52%) unions and for civil marriage, it was 3,715 (48%) unions. The division of marriage by type and also, to some extent, the prejudice against the marriage celebrated during the leap years introduce some biases in the analysis of marriage dynamics in Cyprus. An attempt is made here to avoid them by focusing on the data available for civil marriage (which is easier to accomplish when Cypriots enter into marriages with foreigners). Among all marriages with non-Cypriots, the only marriage celebrated almost exclusively in church is the one between Cypriots and nationals of Greece.

When Cypriots enter into marriages with foreign nationals, the easiest procedure to follow is that of a civil marriage. On the other hand, the ecclesiastical celebration of marriage between Cypriots and foreigners needs special approval from the Cypriot Orthodox Church (this is not possible to be obtained in some cases, mentioned in following chapters).

Moreover, it is also necessary to consider the bias introduced by the cases when a single couple celebrates their marriage twice (i.e. both ecclesiastical and civil marriages). Because of this bias, the data analysis should avoid the absolute comparison between the amounts of the two types of marriage in Cyprus.

B) Percentage of Marriages by Type and Nationality of partners for all marriages in Cyprus by Year- see Table 2.2.

B) Trends in total marriage celebrated in Cyprus are more accurately exposed in Table 2.2 which displays the percent of marriages by nationality of the partners. According to this criterion, there are three types of marriage in Cyprus:

Type “a”- The marriage between two Cypriot partners (i.e. intramarriage or in-marriage- at intrasocietal level);

Type “b”- The marriage between one Cypriot partner and one of foreign nationality (i.e. mixed marriage- at intersocietal level);

Type “c”- The marriage between two foreigners.

For the period under investigation, in 1991 there were 75 (the maximum value) marriages of type “a” for every 100 marriages celebrated in Cyprus; in 2004 there were only 24 (the minimum value for the period under study) marriages of the same type for each 100 marriages celebrated in Cyprus.

---

21 For the period 1989-1999, the average for ecclesiastical marriage was 4,121 (64%) and for civil marriage it was 2,309 (36%).
Therefore, in thirteen years a decrease of 51% in marriage between two Cypriot partners is recorded. With regard to ecclesiastical marriage, there is a similar trend: a decrease from 87% in 1989 to 31% in 2004, a significant drop of 56% in religious marriage.

The marriage of type “b” has its low in 1991 (when the type “a” has its peak) when 13 mixed marriages for each 100 marriages in Cyprus were recorded; the maximum value was recorded in 2004 when took place 19 mixed marriages for each 100 marriages in Cyprus. As the trend for mixed marriage is relatively constant to slightly increasing, the tendency for intramarrige is decreasing constantly- the base for comparison is the total number of marriages in Cyprus.

The marriage of type “c” constitutes the factor which influences, to a great extent, the total number of marriage registered in Cyprus. It ranges from 10% in 1989 to 57% in 2004. This type of marriage does not constitute the object of the present analysis. It is neither intramarrige, nor mixed marriage; it is the marriage between two non-nationals of Cyprus, the majority being of Israeli citizenship.

Overall, the rate of intramarrige predominates over the rate of mixed marriage, with the difference between the two becoming smaller year-by-year (for the period under study). Moreover, because the third type of marriage (between two non-Cypriots) is of no interest in the analysis herein, from now on, the base of comparison changes from the total number of marriage in Cyprus to the total number of marriages involving only Cypriots, both intramarrige and mixed marriage.

C) All Marriages and Mixed Marriages involving Cypriots by Year and Sex—see Table 2.2.a.

C) The number of all marriages involving Cypriots between 1989 and 2004 ranged from a low of 3.467 in 1996 (leap year) to a high of 5.391 in 1991 (see for details, Table 2.2.a.). Also, the total amount of marriage entered by Cypriots during the period under study is 72,354.

The question that arises refers to the amount of marriage by sex -the only difference concerns the amount of mixed marriage entered by Cypriot men and women. With regard to marriages involving Cypriots, in an average year during the period under investigation, approximately 351 Cypriot women and 887 Cypriot men registered mixed marriages. In 2004 there is registered an increase of 4 percent in Cypriot women’s mixed marriages. Between 1989 and 2004, 5,625 Cypriot women and 14,207 Cypriot men married foreigners. The difference is 8,582 (43%) unions of Cypriot men who married foreigners (the trends in the amount of mixed marriages entered by Cypriot women and men are illustrated in Chart 2.1).
As the chart illustrates, there was a greater tendency for Cypriot men to marry foreigners during this period of sixteen years. Obviously, this accounts for Cypriot men showing a higher rate of mixed marriage overall - from 427 (13%) marital unions in 1992 (the lowest value) to 1,456 (35%) marriages (the highest value in 2004). The explanation for this trend is to be found in hypotheses about opportunity or propinquity translated as geographical nearness (e.g. the high number of non-Cypriot women on marriage market in Cyprus) and preference in mate selection process. This question remains to be investigated through empirical research work.

In the meantime, the number of Cypriot women who entered mixed unions oscillated between a minimum of 297 (8%) marriages in 1995 and a maximum of 573 (18%) marriages in 2004 (the same year as for the Cypriot men).

As an observation, the year 2004 could be called “the year of mixed marriage” because a record number of 2,029 mixed marital unions between Cypriots and non-Cypriots were registered.

Looking for a confirmation about the increasing frequency of mixed marriage in Cyprus, data in Table 2.2.a. offer an insight. As data show, for the years between 1989 and 1999, the overall ratio intramarriage-mixed marriage is 3,5 to 1 compared to 2,6 to 1 for the period 1989-2004.

**D) Percentage ‘IN’- and ‘OUT’- marriages for all marriages involving Cypriots by Sex and Year- see Table 2.2.b.**

D) As expected, intramarrriage predominates over mixed marriage every year. The percentage of all unions involving only Cypriot nationals (defined as intramarrriage) ranged
from a high of 86% in 1991 to a low of 57% in 2004 (this low percent is also explained by Cypriots' prejudice about marriage celebrated in leap years).

As Table 2.2.b shows, there has been a gradual decline in the rate of Cypriot intramarriage or a gradual increase in overall rate of mixed marriage between Cypriots and other nationalities, during a period of sixteen years. The increase is 29 per cent in mixed marriage from a low of 14% in 1991 to a high of 43% in 2004 (percentages reported for all marriages entered by Cypriots). This trend is well illustrated in Chart 2.2:

Therefore, the overall tendency to mixed marriage (Cypriot-foreigner) is one of a gradual increase, providing the overall rate of mixed marriage of 27% for all marriages involving Cypriots over a period of sixteen years. Also, the same overall rate of mixed marriage split by sex, registered 10% for Cypriot women out-marrying and 21% for mixed-married Cypriot men.

Cypriot women and men, who got married during the whole period under study, chose Cypriots approximately 73 out of 100 times. During sixteen years, Cypriots have chosen to marry a foreigner 27 out of 100 times (compared to 22 for 1989-1999). Also, in average, every year for each 27 mixed marriages out of 100 marriages involving Cypriots, there were 10 Cypriots brides and 21 Cypriot grooms.

In detail, as presented in Table 2.2.b., the mixed marriage rate for Cypriot women ranged from a low of 7% in 1990 and 1991 to a high of 18% in 2004. The difference of 11 % shows a remarkable increase in the number of Cypriot women who married foreigners starting in 1999 until 2004 (the trend is more accentuated after 2001). Also, the mixed marriage rate for Cypriot men registered its lowest value in 1991 (when it was 8%) and peaked at 35% in 2004 (the same year as for Cypriot women).
Therefore, between 1989 and 2004, 11% more Cypriot men out-married as compared to Cypriot women (in absolute numbers). As reported above, there was a slightly greater tendency for Cypriot men to marry foreigners during this period. Obviously, this accounts for Cypriot men showing a slightly higher rate of mixed marriage overall. Also, this fact can suggest that Cypriot men had a somewhat greater preference for, or opportunity (in the sense of propinquity or geographical nearness) to interact with non-Cypriot women, than did Cypriot women as concerning foreign men. As already mentioned, a similar tendency has begun to be manifest concerning Cypriot women. In this sense, the increasing number of native women marrying foreigners (starting with 1999) can be considered as a new pattern of spouse selection for Cypriot women.

Overall, the Cypriot intramARRIAGE rate is slightly decreasing since mixed marriage rates for Cypriot men have tended to increase gradually between 1989 and 2004, and for Cypriot women between 1999 and 2004, respectively; also, the mixed marriage rates for Cypriot women were relatively constant without large oscillations until the year 1999.

### 2.4.2. Mixed marriage by Type (Civil/Religious) and Nationality of Spouses

The question that concerns foreign spouses of mixed marriage in Cyprus is: when Cypriot women and men marry someone other than a Cypriot, which nationality they marry more often? Population statistics data available in order to answer this question are somehow incomplete. Concerning civil marriage, data are available for (A) five nationalities (i.e. Greek, British, American, Israeli, and Lebanese) considered as being the main nationalities that had had a civil marriage in Cyprus from 1989 to 1994 (according to official Population Statistics). Starting from 1994, (B) another six nationalities (i.e. Romanian, Bulgarian, Russian, German, Iranian, and Filipino) are tabulated as entering into marriages with Cypriots. For the years 2002 and 2003, data on mixed civil marriage are tabulated for (C) another three nationalities: Irish, Moldavian and Ukrainian; also, for this period there are no more data reported about the German and Iranian nationalities. (D) For the year 2004 there are registered data for marriages and civil marriages of residents by ‘nationality of groom and bride’ for eight new nationalities: Belarusian, Sri Lankan, Chinese and Yugoslavian (for ‘nationality of bride’) and Syrian, Pakistani, Egyptian and Indian (for ‘nationality of groom’).

#### A) Intra and Mixed Marriages by Type and Nationality
- When groom is Cypriot – see Table 2.3a.
- When bride is Cypriot - see Table 2.4a.

#### Mixed Marriages by Type and Nationality
- When groom is Cypriot- see Table 2.3b.
- When bride is Cypriot – see Table 2.4b.
The group of five nationalities with data available for both ecclesiastical and civil marriages (for 1989-2003) will be considered first. Therefore, data show intra and inter marriages by type and nationality for men and women, separately as displayed in the set of four tables: Tables 2.3a, 2.3b and 2.4a, 2.4b (see Appendix B).

As already mentioned, marriage in Cyprus is of two types: ecclesiastical and civil, both equally legitimate and valid by law (from 1989 onward). Detailed statistical data for other nationalities (except the group of five nationalities previously mentioned) are available only for civil marriage, starting with 1994, 2002 and 2004, respectively (aspect to be discussed afterwards). The above-mentioned set of four tables displays a clear picture of mixed marriage between Cypriots and the group of five nationalities considered (by the statistical authority in charge) as being the main nationalities that had a mixed marriage in Cyprus (until 1994).

As data appear in official statistics, there are a very large and important number of marriages in the category of “other nationalities” presented in the four-table set. As the Table 2.3b shows, when the groom is Cypriot, it is registered a total of 14,207 mixed marriages for the period 1989-2004. This total includes 11,074 or 78% mixed marriage Cypriot groom- “other nationality” bride category. When the bride is Cypriot (see Table 2.4b), it is registered a total of 5,625 mixed marriages (for the period 1989-2004), of which 2,299 (or 40%) constitute mixed marriages between Cypriot bride-“other nationalities” groom category.

Therefore, for every year in the period under study, there were on average 692 (or 83%) marriages of Cypriot men and 143 (or 17%) marriages of Cypriot women to spouses in the “other nationalities” category. The conclusion is that Cypriot brides preferred to a greater extent grooms from the group of five nationalities, whereas Cypriot men chose to marry “other nationalities” category brides.

Focusing on ecclesiastical marriage, when Cypriot grooms married someone other than their nationals, they mostly married British and Greek brides\(^\text{22}\); the percentage is 13% from all ecclesiastical mixed marriage (in the meantime, the “other nationalities” category represents 70%). As for Cypriot women, they chose to marry Greek nationals in proportion of 52% of all ecclesiastical mixed marriage (and “other nationalities” category made 29%). In the meantime, 13% of Cypriot brides had church marriages with British grooms. Moreover, 3% of Cypriot men and 3% of Cypriot women married religiously American spouses. A percentage of 3% Cypriot women celebrated religious unions with Lebanese grooms whereas only 1% of Cypriot men chose to do so.

While the marital choice of Cypriot women for Greek nationals is very well defined, it is

\(^{22}\) Statistical data in Cypriot Demographic Reports list British Cypriots as British nationals, therefore biases are introduced. Only for the year 2004 there are reported data for marriages of residents of Cyprus, separately.
interesting to find out what Cypriot men preferred in the “other nationalities” category; this question was addressed by looking at data available on civil marriage, starting with 1994, then 2002 and 2004 respectively.

Before doing so, the difference in the number of ecclesiastical and civil mixed marriages was taken into account. When the groom is Cypriot, there are registered 6,192 religious and 8,015 civil mixed marriages for the period 1989-2004.

The difference in favour of civil unions is given by the larger amount of civil marriage Cypriot grooms- “other nationalities” category brides (it makes 88% of all the number of civil marriages entered by Cypriot grooms). The official statistical data disclosed (starting with 1994 and, then in 2002 and 2004, respectively) that the “other nationalities” category includes mainly Eastern-European nationalities, such as: Romanian, Bulgarian, Russian, Ukrainian, Moldavian, Belarusian and Yugoslavian for ‘nationality of bride’ and Syrian, Egyptian, Pakistani and Indian for ‘nationality of groom’.

As expected, regarding the amount of mixed marriage reported for Cypriot brides (for the period 1989-2004), the number of ecclesiastical marriages (3,750 unions) is larger than the number of civil unions (1,875 marriages— for more details, see Table 2.4b, Appendix B). The difference results from the large number of religious unions between Cypriot brides and Greek grooms: 1,984 ecclesiastical unions and only 145 civil marriages. The greatest number of civil marriage, in this case, is between British men and Cypriot women: 227 civil marriages and 483 religious marriages. Also, the number of 1,267 civil marriages between Cypriot brides and “other nationalities” groom is higher than the value of 1,032 religious marriage of the same composition. Once again, data show a pattern change, since there were more religious marriages Cypriot brides-“other nationalities” grooms category (for 1989-1999), and the year 2000 constitutes the beginning of “civil marriage boom” for Cypriot brides and grooms.

At this point of the analysis it is necessary to mention that with regard to the group of the three nationalities (Greek, British and American) who usually celebrate only the ecclesiastical marriage (mostly British and Americans who are of Cypriot origin), the data on religious marriage are considered together with those for civil marriage (see Tables 2.3a, 2.4a, 2.3b, 2.4b. in Appendix B). Also, there is a small number of Lebanese - Cypriot ecclesiastical marriages counted together with the civil unions, as well.

B) All Civil marriages by Nationality of Groom and Bride:
-when Groom is Cypriot—see Table 2.5a.
-when Bride is Cypriot — see Table 2.5b.
(B) Mixed Marriages between Cypriots and a group of eleven foreign nationalities

Starting with 1994, there have been registered only civil marriage data for six nationalities of the “other nationalities” category. These six nationalities are: Romanian, Bulgarian, Russian, German, Iranian and Filipino. The Demographic Reports of the years 2002-2004 contain no more data for the German and Iranian nationalities; instead, there are registered civil marriage data for eleven new nationalities: Irish, Moldavian, Ukrainian, Belarusian, Sri Lankan, Yugoslavian, Chinese, Syrian, Pakistani, Egyptian and Indian (see Table 2.5a, 2.5b.).

When Cypriot women married someone other than a Cypriot man, they most often married ecclesiastically a person of Greek nationality (1,212 marriages registered for the interval 1994-2004). Furthermore, when they entered a civil marriage, they most often chose a British national: 154 civil marriages for 1994-2004 (see Table 2.6b).

When Cypriot men entered into unions with partners other than Cypriot women they most often married a person with Russian nationality. During 1994-2004 there were registered 1,186 marriages Russian brides-Cypriot grooms (see Table 2.6a).

B1) For the period 1994-2004, on average 17% of all civil mixed marriages involving Cypriot men were to Russian women and 14% to Romanian women; these are the highest percentages of mixed marriages reported for Cypriot grooms, in every year-recorded data (see Table 2.7a.). Data in the same table show that until 1999 the highest percentages of civil mixed marriages involving Cypriot men were to Romanian women (the percentages oscillated between 17% and 22%); from 1999 onward, the percentages changed in favour of the Cypriot groom-Russian bride civil mixed marriage (the percentages oscillated between 16% and 20%). In 2004, the most frequent combination was Cypriot groom-Ukrainian bride (20%).

Cypriot men also married with British, Greek and Bulgarian women more frequently than with any other nationalities (with registered data). Thus, overall 6% of all civil mixed marriages were with British, 11% were to Bulgarian women and 13% ecclesiastical marriage with Greek and British brides, respectively.

Since the percentages of Greek and Bulgarian spouses who entered into marital unions with Cypriot men were relatively constant during the period under study, the percentage of civil mixed marriage Russian bride-Cypriot groom has registered a great increase from a
low of 4% in 1994 to a high of 20% in 1999 and in 2000, respectively (see Table 2.7a); it represents an increase of approximately 79%. Instead, from 1999 onwards there has been registered a decrease in civil mixed marriage with Romanian and British brides.

(C) Mixed Marriages between Cypriots and a group of fourteen foreign nationalities

For the three years (2002, 2003 and 2004) when data are registered for Ukrainian and Moldavian nationalities, the highest percentage of 20% is recorded for marriages with Ukrainian brides (in 2004). Also, the percentages reported for unions of Cypriots with Moldavian brides are high (13% for 2003). Concerning the year 2004, mostly women from former Soviet Union married to Cypriot men: 18% Russian brides, 20% Ukrainian and 12% Moldavian brides.

Cypriot men married Filipino women more frequently than any other non-European or Asian nationality, every year; on average the percentage for this type of mixed marriage is 6%. There is a category of nationalities which registered low percentages of mixed marriage with Cypriot men, ranging from 0,2% (Iranian and Israeli) to 0,8/1,3% (German and American) for civil marriages.

B2) Percentage of Civil marriage by Nationality of Groom and Bride when Bride is Cypriot- see Table 2.7b

When Cypriot women entered into civil marriage with a spouse of foreign nationality, they most often chose British grooms, on average 10% for civil and 13% for religious marriages, for the period 1994-2004. Furthermore, high percentages are registered for civil marriages with Greek spouses (9%) and 52% for religious marriages. For Romanian and Lebanese grooms the percentages for civil unions are also high, on average 6% and 7%, respectively. For Bulgarian, Russian and Iranian spouses, the percentages are lower, 3% and 2% respectively. For the rest of nationalities the percentages are small, with the least preferred being the Filipino grooms.

(D) Mixed Marriages between Cypriots and a group of eighteen foreign nationalities

For the first time in 2004, the Population Statistics data show civil marriages of residents by ‘nationality of spouses’ and register eight new nationalities having the most frequent occurring civil marriages in Cyprus. There are four nationalities for ‘nationality of bride’ and another four of ‘nationality of groom’ (see Tables 2.7a-2.7b). The percentages of civil marriages with Cypriots are higher (in 2004) for Cypriot women entering more marriages with Syrian nationals (25%- the highest percentage), Pakistani grooms (10%) and Egyptian men (4%). The trend shown by these data is that more Cypriot women and men prefer Asian spouses, with the tendency being more accentuated for Cypriot women.
When the tabulated nationalities are combined according to geopolitical and socio-economic criteria, three groups result:

1. The Eastern-European group including five (plus two) nationalities: Romanian, Bulgarian, Russian, Moldavian and Ukrainian (Belarusian and Yugoslavian women with data available only for 2004);

2. The Euro-American group with five nationalities: Greek, British, American, German and Irish;


The spouses from the group of East-European countries contributed with 55% of all mixed marriage for Cypriot men and 11% of total mixed marriage for Cypriot women during 1994-2004 (see Table 2.8).

As displayed in Table 2.8, Cypriot men preferred spouses from Eastern Europe countries and Cypriot women chose spouses from countries of the Euro-American group. Cypriot women made this choice in proportion of 23% for civil marriages and 70% for ecclesiastical marriages.

Another pattern revealed by data is that a common and constant marital choice of Cypriot men and women for British spouses; the overall average for civil marriage was 6% for Cypriot men and 10% for Cypriot women; and for ecclesiastical marriage it was 13% for both Cypriot men and women. However, data revealed a decrease in the total number of marriage to British spouses (for Cypriots); for the period 1994-1999 the same percentages for civil marriages were: 13% (Cypriot men-British women), 16% (Cypriot women-British men) and for religious marriage: 16% (Cypriot men-British women) and 13% (Cypriot women-British men).

Considering the ‘type of marriage’ and the ‘nationality’ of spouses, most frequently, Cypriot women had religious marriages with Greek grooms (52%), and also had civil marriages with British grooms (10% -see Table 2.7b). Analogous, the church marriage Greek women-Cypriot men accounted for only 13%. Therefore, Cypriot women have maintained a much more consistent pattern over the years with half of their mixed marriages (every year between 1994-2003) being to Greek nationals. Data for 2004 show that this tendency has started to decrease in favour of the civil marriage Cypriot women-Middle East (Asian) men.

According to data in Table 2.8, the most frequently represented out-marriage group for Cypriot women during the eleven years-period under study was the Euro-American group.
one (for both types of marriage) with Greek being the most chosen nationality. Similarly, for Cypriot men, the most frequently represented out-marriage group was the East-European one for civil marriages. As for religious marriages, the hypothesis is that Cypriot men preferred the same group. The fact supporting this argument is that the religious marriages to brides from the “other nationalities” category made up 77% of all marriages reported for Cypriot grooms. Marriages with women from Russia were the most frequently represented combination until 2004 when the civil marriages with Ukrainian women were the most numerous.

When Cypriot brides married spouses from the East-European group (overall 11% for 1994-2004) they mostly married Romanian (6%) men (see Table 2.7b); overall this means that they actually married Romanians in proportion of 53% of Eastern-European nationals. When Cypriot men entered unions with nationals of the Euro-American group, their first choice was for British women in proportion of 65% (civil marriage) and 44% (ecclesiastical marriage). The civil marriages of Cypriot men with Greek brides made up only 15% and religious marriages accounted for 44% (see Table 2.6a).

Moreover, when Cypriot men have married partners from the Asian group of countries, they had most often chosen women from Philippines in proportion of 6% (from 7% for 1994-1999) of all mixed marriage reported for Cypriot men; the same percentage for Cypriot women accounts for only 0.3%. Therefore, during 1994-2004 Cypriot men have consistently married more Filipino women (403 brides) than have Cypriot women married Filipino men (only 5 grooms).

In the same group of Asian nationalities, the Lebanese one was the most preferred by Cypriot women: 111 (civil marriages) and 75 (ecclesiastical marriages). In the meantime, Cypriot men have married only 30 (civil marriages) and 45 (religious marriages) Lebanese women, which represents a sex ratio of 3.7 to 1 and 4.7 to 1, respectively.

The tendency to marry Iranian and Israeli nationals was very small: 2% to 3% of all mixed marriage involving Cypriot men and women, respectively. However, data for these nationalities were registered mainly because they entered into civil intra-marriages with non-Cypriot spouses in Cyprus.

The Cypriot men married to spouses in the so-called “other nationalities” category made up 28% of all Cypriot men’s civil mixed marriages and 70% of all Cypriot men’s ecclesiastical mixed marriages. One could suppose that the high percentage of ecclesiastical mixed marriage Cypriot men-“other nationalities” category spouses represents the religious celebration of marriages with Orthodox spouses from the Eastern-European group. Correspondingly, the percentage for Cypriot women-“other nationalities” category spouses is 47% of civil mixed marriages and 29% of ecclesiastical mixed marriages (calculated for all Cypriot women’s mixed marriages).
The assumption is made here, however, that this category of “other nationalities” is very heterogeneous in terms of nationality so that, the number associated with any specific country was too small to be tabulated separately in the official statistics. Also, when the number of marriages between Cypriot nationals and spouse of a certain nationality grew high enough, that nationality was disclosed in tabulated data (e.g. see the eight new nationalities tabulated in 2004 for mixed marriages with Cypriots).

Overall, this analysis of statistical data identified some marriage patterns in Cyprus for a period of sixteen and eleven years, respectively. In order to identify causes and search for possible explanations, it is interesting to see how these mixed marriage patterns can be related to patterns of immigration to Cyprus which offer insight in questions of opportunities for encounters between natives and non-natives in the local marriage market. Before turning to this topic, it is useful to summarize the findings resulted from this statistical data analysis in the tables given below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group of nationalities</th>
<th>Most frequent marriage partner for Cypriot men</th>
<th>Most frequent marriage partner for Cypriot women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Civil</td>
<td>Religious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euro-American group</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>British + Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East-European group</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian group</td>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group of nationalities</th>
<th>Least frequent marriage partner for Cypriot men</th>
<th>Least frequent marriage partner for Cypriot women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Civil</td>
<td>Religious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euro-American group</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East-European group</td>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian group</td>
<td>Iranian</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25 The symbol ‘...’ means that there are no tabulated data available for all the nationalities under study in the case of mixed religious marriages between Cypriots and foreigners.
Opportunity is certainly a factor in mate selection. The number of potential non-Cypriots/foreigners eligible as marriage partners depends to some extent on the rate of immigration to Cyprus. It seems reasonable to expect that when the number of immigrants from a country is relatively high (over an extended period of time) there will not only be more opportunities for interaction but, in addition, some greater understanding and perhaps acceptance of such immigrants as marriage partners. As Blau et al. (1982) have posited, the greater the heterogeneity (in terms of nationality, ethnicity etc.) of a community the more likely it is that any given encounter will involve persons from different groups and have the potential to lead to mixed marriage. Perhaps more important, given the general propensity for mixed marriage, is the sex ratio (the number of men divided by the number of women) of those nationalities immigrating to Cyprus.

Statistical data picture a great rise in immigration to Cyprus starting in early nineties even if the same data show that immigration is a quite new phenomenon in Cypriot society (see Table 2.9). According to the definitions in use, there are two kinds of immigrants, given the duration of their stay in Cyprus: short-term and long-term immigrants.

### Immigrants by Sex, 1986-1990 and 1997-2004 – see Table 2.9

The present analysis considers the definitions of the terms used by the Statistical Service for statistical data classification26.

**Short-term immigrants:** “Are persons who enter Cyprus with the intention of remaining less than one year for the purpose of working at an occupation remunerated from within the country or studying. This category may include dependents who accompany such persons or come to join them.”

**Long-term immigrants:** “Are persons who enter Cyprus with the intention to settle in Cyprus, or to stay for one year or more.”

According to the available statistical data, there are no great oscillations in the numbers of short-term immigrants coming to Cyprus until the year 2004 when were 7.438 more short-term immigrants by comparison to the year 2003. The so-called “boom” in immigration flow concerns the long-term immigrants. A total of 629 long-term immigrants came to Cyprus in 1990 and ten years later the number increased by 95 per cent (i.e.12.764 in 2000). Starting with the year 2000, the number of long-term immigrants increased each year, reaching a high of 22.003 persons in 2004. The trend of increasing immigrant flows to Cyprus coincides with the high rates of mixed marriage between

---

Cypriots and foreigners, in the 1990s. Also, as data show, the tendency of rising levels of immigration and mixed marriages is even more accentuated after the year 2000.

2.5.1. A Portrait of the Long-term Immigrant:
Gender, Age, Educational level and Marital status

According to the aim of this analysis, only the statistical data available for the category of long-term immigrants has been taken into account. The rationale is that the ‘long-term immigrant’ category includes the sources of foreign spouses for Cypriots, as identified by the present study (i.e. spouses who came to Cyprus as tourists, spouses from labour immigration flow and spouses who came to Cyprus as wives of Cypriot students abroad). The only complete data available for long-term immigrants are about their ‘sex’ category. In this sense, statistical data reveal the gender differences in long-term immigration, only for the periods 1986-1990 and 1997-2004, respectively. In order to compare the data available, it has been considered useful to determine the sex ratios of long-term immigrants’ category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex Ratio for Long-term immigrants, 1986-1990 and 1997-2004- see Table 2.10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As seen in Table 2.10, the sex ratio for long-term immigrants was slightly in favour of female immigrants, ten years out of thirteen (the exceptions are: in 1987 it stood at 104 men per 100 women, in 2001 it was 120 men for 100 women and in 2003, 110 men for 100 women). Evidently, this is a favourable condition for the mixed marriage Cypriot groom - foreign bride.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Long-term immigrants by Age and Sex, 1986-1988 and 1987-2004 - see Table 2.11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Another characteristic, which informs about the available stock to enter mixed marriage, is the ‘age’ of the long-term immigrants. In this respect, an important piece of information is given in the Census of Population (Report No.19 on Migration, 2001, p.21): “The age composition of migrants from abroad shows a high proportion in the young working ages of 20-44 which cover 64.4% of the total and in particular in ages 20-29. Comparison of the ‘sex’ and ‘age’ structure of migrants as recorded in the 2001 Census of population with that of the 1992 Census presents the same general picture. However, the concentration of migrants in the young working ages is now more accentuated than in the past”. More recent data from Statistical Reports concerning migration and presented in the Table 2.11 are relevant: the peak values for the long-term immigrants flow are registered for the age category 25-29 years old. The pattern stays valid for every year-recorded data. Also, for the same age category (25-29 years old), the sex ratio is in favour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
for female migrants (except for 2002 and 2003), and stood at 65 men for 100 long-term female immigrants in 1997, at 61 male long-term immigrants per 100 women in 1999 and in 2004 there were 95 men for 100 long-term immigrant women. Overall, the age category 25-29 provided the highest percentages of brides for mixed marriages. It is important to note that the next age category (i.e. 30-34 years old) followed the same pattern with the sex ratio being in favour for female immigrants, every year except for the years 2003 and 2004. As regards the age categories 20-24 and 35-39 years old, the immigrant sex ratios were in favour of male long-term immigrants, every year except for 2004.

These general findings about the ‘age’ and ‘sex’ categories of long-term immigrants in Cyprus can explain the greater proportion of mixed marriage entered by Cypriot grooms and moreover, the new tendency to marry foreigners for Cypriot women that coincided with the change of sex ratio in favour of male immigrants (since no demographic data are available concerning the age of spouses entering mixed marriage).

Theoretically speaking, the number of migrants and their sex ratio provide some indication on decreases or increases of opportunity for “transient matches” between people of different nationalities and, in some cases, marriage. In this particular case, considering the data split by ‘long-term or short-term immigrant’ categories together with the Cypriot legislation concerning immigration, one can make the assumption that some of the long-term immigrants are also the spouses who entered into civil marriages with Cyprus nationals, since this kind of marriage enables a Cypriot citizen’s foreign spouse to stay and work in Cyprus without limitations on duration of stay.

Consequently, the situation in Cypriot society contradicts the relevant literature of the domain, which claims that when considering the association between immigration and mixed marriage a lag factor is involved. Gray (1987: 366) defined this lag as the “time between entry into the marriage market and marriage”. Clearly, the population immigrating in a given year is not the same as the population marrying during that year; however, an unbalanced immigration sex ratio over a period of time will produce a large number of men/women unable to find a spouse of their own nationality. In the case of Cyprus, there is a large category of short-term and long-term immigrants (mostly female workers from former the Eastern European Block, female domestic aids from Far-East countries and Middle East countries foreign workers) who change their immigrant-status through the marriage to a Cypriot national; they constitute potential foreign spouses on the marriage market in Cyprus.

In this sense, there are biases that cloud the statistics on mixed marriage. This is the case of those “ghost-marriages”/”blank marriages” or marriages of convenience mostly between male Cypriots and women working in sex industry (mainly from Eastern-European countries and ex-USSR) who can obtain, through marriage, a residence permit
to stay and work in Cyprus instead of having a usual six-months visa to work (and a limited-period work permit) and then go back home.

One would assume that in Cyprus, the population migrating in the ‘short-term’ category do coincide, to some extent, with the population marrying that year since having a mixed marriage means an immigration-status change: visitors or ‘short-term immigrants’ become ‘long-term immigrants’. Also, the category of ‘visitors’ includes tourists and international brides, i.e. foreign spouses who come to Cyprus as wives of Cypriot nationals. In other words, immigration data (for each year) do include the vast majority of mixed marriage spouses reported for that year; a reason is that for staying in Cyprus (without time limitations), non-European Union countries nationals (except for the accession countries Bulgaria and Romania, from 2005 onwards) need a renewable residence permit which they can obtain through marriage to a Cypriot national. As already mentioned, this is an explanation for the concurrence between high percentage of mixed marriage reported for Cypriot men and high values for sex ratio in favour of long-term female immigrants –assumption made under the condition of biases in population statistics on mixed marriage and immigration. Also, another recent tendency manifested after the year 2000 reveals a possible relationship between high percentages of mixed marriages reported for Cypriot brides and high values for sex ratios in favour of long-term male immigrants.

Before analysing data about the sender-countries for immigrants to Cyprus, there are some details to be added to the portrait of long-term immigrant as a ‘spouse category’ of mixed marriage. In this sense, there is more information provided by the Census of Population (1992) concerning the category of ‘migrants from abroad’. Regarding ‘educational level’, the Census revealed that “migrants from abroad were more educated that non-migrants as well as internal migrants” (Census of Population, 1992, p.24). On the other hand, data form the Census of Population (2001) show a different picture: “The educational level of migrants from abroad is different for Cypriots and foreign citizens, Cypriots have a higher educational level. The proportion of Cypriots with third level education is 42,8% [...] and of migrants 32,1% while Cypriots with secondary level education account for 31,1% of the total and [...] 42% for foreign citizens”.

Regarding marital status, data are available only in the 1992 Census: “married persons comprised the largest proportion of migrants from abroad with 51,8%. This proportion does not differ from that of non-migrants” (ibid, p.25). On the other hand, the 2001 Census mentions: “The vast majority of migrants, 82,4% settled in urban areas and in particular in the urban areas of Lefkosia 35,2%, of Lemesos 22,5% and Pafos 14,6%” (p.22).

Overall, the 1992 Census data picture the immigrants in Cyprus as being mostly educated, in proportion of 51,8% married, respectively 2,4% divorced and separated.
Mixed marriage rates for this period (1982-1991) are very low and they correspond to the number of marriages reported for Cypriots who studied abroad and foreign spouses mostly from Greece, Britain and United States\textsuperscript{27}. Therefore, immigration and mixed marriage pattern changes are expected to be identified for the period 1992-2004 because of modifications in the ethnic composition and size of immigration flow to Cyprus (see the increase in immigration from Eastern European and former USSR countries).

2.5.2. Long-term Immigrants by Nationality/ Country of Residence and Sex

Data available on long-term immigrants by ‘country of residence’ (are tabulated only for the years between 2002-2004) and ‘sex’ reveal that Cyprus has experienced a sharp rise in immigration after 1989, a trend that became more evident starting with 1997. The second considerable increase in immigration flow to Cyprus was reported after 2000, when the total number of long-term immigrants for every year-reported data exceeded 12,000 persons. Unfortunately, there are no data available on the ‘marital status’ of long-term immigrants. The only available data concerning long-term immigrants are those presented in Table 2.11 and Table 2.12; these figures do not cover the whole period under study, but are still relevant for pointing out general trends (information on long-term immigration to Cyprus was obtained from Tourism, Migration and Travel Statistics for the years 1999 and 2003 and from the Demographic Report for 2004).

\begin{table}
\centering
\caption{A) Long-term immigrants in Cyprus by Country of residence and Sex, 1989-1990 and 1997-2003 – see Table 2.12 (for the year 2004 data are presented in Table 2.13)}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{Year} & \textbf{Europe} & \textbf{Outside Europe} \\
\hline
1989-1990 & 10,000 & 2,000 \\
1997-2003 & 12,000 & 3,000 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

A) As shown in Table 2.12, complete data on long-term immigration to Cyprus are available for the period 1997 (June-Dec) - 2003*. As it would be expected, the largest number of immigrants came to Cyprus from European countries; more exactly, there is the group of European Union countries that has provided the largest number of long-term immigrants in every year-reported data.

Furthermore, during the above-mentioned period, there were more long-term immigrants from Greece and United Kingdom together, than from any other E.U. country. Greece and then, the United Kingdom are the two largest sources of non-Cypriot grooms (as Table 2.6b shows). The association between the number of long-term immigrants and the number of mixed marriage can be identified when the number of immigrants by ‘sex’ is considered. Concerning the two countries aforementioned, there was an excess of men

\textsuperscript{27} As already mentioned, the statistical data on mixed marriage (religious and civil) are available only for a limited number of nationalities: Greek, British, American, Israeli and Lebanese that have been considered to be the most representative non-Cypriot mate selection groups until 1994. Data for the year 2004 do not change the pattern identified for the previous years.

*For the year 2004, the registered data do not change the patterns already identified until 2003.
among the immigrants; the highest values of this excess are registered for Greece, as being the first source of non-Cypriot grooms. For the United Kingdom, the difference between the numbers of immigrants by ‘sex’ is lower (as long as the United Kingdom is the second largest source of non-Cypriot brides and grooms for Cypriots).

From the group of “Other European Countries” (as mentioned in official statistics), the Russians made up the largest immigrant group overall. In this case, there was an excess of women immigrants, every year with the exceptions of 2001 and 2003 when there were more men than female immigrants. Therefore, it is not a coincidence that the number of Russian brides chosen by Cypriots is increasing starting with 1999. The growing tendency on immigration flow is valid for each country of this separate group. The association long-term immigration-mixed marriage can be identified another time, since the Eastern European countries made up the largest source of non-Cypriot brides.

From the countries of North American continent, the United States supplied the largest number of long-term immigrants every year-tabulated data. It is significant, since the United States constituted one of the major sources of grooms and brides for Cypriot nationals.

Regarding the Asian labour immigration, nationals of Sri Lanka constituted the largest number of long-term immigrants every year (with the exceptions of the years 2001 and 2002), together with the group from Philippines that ranked next in order28 (in this sense, population statistics for the year 2004 tabulate civil mixed marriages Cypriot men-Sri Lankan women, combination that makes 4% of all civil marriage of Cypriot men).

In order to reveal the relationships between mixed marriage and long-term immigration, it was necessary to determine the total numbers of immigrants by region and the corresponding sex ratio, as well (see for details Table 2.13).

B) The total number of long-term immigrants to Cyprus for the eight-year period under study is 106.284 people with women slightly exceeding men (the overall sex ratio is 98 men for 100 long-term immigrant women). Examining each region separately, on average, the lowest sex ratio was registered for the category “Other European Countries” (it includes all European, non-E.U. countries) where there were only 67 men for each 100 long-term female immigrants. In the meantime, the highest sex ratio displayed is for American countries (with the United States as the major source) until 2003. Data calculated including the year 2004 changed this pattern, so that the highest sex ratio for the entire period is registered for African countries (Egypt being the first sender-county)

---

28 The nationals of Sri Lanka and Philippines are exclusively labour immigrants considered by official statistics as long-term immigrants since they have the right to work in Cyprus for more than one year; actually they are “fixed-term visas immigrants”.

### B) Total long-term immigrants in Cyprus by Region and Sex, 1997-2004 - see Table 2.13
with 141 men to 100 women (for the first time in 2004, population statistics tabulate data for marriages between Cypriot women and Egyptian men that made up 7% of all civil mixed marriages entered by Cypriot women).

For European Union countries, the sex ratio was 120 men to 100 women. In other words, the predicted sources for non-Cypriot spouses are the above-mentioned regions: European Union countries (and less the United States) as the main source for non-Cypriot grooms and the “Other European countries” category as the main source of non-Cypriot brides.

Therefore, data on long-term immigration by ‘sex’ and ‘region’ (Table 2.13) show a strong association with the percentages of mixed marriage by group of nationalities for Cypriot women and men, as it appears in Table 2.8. The highest percentage of mixed marriage involving Cypriot men was registered for the East-European group of countries and for Cypriot women was reported for the Euro-American group of nationalities.

Also, there are more Asian women immigrating to Cyprus, the sex ratio being 75 men for 100 women (fact that verifies the choices of Cypriot grooms for Filipino brides, before the increase in the number of female immigrants from Eastern European countries).

As already mentioned, the number of immigrants and the sex ratio of immigrants provide some indication on decreases or increases of opportunity for “transient matches” between people of different nationalities and, in some cases, marriage. This is the reason why, in considering the association immigration-mixed marriage (see data in Tables 2.13 and 2.8), one could predict that an excess of European Union and Arab men, creates more opportunity for relationships with Cypriot women (see for example, the unions Egyptian men-Cypriot women registered in 2004). The same is true in the case of East-European and Asian women (the sex ratios were in favour for women) who constituted large marriageable pools for male Cypriot partners.

In order to identify a clearer pattern for the relationship mixed marriage — immigration, the countries which provided the largest number of immigrants to Cyprus and the largest sources of non-Cypriot grooms and brides, respectively (see Table 2.14) have been considered.

C) One might expect a positive relationship between the two variables (i.e. immigration and mixed marriage) in the table. In order to test the hypothetical relationship between the two series of data, the Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient was calculated (it was considered suitable as it is widely used for variables consisting of ordinal or interval scales). If the starting point is the hypothesis that between the two series of rank orders

| C) Number of Long-term immigrants to Cyprus and number of mixed marriage with Cypriot women and men for the countries where data are available, 1997-2004- see Table 2.14. |
(immigration and mixed marriage) there is a relationship, then the second rank order (for the resulting variable) should correspond to the first one, according to the nature of the relationship.

The coefficient is defined by the following formula:

$$\rho = 1 - \frac{6\sum d^2}{n(n^2-1)}$$

where \(d\) is the difference between the rank pairs and \(n\) is the total number of cases.

In order to compute the rank correlation coefficient, data from Table 2.14 are coded and displayed in Table 2.14a.

$$\rho_1 = 1 - \frac{6 \cdot 172}{13(169-1)} = 1 - 0.47 = 0.53$$  

The rank order correlation between the number of long-term immigrants arriving in Cyprus and the number of mixed marriages with Cypriot women.

$$\rho_2 = 1 - \frac{6 \cdot 93}{13(169-1)} = 1 - 0.25 = 0.75$$  

The rank order correlation between the number of long-term immigrants arriving in Cyprus and the number of mixed marriages with Cypriot men.

The values obtained for the two rank pairs series show that the two variables are strongly associated; in other words, the variation in the number of long-term immigrants to Cyprus determine the variation in the amount of grooms and brides for Cypriot spouses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank order of frequency of mixed marriage with Cypriot women and men, 1997-2004- see Table 2.14a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 2.14a displays the rank order frequency of mixed marriage with Cypriot women and men computed from the existing data on Cypriot mixed marriages and data on the amount of immigration by country.

The population immigrating in a given year is not the same as the population marrying during that year, due to the so-called “lag factor”. However, there are great discrepancies, in some cases, between the number of long-term immigrants and the number of mixed marriages Cypriot- long-term immigrants. For example, at a first sight, Israel, Iran and Germany would appear to exhibit the greatest discrepancy between the total number of long-term immigrants generated and the frequency of mixed marriage with Cypriots; i.e. relatively large number of these nationals have come to Cyprus while few married Cypriots. What explanation could be adopted in this case?

One would say that this pattern might reflect relatively greater cultural distance between the immigrants from the above-mentioned countries and Cypriots or lower preference for each other as marriage mates. Moreover, if one would take into account the fact that a great number of the immigrants coming from United Kingdom and United States are of Cypriot origin, these last two countries would rank the same as the other group of countries mentioned before.
The only group of countries left is that from Eastern Europe. However, data reveal that a significant number of immigrants came to Cyprus from East-European countries during the period 1997-2004 (see table 2.13). This group of countries supplied the largest number of civil marriage mates for Cypriots during the period under study and the tendency is still increasing.

In other words, if the number of immigrants (being also, mixed marriage partners from the sources already mentioned) from Greece, United Kingdom and United States (mostly those spouses of Cypriot origin identified through high percentages of religious marriages with native Cypriots) is not taken into account, the only immigrants who rank in the top positions of Cypriot mate choice are those from the East-European group of countries.

The rank order correlation (Spearman’s r) between the number of long-term immigrants arriving in Cyprus and the number of mixed marriages with Cypriot women for the list of countries on Table 2.14a is 0.53. For mixed marriages with Cypriot men the correlation is 0.75. This indicates that the volume of immigrants is somehow a better predictor of whom Cypriot men married than it is for Cypriot women. The fact is obvious especially for Eastern European countries, where the female immigrants outnumbered male immigrants to Cyprus, every year (i.e. there were approximately two women for each male long-term immigrant). As already mentioned, there were registered more unions Cypriot men - female partners from Russia, Romania, Bulgaria, Ukraine and Moldova (overall, 3,544 unions) than those between Cypriot men and female spouses from Greece, United States, United Kingdom and Germany (i.e. 1,968 mixed marriages for data in Table 2.14a). As already mentioned, the values for rank order correlation coefficients showed a strong association between the number of immigrants and the number of their mixed marriages to Cypriots. Therefore, the number of immigrants to Cyprus is a good predictor of mixed marriage in Cyprus.

D) Table 2.15 displays sex ratios of the long-term immigrants from the same list of countries as in the Table 2.14, and their mixed marriage sex ratios. It is important to mention that since there are no data available on the immigrants’ marital status and their ‘age’ by ‘country of origin’, the comparison between the values of immigrant sex ratios and mixed marriage sex ratios is possible only in relative terms (i.e. because of these biases, only a general tendency can be stated). In other words, there is a bias for the values calculated because the sex ratio of “marriage eligible” immigrants is not used, i.e. 18 years-old and over; consequently, this could be misleading since the sex ratio of the age
cohorts in the “prime” years for marriage is significantly different from the sex ratio of those older cohorts where marriage is less likely.

One might expect a positive relationship between these ratios, i.e. when there is an excess of men among the immigrants from a given country, it follows that more men than women from this group will marry with Cypriots. Also, the same would be true for the opposite case when there is an excess of women among the immigrants from a given country.

Theoretically speaking, the population immigrating in a given year is not the same as the population marrying during that year. This is not the case of Cyprus, since there is a large category of long-term immigrants who marry with Cypriots the same year they acquire the status of long-term immigrants. This is true in the case of East-European (mostly former USSR countries) and Asian/African immigrants who need visas to enter Cyprus and a permanent residence permit in order to stay for more than three months for visitors and six months or four years for foreign workers.

Except for Russians, Romanians, Bulgarians, Filipinos, Ukrainians and Moldavians, there was an excess of men among the immigrants from the total of countries under study. It is important to note that these so-called “exceptions” constitute the group of countries which provided brides for Cypriot grooms. According to this, it is evident that for the cases of Russia, Romania, Bulgaria, Ukraine, Moldova and Philippines, female long-term immigrants outnumbered male immigrants to Cyprus by a margin of 22-90%, every year.

Comparing the Immigrant and the Mixed marriage Sex Ratios, it can be observed that, Cypriot men were more likely to marry women from these last-mentioned countries than were Cypriot women to marry men from the same countries. For Greek, Iranian and Lebanese long-term immigrants, the Mixed Marriage Sex ratios are higher than the Immigration Sex Ratios, indicating that Greek, Iranian and Lebanese men were marrying Cypriot women more often that would be predicted by their proportion in the total amount of immigration to Cyprus.

Overall, the relationship between the Immigrant Sex Ratio and the Mixed marriage Sex Ratio, as measured by the Pearson’s $r$ correlation coefficient is 0.32 (data calculated in Table 2.15) indicating a positive association between these two ratios. It means that the number of immigrants by ‘sex’ is a good predictor for their mixed marriages with Cypriot women and men. As expected, the Immigrant Sex Ratio is high for the countries providing more male long-term immigrants (it varies between 3.01 and 1.04); also for the same countries, the Mixed Marriage Sex Ratio is high, indicating high percentage of mixed marriages Cypriot women - long-term immigrant men (it oscillates between 3.2 and 0.39). Also, the Mixed Marriage Sex Ratio follows a pattern of slight variation for East-European countries: 0.02- Russia, 0.05 - Bulgaria, 0.09- Romania and 0.01 for
Philippines; the small values show more women than men entering into mixed marriages with Cypriots. Also, for the same foregoing mentioned countries including Philippines, Ukraine and Moldova the Immigrant Sex Ratio is small (between 0.07 and 0.8) indicating more women than men immigrating to Cyprus.

The patterns indicated by the values of the two ratios considered are very clear: the correlation between them is positive (their modification follows the same direction). Therefore, data analysis confirms the hypothesis about the variations in the two phenomena considered: when men outnumber female long-term immigrants, there will be more mixed marriages with Cypriot women and when women outnumber long-term immigrant men there will be more mixed marriages with Cypriot men.

The positive relationship between the two variables indicates the two groups of countries providing mixed marriage spouses on Cypriot marriage market: the first one is that of Euro-American countries including: Greece, United Kingdom, the United States and Germany (both Immigrant and Mixed marriage Sex Ratio being in favour of immigrant men) and the second group of Eastern European countries (composed from Russia, Romania, Bulgaria, Ukraine and Moldavia) and Asian countries (Philippines, Iran, Lebanon and Israel) where both ratios are in favour for long-term immigrant women, predicting more mixed marriages to Cypriot men.

Data available only for 2004 disclose more nationalities (from the ‘other nationalities’ category) having civil marriages with Cypriots: more marriages of Syrian, Pakistani, Egyptian and Indian men to Cypriot women and of Belarusian, Chinese, Yugoslavian and Sri Lankan women to Cypriot men. This new pattern of marriage between Arab men and Cypriot women, and between Cypriot men and Asian women is to be confirmed/or not by data for 2005, not available at the start of 2006.

2.6. DISCUSSION:

OPPORTUNITY-IMMIGRATION; PREFERENCE-MIXED MARRIAGE

The existing statistical data regarding mixed marriages between Cypriots and foreigners, and also the levels and composition of the immigration flow to Cyprus picture an image of mixed marriage market and its dynamics in Cyprus.

In general, when considering the marriage market one might envision three kinds of people (Gray, 1987): Those who want to get married (on the marriage market); those who definitely do not want to marry (off the marriage market); and those who might marry if the “right person came along”.

Obviously, people can and do change categories even within short time frames. At least for those in the market, or potentially in the market, the issues of opportunity and preference are relevant. The element of opportunity has received some consideration in
previous sections, in terms of examining the total number and sex ratio of the long-term immigrants in Cyprus, according to the available population statistics data. Of course, considering the number and sex ratio of immigrants (data are not available for unmarried, marriageable and married categories) represents a very crude indicator of opportunity as the distribution of immigrants is not even across the country and there is a tendency for the majority to be concentrated in the four urban Cypriot centres: Nicosia, Limassol, Paphos and Larnaca (see the data from 2001 Census of population mentioned in section 2.5.1). Even within districts where immigrant groups are represented in numbers approximately equal to their proportion of the total population, the immigrant population may be more or less residentially and occupationally segregated and thereby have more or less opportunity for contact with native Cypriots. If it is to look closer to the sources of foreign spouses, some opportunity patterns arise. Therefore, regarding tourism as a source of foreign spouses, there are more opportunities for meeting in areas where tourists are concentrated (e.g. Paralimni area). Moreover, for Cypriot students abroad there is more opportunity to match with foreign spouses from the countries where they study (this is a third source of foreign spouses for Cypriots).

‘Preference’ is probably the more interesting consideration when mixed marriage is discussed. Comparing intra and mixed marriage rates over time and between immigrant groups provides some indication of Cypriots’ preferences, at least in terms of nationality (see the foregoing mentioned Summary tables with Cypriots’ marital choices for different nationalities, as these resulted from the statistical data analysis).

From a perspective that considers countable demographical characteristics, when nationality is related to socio-economic status, (i.e. where members of the host nationality group tend to have higher levels of education, income and occupational prestige than most immigrants) one would continue to expect a tendency toward intramarrriage/homogamy or at least marriage within socio-economic levels. Unfortunately, information on the socio-economic status of marrying Cypriot and immigrant individuals is not available. In this sense, a related piece of information is available regarding ‘long-term immigrants by intended length of stay, purpose of arrival and sex, 2003-2004’ (Demographic Report 2004:154). For example, in 2004, from a total of 22,003 long-term immigrants, 58% came for employment (from whom 96% came for 1 year or more), 25% came for settlement, 8% came for study/training, 6% came for permanent settlement (Cypriots), 1.8% were registered as ‘returning home from work abroad’ and 1.2% had as their purpose ‘visiting friends and relatives’. The percentages calculated for the year 2003 are very similar for each category, showing that more than half of the long-term immigrant flow to Cyprus come for employment for ‘1 year and more’. Concerning the immigrant population, data about their average socio-economic background can be estimated according to their geopolitical region. If for the Euro-
American group of countries high average levels of socio-economic standing are expected, for the East-European and Asian/African groups of countries the same levels are expected to be lower\textsuperscript{29} as these represent the sender-countries for employment long-term immigrants (see the aforesaid tabulated data on ‘purpose of arrival’).

A question to be further investigated below is why, overall, Cypriot men chose spouses considered to be lower in terms of socio-economic status (i.e. they chose mostly spouses migrant women coming for work in Cyprus, and therefore “married down” –a pattern of ‘hypogamy’) and on the other hand, why Cypriot women preferred men who are supposed to have higher socio-economic status (i.e. they chose mostly Greek and British spouses and therefore “marry up”- a pattern of ‘hypergamy’; or at least, married ‘equals’). It is difficult to find out an answer to this question as long as there are no statistical data available regarding such demographical characteristics. Anyway, it counts as one of the assumptions to be investigated empirically in this study. It is worth mentioning the new pattern revealed by data in population statistics for 2004, showing that Cypriot women married Asian (Arab) and Egyptian men more often than East-Europeans (this new pattern will have to await confirmation by data to be recorded in the next few years).

A substantial difference between Marriage Sex Ratio and Immigration Sex Ratio in favour of immigrant women may indicate that Cypriot men are more often finding immigrant women to fit the category of “the right person” and also, immigrant women to find Cypriot men as matching the same category, than is the case for Cypriot women vis-à-vis the immigrant men. This is another aspect and open question to be investigated empirically.

The aim of the present discussion is to identify and underline topics and main tendencies to be investigated by further empirical research. The tendencies already revealed by the foregoing analysis of the available statistical data will be explored empirically through a questionnaire survey about Cypriots’ perceptions, opinions and attitudes towards mixed marriage. As no previous research is available on the topic of mixed marriage and immigration in Cyprus, it is necessary to take into account this picture given by the population statistics data available on the two phenomena under study. Even if statistical data are sometimes incomplete and moreover missing, the information they provide constitutes a suitable starting-point in exploring the topic of mixed marriage between Cypriots and foreigners in Cyprus.

\textsuperscript{29} The immigrants from Asian countries are almost exclusively labour immigrants. Usually, these workers are employed as domestic aids and are considered inferior status immigrants. A reason for this might be also their dark skin colour (they are called pejoratively “mavrouthkia” that literally means “blackies” and they are usually underpaid).
2.7. Empirical Research Hypotheses Formulation:

Patterns and Tendencies Revealed by the Statistical Data Analysis of Mixed Marriage and Immigration in Cyprus

Mixed marriage and immigration are both new and interrelated phenomena in contemporary Cyprus. The statistical data analysis undertaken in this chapter identified an increasing propensity for Cypriots to marry foreigners as a result of the rise in immigration to Cyprus starting in the early 1990's (for Cypriot women, this trend is more accentuated after 1999). Therefore, the number of mixed marriages has increased markedly over the 16 years period covered by this study: there has been a gradual decline in the rate of Cypriot intra-marriage or a gradual increase in the overall rate of mixed marriage between Cypriots and other nationalities. A median increase of 29% in mixed marriage was recorded, from a low of 14% mixed marriages reported in 1991 to a high of 43% mixed marriages in 2004 (from total marriages entered by Cypriots).

Also, 51%,\textsuperscript{30} more Cypriot men married foreigners compared to Cypriot women. The overall average rate of mixed marriage is 27% (10% for Cypriot women and 21% for Cypriot men) for all marriages involving Cypriots during the sixteen years period under study. In this sense, some hypotheses suggested by the statistical data analysis and the literature review (exposed in Chapter I) are mentioned and discussed below.

(a) Theoretically speaking, the increasing number of mixed marriages in Cyprus should determine positive attitudes and opinions at the level of local public opinion. This may be translated in terms of smaller social distance and greater social acceptance of “Otherness”/ or foreigners and marriages to foreigners.

From the point of view of social acceptance, it seems reasonable to conclude that with increased exposure and tolerance toward people from other countries and cultures, prohibitions against marriage with foreign nationals will continue to decline (Kalmijn, 1993). At the level of Cypriot society, the question is to be investigated through a questionnaire survey about attitudes and opinions of Cypriots towards foreigners as marriage partners.

Obviously, social distance (it refers to similarity or closeness based upon social variables or networks) plays a certain role in terms of mate selection. First of all, it should be remembered that culture or ethnicity can only be crudely inferred from nationality or even country of birth. As Cottrell (1990:152) points out “Since most nations are ethnically diverse one cannot assume that a cross-national marriage will necessarily involve very different cultures even if the dominant cultures are very different”.

\textsuperscript{30} The previous rate for the period 1994-1999 was 54%. There is registered an increase in the rate of marriage to foreigners for Cypriot women from 1999 onwards.
(b) With this caveat in mind, a task is to empirically investigate if Cypriots are most likely to marry someone more alike than different from them ethnically or culturally (i.e. this is individuals’ tendency to homogamy illustrated by empirical studies mentioned in the Literature Review in Chapter 1). This hypothesis is based on the assumption that Cypriots have more socio-economic similarities with people from the Euro-American group of countries, as the United Kingdom and the United States (these are the countries where many Cypriots study\textsuperscript{31} and also the host-countries for immigrants of Cypriot origin); the Cypriots have also religious and cultural similarities with people from Orthodox East-European countries (as Russia, Romania, Bulgaria, Moldavia and Ukraine).

Considering all these similarities, the marital choices made by Cypriot men and women reveal some patterns in mixed marriage mate selection. There are registered more mixed marriages Cypriot men-East-European brides and also, more mixed marriages Cypriot brides-Euro-American grooms.

(c) Therefore, when socio-economic status is considered, gender preferences can be identified. If it is to consider the differences in the average economic standings of the above-mentioned groups providing spouses for Cypriots, one could suppose that Cypriot men chose “to marry down” when they married East-European (mostly migrant) women and Cypriot women tended to “marry up” when they married men from the Euro-American group of countries.

The statistical data available show intra and mixed marriages by ‘type’ (ecclesiastical and civil marriage) and ‘nationality’. From 1994 onwards, detailed split data are available for 11 nationalities that entered into marriages with Cypriot nationals. For the years 2002 and 2004 respectively, data for another three and then eight nationalities are added. Therefore, when data were analysed by ‘group of nationalities’, mate selection patterns resulted in a clearer way. Cypriot women have maintained, during the years under study, a constant pattern with half of their mixed marriages being to Greek nationals. Overall, there are more than 14% civil mixed marriages and 41% religious mixed marriages of the type Cypriot women - Euro-American men as compared to the amount of mixed marriage Cypriot men - Euro-American women.

Concerning Cypriot men, the most frequently represented out-marriage group was the East-European one for civil marriages (this combination made up 55% of civil mixed marriage involving Cypriot men) and the “other nationalities” category for religious unions (a combination that made up 70% of religious mixed marriage involving Cypriot men and 29% for brides from the Euro-American group). The comparable figures for Cypriot women are 23% civil mixed marriage and 68% religious mixed marriage, respectively (both for the Euro-American group).

\textsuperscript{31} Data from Statistics of Education, Report 36 (2005:205) show that in 2003/04, from a total of 17,631 Cypriot students abroad, 15,882 (90\%) were studying in Greece, United Kingdom and United States.
Until the year 2003, the percentages of civil mixed marriages between Cypriot women and men from Eastern-European and from Asian group of countries were almost the same (11% and 10%, respectively). The data calculated including the year 2004 show that the number of civil marriages of Cypriot women with Arab/Asian men reached 19% (of all marriages involving Cypriot women) and the combination Cypriot women-East-European men made up only 11%.

In the meantime, the Asian group ranks the third position in Cypriot male preference, and the Euro-American spouses made up 9% (compared to 17% for 1994-1999) from the total number of civil mixed marriage entered by Cypriot men.

(d) The statistical data show a great rise in immigration to Cyprus starting with early 1990's. Data on long-term immigration by ‘sex’ and ‘region’ show a strong association with the percentages of mixed marriage by ‘group of nationalities’ for Cypriot men and women. On average, the lowest Immigration Sex Ratio is registered for the East-European group of countries (63 men for each 100 long-term immigrant women, the excess for immigrant women predicting more opportunity for mixed marriage); in the meantime, the highest immigration sex ratio is registered for the Euro-American group (for each 100 female immigrants to Cyprus there are 126 men- the excess for immigrant men predicts more opportunity for foreign male marriage partners). Given the existing statistics with data on immigration by ‘nationality’ available for the period 1997-2004, the calculated value of the rank correlation coefficient Spearman’s (0,75) indicates that the volume of immigrants is somehow a better predictor of whom Cypriot men marry than is for Cypriot women. The statistical data revealed that the largest number of immigrants came to Cyprus from East-European countries (for the interval 1997-2003, with data calculated for only 13 countries, with data available also, for mixed marriages), group that supplied the highest amount of marriage mates for Cypriots during the same period under study.

(e) Overall, the relationship between the Immigrant Sex Ratio and the Marriage Sex Ratio, as measured by the Pearson’s r correlation coefficient (0,32) indicates a positive association between the two ratios. The patterns contoured by the values of the two ratios considered are very well defined: there are two main groups of countries providing mixed marriage spouses for Cypriots. The first one is that of Euro-American countries: Greece, United Kingdom and United States (both Immigrant and Mixed marriage Sex Ratios being in favour of immigrant men) and the second group is the Eastern-European one where both ratios are in favour for long-term immigrant women. As mentioned, the new pattern revealed by statistical data for 2004 accounts for the Arab/Asian group of countries as the second source of grooms for Cypriot women.

---

32 Data show an increased tendency for Cypriot women to marry foreigners starting in 1999.
In terms of socio-economic status, the Euro-American group of nationalities is perceived as a “higher”/superior status migrant group and it represented the source of most wanted spouses for Cypriot brides; the second group of East-European countries is considered to be a “lower” status immigrant group, perceived as inferior because of its average low socio-economic standing; it was also the major source of brides for Cypriots.

Envisaging these mate selection patterns (both of preference and opportunity) pictured by the statistical data analysis conducted in this chapter, the next step is their empirical investigation, as they reflect different perceptions and attitudes of native Cypriots towards immigrant groups in Cyprus.
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MIXED MARRIAGE IN CYPRUS. A combined methodological approach.

A. The Problem: BACKGROUND, PRIOR RESEARCH, RELATING TO SOCIAL THEORY, CHOOSING AN APPROACH

3.1. Background of the Problem and Prior Research

The study presented here aims at highlighting the pattern and social context of “mixed marriage” in Cyprus. “Mixed marriage”, as used in this study, is defined as the marriage between one overseas born partner from foreign parents and one Cypriot born partner (i.e. in this case, the characteristic considered as a marker of difference between partners is ‘nationality’).

There are two usages (of a legal and a social kind), which characterize the term “mixed couple” and also reflect the two-sided reality lived by this type of union: an official, legal and administrative usage and a social and mediated usage based on the representations of “Otherness”. The later significance given to the “mixed” is the most variable, subjective, sensitive to prejudice, and the most frequent in everyday life.

This study analyses the social aspect of the mixed marital partnership as a recent phenomenon in Cyprus. More specifically, it focuses on the issues related to mate selection. Why do people choose “the difference”? The study explores two large reason categories: those invoked by foreigners who married Cypriots (as subjects’ arguments) and those reasons given by Cypriot nationals (as third parties’ opinions) in general. Because each of the two sets of arguments requires different methods of investigation, a mixed/combined methodological approach was adopted.

Therefore, in order to investigate first-hand experiences of spouses from mixed marriages, qualitative techniques are required. More explicitly, the author conducted twenty semi-structured interviews with foreign spouses from mixed marriages in Cyprus. Qualitative techniques stress personal understanding, common sense and introspection.

In order to obtain a wider picture of how mixed marriage is perceived at a societal level, an opinion survey (on a national sample of 400 Cypriot nationals) at the level of Cypriot public opinion was carried out. Therefore, quantitative techniques that presume counting, scaling and abstract reasoning were used.

Thus, this research combined different methods in order to reveal diverse dimensions of the phenomenon (i.e. mixed marriage in Cyprus), to strengthen shortcomings of each method, and/or to double-check findings by examining them from several different vantage points.

Triangulation’ is the key word used to name the combination of different methods, study groups, local and temporal settings, and different theoretical perspectives in dealing with a phenomenon (Schutt, 1999:382).
The integration of different methods makes it possible to weave back and forth between different levels of meaning. In this particular case, the study captured a subjective meaning of subjects/foreigners who entered into mixed marriages to Cypriots and also, a kind of objective meaning of Cypriot public opinion who perceive mixed marriage from “outside”.

**Prior Research.** Specialized literature review revealed that there is no prior research available on the topic concerning marriages between Cypriots and foreigners. Anyway, the importance of this inquiry is motivated by the intensity of a new social phenomenon in Cyprus, in the 1990, that is the increasing propensity of Cypriots to marry non-nationals/foreigners.

Mixed marriage in Cyprus is a multi-layered phenomenon with a broad typology. In brief, there are two factors that seem to determine changes in the demography of local marriage markets: tourism and the greatly increased flow of work immigrants, of whom the majority is given by women from the Former Soviet Bloc and Eastern Europe who come to Cyprus through various employment agencies to cover workforce needs of Cypriot economy. Many of these women enter prostitution under the cover name of “artistes” in cabarets. They get a six-month working permit and in order to insure a longer working period (guaranteed by a renewable residence permit), they enter into ‘convenience marriages’ with Cypriot men (see for more details on this subject R. Lenz’s study “Εμπόριο Γυναικών στην Κυπριακή Δημοκρατία”/“Sex-trafficking in the Republic of Cyprus”, 2006). Cabaret artistes plan to make their fortune and then return home, but many of them stay back and make families, get Cypriot citizenship. Another source of foreign brides is formed from women married to Cypriots who studied abroad (and met their wives).

As a starting point for investigating this relatively new phenomenon in Cypriot society, the tendency of natives to marry foreigners was quantified. The existing population official statistical data from Demographic Reports indicate that Cypriot-foreigner marital unions are on the rise for the period under study, 1989-2004. The raw percents analysis resulted in a typology of mixed marriages in Cyprus which accounts for: (a) Gender specific preferences in mate selection process; and (b) A regional pattern in choosing foreign spouses. The nationalities of foreign marriage partners are clustered according to socio-economic, cultural, religious, geographical and racial characteristics in three groups: Euro-American, East-European and Asian/African. Therefore, in order to reveal some of the categories of mixed marriage typology in Cyprus, the analysis employed specific statistical coefficients. The relationship between Immigrant Sex Ratio and Marriage Sex Ratio was measured by the Pearson’s correlation coefficient in order to

---

34 There is also a category of young Muslim work immigrants from Middle East countries who usually enter marriages to Cypriot women with decreased desirability on marriage market, as divorced or middle-aged women (the number of such marriages is very small- see data in Appendix B).
account for Cypriots’ marital preferences. The results revealed that Cypriot brides preferred as spouses, men from the Euro-American group and in the meantime Cypriot grooms made their first choice for East-European brides.

One possible framework to interpret the results obtained through this statistical data analysis is given by the exchange theory perspectives, a classical paradigm frequently employed in different empirical studies to understand the motivations of mixed marriage as opposed to homogamy (the “natural” pattern in mate selection as discussed in Chapter I on literature review). Therefore, the findings from statistical data could be interpreted in terms of mixed marriage resource exchanges or preference for socio-economic resources, since the Euro-American group is considered a “higher” status migrant group and the East-European group has a “lower” migrant status. This is a hypothesis, among possible others, which was suggested by a pattern observed in statistical data. However, the present study challenges this classical argument by conducting empirical research and taking into account a possible explanation of the way “taste” is shaping people’ choices in mate selection process. The topic of “taste” is a fundamental one in the aesthetical field of sociology, represented by scholars such as Kant, Bourdieu, Burke and Gadamer.

3.2. Relating to Social Theory and Choosing an Approach

Theoreticians emphasize three factors as central to the propensity for exogamy (i.e. mixed marriage): attitudes, opportunity and exchange (Lieberson and Waters, 1988). Attitudes encompass both group members’ views towards endogamy in general and towards exogamy with a particular out group. Out groups, in turn, are perceived as arranged in a hierarchy reflecting their desirability as mates. These generalizations about attitudes, however, are subject to qualifications (Kalmijn, 1998). For instance, Cypriot men and women may rank foreign nationalities living in Cyprus differently. Finally, attitudes are malleable. Factors such as youth, education, and urban residence might heighten tolerance and acceptance towards mixed marriage; it represents an aspect to be investigated in the case of Cypriot society.

A second critical determinant of exogamy is opportunity or the chance that men and women of different backgrounds will become acquainted. Opportunity is primarily a structural phenomenon, driven by such factors as sex ratio, group size, and segregation. Thus, large groups will be more endogamous than small groups because large groups have more members to choose from (Blau et al, 1982).

35 The unions between Cypriots and partners from the Asian group of countries are less frequent and do not constitute the subject of the present study because of several reasons. One of these reasons is related to the theoretical framework of this study which is not suitable to analyze this type of union because of striking cultural and religious differences. This type of marriage may constitute the subject of a separate sociological study which should account also for theological and juridical aspects.
Similarly, highly segregated groups will be more endogamous than less segregated groups because the former have little chance to interact with outsiders. Moreover, group size and segregation are not independent. Members of large groups can construct segregated lives more easily than members of small groups because large groups have the numbers to dominate neighbourhoods, schools, workplaces and the like. Again, certain individual traits increase opportunity, for instance, education (Kalmijn, 1998).

A third factor associated with mixed marriage is *status hypergamy*. The most plausible account, the “exchange” explanation, was first formulated by Merton (1941). Building on the general observation that men exchange their breadwinning capacity for the reproductive and nurturing capacities of women, he hypothesized that Black intermarrying husbands use their economic potential to compensate for their minority status. Since men’s average earnings are superior to women’s, in the typical intermarriage, a minority man with relatively good earnings prospects pairs with a dominant group woman of modest circumstances.

Of course, the operation of exchange presupposes both favourable attitudes and opportunity for contact. In this sense, exchange is more a catalyst than a precondition for attraction. Still, all three factors are associated with the propensity for mixed marriage. But how could one measure “propensity” for mixed marriage? Here comes the point because more than favourable attitudes and opportunity for contact, there is questions of *taste, need* and *pleasure* in spouse selection. These constitute a more subjective factor in the marital choices made by individuals. Are these marital choices, based on taste, strategies for distinction as Bourdieu (1984) put the problem? Furthermore, one can think that since people don’t learn in educational systems the way to choose a partner for an intimate relationship, this choice might be a question of taste. Attitudes, opportunity, exchange and taste are the factors considered when investigating empirically mixed marriage in Cyprus. Therefore, the question to be answered is: “Are these factors changing in ways compatible with an increase in marriages between Cypriots and foreigners?”

The present work focuses on identifying Cypriots’ attitudes towards mixed marriages between natives and foreigners through a questionnaire survey. Some of the questions to be answered here are: “Which are Cypriots’ opinions about marriages with foreigners?” “Do Cypriots perceive foreign nationalities in Cyprus as arranged in a hierarchy reflecting their desirability as mates?”. The quantitative findings will identify the stand of Cypriot public opinion on mixed marriage as a social phenomenon and will inform about the influence exercised by third party agents on mixed marriage mate selection process.

The other two plus one factors influencing the propensity for exogamy (i.e. opportunity, exchange and taste) are explored by using a qualitative method, i.e. semi-structured interviews with mixed couple partners. This qualitative investigation will provide a more
subjective, but in the meantime an entitled and legitimate point of view of those who are the main protagonists of mixed marriage in Cyprus.

Both types of findings, quantitative and qualitative, will be used in drawing conclusions about the mate selection process in mixed marriage in Cyprus.

**Choosing an Approach.** Exploratory research is associated with the use of methods that capture large amounts of relatively unstructured information. Exploration is the motive for inductive research. It begins with specific data, which are then used to develop (induce) a general explanation (a theory) to account for the data. The patterns in the data are then summarized in one or more empirical generalizations that can be compared to the hypothesis.

This study uses both *descriptive* and *exploratory* types of research. Because there are no previous studies on mixed marriage in Cyprus, the primary aim is defining and describing the social phenomenon of interest. Some of the central questions here are “Who is mixed married?” and “How many people are mixed married?” A first answer to these questions is given by analysing population data from official statistics available on mixed marriages in Cyprus (as is presented in Chapter II).

Moreover, the present investigation goes beyond description and seeks to find out how people get along in the setting under question, what meanings they give to their actions, and what issues concern them. Thus, the goal is to identify the reasons that determined people to enter mixed marital relationships. This is possible by conducting exploratory research at each of the levels of *individual-group-society model* adopted in this study, which gives the determinants of decision-making in mate selection process (for mixed marriages):

(a) Individual motivations (or preferences/ tastes of individuals for quantifiable and non-quantifiable resources in a partner): the “taste and exchange factors” to be investigated through semi-structured or standardised open-ended interviews;

(b) Third-party agents (or the influence of social groups): attitudes to be determined through a questionnaire social survey and also double-checked/verified through the above-mentioned set of interviews.

(c) Marriage market mechanism (or the opportunity for matching): described by an analysis of statistical data from official Demographic Reports and exemplified through the set of interviews conducted with foreign spouses married to Cypriots.
B. QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH DESIGN and METHODS for
QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY

Of the three-plus-one factors central to the propensity for exogamy (i.e. attitudes, opportunity, exchange and taste), attitudes are the most intriguing, theoretically. Cypriot public opinion on mixed marriage is an unknown social field since there is no prior investigation on attitudes, perceptions and representations about marriages between foreigners and Cypriots. In order to obtain a picture of the social perception/image on the phenomenon under study, the author designed a questionnaire survey about Cypriots’ opinions, perceptions and attitudes towards mixed marital unions in Cyprus. The methodology of research is described in the following sections.

3.3. Hypotheses

The working hypotheses resulted from the previous analysis of statistical data on marriages between Cypriots and 14 nationalities (see for details Chapter II) and from the literature review, as developed in the first chapter. Eleven out of these fourteen nationalities are tabulated in the questions of the questionnaire36. The hypotheses are:

(a) Exposure/tolerance towards foreigners: With increased exposure and tolerance towards people from other countries and cultures (see the high increase in immigration flow to Cyprus for the interval under study 1989-2004), attitudes towards marriage with foreign nationals become more favourable.

(b) Social distance plays a certain role in terms of mate selection. Foreign nationalities are perceived as arranged in a hierarchy reflecting their desirability as mates. Which foreign nationalities constitute a more socially accepted pool of mates for Cypriots? There is less social distance for the Euro-American and East-European groups of nationalities comparative to the Asian group of nationalities (as a first racial distinction white-non-white). The smallest social distance is for spouses from Greece: more than half of the Cypriot women’s mixed marriages being with Greek nationals.

(c) Down-up or hypergamy hypothesis: Cypriot men prefer East-European brides and Cypriot women prefer Euro-American grooms.

3.4. Sample Design. Stratified Random Sampling

(Proportional quota random sampling)

As sample selection method, probability sampling or random sampling has been used. It refers to sample designs where units are selected by some probability

---

36 When the questionnaire was conceived, statistical data were available only for eleven foreign nationalities that entered into civil marriages with Cypriots.
mechanism, allowing no scope for the influence of subjectivity. The advantages of this 
method are that it enables the avoidance of selection biases and that it permits the 
precision of estimators to be assessed, using only information that is collected from the 
selected sample.

General Universe or population of interest: The population of the Republic of Cyprus 
in the Government controlled area of Cyprus

Target population or sampling frame:

Greek Cypriots Men and Women, 15 years of age and older

Stratified random sampling: involves dividing the target population into non-overlapping 
groups (i.e., strata), then do a simple random sample in each stratum. The aim of 
stratification is to guarantee that the sample reflects the structure of the population in 
terms of one or more important variables. The designed sample reflects both the age 
distribution and the gender distribution of the population by place of residence. Therefore, 
the sample is representative for the age, gender and residence structures of the 
population of interest.

\( N = \) the number of cases in the sampling frame; \( n \) = the number of cases in the sample;

\( NCn \) = the number of combinations (subsets) of n from N;

\( f = n/N \) the sampling fraction;

Strata: \( N1+N2+N3+\ldots+\ldots+Nj = N \)

\( N \) = 540702* Greek Cypriots 15 years of age and older

\( N1 = 262158 \) Cypriot men \( N2 = 278544 \) Cypriot women;

Sample size: \( n=400 \), \( n = 1/\text{error}^2 \), error = 0.05 this means that the sample value of a 
variable is likely to be within \( \pm 5 \% \) of the true population value (at 95% confidence level). 
In other words, 95 percent of the possible samples under the specified design will produce 
an estimate within plus or minus two standard errors of the true population value.

The precision of the estimators (sampling variance) was enhanced by ensuring the 
sample stratification.

If \( n=400 \), then \( n1 = 200 \) men (50%), \( n2 = 200 \) women (50%); the strata are:

- Gender: Masculine- Greek Cypriot men, 15-65 and over years old;
  Feminine- Greek Cypriot women, 15-65 and over years old;
- Age: the sampling frame is divided in 6 categories of age:
  15-24, 25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, 65 and over;\(^{37}\)
- Place of residence: urban and rural for all five Greek Cypriot districts:
  Lefkosia, Limassol, Larnaka, Pafos and Ammochostos\(^{38}\) (only rural).

\(^*\) Data are calculated from unpublished tables with data from the Census of population 2001 ("Population by Age, Sex and 
District (Urban-Rural), 1/10/2001") obtained from the Statistical Service, Republic of Cyprus. When the sample was 
calculated (i.e. April 2003), the Vol. I General & Demographic Characteristics from the Census of Population 2001 was 
unpublished.

\(^{37}\) These are the age groups with data available in the last Census of population 2001.

\(^{38}\) Ammochostos urban area is under Turkish occupation since 1974.
The sample values were obtained by applying the sampling fraction for each stratum. The numbers for population by gender, age and place of residence are taken from the Census of population 2001.

All the calculated values for these strata are available in Table 3.1 and Table 3.2, Appendix C. Also, the sample values are calculated from the two last-mentioned tables and shown in Table 3.3, Appendix C for Chapter III.

The respondents were selected randomly, according to these three strata.

3.5. Questionnaire Design

The construction of the questionnaire as a research instrument is based on the three hypotheses above-mentioned. The first hypothesis regarding Cypriots’ exposure/tolerance towards foreigners is tested by questions 1-4 and 6-11. The second hypothesis concerning the social distance between Cypriots and foreigners is addressed by questions 5, 12-16 and 17-19. Finally, the third hypothesis is examined through questions: 20-22 (for details see Appendix D for Chapter III).

3.5.1 Pilot Study: Informal examination of the questionnaire by experts and the pre-test stage. Once constructed, a first draft of the questionnaire, the issues of content and face validity (or construct validity) were addressed. This included a pilot study the purpose of which was to “test” the survey. The questionnaire gained critical but supportive comments from specialists familiar with the design and analysis of the questionnaires. Constructive feedback was provided on the phrasing of the questions, the amount of time necessary to complete the survey form and the demographic questions content. Fifteen questionnaires were administered to respondents of different ages, sexes and places of residence; the interviewees’ comments were taken into account in revising the survey questionnaire.

3.5.2 Questionnaire sections. The questionnaire contains 29 questions grouped into 8 sections as follows (see Appendix D for Chapter III):

1. Foreigners in Cyprus- The estimation of the number of foreigners in Cyprus and respondents’ opinion about the number of foreigners in Cyprus (Q1-Q2).
2. Foreign workers in Cyprus – The estimation of the number of foreign workers in Cyprus and opinions about the number of foreign workers in Cyprus (Q3-Q4).
3. Foreigners-Cypriots Social Distance Scale (Q5) - Cypriots’ attitudes towards foreigners as marriages partners, relatives, neighbours, work colleagues, citizens and visitors in Cyprus.
4. Cypriots’ foreign influence exposure (Q6–Q11) – Respondents who lived/or not abroad and their foreign relatives.
(5) Opinions towards marriage with foreigners (Q12-Q16) - Estimation of the number of mixed marriage in Cyprus; propensity to accept/not relatives or friends to mixed marriage; approval of mixed marriage; the importance of foreigners’ nationality in mixed marriage.

(6) Contacts with and preferences for different foreign nationalities living in Cyprus (Q17- Q19) - Preferences and direct contacts with foreigners living in Cyprus.

(7) Nationality and marriage: preference for foreign spouses (Q20–Q22) –Respondents would accept/not to marry different nationalities living in Cyprus.

(8) Demographic questions / Independent variables (Q23- Q29) - Respondents’ sex, age, education, occupation, marital status, approximate annual income and place of residence.

Regarding the type of questions, the majority are closed questions, with pre-determined answers. Given the exploratory character of the research, open-ended questions have been included in the questionnaire, in order to collect more insights on topics that are not quantifiable.

The questionnaire was self-administered in its Greek version. Both Greek and English versions are available in Appendix D (for Chapter III). The 400 respondents were interviewed during the period September 2003 – April 2004.

C. QUALITATIVE RESEARCH DESIGN and METHODS for INTERVIEW Survey

If the term “mixed marriage” is conceptualized accounting for its social usage, the dimensions already mentioned are attitudes, opportunity, exchange and taste. These are the factors to be inquired through interviewing mixed marriage spouses.

Both foreign women and men who entered into mixed marriages with Cypriots were interviewed so as to obtain a picture of the meaning, structure and functioning of mixed marriage as a social phenomenon. The rationale for choosing to interview foreigners (women and men) is motivated by the author’s own marital status as a foreigner married to a Cypriot and then sharing the same experience with the interviewees. Variables such as age, race, gender and social class have been identified as having a bearing upon interview. This is expressed by Kane (1990:68) as: “…the closer the interviewer is to the respondent in class, sex, age and interest, the greater chance the interviewer has of being successful”.

Of course, this is an ideal position, rather than a prerequisite for interviewing. Accounting for this point of view, people who were recruited had some similar characteristics with the interviewer (i.e. the author of the study): more women, more Romanian nationals and more people in their thirties. This is also a reason why Cypriot male spouses were not interviewed, and therefore mate selection in mixed marriages as presented herein reflects only the foreign spouses’ experiences.
3.6. Interview Design

3.6.1. Interviewees’ recruitment. Twenty mixed couple spouses were recruited (respectively, 18 women and 2 men from mixed marriages) who got married between 1976 and 2002. The focus is on mixed marriage\(^{39}\) between Cypriots and partners from the Eastern-European group of nationalities (five Romanian women, three Russian women, two Bulgarian women, one Ukrainian woman, and one Czech woman) and on the Euro-American group of nationalities (two English women and one English man, one Swedish woman, one Danish woman, one German woman and one Australian woman); the Asian\(^{40}\) (one Christian Palestinian man) group of nationalities is less represented, as is not of concern in this study.

From the total of 20 interviewees, 18 are foreign nationals married to Cypriots and two are children from mixed marriages of Cypriot nationals with foreigners: a Russian-Cypriot woman married to a Palestinian man and a Palestinian-Cypriot man married to a Cypriot woman; they identified themselves with the nationality of their foreign parent, respectively Russian and Palestinian. Also, from the total of 20 interviewees, two foreign women are divorced and have entered into long-term relationships (i.e. cohabitation) with other Cypriot partners. These four cases that differ from the rest of 16 cases of mixed marriage between foreigners and Cypriots revealed more complex issues about mate selection and stages of coupling in mixed marriage in Cyprus, which may constitute subjects to be investigated through further research (as it is further discussed in Chapter VI).

Also, it is significant for qualitative data validity that the interviewees have their place of residence in different districts of Cyprus: four in Nicosia, seven in Limassol and nine in Larnaca. The informants were recruited and interviewed by the author in the period between February 2004 and January 2005.

3.6.2 Sampling. The study employed two non-probability sampling methods that suit its preliminary and exploratory character. Networking or Snowball sampling is one of the non-probability sampling methods that have been employed. It means that the first step was to identify one foreign woman/man (who entered a mixed marriage) in the population of interest and spoke to her/him, then asked that woman/man to identify others in the population and spoke to them, then asked them to identify others, and so on. As a consequence, the sample “snowballed” in size. A problem of bias in the case of this method is that respondent networks tend to be homogenous in their attributes, rather than

\(^{39}\) Demographical characteristics of interviewees are available in Appendix G for Chapter V.

\(^{40}\) Partners from the Asian group of countries are not envisaged by this study because of the reasons that have already been mentioned (i.e. less frequent incidence, cultural and religious differences that cannot be explained by the theoretical framework of the present study).
providing links to others who have different social characteristics. Therefore, in addition to this method, *advertising* in newspaper was used. A press release was constructed (in three languages) and published in three different newspaper-type publications that cover the whole area of the Republic of Cyprus.  

### 3.6.3 Sample size

The number of interviewees in the sample was not pre-determined. The selection of new interviewees continued until the saturation point was reached; it was the point when new interviews seemed to yield little additional information (n=20). As new issues emerged in first interviews and were not fully covered by the questions existing in the interview schedule, additional interviewees were selected to represent different opinions about those new issues. Therefore, the interaction with the people interviewed constituted a continuous process of theoretical construction based on empirical evidence provided by the interviewees.

### 3.6.4 Methods

Qualitative methods are well suited to the exploration of new or poorly understood social settings. The study presented here is a case in point. As a method of investigation, the author used the *standardised open-ended interview* (or semi-structured interview). It means that the exact wording and sequence of questions were determined in advance. All respondents were asked the same basic questions in the same order. It ensured that the respondents answered the same questions, thus increasing comparability of the given responses. Data were completed for each person on the topics addressed in the interview. The use of follow-up questions improved understanding and clarification of pre-given and new topics that, as already mentioned, emerged from previous conversations with respondents.

### 3.6.5 Instruments

The standardized open-ended interview was conducted using an interview schedule (see Appendix E for Chapter III, for details) containing a set of open-ended questions and additional follow-up questions tailored to the preceding answers. The follow-up questions were useful because they aimed to learn more about interrelated belief systems or personal approaches to things, rather than measure a limited set of variables. The great number of the follow-up questions is not included by the interview schedule, as these were specific to each narrative separately. The fact that the author disclosed to the interviewees her status as a Cypriot national’s wife (after a number of questions) determined them to speak more freely, as they became more confident (actually, the author observed an attitude shift as the interviewees showed more willingness to talk and share their experience).

---

41 These publications are: a Greek newspaper (Σημερινή), an English weekly periodical (Cyprus Weekly) and a Russian newspaper published in Limassol. In sum, ten respondents were selected through advertising and ten through networking sample.
3.6.6 Research Aims. The study aimed to determine rationales for entering mixed relationships in Cyprus, by identifying the determinant elements of mixed marriage mate selection choice. The study set the stage for testing the assumptions of social exchange theory challenged by an aesthetic sociology perspective about choices based on taste, in relation to mixed marriage mate selection. Therefore, another research aim was to find out whether spouses entered marital relationships under the condition of assets exchanges as the classical exchange perspective on mixed marriage shows; and whether mate selection implied choices made on the basis of pure taste dispositions. Moreover, the study explored possible patterns of hypergamy or hypogamy resulting from the type of resources being exchanged by mixed marriage partners.

3.6.7 Hypotheses. Exploratory research questions formulation was based both on the social exchange theory assumptions and aesthetic sociology assumptions in relation to mate selection and also, on patterns revealed by the statistical data analysis performed in the Chapter II about Mixed marriage and Immigration in Cyprus.

a) Exchange hypothesis. The first exploratory research question is whether mixed marriage mate selection was made under the condition of bilateral exchanges of favourable and unfavourable characteristics of spouses in the marriage market or on the basis of spouses' pure taste dispositions. Translated to Cypriot context, the question is whether foreign spouses chose to marry Cypriots under the condition of bilateral exchanges of material and non-material resources or on the basis of pure taste dispositions.

b) Hypergamy/hypogamy hypothesis. The second exploratory research question is whether Cypriot spouses “marry down”/down marry socio-economically when they choose a marriage partner from the Eastern-European group of countries (who are considered as having an average lower economic status due to their migrant workers status in Cyprus) and respectively, whether they “marry up”/up-marriage socio-economically when they marry partners from the Euro-American group of countries (given the average high economic standards of Western societies and the fact that these constituted ‘host countries’ for the Cypriot immigration).

c) Similarity hypothesis. Cypriots are most likely to enter into mixed marriages with those who are more alike then different from them, ethnically or culturally. According to this, the high amount of mixed marriage Cypriot-Eastern-European spouses might be explained by religious and cultural homogamy (as Russians, Bulgarians and Romanians nationals are Orthodox Christians like the Greek Cypriots).
Given the nature of the present quantitative investigation, which is a more ethnographic account of limited cases of foreigners married to Cypriots, the validation or invalidation of these hypotheses is possible only through indicative findings that cannot be too readily generalized to the entire amount of mixed marriage between foreigners and Cypriots in Cyprus.

3.7. Conceptualization and Measurement for Interview Schedule

The present analysis of mixed marriages in Cyprus refers to marriage partner choice or mate selection process. In order to construct the interview schedule administered to spouses of mixed marriages, the concept of ‘mate selection’ as this applies to mixed marriage was operationalised.

**Concept.** Mate selection in mixed marriage (with the meaning of ‘cross-cultural’ or ‘inter-countries’ mixed marriage)

**Dimensions.** Determinant elements influencing mate selection in mixed marriage are considered focusing on the role of:
- I. Preferences for marriage candidates and foreign influence exposure (individual motivations);
- II. Constraints of third party agents (community and relatives influences);
- III. Mechanisms of local marriage market (contact opportunities/propinquity).

**Variables.**

I. Preference/ taste for resources in a partner:

1. Material resources (material assets) – a. socio-economic resources:
   - Goods and money (properties, earnings, income, job stability etc.);
   - Status and prestige.
2. Nonmaterial resources (relational assets):
   a. Cultural resources: educational level, values, lifestyles;
   b. Psychological resources: love, esteem, approval and affection;
   c. Physical attractiveness/appearance.
3. Foreign influence exposure:
   a. Foreign relatives (upbringing in a mixed family, contacts with foreign relatives);
   b. Life abroad (work and studies abroad);
   c. Previous relationships with foreign partners (possible cohabitation);
   d. Attitudes and sentiments about the foreigners in one’s home country.

II. Third parties’ influence on mixed marriage partner choice:

1. The Family:
   a. Meetings with potential marriage candidates;
b. Advice and opinions about marriage candidates;
   c. Possible support or strong sanctions about candidates’ marital decision.

2. The Church:
   a. Orthodox Church’s acceptance or disapproval of religious mixed marriage;
   b. Permission accordance for religious wedding celebration.

3. The State:
   a. The treatment of foreigner/ alien spouse:
      - By the Immigration Law;
      - By the State authorities.
   b. Contact with immigration authorities for alien residence and work permits;
   c. Native status accordance;
   d. Cypriot Citizenship acquisition/ acquisition.

III. Contact opportunities on Cypriot marriage market:
   a. Spouses participation on marriage market:
      - Marital intention: mate-search behaviour;
      - Local mate availability;
      - Standards/tastes for acceptable candidate partners.
   b. Interaction with possible/ potential marriage partners:
      - Dating and courtship.
   c. Type of setting couples had in common before they got married:
      - The meeting settings.

Some further dimensions concerning children of mixed couples, social life and work in Cyprus as a foreign national are added to the theoretical framework of mate selection in mixed marriage, in order to spot some degrees of success in spouse selection process.

IV. Life in Cyprus as a foreigner
   a. Children from mixed marriages:
      - Feelings about coming from a mixed marriage;
      - Languages spoken;
      - Treatment at school.
   b. Work in Cyprus:
      - Treatment at work;
      - Languages spoken.
   c. Participation in social life:
      - Friends/social networks in Cyprus;
      - Participation in common activities together with natives.

The above scheme constitutes the conceptualisation framework on which the Interview Schedule is based. All the variables mentioned are converted into questions that make up
the schedule for the semi-structured interview. These pre-determined questions were supplemented by follow-up questions tailored for each particular case (and then not specified in the interview schedule). The interviews were conducted using the most familiar common spoken language both for each interviewee and for the interviewer\(^{42}\) (the English and Greek versions of Interview Schedule are available in Appendix E).

3.8. Qualitative Content Analysis

In order to analyze the interview data, the qualitative content analysis was employed. This is one of the classical procedures for analyzing textual materials. One of its essential features is the use of categories, which are often derived from theoretical models: categories are brought to the empirical material and not necessarily developed from it, although they are repeatedly assessed against it and modified if necessary. The concrete interview situation brought out new categories (besides those who were mentioned in the Interview schedule) that refer to additional topics, such as: the theme of divorce in mixed marriage and cohabitation of foreigners with Cypriots; another topic very often referred by the interviewees was ‘Cypriot mentality’ and its implications on all the stages of mixed marriage mate selection process and also, on mixed couples’ life. The findings yielded by the qualitative content analysis are presented in Chapter five.

D. DATA ANALYSIS for QUESTIONNAIRE and INTERVIEW SURVEYS

3.9. Questionnaire Data. The responses recorded for the sample respondents (N=400), were analyzed using SPSS (Statistical Product and Service Solutions, formerly Statistical Package for Social Sciences), version 11.0, 2001.

First, frequency tables were calculated for each question to obtain an overview of data. In order to represent graphically the results, pie charts and bar charts were obtained by running the corresponding procedures.

Then, searching for bivariate relationships, variables were combined in cross-classifications (i.e. contingency tables). The results from contingency tables were presented in contingency summary tables for each question. Also, the introduction of control variables provided even more information about the adequacy of the hypotheses. Since the variables employed could not be assumed to be more than nominal and ordinal scale, the form of analysis used was non-parametric tests. Chi-square was used as the statistical test of significance, with the null hypothesis rejected at the 0.5 level of

\(^{42}\) The languages of the interviews are Greek, Romanian and English. In total, five interviews were conducted in Romanian, six interviews in Greek and nine interviews in English.
probability. To find out if there is any association among variables, chi-square tests of association\textsuperscript{43} were calculated. As already mentioned, in order to test hypotheses about the population values, chi-squared tests that measured for independence\textsuperscript{44} were used.

The findings obtained by employing all the foregoing mentioned descriptive and inferential statistical procedures are presented in Chapter four and in Appendix F, Table sets 4.1-4.27.

3.10. Interviewing Data. The data collected from the twenty interviews conducted with spouses from mixed marriages were analysed using the method of quantitative content analysis\textsuperscript{45}. It consisted in the following steps:

- The material was defined and those parts of the interviews which were relevant for answering the research question have been selected;
- The situation of data collection was analysed (How was the material generated? Who was involved? Who was present in the interview situation?);
- The analytical technique that in this case was the technique of summarizing content analysis was defined;
- The “analytic units” were defined: the “coding unit” defines “the smallest element of material which may be analyzed, the minimal part of the text which may fall under a category”; and the “contextual unit” that defines the largest element in the text that may fall under a category.

By applying the technique of summarizing content analysis to the text, the material was paraphrased, less relevant passages and paraphrases with the same meanings were skipped (first reduction) and similar paraphrases were bundled and summarized (second reduction). This is a combination of reducing the material by skipping statements included in a generalization, in the sense of summarizing it on a higher level of abstraction.

Every interview from the total of twenty cases was split up into ‘analytic categories’, ‘contextual units’ and ‘coding units’. The analytic categories were constituted from the three dimensions of the theoretical framework used in analyzing mate selection in mixed marriage. Also, extra analytic categories were attached, concerning other related topics.

The interview findings presentation is based on the above-mentioned theoretical framework for mate selection in mixed marriage between foreigners and Cypriots in Cyprus (as presented in section 3.7.).

The chapters that follow present the quantitative and qualitative findings as these resulted from the employment of a combined methodological approach or multi-strategy research.

\textsuperscript{43} Chi-square values were tabulated if no more than 20% of the tables’ cells had expected counts less than the values of the minimum expected counts.

\textsuperscript{44} To test variables independence in the population of interest, only chi-square values with significance levels $p<.05$ were used.

\textsuperscript{45} The procedure followed in this study was developed by Mayring (1983) in Flick, U, An Introduction to Quantitative Research, Sage Publications, London, 1998, p.192-196.
E. MAKING the STUDY CREDIBLE: EVALUATION of MEASURES

3.11. Questionnaire survey:

Ways to improve the questionnaire Reliability and Validity

Research design suggests standards for good and convincing research. In quantitative research, the standards most frequently used are those of validity and reliability. If research is valid, it closely reflects the world being described. If work is reliable, two researchers studying the same topic will come up with compatible observations.

Some strategies have been developed for refining survey questions. As the survey presented here focuses on a previously unmeasured concept (i.e. mixed-marriage mate selection in Cyprus) new measures had to be devised. In the relevant literature, Fowler (1995) has suggested three strategies a researcher can use to improve likelihood that the new measures will be reliable and valid: (a) Engage potential respondents in group discussions about the questions to be included in a survey; (b) Conduct cognitive interviews; (c) Audiotape test interviews during the pre-test phase of a survey.

In the study reported in this thesis, the second strategy was employed. The researcher asked people test questions, and then probed with follow-up questions about how they understood the question and what their answer meant (see also section 3.5.1 about the Pilot Study including two stages: the informal examination of the questionnaire by experts and the pre-test stage).


Most indicators of validity and reliability do not fit qualitative research. Trying to apply these indicators to qualitative work distracts more than it clarifies. Instead, researchers judge the credibility of qualitative work by its transparency, consistency-coherence, and communicability (Rubin & Rubin, 1995: 85). The author designed the interviewing to achieve these standards.

(a) ‘Transparency’ means that a reader of a qualitative research report is able to see the basic processes of data collection. In this sense, the author prepared a written version of each interview – the transcripts (made directly from the tapes, each interview being taped) are edited versions of the tape recordings, including pauses and other nonverbal indications of what occurred (see also section 3.9. about interview data analysis). Therefore, ‘flights of imaginative fancy’ (ibid, p.87) are controlled as the original interviews are publicly available and quotes from the interviews were used to support each major conclusion.
(b) ‘Consistency’ means that the researcher checked out ideas and responses that appeared to be inconsistent. ‘In qualitative research the goal is not to eliminate inconsistencies, but to make sure one understands why they occur’ (ibid, p.87). In this sense, the author examined themes in one interview for coherence with the themes presented in others. Regarding the consistency of individuals, the researcher took into account the sensitive content of the topic under investigation (i.e. motives in mixed marriage mate selection) and was aware that interviewees told, in a few cases, some idealized version of the truth. This was the point when the researcher checked out inconsistencies and looked for increasing credibility of the research by adding depth to the understanding of the culture (e.g. some interviewees, mostly women, talked more freely about other foreign nationals’ reasons for marrying Cypriots).

Moreover, ‘credibility is increased when the researcher can show that core concepts and theme consistently occur in a variety of cases and in different settings’ (ibid, p.90). In this respect, the author asked different categories of mixed married spouses: women and men, divorced (from Cypriots spouses) foreign spouses who entered into second relationships with Cypriots, foreign nationals married to Cypriots and mixed married offspring (of mixed marriages between foreigners and Cypriots). This variety in the respondents’ demographic characteristics assured that concepts and themes of the interview schedule consistently occurred in different cases.

(c) ‘Communicability’ means that ‘the portrait of the research arena that one presents should feel real to the participants and to readers of the research report’ (ibid, p.91). Concerning this aspect, the author tried to present the richness of detail, abundance of evidence and vividness of the interviews to help convince those who have never been in the field that this material is real.

Another way of enhancing how well the researcher communicated was to make sure that those being interviewed talked about their firsthand experiences. In this respect, all the participants were mixed-married spouses from marriages between foreign nationals and Cypriots. It is worth mentioning that some of the respondents acted as informants on the experiences of others (narratives that were taken into account due to the high sensitive content of the topic). At this point, the open-ended responses of the quantitative survey added credibility by presenting similar opinions (about motives in mixed marriage mate selection in Cyprus) of people not involved in mixed marriage.

These are the methods and standards through which the qualitative interviewing study presented here aims at gaining credibility.
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A. FINDINGS of MIXED MARRIAGE in CYPRUS QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY

4.1. Questionnaire Survey Respondents' Demographic Characteristics
(Questions set 23-29)

The findings for questions set Q23-Q28 are presented in Summary Table 4.1, Appendix F. The survey sample is stratified on sex, age and residence and as a result, the calculated sample values for these characteristics reflect the sex, age and residence structures in the population of interest.

The most frequent demographic characteristics for sample respondents are:
Sex: Most respondents were men (50, 2%). This is true for each district excepting Nicosia (with more female respondents);
Age: The highest percentage of respondents were young, aged 15-34 (37%). This is true for all districts excepting Ammochostos and Limassol (the percentages for young and middle aged respondents are equal);
Education: A large proportion of the respondents were educated, having college, university, masters and doctoral degrees (44%). This is true for Nicosia and Limassol. For the rest of districts, most respondents had high school degrees.
Occupation: The highest percentage of respondents were private sector employees (25,2%). This is true for Larnaca and Limassol districts, whereas for the rest of districts, most respondents were civil servants.
Marital status: As expected, most respondents were married, engaged or cohabitating (70,2%).
Residence: As would have been expected, the majority of respondents (68%) lived in urban areas of Cyprus.
Approximate annual income: More than half of the respondents had an annual income between 6000 and 20000 Cyprus pounds (53, 8%).
Also, relative to education, the survey sample values show a difference in education between men and women, with women being more educated, as presented in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total sample respondents</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary education</td>
<td>13,9%</td>
<td>20,1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary education</td>
<td>44,3%</td>
<td>33,7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(High school)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary education</td>
<td>41,8%</td>
<td>46,2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(college, university, master, doctorate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4.2. Cypriots’ Opinions and Estimations of the Numbers of Foreigners and Foreign Workers in Cyprus (Questions 1-4)*

*Questions 1-4: Detailed findings for questions set Q1-Q4 are displayed in Tables 4.2.-4.5, Appendix F for Chapter IV. The main findings are summarized in the following table:

**Summary table for questions Q1-Q4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Most frequent response (% respondents)</th>
<th>Control for a third variable (findings)</th>
<th>Valid chi-square tests (for the following variables) P &lt; .05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1) Estimate the number of foreigners in Cyprus. (see also Table 4.2, Appendix F)</td>
<td>“Large and extremely large” (86%).</td>
<td>The most frequent response is given by the respondents who have at least one of the following demographic characteristics</td>
<td>‘Respondents’ residence’ $(\chi^2=8.52; df=2)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2) Beliefs about the estimated number of foreigners in Cyprus (compared to the size of Greek-Cypriot society). (see Table 4.3, Appendix F)</td>
<td>“The large and extremely large number of foreigners is bad and very bad for Cypriot society” (58%).</td>
<td>Female, aged 35-55 years old, rural, of primary education, self-employed, with high annual income.</td>
<td>‘Respondents’ sex’ $(\chi^2=8.68; df=2)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3) Estimate the number of foreign workers in Cyprus. (see also Table 4.4, Appendix F)</td>
<td>“Large and extremely large” (91%).</td>
<td>Male or female, young age, residence in rural, high school education, single, low income (&lt;6000 Cyprus pounds/yr.), constructors, workers or farmers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4) Beliefs about the estimated number of foreign workers in Cyprus (given the size and needs of the Greek-Cypriot economy). (see also Table 4.5, Appendix F).</td>
<td>“The large and extremely large number of foreign workers is bad and very bad given the size and needs of Cypriot economy” (44%).</td>
<td>Female or male, young age, high school degree, urban or rural areas, low income (&lt; 6000 Cypriot pounds/yr.), widowed/divorced or separated, constructor, farmer or worker.</td>
<td>‘Respondents’ Yearly Income’ $(\chi^2=20.28; df=8)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In order to ease the text reading, the main quantitative findings are tabulated in separate tables for each question or questions set.*
Findings: The Cypriots living in rural areas of Cyprus are more likely to estimate the number of foreigners in Cyprus as ‘large’ and ‘extremely large’.

The Cypriot women are more likely to believe that the ‘large’ and ‘extremely large’ number of foreigners is ‘bad’ and ‘very bad’ given the small size of Cypriot society.

The Cypriots with low yearly approximate income are more probably to believe that the ‘large’ and ‘extremely large’ number of foreign workers is ‘bad and very bad’ given the size and needs of Cypriot economy.

4.3. Foreigners-Cypriots Social Distance Scale (Question 5)

*Question 5a-5g*: Detailed findings for the questions set Q5 are displayed in Tables set 4.6.a - 4.6.g, Appendix F for Chapter IV. The main findings are summarized in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Most frequent response (% respondents)</th>
<th>The most frequent response is given by the respondents who have at least one of the following demographic characteristics</th>
<th>Control for a third variable (findings)</th>
<th>Valid chi-square tests (for the following variables)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q5.a) Respondent would be willing to marry a foreigner.</td>
<td>“Disagree and strongly disagree” (46%).</td>
<td>Female, old ages, primary education, rural areas, low income, widowed, separated or divorced; worker, constructor or farmer.</td>
<td>Of the respondents who never lived abroad and have relatives married to foreigners, the women are most likely to give the most frequent response. Both men and women who don’t have relatives married to foreigners are more likely to give the most frequent response.*</td>
<td>‘Respondents’ sex’, ‘Respondents’ education’, ‘Respondents’ income’, ‘Respondents’ age’, ‘Respondents’ residence and ‘Respondents’ occupation’ are significantly associated with the dependent variable (see also Table 4.24, Appendix F).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5.b) Respondent would be willing to accept a foreigner to his/her family as relative.</td>
<td>“Strongly agree and agree” (58%).</td>
<td>Male, aged 15-34 years old, urban areas, educated, single, high income, and private sector employee.</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Respondents’ sex’ (χ²=6.81, df=2), ‘Respondents’ Residence’ (χ²=8.47; df=2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5.c) Respondent would accept a foreigner as neighbour.</td>
<td>“Strongly agree and agree” (79%).</td>
<td>Male or female, older than 55 years, Cyprus urban, of primary education, married/engaged or cohabitating, intellectual or artist.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Most frequent response (% respondents)</td>
<td>The most frequent response is given by the respondents who have at least one of the following demographic characteristics</td>
<td>Valid chi-square tests (for the following variables)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5.d) Respondent would accept a foreigner as work colleague.</td>
<td>&quot;Strongly agree and agree&quot; (76%)</td>
<td>Male, old age, urban areas, less educated, married/engaged or cohabitating, private sector employees.</td>
<td>‘Respondents’ sex’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>($\chi^2=9.12; \text{df}=2)$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5.e) Respondent would accept a foreigner as citizen in Cyprus.</td>
<td>“Agree and strongly agree” (56%).</td>
<td>Male, older than 55 years, urban areas, less educated, high annual income, less educated, private sector employees.</td>
<td>‘Respondents’ sex’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>($\chi^2=7.92, \text{df}=2)$ and ‘Respondents’ occupation’ ($\chi^2=24.30; \text{df}=14$).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5.f) Respondent would accept a foreigner as visitor in Cyprus.</td>
<td>&quot;Strongly agree and agree&quot; (88%)</td>
<td>Female, old age, urban areas, of primary education, with low annual incomes, separated/divorced/widowed, pensioner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5.g) Respondent would exclude some foreigners from Cyprus.</td>
<td>&quot;Disagree and strongly disagree&quot; (83%)</td>
<td>Female or male, aged 15-34 years old, educated or less educated, urban areas, with high or medium annual incomes, self-employed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*When controlling for a third variable, the chi-square test is valid for the variables: ‘Respondent’s attitude towards own marriage’ and ‘Respondent’s sex’ by ‘Respondents who have never lived abroad’: $\chi^2=16.668$, df=2; and for ‘Respondent's attitude towards own marriage’ and ‘Respondent’s sex’ by ‘Respondents who have relatives married to foreigners’: $\chi^2=14.078$, df=2.

Findings: The Cypriots who are more likely ‘to disagree and strongly disagree’ with their hypothetical marriage to a foreigner belong to at least one of the following demographic categories: woman, older than 65 years, with primary level education, living in rural areas, with low annual incomes (<6000 Cyprus pounds) and worker, constructor or farmer.

The Cypriot men and Cypriots living in urban areas of Cyprus are more likely to be willing to accept a foreigner to their family as relative.

The Cypriot men are more likely to accept a foreigner as their work colleague.

The Cypriot men and the Cypriots working as private sector employees are more likely to accept foreigners as citizens in Cyprus.

The Cypriot women who never lived abroad and have relatives married to foreigners and also, the Cypriot men and women who don’t have relatives married to foreigners are less likely to be willing to marry a foreigner.
**4.4. Cypriots’ Foreign Influence Exposure** (Questions 6-11)

**Questions 6-11:** Detailed findings for the questions set Q6-Q11 are displayed in Tables 4.7 - 4.12, in Appendix F for Chapter IV. The main findings for this questions set are summarized in the tables below:

Summary table for findings from questions Q6-Q9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Most frequent response (% respondents)</th>
<th>The most frequent response is given by the respondents who have at least one of the following demographic characteristics</th>
<th>Control for a third variable (findings)</th>
<th>Valid chi-square tests (for the following variables)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q6) Respondents who lived in at least one foreign country (see Table 4.7, Appendix F)</td>
<td>“Yes” (44%)-a</td>
<td>a) Male, aged 35-54 years old, of tertiary education, urban areas, high incomes, intellectual/artist. b) Female, aged 15-34 years old, less educated, rural areas.</td>
<td>Male respondents who lived abroad are likely to be more educated than their female counterparts.*</td>
<td>‘Respondents’ age’, ‘Respondents’ education’, ‘Respondents’ annual income’ and ‘Respondents’ occupation’ (see for details Table 4.7, Appendix F).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7) a) Number of foreign countries where the respondents have lived. (see Table 4.8.a, Appendix F)</td>
<td>“One country” (66%).</td>
<td>Female, aged 35-54 years old, urban Cyprus, less educated, low incomes, private sector employees or housewives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7)b) Number of years the respondents lived abroad. (see Table 4.8.b, Appendix F)</td>
<td>“For more than one year” (66%)- of these “between 3-5 years” (30%).</td>
<td>Female, older than 35 years, educated, married, urban areas, intellectual/artist, high income.</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Respondents’ Age’ ($\chi^2=13.41; \ df=6$).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8) Purpose of living abroad. (see also Table 4.9. Appendix F)</td>
<td>“As students” (46%).</td>
<td>Female, aged 35-54 years, educated, rural areas, intellectual/artist, single, high incomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9) Respondents have relatives who married foreigners (see also Table 4.10, App. F)</td>
<td>“Yes” (55%)</td>
<td>Male, young, educated, urban Cyprus, intellectual/artist, with medium to high incomes and single.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chi-square tests of independence are valid for the variables ‘Respondents who lived in a foreign country’ and ‘Highest education achieved’ when controlling for the influence of ‘Respondents’ sex’ variable. When estimations are made for to the population of interest, Cypriot men who lived abroad tend to be more educated than their female counterparts (see Table 4.7, Appendix F).

Findings: The Cypriot men aged 35-54 years, the Cypriots with tertiary level education, those with high yearly incomes and the Cypriots who are intellectual and artists are more probably to have lived in at least one foreign country. The Cypriots older than 35 years are more likely to have lived abroad for more than one year.

**Question 10.** Summary table for findings from Q10: Respondents specify their relative(s) married to foreigner(s). See also Table 4.11, Appendix F for Chapter IV.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Most frequent response (% respondents)</th>
<th>The most frequent response is given by the respondents who have at least one of the following demographic characteristics</th>
<th>Valid chi-square tests (for the following variables)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) Respondent’s parent married to a foreigner</td>
<td>2% (of those with relatives married to foreigners)</td>
<td>Male or female, young, with high school, rural or urban Cyprus,</td>
<td>P&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) Respondent’s son/daughter married to a foreigner</td>
<td>6% (idem)</td>
<td>Female, older than 55 years, less educated, urban areas, pensioners, widowed/divorced or separated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) Respondent’s sister/brother married to a foreigner</td>
<td>23% (idem)</td>
<td>Female, aged 35-54 years, urban areas, educated, with high incomes, self-employed.</td>
<td>‘Respondents’ age’ (χ²=9,20; df=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) Respondent’s grandparent married to a foreigner</td>
<td>1% (idem)</td>
<td>Male, aged 15-34 years, urban areas, educated, intellectual/artist and single.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E) Respondent’s aunt/uncle married to a foreigner</td>
<td>23% (idem)</td>
<td>Female, aged 15-34, rural areas, high school education, with low income, single, private sector employee.</td>
<td>‘Respondents’ age’ (χ²=28,2; df=2) and ‘Respondents’ education’ (χ²=8,31; df=2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F) Respondent’s cousin married to a foreigner</td>
<td>45% (idem)</td>
<td>Female, aged 15-34 years old, rural areas, educated, single, with medium income, private sector employee or constructor/farmer/worker.</td>
<td>‘Respondents’ age’ (χ²=8,57; df=2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G) Respondent’s other relatives married to foreigners</td>
<td>19% (idem)</td>
<td>Male, older than 55 years, less educated, rural areas, housewives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data show that more than half of all sample respondents have relatives who married foreigners. Of this percentage, the most frequent relative married to a foreigner is ‘the cousin’ (one out of four respondents has a cousin married to a foreigner), then ‘an aunt or
uncle’ and ‘a sister/brother’ (same percentages of 23%). The less frequent relatives married to foreigners are parents and grandparents.

Findings: It is more probably for the Cypriots aged 35-54 years to have a sister/brother married to a foreigner; the Cypriots aged 15-34 and those with high school tend to have an uncle/aunt married to a foreigner; and the Cypriots aged 15-34 are more likely to have a cousin married to a foreigner.

**Question 11:** Summary table for findings from Q11 - see also Table 4.12, Appendix F for Chapter IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Most frequent response (%respondents)</th>
<th>The most frequent response is given by the respondents who have at least one of the following demographic characteristics</th>
<th>Valid chi-square tests (for the following variables) P&lt;0.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q11) Respondents’ opinion about their relatives’ marriages to foreigners.</td>
<td>“Very successful and successful” (58%)</td>
<td>Male, aged 15-34 years old, rural areas, tertiary degree, married, private sector employee, with low income.</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.5. Cypriots’ Opinions and Attitudes towards Mixed Marriage at Societal and Personal Levels (Questions 12-16)**

Detailed findings for the questions set Q12-Q16 are displayed in Tables 4.13 - 4.17, in Appendix F for Chapter IV. The main findings are summarized in the following tables:

**Questions 12 and 13:** Summary table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Most frequent response (%respondents)</th>
<th>The most frequent response is given by the respondents who have at least one of the following demographical characteristics</th>
<th>Valid chi-square tests (for the following variables) P&lt;0.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q12) Estimate the number of mixed marriages in Cyprus. (see Table 4.13, App. F)</td>
<td>“Extremely large and large” (52%).</td>
<td>Female, older than 55 years, rural areas, less educated.</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13) Opinion about the estimated number of mixed marriages in Cyprus. (see table 4.14, App. F)</td>
<td>“Neither good, nor bad (given the size of Greek-Cypriot community)” – (44%)</td>
<td>Male or female, aged 35-54 years old, urban or rural areas, educated, intellectual/artist, married.</td>
<td>Variable significantly associated: ‘Respondents’ sex’ ($\chi^2=14.71; df=2$).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings: The Cypriots (men and women) tend to believe that the ‘extremely large and large’ number of mixed marriages in Cyprus is neither good, nor bad (given the size of Greek-Cypriot community).
Question 14.a-14.g: Respondent would be willing/not to accept their relatives and friends marrying foreigners. See also Table 4.15, Appendix F.

Summary table for question 14:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Most frequent response (% respondents)</th>
<th>The most frequent response is given by the respondents who have at least one of the following demographic characteristics</th>
<th>Valid chi-square tests (for the following variables) P&lt;0.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Accept parents to mixed marriage.</td>
<td>“No” (91%)</td>
<td>Female, old ages, less educated, rural areas, low income, workers/constructors/farmers or pensioners.</td>
<td>‘Respondents’ age’ ($\chi^2=8,008;\text{df}=2$) and ‘Respondents’ education’ ($\chi^2=8,43;\text{df}=2$).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Accept children to mixed marriage.</td>
<td>“No” (69%)</td>
<td>Female, old ages, less educated, rural areas, low income and housewives.</td>
<td>‘Respondents’ income’ ($\chi^2=10,64;\text{df}=4$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Accept siblings to mixed marriage</td>
<td>“No” (64%)</td>
<td>Female, old, less educated, residence in rural areas, with medium incomes and self-employed.</td>
<td>............................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Accept aunt/uncle to mixed marriage</td>
<td>“No” (63%)</td>
<td>Male or female, older than 55 years, less educated, rural areas, widowed/divorced or separated, housewives.</td>
<td>‘Respondents’ residence’ ($\chi^2=8,35;\text{df}=1$) and ‘Respondents’ age’ ($\chi^2=13,97;\text{df}=2$).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Accept cousin to mixed marriage</td>
<td>“Yes” (55%)</td>
<td>Male, young age, educated, inhabitants of urban areas, singles and private sector employee.</td>
<td>‘Respondents’ age’ ($\chi^2=6,89;\text{df}=2$) and ‘Respondents’ residence’ ($\chi^2=5,55;\text{df}=1$).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Accept friends to mixed marriage.</td>
<td>“Yes” (55%)</td>
<td>Male, young ages, educated, urban areas, low income and private sector employee.</td>
<td>‘Respondents’ sex’ ($\chi^2=4,64;\text{df}=1$) and ‘Respondents’ education’ ($\chi^2=6,18;\text{df}=2$).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Do not accept relatives or friends to mixed marriage.</td>
<td>“Not agree” (81%)</td>
<td>Male, aged 35-54 years old, educated, urban areas.</td>
<td>‘Respondents’ sex’, ‘Respondents’ age’ and ‘Respondents’ education’, (see for details Table 4.24, Appendix F)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings: Cypriot respondents are not willing to accept close relatives marrying foreigners. More than half of the people questioned don’t accept their parents, children, siblings and aunts/uncles to marry foreigners. The respondents are most likely to accept their friends or cousins to marry foreigners.

The Cypriots aged 65 years and older and the Cypriots with less education tend not to accept parents entering mixed marriages.

The Cypriots with low annual approximate incomes (less than 6000 Cypriot pounds) are not likely to accept their children to mixed marriage.

The Cypriots older than 55 years and those living in rural areas of Cyprus tend not to accept their aunt/uncle to mixed marriage.
The young Cypriots and Cypriot inhabitants of urban areas are most likely to accept
their cousin to mixed marriage.

The Cypriot men and educated Cypriots tend to accept their friends to marry foreigners.

The Cypriot men, Cypriots aged 35-54 years old and educated Cypriots are more likely
to accept their friends and relatives to mixed marriages.

**Question Q15: Summary table - see also Table 4.16, Appendix F**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Most frequent response (%respondents)</th>
<th>Control for a third variable (findings)</th>
<th>Valid chi-square tests (for the following variables)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q15) Agree or not with the idea of marriage between a Cypriot and a foreigner</td>
<td>“Agree” (42%)</td>
<td>Male respondents who lived abroad or not are more likely to agree with the idea of mixed marriage and female to disagree.* Of the respondents who have or not relatives married to foreigners, the men are more likely to agree.*</td>
<td>‘Respondents’ sex’, ‘Respondents’ residence’ and ‘Respondents’ age’ (see for details Table 4.24, Appendix F).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The chi-square test of independence is valid ($\chi^2=13.28; df=2$) for the variables ‘Respondents would agree/not agree with the idea of mixed marriage’ and ‘Respondents’ sex’ by ‘Respondents who never lived abroad’.

Also, the chi-square test is valid ($\chi^2=12.67; df=2$) for the variables ‘Respondents would agree/not agree with the idea of mixed marriage’ and ‘Respondents’ sex’ by ‘Respondents who have relatives married to foreigners’.

Findings: The Cypriot men, those Cypriots aged 15-34 years old and Cypriot inhabitants of urban areas are more likely to agree with the idea of mixed marriage between a foreigner and a Cypriot. The same opinion is more probably to be shared by the Cypriot men who have never lived abroad and by Cypriot men who have relatives married to foreigners.

**Question Q16: Why would the respondents agree/or disagree with mixed marriage?**

The detailed findings for Q16 are presented in Table 4.17 Appendix F for Chapter IV.

Of the 259 respondents who answered this question, 44% gave reasons to agree, 39% invoked reasons against and 17% gave reasons for their ‘don’t know’ answer. There are 26 categories of reasons ‘to agree’ with mixed marriage, recoded into 11 categories given by 114 respondents (50% men, 17% women).
Cypriot respondents agree with mixed marriage because (the most invoked reasons):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons in favour of mixed marriage</th>
<th>The reasons are given by the respondents who have at least one of the following demographic characteristics:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) ‘Free choice of marriage partner’ (25%).</td>
<td>Male, aged 35-54 years old, high school education, residence in urban areas, worker/farmer/constructor, widowed/divorced or separated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) ‘Love and mutual understanding as motivation for mixed marriage’ (18%)</td>
<td>Female, older than 55 years, less educated, from rural, pensioner, widowed/divorced or separated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) ‘All humans are equal, doesn’t matter their ethnicity or religion’ (15%)</td>
<td>Female, young age, educated, from rural areas, private sector employee and single.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) ‘If partners agree that they match, then nothing else matters’ (11%)</td>
<td>Male, aged 35-54 years old, educated, from rural, public servant, single.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are 28 categories of reasons and 12 reasons recoded (from a total of 102 responses) for ‘do not agree’ with mixed marriage. A percentage of 24% from the male respondents and 44% of the female respondents gave reasons against. Respondents do not agree with mixed marriage because (the most invoked reasons):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons against mixed marriage</th>
<th>The reasons are given by the respondents who have at least one of the following demographic characteristics:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) ‘The foreigners have different cultures, mentalities and languages’ (29%).</td>
<td>Female or male, aged 35-54 years old, educated, intellectual/artist, rural areas of Cyprus, widowed/divorced or separated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) ‘Different mentalities and opinions lead to conflicts’ (16%).</td>
<td>Female, aged 35-54 years old, less educated, urban or rural, single and intellectual/artist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) ‘There are more unsuccessful then successful mixed marriages’ (14%).</td>
<td>Male, older than 55 years, high school education, married, pensioner, living in urban areas of Cyprus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) ‘Mixed marriages have negative results: destroy Cypriot ethnicity, culture and history’ (12%).</td>
<td>Male, aged 15-34 years old, high school education, living in urban areas, private sector employee, single.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents’ answers (33 respondents) were grouped into 20 categories of reasons recoded in 11 reasons for “don’t know”: to agree or not with mixed marriage. The most invoked reasons are the following:

1) ‘Mixed marriage depends on a lot of factors and it needs deep thoughts in order to decide’ (30%);
2) ‘It depends on the spouses and their reasons to enter mixed marriage’ (19%);
3) ‘Mixed marriage has advantages and disadvantages; but the tendency is recent’ (16%).

Overall, there are more reasons favourable to mixed marriage. The most invoked reason is the “free choice of marriage partner”; the other reasons emphasize love, mutual
understanding and spouse matching. People between 35-54 years old, male respondents, people living in rural areas of Cyprus and educated people are more likely to give reasons supporting mixed marriage.

Those respondents who do not agree with mixed marriage motivated that the foreigners have different mentalities, cultures, religions and languages. Moreover, these differences lead to conflicts that make mixed marriages unsuccessful marriages and the divorce an inevitable end of a mixed marriage. There are more women, older age people, from rural areas and less educated respondents who invoked reasons not in favour of mixed marriage.

4.6. Cypriots’ Contacts with Foreign Nationalities Living in Cyprus (Q17-Q19)

**Question 17:** Summary table - see more details in Table 4.18, Appendix F, Chapter IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Most frequent response (% respondents)</th>
<th>The most frequent response is given by the respondents who have at least one of the following demographic characteristics</th>
<th>Valid chi-square tests (for the following variables)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q17) Opinions about the importance of foreigner’s nationality in mixed marriage.</td>
<td>“Very important and important” (69%)</td>
<td>Female, living in rural areas of Cyprus, people older than 55 years, less educated, pensioner, with high incomes, widowed/divorced or separated.</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Q18:** How much do the respondents like different nationalities living in Cyprus?

The detailed findings are displayed in Table 4.19, Appendix F for Chapter IV.

The most wanted nationality living in Cyprus is the Greek one (87% of the respondents ‘like it very much and like’). The next two nationalities have similar percentages for respondents’ preferences: 36% ‘like very much’ and ‘like’ British nationals and 33% gave the same answer for Russian nationals. The least preferred are the Israeli and Iranian nationalities registering the highest percentages for ‘Don’t like and don’t like at all’ answers, 48% and 46%, respectively.

When considering the choices made by both male and female respondents, the male respondents ‘like very much’ and ‘like’ Greek nationals (86%), Russian (46%), British (36%) Romanian (30%) and German nationals (30%); female respondents prefer Greek (88%), Romanian (40%), British (35%), German (20%) and American nationals (22%). The least preferred by men are the Israeli and Iranian nationals (48% and 40%), and by women: the Iranian and Israeli nationals (41% and 49%).

Overall, European countries nationals are more likely to be preferred to Asian countries nationals.
Summary table for question Q18: according to the respondents’ preferences, eleven foreign nationalities living in Cyprus are clustered into four groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>The most frequent response is given by the respondents who have at least one of the following demographic characteristics</th>
<th>Valid chi-square tests (for the following variables) P&lt;0.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) The most preferred ('like very much' and 'like' nationalities living in Cyprus: Greek (87%), British (36%) and Russian (33%).</td>
<td>More women prefer Greek and more men prefer British and Russian nationals. Older than 55 years, less educated, with medium incomes and inhabitants of urban areas of Cyprus.</td>
<td>Variables significantly associated: ‘Preference for British nationals' and ‘Respondents' age’ (χ²=24.03;df=4); ‘Preference for Russian nationals’ and ‘Respondents’ sex’ (χ²=35.7;df=2). (see also Table 4.24, Appendix F).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) “Neutral” to “Like and like very much” attitude towards the following nationalities living in Cyprus: German (33% and 25%) and Romanian (35% and 23%).</td>
<td>More women prefer German and more men prefer Romanian nationals, aged 15-34 years old, educated, with low incomes and inhabitants of urban areas of Cyprus.</td>
<td>Variables significantly associated: ‘Preferences for Romanian nationals’ and ‘Respondent’ sex’ and ‘Respondents’ age’, respectively. ‘Preference for German nationals’ and ‘Respondents’ sex’ (see also Table 4.24, App. F).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) “Neutral” to “Don’t like and don’t like at all” attitude towards the following nationalities living in Cyprus: Bulgarian (34% and 24%) and American (32% and 27%).</td>
<td>More women, 15-34 years of age prefer Bulgarians and respectively, 35-54 years of age for Americans, and living in urban areas of Cyprus.</td>
<td>Variables significantly associated: ‘Preference for Bulgarian nationals’ and ‘Respondents’ sex’ (see also Table 4.24, App. F).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) The least preferred nationalities ('don’t like' and ‘don’t like at all’) living in Cyprus are the following: Israeli (48%), Iranian (46%), Filipino (36%) and Lebanese (33%).</td>
<td>Women, aged 15-34 years old (with the exception of the Iranian nationality that is least preferred by those older than 55 years old), less educated, with low incomes and living in urban areas of Cyprus.</td>
<td>Variables significantly associated: ‘Respondents’ preference for Iranian nationals’ and ‘Respondents’ sex’ and ‘Respondents education’, respectively. ‘Respondents’ preference for Filipino nationals’ and ‘Respondents’ sex’ (see also Table 4.24, App. F).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings: When estimating to the population of interest, the Cypriots older than 55 years tend to ‘like’ and ‘like very much’ British nationals living in Cyprus. The same attitude is more likely to be displayed by Cypriot men about Russian nationals.

The Cypriot men and the Cypriots aged 15-34 years old are more likely to prefer Romanian nationals living in Cyprus and more Cypriot women to prefer German nationals.

The Cypriot women are not so likely to prefer Bulgarians living in Cyprus.
The Cypriot women and less educated Cypriots are not so likely to prefer Iranians living in Cyprus. Also, the Cypriot women are more likely to share the same attitude about Filipino nationals.

Question Q19: How well do the respondents know foreign nationals living in Cyprus?

Detailed findings for Q19 are displayed in Table 4.20, App. F (Chapter IV).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most known foreign nationalities living in Cyprus (by Cypriot respondents) (%)</th>
<th>Very well known and known foreign nationalities living in Cyprus (by Cypriot respondents) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Cypriots</td>
<td>Male Cypriots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek (87) British (58)</td>
<td>Greek (88) British (60)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less known foreign nationalities living in Cyprus (by Cypriot respondents)</th>
<th>Least known foreign nationalities living in Cyprus (by Cypriot respondents)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Cypriots</td>
<td>Male Cypriots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German (14) Lebanese (20) Filipino (19)</td>
<td>Filipino (17) German (17) Lebanese (21)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘Know very well and well’ different foreign nationalities living in Cyprus</th>
<th>Male, young, educated private sector employee and intellectual, with medium incomes, living in urban areas of Cyprus.</th>
<th>See Table 4.20 for Q19 in Appendix F.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less contact with different foreign nationalities living in Cyprus</td>
<td>Female, old ages, less educated and living in rural areas of Cyprus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the percentages of male respondents who ‘know very well’ and ‘well’ different nationals living in Cyprus are higher than the percents for female respondents, showing that men interact more often with foreigners living in Cyprus.

On the whole, the percentages for the answers ‘know very well’ and ‘well’ different foreign nationalities living in Cyprus are high enough in order to show that Cypriots interacted, entered relationships and had different contacts with other ethnicities.

Findings: The Cypriots with tertiary level education are most probable to know ‘well’ and ‘very well’ Greek nationals living in Cyprus.

More Cypriot men and Cypriots with tertiary level education know ‘very well’ and ‘well’ British nationals. Cypriot men tend to know ‘very well’ and ‘well’ Romanian nationals. Also, Cypriots with tertiary education are most probable to know ‘very well’ and ‘well’
Bulgarian, Russian, American, German, Lebanese and Filipino nationals living in Cyprus. Cypriot women tend to know ‘very well’ and ‘well’ German nationals living in Cyprus. More Cypriots aged 35-54 years old and Cypriot inhabitants of urban areas are likely to know ‘well’ and ‘very well’ Lebanese nationals.

Overall, the Cypriots with tertiary education and the Cypriot men are more likely to know ‘well’ and ‘very well’ foreign nationals living in Cyprus.

4.7. Nationality and Mixed Marriage: Cypriots’ Preferences for Foreign Spouses
(Questions 20-22)

**Question 20:** The question Q20 is about foreign nationalities which respondents would marry. Detailed findings for Q20 are displayed in Table 4.21, Appendix F for Chapter IV.

More than three quarters of the respondents would marry Greek nationals. The percentages for “yes” responses given for all the other nationalities are smaller than 30%. Also, except for the Greeks, all percentages for “no” responses are higher than 50%. It means that half of the respondents would not (even in a hypothetical situation) marry foreigners. The percentages for “NA” responses oscillate between 14% and 16%, except for the Greeks (3%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cypriot respondents said “yes” to marriage with (the highest percentage):</th>
<th>Cypriot respondents said “no” to marriage with (the highest percentage):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Cypriots (%)</td>
<td>Male Cypriots (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greeks (80)</td>
<td>Greeks (80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British (30)</td>
<td>Russians (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americans (27)</td>
<td>British (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russians (25)</td>
<td>Germans (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germans (22)</td>
<td>Romanians (29)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, when considering ‘Respondents’ sex’, the percentages for “Yes” to mixed marriage responses given by the male respondents are higher then those of the female respondents (concomitantly, the percentages for “No” responses given by female respondents are higher then those given by male respondents). It means that the male respondents are more likely to marry different foreign nationalities living in Cyprus. When considering ‘Respondents’ age’, the higher percentages for “NA” responses are registered for the age groups older than 35 years. Then, the most likely to answer this question are the young, educated and single respondents. This is one of the reasons why young and educated respondents gave the highest percentages for “Yes” responses to marriages with all nationalities. Those who are more likely to marry foreigners belong to the following...
categories of respondents: male, young, educated, single and inhabitants of urban areas of Cyprus. The respondents who are less likely to marry foreigners belong to the following categories: female, people older than 55 years, less educated people, widowed/separated or divorced people and those living in rural areas of Cyprus.

**Pattern:** The percentages for the answers given by the Cypriot respondents revealed a male preference for brides from Russia and an unambiguous female preference for grooms from the Euro-American group of countries (Greeks, British, American and German). Overall the percentages for ‘yes’ responses are very low compared to those for “no” responses. It means that Cypriots are not so likely to enter into marital unions with foreigners. Furthermore, especially Cypriot women are not so likely to marry foreigners (see the very low percentages given by women for “Yes” responses); on the other hand, Cypriot men would marry Russian, Romanian and Bulgarian women.

The valid values of Chi-square tests are displayed in Table 4.21 and Table 4.24, Appendix F and the estimations to the population of interest are given below.

**Findings:** More Cypriots with tertiary education and Cypriots living in urban areas would marry Greek nationals (those with primary education and living in rural showed an opposite opinion). The Cypriots living in rural areas are more likely not to marry British nationals, instead those living in urban show an opposite attitude.

More Cypriot men, Cypriots living in urban areas, Cypriots with medium incomes and Cypriots working as private sector employees would marry Romanian nationals.

Those who would marry Bulgarians are Cypriot men and Cypriots with medium incomes. People belonging to the last mentioned categories and Cypriots working as private sector employees would marry Russian nationals.

The Cypriots living in urban areas, those having tertiary education and aged 15-34 years old would marry Americans.

More Cypriot men, Cypriots aged 15-34 years old, Cypriots with tertiary education, Cypriots with high incomes and Cypriot intellectuals or artists would marry Germans.

Most Cypriot women would not marry Lebanese, Iranian, Israeli and Filipino nationals. Young Cypriots would marry Lebanese and Israeli nationals. Cypriots with tertiary education would marry also Lebanese nationals.
**Question 21:** Summary table—see more details in Table 4.22, Appendix F, Chapter IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Most frequent response (% respondents)</th>
<th>The most frequent response is given by the respondents who have at least one of the following demographic characteristics</th>
<th>Valid chi-square tests (for the following variables)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does foreign nationality influence or not Cypriots’ marriage decision?</td>
<td>“It influences” (58%)</td>
<td>Female or male, older than 55 years, inhabitants of rural areas of Cyprus, educated, with high incomes, single, pensioner.</td>
<td>‘Respondents’ income’ ($\chi^2=9.50; df=4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings: The Cypriots with high annual incomes (more than 40000 Cypriot pounds) tend to believe that foreign nationality influences Cypriots’ marriage decision.

**Question 22:** about the reasons why foreigners’ nationality influences or not Cypriot marriage decision. The detailed findings are presented in Table 4.23, Appendix F for Chapter IV.

A percentage of 42% (or 169 persons) of total respondents said that foreigners’ nationality influences Cypriots’ marriage decision and gave their reasons. They invoked reasons grouped into 38 reason categories (recoded into 11 reasons) why the foreign nationality influences mixed marriage; there are 48% men and 52% women.

Reasons why foreign nationality influences Cypriots’ marriage decision (the reasons with the highest percentage):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>The reasons are given by the respondents who have at least one of the following demographic characteristics:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) ‘Different cultures, mentalities and religions’ (33%).</td>
<td>Male, young, educated, rural Cyprus, public servant, with high incomes, widowed/separated or divorced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) ‘Because of different religion’ (32%).</td>
<td>Male, old ages, less educated, living in urban areas of Cyprus, worker/constructor/farmer, married, with small income.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) ‘Common ethnical features are advantages for mixed marriage and the opposite’ (17%).</td>
<td>Female, aged 35-54 years old, educated, residence in rural areas, singles, people with medium incomes and pensioners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) ‘Because the Cypriots comment mixed marriage due to their prejudices about each nation’ (8%).</td>
<td>Female, young, educated, people living in urban areas of Cyprus, single, public servant, with low incomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A percentage of 16% (or 62 persons) of the Cypriot respondents answered that the foreign nationality of a spouse does not influence mixed marriage and gave their reasons (53% men, 47% women). They invoked reasons that were grouped into 17 reason categories (recoded into 11 reasons) why foreign nationality does not influence Cypriots’ marriage decision. The reasons with the highest percentages are the following:
Reasons | The reasons are given by the respondents who have at least one of the following demographic characteristics:
---|---
1) ‘If there is love, there are no ethnicities’ (36%). | Female, high school degree, young, living in urban areas of Cyprus, worker/farmer/constructor, with low income, single.
2) ‘Ethnicity doesn’t matter as long as the spouse is already foreigner’ (19%). | Male, young, educated, inhabitant of rural areas of Cyprus, intellectual/artist, with high income.
3) ‘The human character is the most important’ (13%). | Female, less educated, urban areas of Cyprus, self-employed, with low incomes, widowed/divorced/separated
4) ‘Free choice of marriage partner’ (8%) | Male, older than 55 years, less educated, people living in rural areas of Cyprus, married and with low incomes.
5) ‘The Cypriots entered marriages with a lot of nationalities’ (5%).
5) ‘If Cypriots marry foreigners, this is from love’ (5%). | ---------------

Only 3% (or 12) of the respondents gave their reasons why they ‘don’t know’ if foreign nationality influences Cypriots’ marriage decision. From a total of six reason categories (five recoded), the most invoked reasons are: (1) ‘If is out of love, nationality plays no role; if it is a marriage of convenience, then it does’ (42%) and (2) ‘People think differently’ (33%).

Overall, almost half of the respondents who gave reasons believe that foreign spouse’s nationality influences Cypriots’ marriage decision. The respondents believed that it is because of differences in religion and mentalities (i.e. cultural differences) that foreign nationality influence Cypriots’ marriage decision. Moreover, in order to cope with these differences, a Cypriot should choose from those ethnicities that have commonalities (as culture, religion, mentality) with the Cypriots. There are more women, educated and young people that invoked societal factors influencing marriage decision. Love, free choice of marriage partner and human personality are the reasons to say that foreign nationality doesn’t influence Cypriots' marriage decision. There are more male respondents who gave this type of reasons.

The next step is to analyze these questionnaire survey findings, task undertaken in the following section.
B. ANALYSIS and EVALUATION of QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY FINDINGS

This section aims to interpret the findings reported with respect to furnishing evidence for each hypothesis posed in the problem statement. As already mentioned in Chapter III, there are three hypotheses resulted from the literature review and the analysis of existing statistical data on mixed marriages and immigration in Cyprus (see Chapter II). Quantitative findings from different question sets furnish evidence for each of the three hypotheses about patterns of mixed marriage mate selection in Cyprus.

4.8. Cypriots' Opinions about Foreigners and Cypriots' Exposure to Foreign Influence

This section discusses the quantitative findings reported with respect to furnishing evidence for the question sets that relate to the first hypothesis given below. Exposure and tolerance towards foreigners: With increased exposure and tolerance towards people from other countries and cultures (see the high increase in immigration flow to Cyprus for the period 1989-2004), attitudes towards marriage with foreign nationals become more favourable (Kalmijn, 1991b). This hypothesis is tested through the following questions sets:

(1) Questions set Q1-Q4: Opinions and estimations of the number of foreigners and number of foreign workers in Cyprus; and (2) Questions set Q6-Q11 about Cypriots’ Foreign influence exposure: life abroad (maximum foreign influence) and relatives married to foreigners (high foreign influence).

4.8.1 Questions set Q1-Q4. This questions set is about how Cypriots regard foreigners’ presence in Cyprus. The first questions focus on opinions and estimations about the numbers of foreigners and foreign workers in Cyprus. Cypriot respondents’ appreciations of these numbers are consistent with the statistical data that reflect an increase in immigration flow to Cyprus, for the years between 1989 and 2004. Thus, more than 80% and 90% respectively, of the Cypriot respondents estimated the number of foreigners and foreign workers in Cyprus as ‘large’ and ‘extremely large’ (see Table 4.25, Appendix F). The Cypriots living in rural areas are likely to have this opinion about the number of foreigners in Cyprus. A percentage of 60% of the Cypriot respondents appreciated that the ‘extremely large’ and ‘large’ number of foreigners in Cyprus is a ‘bad’ and ‘very bad’ thing given the small size of the Greek-Cypriot community (Cypriot women tend to have this opinion). More than 45 percent s of the respondents said that the ‘extremely large’ and ‘large’ number of foreign workers in Cyprus is a ‘bad’ and ‘very bad’ thing given the size and the needs of the Greek-Cypriot economy. The Cypriots with low incomes are more likely to share this opinion.
Therefore, even if there are more respondents who estimated the number of foreign workers in Cyprus as ‘large’ and ‘extremely large’, their opinion about it is more favourable than their opinion about the large number of foreigners in Cyprus.

On the whole, the findings from the questions set Q1-Q4 support the hypothesis that Cypriots are exposed to increasing foreign influence, since the majority estimated the numbers of foreigners and foreign workers in Cyprus as ‘large’ and ‘extremely large’. Moreover, they were concerned about this situation, given the small size of Greek-Cypriot community and the needs of Cypriot economy. This seems to be a “natural” reasoning, since small groups are governed by the logic of numbers; i.e. if the outside foreign influence is strong, small groups are threatened by disappearance.

A clear difference can be identified in the perception of outside foreign influence, as long as respondents’ attitude is more favourable towards the foreign workers in Cyprus. Even if the number of foreign workers was perceived as ‘large’ and ‘extremely large’, they are seen as coming to Cyprus to earn money and then return to their homelands. On the other hand, the foreigners who come to settle down in Cyprus are perceived as a possible threat, given the small size of the Greek-Cypriot community. Whereas foreign workers come to fill out some needs of Cypriot economy, many foreigners come to marry Cypriots (fact that might create a shortage of marriageable native mates) and make a living by entering different jobs (it influences negatively unemployment rates of the native population). On the whole, Cypriots’ opinion about the foreign nationals presence in Cyprus is an unfavourable one.

The next step is to find out how many respondents lived abroad and for how many years, knowing that living abroad means being exposed to maximum foreign influence. Another category of respondents who are exposed to high foreign influence is the respondents who have relatives married to foreigners and therefore, have direct contact with mixed married couples.

4.8.2 The questions set Q6-Q11 measures the foreign influence exposure for (a) respondents who lived abroad (maximum exposure to foreign influence) and for (b) those having relatives who married foreigners (high exposure to foreign influence).

4.8.2.1 Questions subset Q6-Q8: (a) Respondents who lived abroad. Almost half of the respondents lived in at least one foreign country. Of these, there are more male than female respondents who lived in at least one foreign country. As verified by the chi-square test of independence, the Cypriot men who lived abroad are more educated than their female counterparts. The majority of the respondents lived in one foreign country, between 1-5 years and as students (see Tables 4.26 A and 4.26 B in Appendix F). According to the chi-square tests, the Cypriots who lived abroad are educated (with university, master or doctorate degrees), aged between 35-54 years old, intellectuals or
artists and have medium to high annual incomes. The Cypriots who never lived abroad are likely to be less educated, to have low annual incomes and work as constructors, farmers or workers. On the whole, the Cypriots who are/were exposed to maximum foreign influence are those who lived abroad as students, in one country, between one and five years.

4.8.2.2 Questions subset Q9-Q11: (b) Respondents exposed to high foreign influence (e.g. those having relatives who entered into mixed marriages with foreigners).

More than half of the respondents have some relatives married to foreigners (there are no differences in the percentages by ‘sex’ and ‘area of residence’). The categories of respondents that have some relatives married to foreigners coincide with those of the respondents who are more likely to have lived abroad: educated, young, intellectual or artist, with medium to high annual income.

Confirming the statistical data findings, the survey findings showed that mixed marriage is a new phenomenon in Cyprus, since large percentages of respondents have a cousin, an aunt or uncle or a sister/brother who married foreigners and none of the Cypriot respondents had mixed married grandparents.

The most frequent relative married to a foreigner is ‘the cousin’ (one out of four respondents has a cousin married to a foreigner) and one out of eight respondents have a ‘sister/brother’ or an ‘aunt/uncle’ married to foreigners. The value of chi-square test of independence shows that the Cypriots aged 15-34 years old are more likely to have an aunt/uncle and a cousin married to foreigners; moreover, Cypriots aged between 35-54 years are more likely to have a sister/brother married to a foreigner.

It is less probable for the Cypriot respondents to have a parent or a grandparent married to foreigners (because the phenomenon is relatively recent in Cyprus).

More than half of the respondents who have relatives married to foreigners perceived these marriages as being ‘successful’ or ‘very successful’. These respondents are likely to belong to at least one of the following demographic categories: male, living in rural Cyprus, educated and aged 15-34 years old. Less than a quarter of the respondents classified their relatives’ marriage to foreigners as ‘not very successful’ and ‘unsuccessful’. Such respondents are likely to belong to at least one of the following demographic categories: female, older than 55 years, less educated, and living in rural or urban areas of Cyprus.

Overall, more than half of the respondents have relatives married to foreigners, and almost half of these have a cousin married to a foreigner. Also, more than half of the Cypriot respondents (who have relatives married to foreigners) perceived these marriages as ‘successful’ and ‘very successful’. How could one explain this favourable attitude since the general opinion about foreigners in Cyprus is unfavourable?
It seems that the increased exposure and contact with foreigners as relatives diminishes social distance and ‘the foreigner as relative’ is perceived *per se* being accepted as part of one’s family. Moreover, the foreigner as a member in one’s family is not part of an anonymous mass of foreigners that are unfavourably perceived by the Cypriot public opinion. In other words, a well-known foreigner is not a stranger anymore for Cypriots; he/she is tolerated and accepted as family member because of an increased exposure to integration/assimilation factors, such as: knowledge of the Greek language, participation in community activities, participation in different common celebrations and leisure activities.

Therefore, the findings for the questions set Q6-Q11 support the hypothesis about the favourable attitudes towards foreigners being associated with an increased exposure to foreign influence. Almost half of the respondents lived abroad (maximum foreign exposure), more than half of the respondents have relatives married to foreigners (high foreign exposure) and more than half of the respondents who have relatives married to foreigners favourably perceive these mixed marriages.

**4.8.2.3 Conclusion for Questions sets Q1-Q4 and Q6-Q11:** In general, the findings from the two questions sets support the working hypothesis that with increased exposure and tolerance towards people from other countries and cultures (see the high increase in immigration flow to Cyprus for the period 1989-2003), attitudes towards marriage with foreign nationals become more favourable. The respondents stated different opinions for different categories of foreigners. Therefore, if the attitude towards foreigners in Cyprus is unfavourable, the attitude towards foreign workers in Cyprus is less unfavourable and the attitudes towards relatives’ marriages to foreigners are favourable.

As a result, attitudes about foreigners are getting more favourable with the decrease in social distance between Cypriots and foreigners in Cyprus. One could explain this shortage in social distance as a gradual personalization of ‘the foreigner’, process taking place when he/she is becoming more integrated in Cypriot society. Findings from the following questions sets will specify more precisely the Cypriots-foreigners/mixed marriage social distance as it results from the responses given by the people questioned.

**4.9. Cypriots-Foreigners Social Distance, Opinions and Attitudes towards Mixed marriage and Contacts with/Preferences for Foreign Nationalities living in Cyprus**

This section discusses findings from the question sets which are related to the following second working hypothesis resulted from the statistical findings on mixed marriage mate selection patterns (as discussed in Chapter II):
Social distance plays a certain role in terms of mate selection. Therefore, the nationalities living in Cyprus are perceived as arranged in a hierarchy reflecting their desirability as mates. Which nationalities constitute a more socially accepted pool of marriage mates for Cypriots? There is less social distance for the Euro-American and East-European groups of nationalities comparative to the Asian group (the racial distance white-non-white and the religious distance Christian-Muslim). The smallest social distance is for mainland Greek spouses; more than half of the mixed marriages reported for Cypriot women are with Greek nationals. This hypothesis is examined through the following questions sets:

(1) Questions set Q5: Cypriots-foreigners social distance scale; (2) Questions set Q12-Q16: Opinions/attitudes towards mixed marriage at societal and personal levels; and (3) Questions set Q17-Q19 about Contacts with and preferences for foreign nationalities living in Cyprus.

**4.9.1 Questions set Q5: Cypriots-foreigners social distance scale**

(based upon willingness to allow diverse ethnic groups to degrees of intimacy). Which is the social distance between foreigners and Cypriots? First of all, Cypriot respondents do not want to exclude foreigners from Cyprus. The most favourable attitude is towards the foreigner as visitor in Cyprus and the most unfavourable attitude is about the foreigner as spouse. The social distance increases from left to right, as follows:

- Foreigner as visitor
- Foreigner as neighbour
- Foreigner as work colleague
- Foreigner as relative
- Foreigner as citizen
- Foreigner as spouse

Foreigners as visitors in Cyprus are most likely to be accepted because Cypriot economy is based on tourism. On the other hand, the foreigners as citizens in Cyprus are less likely to be accepted given the small size of the Greek-Cypriot community (as asked in the survey questionnaire). This finding is further supported by Cypriot respondents who expressed unfavourable opinions about the ‘extremely large’ and ‘large’ number of foreigners in Cyprus. Cypriot men and Cypriots working as private sector employees are more likely to accept foreigners as citizens in Cyprus. Moreover, Cypriot men and Cypriots living in urban areas are more likely to accept a foreigner to their family as relative. More than three quarters of the respondents ‘agree and strongly agree’ with having foreigners as neighbours and work colleagues (see Summary table 4.27, Appendix F). In this sense, the Cypriot men are more likely to accept a foreigner as their work colleague. One could say that the Cypriot respondents are likely to accept foreigners as long as they do not interfere with two valuable entities for the Cypriots: their family and homeland. This is why the respondents are less likely to accept foreigners as relatives, citizens in Cyprus and as spouses. In general, people are reticent in accepting foreigners in their family and homeland, on a permanent basis. Visitors, neighbours and work colleagues belong to transient status categories that are not perceived as long-lasting. On the other hand, the perception of foreigner as relative, citizen and spouse is different: these are less
temporary statuses (theoretically speaking). One could ask ‘why accept foreigners as relatives, citizens or spouses?’ providing that there are plenty of natives that may respond to these roles. Sometimes, the cause might be people’s natural tendency to fear the foreign “otherness” translated into Cypriots peasants’ traditional mistrust about ‘foreigners’ from other villages (as mentioned in the literature review, Chapter II).

In the present inquiry, the interest is focused mostly on respondents’ attitudes towards their hypothetical marriages to foreigners (or foreigner as a spouse). In this instance, the results of chi-square tests of independence allow the formulation of inferences about the population of interest. Therefore, the Cypriots who are most favourable about their own hypothetical mixed marriage (a percentage of 26%) belong at least to one of the following demographical categories: male, educated (tertiary education), aged between 15-34 years old, intellectual or artist, with medium to high income and inhabitant of urban areas of Cyprus. These demographic categories coincide with those categories of Cypriots who are most likely to have lived abroad (they were exposed to maximum foreign influence). On the other hand, those Cypriots who are less likely to accept their hypothetical marriage to foreigners (a percentage of 46%) belong to at least one of the following demographic categories: woman, older than 65 years, with primary education, worker, constructor or farmer, with low annual incomes and inhabitant of rural areas of Cyprus. Once again, these categories coincide with those of the Cypriots who have never lived abroad. When controlling for a third variable (i.e. for the two variables that measure degrees of exposure to foreign influence) more relevant information is revealed: the Cypriots who never lived abroad, either man or woman, are more likely to ‘disagree’ and ‘strongly disagree’ with their hypothetical marriage to a foreigner. Moreover, the Cypriot men who have relatives married to foreigners are more likely to ‘agree’ with their hypothetical marriage to a foreigner and simultaneously, the Cypriot women are more likely to ‘disagree’ and ‘strongly disagree’.

Overall, the Cypriots are more likely to disagree (46%), than to agree (26%) with their hypothetical marriages to foreigners (in spite of their increased exposure to foreign influence); this attests that the greatest social distance is between Cypriots and foreigners as spouses. In the meantime, the statistical findings show that in an average year (during 1989-2004) 27 out of 100 marriages entered by Cypriots were to foreign nationals (see Table 2.2b, Appendix B). Therefore, the percentage of 26% (more men than women) Cypriots who would agree with their hypothetical marriage to a foreigner coincides with the reported overall rate of mixed marriage (which is 27%, with 9% women and 17% men); this coincidence supports the reliability and validity of the questionnaire survey.
4.9.2 Questions set Q12-Q16: Cypriots’ opinions and attitudes towards mixed marriage at (a) societal and (b) personal levels

(a) More than half of the Cypriot respondents estimated the number of mixed marriages in Cyprus as being ‘extremely large’ and ‘large’. Their estimation is right as long as the statistical data analysis (conducted in Chapter II) revealed that the number of mixed marriages in Cyprus is on the rise, starting in 1990 until 2004, the average rate of mixed marriage being more than a quarter out of all marriages entered by Cypriots.

Given the size of the Greek-Cypriot community, almost half of the respondents (44%) classified the perceived as ‘large’ number of mixed marriages in Cyprus as ‘neither good, nor bad’ while, more than a quarter of the respondents reported an unfavourable attitude (31%) and only 16% of them adopted a favourable attitude. The results of chi-square tests allow estimations to the population of interest as concerning the answers given by the male and female respondents. Therefore, both Cypriot men and women are likely to adopt a neutral attitude towards having a ‘large’ and ‘very large’ number of mixed marriages in Cyprus, classifying this as ‘neither good, nor bad’ given the size of Greek-Cypriot community.

Cypriot respondents’ neutral attitude towards the large number of mixed marriages supports the favourable opinion expressed about their relatives’ mixed marriages. On the other hand, most of the Cypriot respondents (46%) said that they are not willing to enter into marriages with foreigners. Therefore, they perceive as ‘successful’ the mixed marriages entered by their relatives, but do not want to enter a mixed marriage themselves.

On the whole, Cypriot men are more likely to adopt a favourable attitude towards mixed marriages: their own mixed marriage, their relatives’ mixed marriages and the number of mixed marriages at a societal level. Instead, the Cypriot women are likely to adopt the opposite attitude towards mixed marriages at all the above-mentioned levels. So far, the respondents are most likely to adopt the following attitudes: Respondents’ relatives who entered mixed marriages- Favourable attitude; Respondents’ own marriages to foreigners – Unfavourable attitude; ‘Extremely large’ and ‘large’ number of mixed marriages in Cyprus- Neutral attitude. The results of chi-square tests show that these estimations are valid for the population of interest.

(b) The previous findings showed that more than half of the Cypriot respondents have relatives married to foreigners. It is interesting to find out whom of their relatives/friends would the respondents be willing to accept marrying foreigners (in a hypothetical situation)?

Taken as a whole, the respondents are not likely to accept their relatives entering mixed marriages. Most of them would not want their parents to enter mixed marriages (84%).
More than 60% of the respondents would not accept their siblings, children, and aunts/uncles to enter mixed marriages. On the other hand, more than half of the respondents are most likely to accept their friends (63%) and cousins (51%) to enter mixed marriages. As the respondents have already reported, the most frequent relative married to a foreigner is the cousin. One out of four respondents has a cousin married to a foreigner and one out of two respondents would be willing to accept his/her cousin to marry a foreigner. Why would the respondents be willing to accept their cousins marrying foreigners, and not accept siblings, children or aunts/uncles? It is worthwhile mentioning that Cypriots perceive ‘the cousin’ as a distant relative, part of their extended family. Cousins and friends are not perceived as being part of the respondents’ close families/relatives (because most Cypriots have a lot of cousins). This may explain the increased acceptance of a cousin’s mixed marriage as opposed to a close relative’s.

More than three-quarters of the respondents do not agree with not accepting their relatives or friends to marry a foreigner. This is because the respondents are more likely to accept friends and cousins (as distant relatives) to marry foreigners, but not their close relatives. According to chi-square tests, the Cypriot men, educated Cypriots and middle-aged Cypriots are more likely to accept their friends and relatives to marry foreigners. The young Cypriots and Cypriots living in urban areas tend to accept their cousins to mixed marriage. The Cypriots with less education and those with low annual income are more likely not to accept their parents marrying foreigners. Also, the Cypriots living in rural areas tend not to accept their aunt/uncle to mixed marriage.

So far, the analysis would predict that Cypriot respondents’ attitudes towards mixed marriage are neither favourable, nor unfavourable (or neutral). Let’s see if the findings confirm the predictions. When the respondents were asked directly if they ‘agree or not’ with the idea of mixed marriage between a Cypriot and a foreigner, a percentage of 42% ‘agree’, 31% ‘don’t agree’ and 27% ‘don’t know’. The last percentage is large enough to indicate that the respondents cannot decide what kind of attitude to adopt. When the respondents were asked if they agree with their relatives’ mixed marriages, more than a half responded favourably. These differences and hesitations in adopting an attitude towards relatives’ mixed marriages on one hand, and towards mixed marriages at a societal level on the other hand reveal the complexity of the phenomenon under study. This is the point where open-ended questions are needed. When the respondents give their reasons for the attitudes adopted, the perception of mixed marriage is revealed on its all dimensions.

The results of chi-square tests of independence allow inferences formulation at the level of the population of interest. Thus, the Cypriots who are more likely to agree with the
idea of mixed marriage between a Cypriot and a foreigner are: men, aged 15-34 years old and inhabitants of urban areas. Those Cypriots who adopt an opposite attitude are: women, older than 55 years and inhabitants of rural areas. Once more, the Cypriot men are more favourable to mixed marriage than their female counterparts. This is true, since the statistical data on mixed marriage show that there are more Cypriot men than women who entered into marriages with foreigners. When controlling for a third variable (for two variables that measure the degree of exposure to foreign influence), more information is revealed: the Cypriot men who have never lived abroad are more likely to agree with the idea of mixed marriage and their Cypriot women counterparts to disagree. Moreover, the Cypriot men who have relatives married to foreigners are more likely to agree with the idea of mixed marriage and meantime the Cypriot women are more likely to disagree and to declare that ‘don’t know’.

Why do Cypriot women not agree with mixed marriage between Cypriots and foreigners? As would be expected, they gave more reasons against mixed marriage.

(1) The “difference” is the major reason not in favour of mixed marriage. There is a “chain” reaction here: the “difference” leads to conflict, the conflict leads to divorce, the divorce means family dissolution and all these factors together have negative societal consequences: destroy Cypriot ethnicity, culture and tradition. Thus, the reasons invoked against mixed marriage gravitate around the leitmotiv of ‘difference’: the foreigners have different cultures, languages, and religions. All these differences determine a mentality gap that leads to conflict. The belief is that in the case of mixed marriage, the conflict is more likely to arise than in the case of a marriage between two Cypriots and then, the mixed marriage will be more likely unsuccessful. Moreover, because of all these differences, mixed marriages are not only convicted to dissolution, but also are disastrous for the Cypriot ethnicity, culture and history. This is how those who gave reasons against mixed marriage (mostly female respondents) pictured the phenomenon. All the negative factors that might influence mixed marriage are projected to a societal level. This is a deterministic perspective on mixed marriage: ‘foreigner’ means difference and difference is bad, then any mixed marriage is (because of its a priori problematic nature) committed to failure.

(2) Another category of reasons (unfavourable to mixed marriage) emphasizes material motivations of foreign spouses, such as: “Foreigners marry Cypriots for material reasons and destroy Cypriot families”, “No to blank mixed marriages, for material reasons”. This category of reasons supports to some extent exchange theory assumptions that marital partners exchange material and non-material resources.

(3) A third category of reasons against mixed marriage accentuates racist and xenophobic motivations: “Generally I don’t like foreigners, especially East-Europeans because they are the cause for high unemployment and extra-conjugal relationships”,...
“Papoutsi apo ton topo sou che an einai balomeno” (“Better shoes from one’s homeland, even if they are patched”), “Foreigners gain rights and Cypriot land”, “Foreigners bring in Cyprus the worst from their countries”, “A large number of foreigners in Cyprus makes us feel foreigners in our country”, “Foreign mentalities will change the Cypriots' pure and honest mentality’, “Cypriots trust more only Cypriots”, “It’s better for spouses to have the same nationality”. This last category of reasons might be considered as reasons against the foreigners in general. Foreigners are identified with all evils in Cypriot society, such as: unemployment, extra conjugal relationships, alienation, and bad influences on the Cypriot mentality. This is why (according to respondents’ opinions) it is better for the Cypriots to marry only Cypriots because they trust each other more easily.

There is one more category of negative reasons that is somehow “masked” behind difference, material reasons and racist/xenophobic motivations. One of the female respondents expressed it directly: “I don’t agree with mixed marriage because Cypriot men favour foreign women and neglect Cypriot women”. This reason reflects a sort of insecurity felt by Cypriot women as a result of Cypriot men’s preferences for foreign spouses. In general, Cypriot women (most of them having Mediterranean physical characteristics such as darker hair, skin and eyes colours) consider foreign European women as more attractive physically because of some physical appearance characteristics such as skin, hair or eyes that usually have lighter colours.

Overall, there are more reasons against mixed marriage (28 reason categories and 39% respondents) and more respondents who approved of mixed marriage (44% respondents and 26 reason categories). Half of the Cypriot male respondents approved of mixed marriage. The most frequent reasons emphasize:

(1) Free choice of marriage partner, love and mutual understanding as motivations of mixed marriage, the equality of human beings (irrespective of ethnicity or religion), and the assortative matching of partners. This constitutes a more liberal and open-minded perspective on mixed marriage, based on the universal principles of liberty and equality applied to the mate selection process. It also “equals” mixed marriage with non-mixed marriage and stresses individual factors determining mixed marriage. The differences of any type are deleted, love and mutual understanding are put above any material reason and foreigners are recognized as equal human beings. This is the picture given by the most frequent favourable reasons mentioned by the respondents.

There are also other categories of reasons that reveal interesting aspects, part of a favourable perception on mixed marriage in Cypriot society.

(2) In this sense, there is a category of reasons that perceive mixed marriage as a beneficial change at the level of Cypriot society, such as: “Mixed marriage gives the chance to escape from the Cypriot mentality and habits”, “I consider that mixed marriage
is a good thing because in Cyprus, marriage is an acquaintances affair". Moreover, through mixed marriage, the Cypriots have the chance to learn about other ethnicities: “This type of marriage let as know other customs, traditions or behaviours”, “Mixed marriage makes easier the acceptance of the foreigners”, “Mixed marriage helps to improving relations between different ethnic groups”.

(3) Another group of reasons favourable to mixed marriage is that of a biologic/genetic kind: mixed marriage is conceived as a way of renewing the genetic code of the native population. Such reasons were expressed by participants as follows: “I agree with mixed marriage because it generates new races”, “Mixed marriage improves culture, human relations and human health because of new genes”, “Mixed marriage makes our people good-looking”.

(4) There are also some reasons that support mixed marriage which encounters opposition from third parties. Many times, partners’ mutual feelings and choices are put above any other opposition: “Two people in love must marry, even if others are against”, “If partners think they will have no problems and don’t care what people say, then it is all right”.

(5) An anti-xenophobic perspective on mixed marriage is revealed by the following favourable reasons: “I agree with mixed marriage because I like foreigners and I am not racist”, “If we were foreigners in foreign country, we wouldn’t like not to be accepted”, and “Foreigners shouldn’t be deprived of human rights”.

(6) And a last category of favourable reasons conceives of mixed marriage as a frequent phenomenon: “In the context of contemporary globalisation, mixed marriage should be a normal phenomenon”.

A small number of respondents don’t know what to believe about mixed marriage between foreigners and Cypriots. Their indecisiveness is caused by a kind of “two-sided” reality of the phenomenon. Therefore, as some respondents mentioned, ‘there are good and bad mixed marriages’. Who decides which one is good and which is bad? The most frequent reasons of this kind are the following: “Mixed marriage depends on a lot of factors and it needs deep thoughts in order to decide”, “It depends on the spouses and their reasons to enter mixed marriage” and “Mixed marriage has advantages and disadvantages; but the tendency is recent”.

Thus, making a clear-cut statement about mixed marriage seems to be very difficult as long as so many factors influence the phenomenon (as perceived by the respondents): differences of all kinds (ethnical, religious or cultural), divorce and conflicts in raising offspring; and on the other pole there is love, mutual feelings of understanding between spouses and, above all, the equality and liberty of free choice in mate selection.
4.9.3 Questions set Q17-Q19 about Cypriots’ contacts with and preferences for foreign nationalities living in Cyprus

“I don’t know to agree or not with mixed marriage, because it depends on foreigners’ countries of origin”. This is how one of the people questioned expressed the ‘dilemma of mixed marriage in Cyprus’. According to this point of view, a mixed marriage is judged/perceived in relation to the foreign spouses’ nationality; this can be illustrated through the statement: “Tell me where from are you, in order to know whether your mixed marriage is good or bad”. This is how one enters the dangerous zone of prejudices (positive and negative); and ethnicities or nationalities are about prejudices, inequalities, discrimination, xenophobia and racism.

The majority (70%) of the people questioned responded that a foreigner’s nationality is ‘very important’ and ‘important’ in mixed marriage. Only nine out of one hundred respondents believed that foreign nationality is not important in mixed marriage. The respondents who share the general opinion are likely to have at least one of the following demographic characteristics: female, inhabitant of rural areas of Cyprus, older than 55 years and less educated. These categories are identical with those who showed an unfavourable opinion about foreigners and mixed marriage between Cypriots and foreigners, so far. Instead, the respondents who are more likely to believe that the nationality of a foreigner is not important for mixed marriage are likely to have at least one of the following demographic characteristics: male, educated, inhabitant of urban areas and of young age. Again, these categories are identical with those who were identified as being more favourable to foreigners and mixed marriage in Cyprus, so far.

Since the respondents are so clear-cut when expressing their opinion about the importance of nationality for mixed marriage, then they should formulate also unambiguous preferences for the nationalities living in Cyprus.

What are the respondents’ preferences for eleven foreign nationalities* living in Cyprus? Are these preferences the result of contacts between foreigners and Cypriots, or the result of the images that mass media or other opinion leaders have created and propagated in society? According to the findings about the respondents’ preferences, the eleven foreign nationalities (living in Cyprus) and tabulated in the questionnaire can be grouped into four categories: (a) The most preferred nationalities living in Cyprus: Greek, British and Russian; (b) Preferred nationalities: German and Romanian; (c) Less preferred

* Note: The questionnaire about Cypriots’ attitudes towards mixed marriage in Cyprus contains questions about eleven nationalities with statistical data available for mixed marriages with Cypriots (for the years between 1989 and 2004) which were analysed in Chapter II.
nationalities: Bulgarian and American; (d) Least preferred nationalities: Israeli, Iranian, Filipino and Lebanese.

(a) As expected, the most wanted (87%) and also well-known (87%) nationality living in Cyprus is the Greek one. The “foreign” adjective was intentionally omitted because the respondents do not consider the Greek nationals as foreigners in Cyprus. The rationale for considering the Greek nationals as foreigners (in the present study) is the tabulated statistical data analysed in Chapter II. A clarification is needed here: the Cypriot statistical authority tabulated the Greek citizenship as foreign nationality because both the native nationality and citizenship in the Republic of Cyprus is the Cypriot. The fact that the Greek nationality was considered a foreign one, together with the other ten foreign nationalities, intrigued the people questioned who asked rhetorically “If we are not Greek as well, what we are?” The point here is that the Greek-Cypriots identify themselves (as the Greeks also do) with a Hellenic famous past that made the glory of Greek civilization as the root of the European civilization and culture.46

Since the percentages of those who ‘prefer’ and those who ‘know’ Greek nationals are identical, one could assume that respondents’ preferences are based on an experience of direct contacts with mainland Greek men and women living in Cyprus.

The difference is very small between the percentages of those who prefer British (36%) and those who prefer Russian nationals (33%). On the other hand, the respondents who met and know British nationals (58%) are twice as many the respondents who met and know Russian nationals (29%). Therefore, there are more respondents who met and know British nationals without preferring them, and there are more respondents who prefer Russian nationals without having any previous contacts with them. A possible explanation could be that both the mass media and Cypriot public opinion are more favourable regarding Russian nationals. Moreover, historical and political reasons concerning the Cypriot problem are at stake here. This is a national cause for the Greek-Cypriots, so that they prefer different foreign political powers as long as these support Greek-Cypriot interests. It seems that this public political perception does influence preferences reported by common people about different nationalities.

As the values of chi-square test of independence show, the Cypriots who prefer British nationals are likely to be older than 55 years. The Cypriots who prefer Russian nationals are most likely to be men. And the Cypriots who know ‘very well’ and ‘well’ Russian and British nationals are most likely to have higher education and to be men (only for British people).

46 This is how Argyrou, V. in his book Marriage as a symbolic struggle. Tradition and modernity in the Mediterranean formulates the argument about a Greek-Cypriot identity constructed in a context of a historical continuity with classical, glorious Greek civilization. However, the identification is not true for nowadays context of Greek identity since “the practice implies that there are two ways of being Greek and that the Cypriot way is superior” (p.54-56).
Why do the Cypriots (those aged 55 years and older) prefer British (even if these people comprise only half of the respondents who met and know them) and Russian nationals? An explanation could be one concerning the large numbers of British and Russian long-term immigrants (and tourists) coming to Cyprus (as the statistical data show- see Chapter II for details). Then, Cypriots have had enough opportunities to know them well and very well; also, many Cypriots study or studied in Britain and Russia; moreover, there is registered a high number of mixed marriages between Cypriots and British nationals, and between Cypriot men and Russian women (see the statistical data in Chapter II). Furthermore, the British identity is perceived as a superior cultural identity and, also, British nationals are considered as having, on average, high incomes. On the other hand, the Russians are Christian Orthodox and this constitutes a pertinent similarity with the Cypriots.

Also, an explanation of Cypriot men’s preference about Russian nationals might concern the fame of good-looking physical appearance of Russian women working in Cyprus. “Russian girls are fashion now” (this is how a man who filled in the questionnaire responded, motivating his preference for Russians). He appears to be right, since the number of mixed marriages between Cypriot men and Russian women was on the rise, registering an increase starting with 1999 until 2003 (as statistical data show in Chapter II).

(b) The respondents are likely to prefer German (25%) and Romanian (23%) nationals. Their attitude is described as ‘neutral’ to ‘like’ and ‘like very much”. If the two nationalities are at the same levels as regarding the respondents’ preferences, the situation changes when the respondents declare whether they met and know these nationalities. The percentages of respondents who ‘met and know’ Romanian nationals (24%) and of respondents who ‘like’ and ‘like very much’ Romanians (23%) are equal. Even if the German nationals are among the less known nationalities (14%) in Cyprus, they are more likely to be preferred by Cypriot respondents (25%).

Cypriot men and Cypriots aged 15-34 years old are more likely to prefer Romanian nationals and more Cypriot women prefer German nationals. Moreover, the Cypriot men tend to know ‘very well’ and ‘well’ Romanians and the Cypriot women are more likely to know German nationals living in Cyprus. This finding might help to explain the respondents’ choices when they are asked about their hypothetical marriages with foreigners of different nationalities.

(c) The people questioned adopted a neutral to unfavourable (“don’t like and don’t like at all”) attitude towards Bulgarian (24%) and American (27%) nationals living in Cyprus. Both nationalities are amongst the well-known nationalities living in Cyprus. Both male and female respondents are likely to know ‘well’ and ‘very well’ Bulgarian (23%) and American (22%) nationals. As chi-square test of independence show, Cypriot women are
more likely to adopt an unfavourable attitude towards Bulgarian nationals. It is more likely for the Cypriots with tertiary education to know Bulgarian and American nationals living in Cyprus.

So far, the findings show differences in Cypriots’ preferences by ‘respondents’ sex’. Cypriot men prefer Russian, Bulgarian and Romanian nationals, and Cypriot women prefer British, German and American nationals living in Cyprus. Therefore, the responses given by the people questioned confirm the existing statistical data that revealed identical differences in the marital choices made by Cypriot men and women.

(d) The least preferred nationalities living in Cyprus are the Israeli, Iranian, Filipino and Lebanese. The least known in Cyprus are the Iranian nationals, followed by the Israeli, Germans and Lebanese. The Filipino nationals are among the well-known nationalities, especially for Cypriot female respondents. Cypriot women are not so likely to prefer Iranians and Filipinos living in Cyprus (this is proved by the very small percentage of marriages between Cypriots and these nationalities). More Cypriots aged 35-54 years old and Cypriot inhabitants of urban areas tend to know ‘well’ and ‘very well’ Lebanese nationals who are also the most preferred among Asian nationalities living in Cyprus (see also the marriage Cypriot-Lebanese, a constant marital choice for Cypriots).

Therefore, the least known and preferred are the Israeli and Iranian nationals. Together with the Filipino and Lebanese nationals, these constitute the Asian group of nationalities that is characterised by racial, cultural and religious differences by comparison to the native population researched; except for the Israeli nationals and some Lebanese nationals (who are Orthodox), the other nationalities mentioned are non-white races and Muslims. Therefore, the greatest social distance is between the Cypriots and the Asian group of nationalities: there is less contact and preference for non-European nationals in Cyprus.

4.9.4 Conclusions for questions sets: Q5, Q12-Q16 and Q17-Q19. The findings from all the three above-mentioned and analysed sets of questions support the hypothesis that foreign nationalities living in Cyprus are perceived in a hierarchy reflecting their desirability as mates. In other words, the statistical findings about mixed marriages and immigration in Cyprus coincide with the quantitative findings (i.e. the Cypriot respondents’ preferences for foreign nationals reflect the marital choices for foreign spouses made by Cypriots, as identified in Chapter II).

Therefore, the questionnaire findings identified a hierarchy in the respondents’ perceptions of different foreign nationalities living in Cyprus. The basic axis in this hierarchy is given by the racial categorisation ‘white-non-white’ and the religious separation Christian-Muslim. The Cypriots are Europeans and then, ‘white’ and Christians.
This is the main “difference” that was also invoked as a main reason against mixed marriage.

Geographical distance almost always means social, cultural, political or religious distance. Geographically, Cyprus is closer to Middle East than to Europe. Also, Cyprus is a small island with a small-size community that conserves all the characteristics common to its dimension. Thus, the Cypriots aspire to an European identity, but not any identity. It is a superior identity, at least one that is perceived as such because of material and non-material assets that stay behind it: the “Western” identity (see the literature review in the Chapter I) of the Euro-American group of countries (as considered by the present analysis).

Both categories of findings (yielded by the statistical data analysis and the quantitative investigation) showed that Cypriot women are more likely to prefer spouses from the Euro-American group of countries and Cypriot men would prefer nationals from the Eastern-European group of countries. These preferences constitute a second hierarchy that accounts for economic differences and inequalities. The analysis of the reasons against mixed marriage revealed that Cypriot respondents are aware of the “blank” mixed marriages entered by Eastern-European women working in cabarets, mixed marriages for material reasons or to assure a residence permit in Cyprus entered again by Eastern-European women and Eastern-European migrants with poor economic standing that generate unemployment in Cyprus where they come to work. Despite of these differences in their preferences, Cypriot men and women agree with respect to choices for Greek nationals. As the findings showed, the great majority of the respondents met, knew and preferred Greek nationals living in Cyprus.

In conclusion, according to cultural, religious, racial and economic differences and similarities (reflected in prejudices and positive/negative stereotypes at the level of local public opinion), the social distance between Cypriots and foreigners increases or decreases as follows: the largest social distance is between Cypriots and foreigners from the Asian group of countries and the smaller social distance is between Cypriots and foreigners from the Euro-American and Eastern-European group of countries.
4.10. Nationality and Mixed Marriage: Cypriots' Preferences for Foreign Spouses

This section discusses the findings reported with respect to furnishing evidence for the questions set regarding the third working hypothesis that resulted from the statistical data analysis (conducted in the Chapter II) and is given below.

Down-up marrying or hypergamy hypothesis: Cypriot men prefer Eastern-European brides and Cypriot women prefer Euro-American grooms. This hypothesis is tested through the questions set Q20-Q22 about ‘Nationality and mixed marriage: preferences for foreign spouses’.

4.10.1 The findings from question 20 about the nationalities respondents would marry confirm the findings of the question five about the respondents’ attitude towards their hypothetical marriage to a foreigner. Therefore, half of the respondents would not (even in a hypothetical situation) marry foreigners; on the other hand, the percentage of Cypriot respondents who would marry a foreigner (27%) equals the overall average rate of mixed marriage entered by Cypriots (as shown in Table 2.2.b, Appendix B). Except for the Greek nationals, the percentages for “yes” responses for all the other nationalities are smaller than 30% (percentage verified once more by the above-mentioned rate of mixed marriage resulted from statistical findings and also, by those respondents who would marry foreigners representing 26 percents of all the respondents).

When considering ‘respondents’ sex’, once again the findings of the question 20 confirm the results from question number five that the Cypriot men are more favourable to marrying foreigners, by comparison with their female counterparts. This tendency of Cypriot men to be favourable to marriages with foreigners is supported by the registered statistical data that show a large difference between the number of mixed marriages entered by Cypriot men and women, respectively.

The statistical data analysis conducted in Chapter II revealed some patterns regarding mixed marriage mate selection process. For the period 1994-2004, the largest number of mixed marriages entered by Cypriot men is with Eastern-European brides; Cypriot women entered into mixed marriages mostly with Euro-American grooms. The people questioned expressed preferences that coincide with registered statistical data on mixed marriage. Male respondents preferred Russian brides in proportion of 40% (this also represents the most frequent mixed marriage combination for Cypriot men), and then they chose British (31%), German (30%) and Romanian (29%) brides (with difference of only one percent).

As statistical data findings show, when Cypriot men entered into marriages with Eastern-European brides, they chose mostly Russian and Romanian brides, and less often Bulgarian brides. From the Euro-American brides, Cypriot men chose British, American and German brides.
Cypriot female respondents’ preferences match the existing statistical data on mixed marriage entered by Cypriot women; they would prefer British, American and German grooms and they also married these nationalities most frequently (same hierarchies for both Cypriot women’s hypothetical mate choices and the tabulated statistical data on mixed marriages reported for Cypriot women).

Regarding the group of Asian countries, the statistical data on mixed marriage revealed that Cypriot men married more often Filipina women while Cypriot women chose Lebanese grooms (data registered for the year 2004 show more marriages Cypriot women-Syrian and Egyptian men, respectively). The least frequent mixed marriages were those between Israeli or Iranian nationals and Cypriot men or women. Once more, the people questioned answered in concordance with the existing statistical data on mixed marriages. The great majority of the respondents said “no” to Israeli and Iranian grooms and brides, while for Lebanese nationals were registered the smaller percentages in the Asian group of nationalities for the “no” answers given by both male and female respondents.

The results of the chi-square tests of independence allow the formulation of estimations for the population of interest, for each nationality (excepting British, American and Greek nationalities) and the variable ‘Respondents’ sex’. Therefore, a significant finding is that the Cypriot men are more likely to marry Eastern-European women whereas the Cypriot women are less likely to choose Eastern-European men. Also, Cypriot men prefer mostly Russian brides (less German and Romanian brides) and Cypriot women living in urban areas prefer British and American grooms. Cypriot women are more likely not to prefer Israeli, Iranian and Filipino grooms. Young Cypriots would marry Lebanese and Israeli nationals.

On the whole, the percentages for “yes” responses are very low (but higher-i.e.30 per cent- then the overall mixed marriage rate of Cypriots – i.e. 27 per cent- for the period 1989-2004) compared to those for the “no” responses in the case of the respondents’ hypothetical marriages to foreigners. This shows that more than a quarter of Cypriots are likely to marry foreigners (and on average, 27% of the Cypriots did so- see Table 2.2.b). Moreover, the Cypriot women are less likely to marry foreigners (as the statistical data findings show, as well).

The categories of Cypriots who are most favourably disposed to marrying foreigners are: male, young (15-34 years of age), of higher education and people living in urban areas. The categories of Cypriots who are most unfavourable to marry different nationalities are: women, people older than 55 years, less educated people, and people living in rural areas of Cyprus. It is known that age, education and residence are personal characteristics that influence different attitudes: young ages, higher education and urban residence maximize open-minded, liberal, tolerant and favourable attitudes; older ages, less education and
rural residence favour conservative, intolerant, narrow-minded and unfavourable attitudes (as showed also in the literature review).

Prejudices about different nationalities are common in nowadays society. Prejudices and stereotypes (negative and positive) create images of foreign nationalities living in one country. Because of a general lower economic standing, the Eastern-European nationalities (mostly work migrants in Cyprus) are perceived as foreigners with an unequal/inferior status by comparison to the West-European nationalities (mostly tourists in Cyprus). In the case of the Asian group of nationalities, besides of their lowest economic background, they have two more characteristics perceived as inferior from the point of view of the Western culture: the Muslim religion and racial characteristics such as darker skin colour.

4.10.2 Question 21. In this context, which is the relation between ‘foreign nationality’ and Cypriots’ marriage decision? Could the nationality (and not any other characteristics of a possible spouse) influences Cypriots’ marriage decision in such extent that one would say, “I do not marry X because he/she is an American” or “I marry Y because he/she is a Russian”?

As already mentioned, almost three quarters of the respondents expressed the opinion that spouse’s foreign nationality is ‘important’ and ‘very important’ for mixed marriage. The next question was whether foreign nationality influences or not Cypriots’ marriage decision. More than half of the people questioned (58%) answered that spouse’s foreign nationality influences marriage decisions taken by Cypriots. These respondents are likely to belong to at least one of the following demographic categories: older than 55 years, people living in rural areas of Cyprus, of higher education, people with high income, singles, pensioners. Therefore, the respondents who are most likely to believe that spouse’s foreign nationality is ‘important’ and ‘very important’ for mixed marriage and also, that it influences Cypriot marriage decisions belong to at least one of the following categories: older than 55 years and inhabitants of rural areas of Cyprus.

Moreover, chi-square results show that Cypriots with high annual incomes tend to believe that foreign nationality influences Cypriots’ marriage decision.

4.10.3 Question 22. It is interesting to learn why spouse’s foreign nationality influences/or not marriage decisions made by Cypriots. Almost half of the respondents agreed that foreign nationality influences Cypriots’ marriage decisions and also mentioned their reasons. There are more female respondents who answered this question. The categories of unfavourable reasons coincide, to a large extent, with categories of reasons given against mixed marriage. Therefore, difference as disadvantage, commonality/similarity as advantage and prejudices about foreign nationalities are the
most invoked reasons to support the statement that foreign nationality influences the marriage decisions taken by Cypriots. Let’s discuss these reasons mentioned by the people questioned.

(a) Different cultures, mentalities, economic backgrounds and religious faiths might affect the children resulted from mixed marriage, and also influence marital behaviour and attitude towards divorce. That is why, as the respondents argued, it is better for Cypriots to choose from those nationalities with which they have some commonalities/similarities: “We search to see which ethnicity is closer to ours”. Thus, some respondents stated clearly that “Common ethnical features constitute an advantage for a mixed married couple and the opposite”. Religion is a case in point, as respondents pointed out: “If foreigners are Christians, there is no reason to disagree with mixed marriage”; amongst Christians, the Orthodox are favoured: “Only Orthodox foreigners are accepted”. Moreover, the religious gap might be a serious obstacle: “The religion plays a very important role in a family, so Muslims and Christians cannot live together”. A conclusion could be that the nationality of a foreigner should influence a Cypriot’s marriage decision “In order to avoid large contrast and oppositions leading to later problems”; this is the point of view expressed by most Cypriot respondents.

(b) Except for differences or commonalities, other factors that concern characteristics of an individual nature in spouse selection might support the opinion that foreign nationality influences Cypriots’ marriage decisions: “It is about subjective preference for different nationalities”, “Each nationality differs from the other so that the Cypriots will choose”, “It is not hard for Cypriots to decide when the partner is British or American”, “I don’t like at all some nationalities”. Thus, factors such as preferences and tastes are brought into the question when one says that the foreign nationality influences Cypriots’ marriage decisions.

(c) The preferences for material resources are invoked as reason why foreigners’ nationality influences marriage decision: “Lots of these girls have as purpose money, Cypriot citizenship and Cypriot residence”. This can be disastrous as long as “Cypriot women take into account nationality and Cypriot men don’t”. Instead, “Cypriot men take into account mostly, only foreign spouses’ physical appearance”. These reasons support assumptions of the exchange theory about resources exchanges between spouses.

(d) There is another large category of reasons that were frequently invoked by the respondents when they have motivated why foreigners’ nationality influences Cypriots’ marriage decisions. These are the reasons about prejudice, xenophobia and, generally, reasons regarding third parties’ influences. Thus, foreigners’ nationality influences marriage decisions taken by Cypriots because “The Cypriots comment mixed marriage because of their prejudices about each nationality”, “Because deep inside we are racist” and “Because there is enough prejudice and xenophobia in Cypriot society”.
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(e) The people questioned mentioned also, reasons that emphasize opportunity for contacts on marriage market: “Those who marry foreigners perhaps cannot find Cypriot partners”. The fact that one cannot find mates on marriage market is related to the influence of different factors. One factor could be one’s declined desirability as marriage partner because of different personal characteristics: marital status (e.g. divorced), age (e.g. old ages), economic background (e.g. very low incomes), physical appearance (e.g. not very good-looking) etc.

(f) Third parties’ (more exactly, close family and relatives) influences on mate selection are also said to influence Cypriot marriage decision for a foreign spouse: “Because a Cypriot will be influenced by his/her relatives” and “Mixed marriage will be commented by Cypriots’ relatives”. Also, an extreme opinion about the perception of mixed marriage was exposed: “Because mixed marriage is considered to be a taboo in the Cypriot society”. Therefore, the reasons why people questioned believe that foreigners’ nationality influences Cypriots’ marriage decisions coincide with the reasons invoked against mixed marriage.

Only a quarter of the people questioned believed that foreigners’ nationality does not influence Cypriots’ marriage decision. Less than a quarter of the respondents gave their reasons; there are also more male than female respondents who answered this question. These reasons coincide with those invoked as reasons in favour of mixed marriage.

(a) Love, psychological/personality traits and free choice of marriage partner are the most frequent reasons that emphasize the primacy of personal marital decision without any other interference. Of course, this is an ideal case that denies societal influences. Love is perceived as a primordial principle that overcomes any influence of nationality: “If there is love, there are no nationalities” (women and young people are more likely to give this reason). Moreover, “If Cypriots marry foreigners, this is out of love”. But love can be dangerous, as long as “When Cypriots fall in love, they don’t see things clearly”.

(b) When a Cypriot marries a foreigner, this is already a choice for difference: “Ethnicity doesn’t matter as long as the spouse is already a foreigner”; this is a reason free from any discrimination against different nationalities. Furthermore, “Nationality of a bride is not important for men” and “A possible problem could be the religion, not the nationality”.

(c) Some respondents did not perceive nationality as an impediment anymore, since “Cypriots enter now marriages with lots of nationalities” and “There are differences, but in our contemporary world, these are no obstacles anymore”. Respondents are aware of the high frequency of mixed marriage in nowadays Cyprus (as their estimations about the number of mixed marriage in Cyprus already showed) and given this high frequency, the phenomenon of mixed marriage is not considered as a form of deviation from homogamy rules.
(d) In this context, foreign nationality is not a determinant factor for Cypriots’ marriage decision since, mixed marriage is perceived as a second chance for those people with declined desirability in the mate selection process: “Because they don’t find a Cypriot spouse”. Besides, ‘nationality’ is not determinant for marriage decision because: “Nowadays almost everybody searches for good-looking partners”; then, physical appearance in this case is supposed to determine the marital choice. Overall, the reasons given to support the belief that foreign nationality is not a determinant condition for Cypriots’ marriage decision are very similar with the reasons that people questioned invoked when they agreed with the idea of mixed marriage.

Almost a quarter of respondents did not know if there is any influence of the foreign nationality in Cypriot marriage decision-making process. Only a few of these respondents also gave their reasons for argumentation. There are five recoded reason-categories that reveal both situations: when foreign nationality ‘influences’ and when it ‘doesn’t influence’ Cypriots’ marriage decision. The most frequent reason is the following: “If is out of love, nationality plays no role; if it is a marriage of convenience, then it does”. Also, “It depends on how much they love each other”. These reasons expose the two-sided reality of mixed marriage (as it has been already discussed) and of the mixed marriage decision, as it is perceived at the level of Cypriot public opinion. There is a socially accepted mixed marriage out of love and a mixed marriage that is usually an extreme “blank” marriage out of interest or marriage of convenience. One could delimit here a so-called “covert discrimination” against mixed marriage since ‘nationality’ is not a determinant factor as long as marital partners are bounded by love relationship and the opposite. Negative and positive stereotypes about different foreign nationalities living in Cyprus appear to constitute the lenses throughout which the Cypriots perceive mixed marriage, given the fact that non-mixed marriage happens exactly for the same reasons: paraphrasing a respondent’s statement, “out of love or out of convenience”.

In other words, according to the existing prejudices at the level of public opinion and stereotypes (positive and negative) about each nationality (as mentioned by the respondents) the Cypriots are likely to judge mixed marriage. The general criteria are: religion, economic standing and racial characteristics, such as skin colour. A nationality that has many similarities with the Cypriots on these markers is most likely to be perceived as closer in terms of social distance and implicitly acceptance.

This is the reason why Cypriots accept easily European foreigners, and not Asian or African. This is a form of (racial) discrimination as long as mixed marriage partners are perceived by Cypriots favourably or less favourably, according to their nationality, even if there are registered marriages between Cypriots and different nationalities. As some respondents argued, “Cypriots enter into mixed marriages with many nationalities”. In an optimistic manner, one could expect that the large number of mixed marriages in Cyprus
and the diversity of foreign nationalities that enter into mixed marriages with Cypriots will contribute to a greater acceptance of the phenomenon, year-by-year (see the increasing number of mixed marriage recorded every year). Overall, the Cypriot respondents gave answers that are confirmed by the statistical data findings, and then, the three working hypotheses are verified.

The next step in analyzing mixed marriage in Cyprus is to investigate the phenomenon from within, giving a voice to those who are its main protagonists. This task requests a qualitative approach of mixed marriage between Cypriots and foreigners in Cyprus, which has as a purpose to identify the factors that intervene in mixed marriage spouse selection process. This type of inquiry is undertaken in the following chapter.
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Introduction

The content analysis of the findings from the twenty semi-structured interviews was completed according to the conceptualization framework of the qualitative research developed in this study (see section 3.7., Chapter III). The discourse is centred on the three main topics that are interplaying in the mixed marriage mate selection process: Preferences of individuals for certain characteristics in a spouse; the influence of the social groups of which the spouses are members; and the constraints of the marriage market in which individuals are searching for a spouse. As an attempt to evaluate the success of the mating and matching process, some other topics are brought into discussion, such as: children from mixed marriages, work and life as a foreigner in Cyprus. Given the broad meanings and their possible interpretations, as they were revealed by qualitative data, each topic (or analytic category) will be discussed separately in the following sections.

5.1. The Context: Mixed marriage in a Changing Cypriot Society

The qualitative content analysis of the semi-structured interviews with foreign spouses revealed some facts about Cypriot society, that have been also previously identified in this study both by reviewing the literature of the domain and by analyzing statistical data on mixed marriage and immigration in Cyprus. After the Turkish invasion in 1974, in the decade of the eighties Cyprus economy underwent an economic boom, and started to develop as a flourishing economy. This economic growth caused an unprecedented immigration flow to Cyprus in the nineties; and this trend is nowadays even more accentuated (as statistical data show). The increasing immigration flow together with tourism in Cyprus changed the demographic structure of the native population causing a prevailing stock of marriageable partners, composed especially of foreign women. In this context, mixed marriage in Cyprus started to become a wide-spread phenomenon. This period also coincided with the years of liberation from Russian influence and communism of the East-European countries, a region that used to have and still has less developed national economies, by comparison to the Western countries. Countries from the Eastern part of Europe constitute the sender-countries for short-term and long-term immigrants in Cyprus; meanwhile the Western part of Europe constitutes the region with the highest rates of tourism in Cyprus. In short, the development of the Cypriot economy created the conditions favourable to an increase both in tourism and in immigration flow to Cyprus. These tendencies were revealed in Chapter II that accounted for the changing context of Cypriot society.
In this sense, most of the participants in the semi-structured interviews succeeded to give a picture of all these societal dynamics registered in statistics with demographical data.

Youta, a Danish woman met her Cypriot husband eighteen years ago in Limassol. At that time, she was a tourist and one of the many Western tourist women who met their husbands in Cyprus. She exposed an 18 years old image of Limassol, the second important city of Cyprus and the biggest harbour:

“... it was very nice here- it’s been totally different- Limassol was a little fishing town that time and here where we are (a.n. Makariou avenue) was not even asphalt. There was no building near the harbour and now is full. And the people were different, friendlier, and more kind- there was more restaurants and very few pubs. Now is mostly pubs and also, the streets are dirtier”. This is a picturesque image of a small town in opposition to the contemporary image of a developing city. In only twenty years, the Cypriot small towns have grown very fast, developing as prosperous economic systems and people’s living standards also improved. But the economic change has also influenced Cypriots’ everyday social interaction. Many of the foreign respondents referred to trends in changing systems of values, attitudes, believes, opinions or lifestyles in Cyprus. They often concluded that the shift in the economic domain was faster than the changes in Cypriot mentality. The parallelism between the changes undergone in these two spheres is commented by Ana, a Czech woman married to a Cypriot man who first came to Cyprus with her husband fifteen years ago:

“I think their problem (Cypriots’ problem) is that their economic standard developed more quickly that they managed to develop culturally/intellectually. Here, the economic standard for an average family is: a house, 2 or 3 cars and children who study; few years ago the standard was a TV, mobile phones and other electrical machines- they all have now these things. All these things in my country are not the economic standard, and here in Cyprus they are. But the cultural level didn’t develop concomitantly with the economic growth. In my country happened the opposite way around.” This quotation shows the discordance between the economic development and mentality resistance to change. In spite of the fact that Cypriots’ economic standards improved quickly, the changes in mentality need time and generations and therefore constitute long-duration processes.

A common point made by both categories of respondents (from the Euro-American and East-European group of countries- as considered in the present study) constitutes an observation about what they called ‘Cypriot mentality’ considered as inferior and less European, and even proposed ways of coping with it. Of course, this is not a theme that makes the object of this study, but addresses it in a more indirect way. This is the reason why the respondents’ arguments about Cypriot mentality will be more closely examined in a separate section.

Another theme that concerns mentality, and concomitantly illustrates the changing context of Cypriot society is the emancipation of Cypriot women. This is also a recent
phenomenon mentioned, amongst others, by Genette, a Swedish woman married to a Cypriot man:

“I came here 12 years ago and that time, you would never have found any Cypriot girl working in a bar, café or restaurant, ever. Did not exist because they would got a very bad name, if they did. They didn’t dress the way they do now- as with tights or mini skirts, no. Time has changed a lot of things in Cyprus, actually. But I find that many times they try to keep up with the men and many times they do like the bad things the men used to do. So, the Cypriot women are now like the men, unfortunately: they drink more, smoke more and have also lovers. You couldn’t see these ten years ago. But today they changed a lot- they travel more and see other women in Europe, so the Cypriot women are getting stronger. They don’t want to sit home with the baby anymore, but go to work. Also, here the mother raises her children and then raises her grandchildren- it is a very common thing in Cyprus, they still do that. But I think the young Cypriot women today, they won’t raise their grandchildren, I doubt it very much”. The Swedish woman respondent described with the eyes of a foreigner the dynamics of a process which coincided with her arrival in Cyprus- it started at that time and is still developing. It evokes the entry of Cypriot women in the public sphere and the negation of the primacy given to their biological role attached to the private sphere. When considering these changes in the gender role of Cypriot women from a feminist perspective, one could evaluate them as a sign of modernization, a decline in traditional values that used to govern Cyprus as a small-size society. Whatever perspective might be adopted, the point here is that this phenomenon indicates a change in social interaction patterns and implicitly in systems of values and believes in Cyprus.

In these conditions of shifting social patterns in Cyprus, the local marriage market is shaped by the demographic composition of the population as a whole. As the statistical data analysis indicated, starting with the nineties, the immigration flow to Cyprus and the rate of mixed marriages have showed increasing rates, year by year. Therefore, beginning with this period, the local marriage market has been greatly influenced by tourism and the increased number of foreign women, usually from the former Soviet Block and Eastern Europe who came to work in Cyprus.

A German woman, Marian described the implications of this phenomenon on the Cypriots’ perception of different foreign nationals who live in Cyprus:

“Actually, now there is a problem with all these coming from the countries that were under Russian influence and if before I used to be approached as English (anything foreign was English) now everything foreign is Russian. I don’t have anything against the Russians, but because of the way they look like English. I don’t like the fact that before they thought I’m English and now they think I’m Russian. But English was the superior and Russians…you know what’s happening. I’m sorry about this- I know a lot of Russian people and I like them, but it’s just what’s happening”. If the “English identity” is perceived as a superior one, what is happening with the “Russian identity” – since the two identities are opposed in the public opinion discourse? The “Russian identity” denotes, at the level of Cypriot public opinion, all the East-European nationalities that used to be under Russian influence. This is how, in a way, the Russian
political influence constructed stigmatized Eastern-European identities. At the level of public opinion discourse in Cyprus, these countries are still perceived as a regional entity which is characterized by weak economies, low wages and poverty, unemployment and low living standards.

In the next section the word is given to those respondents who came from these East-European countries (both Former Soviet Union and Eastern-European groups of countries) and who described the economic conditions in their home countries as these used to be around ten years ago, when most of them came to Cyprus.

5.2. Preferences of Mixed Marriage Candidates

In Western societies, the preferences of the partners are usually central in the process of partner choice. In the following sections, the preferences of the twenty participants in this study will be analyzed.

From an exchange theoretical perspective, revealed by the literature review, unmarried men and women or potential spouses operate within a marriage market which defines aggregate patterns of marriage selection. Potential spouses are evaluated on the basis of the resources they have to offer for exchange. Several kinds of resources obviously play a role in the choice of a spouse, but sociologists have mostly focused on socioeconomic and cultural resources. When married, spouses pool these resources to produce family goods, such as economic well-being, status, social confirmation, and affection.

5.2.1. Socioeconomic Resources of Cypriot and Foreign Spouses

Socioeconomic resources are defined as resources that produce economic well-being and status (Kalmijn, 1998). Economic well-being is shared by the family members and status is granted to the family as a unit rather than to its individual members. As a result, the income and status of one spouse contribute to the income and status of the other by raising the income and status of the family. People maximize their income and status by searching for a spouse with attractive socioeconomic resources. The outcome of this competition is that the most attractive candidates select among themselves while the least attractive candidates rely on one another. As a result, competition for socioeconomic resources on the marriage market leads to an aggregate pattern of homogamy (as discussed in chapter one). This point is illustrated by Valeria, a Russian woman married to a Cypriot man:
‘My husband is not rich, is a middle-class man. To marry a millionaire you have to be a millionaire too, to belong to their society’. ‘In Russia I had the same salary I have now, but there I worked much less and did a better job then I do here’.

In Russia, she used to be an opera singer and in Cyprus works as a music teacher in two private music schools. Her husband is a civil servant and has been working in a government job for twenty years. He has no university studies, but earns a higher wage than his spouse. Therefore, Valeria’s status and prestige changed negatively, in the sense of a downward occupational mobility without any change in her income levels (as she declared). Therefore, the income and status of their family depend primarily on the occupation of the Cypriot husband who has a superior socioeconomic background.

With regard to status and prestige, when the status of the family depends primarily on the occupation of the husband, there will be an exchange of male prestige and female qualities in other respects, such as class background, physical attractiveness, and cultural participation (Jacobs & Furstenberg, 1986; Stevens et al, 1990; Uunk, 1996). But also, with an increasing number of married women participating in the labour market, the wife’s socioeconomic resources may also become increasingly important for the status and economic well-being of the family (Davis, 1984). This is the case of the most working women interviewed. Their work is motivated by economic needs of their families. A case in point is that of Lia’s, a Romanian woman who raised both her children and as soon as they went to school she found a job:

“We have problems because of the money- all the problems start from money: when you don’t have or you have too much; anyway, the latter is not and will not be my case. For the time being, our financial situation improved because almost one year before, I started work”.

This example illustrates also, the case when the competition among marriage partners searching for a spouse on the marriage market varies with the role women play in society.

When marriage is based on the benefits that stem from the division of paid and domestic labour in the household, prevailing gender differences in earning give men a comparative advantage in productive labour so that the wife’s time is used more efficiently when is spent on household labour and children raising. As a result, men and women exchange paid and domestic labour resources (Kalmijn, 1998).

This is the situation of five women and one man participants in the study; the latter matches the “stereotype” of the woman as belonging to the private sphere. Therefore, Ron is an English man married to a Cypriot woman, a music teacher in a public school. This is an example of fatherhood: he stays home looking for their one-year old baby and his wife plays the role of “the breadwinner”:

“I want just to be happy and have children. Personally, I didn’t get any goals, she wants to continue a career and I was happy to let her continue a career, look after the baby and support her. It is the opposite way round from most relationships. Especially in Cyprus, it is only the woman staying home, does the housework etc and the man has a career. But because of the age
difference, I've done the work I wanted to do and I've got no real goals and she has, and I came out with the best option which I think we had’” (Ron). This case is very suggestive for the situation of gender roles transgression and confirms the difference between the superior status of the native Cypriot irrespective of gender and the inferior status of foreigner/immigrant in Cyprus, again irrespective of gender, together with all the imbalanced power relations stemming from this status inequality. It also could suggest a point of view for explaining why the mixed marriages between Cypriot women and foreign men are less frequent than those between foreign women and Cypriot men.

Even if they have usually low-paying jobs, foreign women in Cyprus do participate in the labour market and produce socioeconomic resources for their families. The point here is whether their labour is the reflection of women’s desire to work outside the home or a reflection of economic needs of their family. The content analysis of the semi-structured interviews revealed that the specific case is rather the second one: foreign women’s paid labour is a reflection of the economic needs of their families. Most of them work to pay loans they took for paying a property. This is the case of a Romanian woman, Lia; it is also Lena’s case, a Bulgarian woman and Valeria’s, a Russian woman.

“Now that I work and we are better financially speaking, we succeeded to buy this apartment, of course with a loan…when I’ll be 60, I will own it…(Lia smiles).

Furthermore, for Valeria, work means financial independence in marital relationship:

“I worked as a receptionist, then worked in some tourist agencies and now I work in two music schools and I don’t have problems with the money. I don’t ask him (her husband) everyday to give me five or ten pounds. I have my money and it gives me independence”.

Another two foreign women work in order to save some money to buy a property or to pay for their children’s education. One is Nadejda’s case, a divorced Ukrainian woman with one daughter, who married a divorced Cypriot man with three children. She works as a waitress in a restaurant and her husband is a driver.

“ We have some problems because now we don’t have any property- we rent a flat. Because in my country everybody tries to have their house, I also try to do something. When he divorced, he gave everything to his ex-wife and children. So, we work and save to buy something, but now it is not so easy with the prices going up. I don’t know if we can fix this problem”. (Nadejda)

A similar case is Olga’s, a divorced Russian woman, 45 years old with one daughter; she married a Cypriot man, divorced with three children from two previous marriages. The last-mentioned two cases constitute matches of spouses with similar marital backgrounds as divorced with children and therefore, declined eligibility on the marriage market. They mentioned also, the poor economic backgrounds of their divorced Cypriot spouses.

Whatever rationale is invoked for their participation in the labour market, the foreign women working in Cyprus enter this market with the purpose of gaining economic resources. From a total of eighteen foreign women respondents, thirteen women participate in paid workforce. If we consider nationality, eleven of these working women
are women from the East-European group of countries and only two are women from the Euro-American (or Western) group of countries. It is significant to note that these last two working women have divorced Cypriot men and entered companionate relationship with other Cypriot partners. They have also children to rise and good paying jobs that do not require Greek language proficiency which they did not achieve.

5.2.1.1 Socioeconomic Resources of Eastern-European Spouses

From the group of eleven Eastern-European women, eight came to Cyprus as migrant workers and this is how they met their Cypriot husbands. What was it that pushed them to search for work abroad? They invoked reasons that refer to the economic situation of the Eastern-European countries after the crash of communism as a political system. At the beginning of the nineties, these countries entered a period of transition to market economy that translated into a system crisis with all its consequences: unemployment, job insecurity, low wages and poor living standards and as an outcome, people’s impulse to leave their countries in search for a better living.

The Eastern-European women respondents gave a very illustrative account of this economic situation and their wish to search for better paid jobs outside their countries- this constitutes a leitmotiv that appeared in each of the interviews with these eight working women from Eastern-European countries. For example, Liana, a Romanian woman, describes the conditions that triggered many of her co-nationals abroad:

“...at the beginning of the 90s, life in Romania was very hard, it was a transition period from the communist regime to market economy and everybody was thinking to leave (...). After I finished the college I worked in Bucharest, but my thoughts were to leave, to leave...(laughing)...somewhere...the wage I got as a nurse was ... .We (Liana and her sister) could hardly pay the rent, and we used to buy our clothes by paying instalments...”.

Many confessions of the people interviewed show the incentive for East-European nationals to leave their countries (at least it used to be the situation ten years ago) and try to make a better living abroad. Apart from economic needs to be fulfilled through working abroad, living in a foreign country constituted also a ‘dream to come true’: the wish for contact with other people and cultures abroad. After the fall of the communist regime in Romania (the author knows from personal experience) everybody applied for a passport. This fact had also a symbolic meaning: getting a passport was equivalent in people’s minds with a proof of their newly-found freedom. Even if many people didn’t travel abroad, they wanted just to have a passport that has been for so many years a forbidden human right by a dictatorial regime.

In these conditions of economic instability in their countries, many women from East-European countries were brought to Cyprus by Cypriot employment agencies to fulfil workforce needs of the Cypriot economy. This is how the employment immigration flow to Cyprus registered an increase especially for those domains that were not covered by
working Cypriot women as: work in restaurants, pubs, cabarets or more professional jobs such as nurses. As has been already commented by respondents, ten years ago, Cypriot women’s participation in the labour market has not constituted a common phenomenon. Among other respondents, Youta, a Danish woman who married a Cypriot and came to Cyprus fifteen years ago illustrated the phenomenon of Cypriot women participating in employment: “The Cypriots seem to be busy now. When I moved here, all the Cypriot women were housewives, now they are not home; they all work. They’re working because they send their children to study abroad and it costs money. It’s very few who is not working”.

As statistical data show, there were more women than men from Eastern-European countries who came to Cyprus for work (between 1997 and 2004 there were 8,744 long-term immigrant men and 13,041 women coming to Cyprus from Eastern European countries -see for more details Chapter II). In the present sample, from the eight East-European female respondents who came to work in Cyprus, two worked as nurses, five worked as waitresses in pubs or coffee shops and one worked in cabaret. All of them came as migrant workers and it happened that they have met also Cypriot spouses.

What was their rationale for entering marriages to Cypriot men? In this case, one could assume that since they already have had their jobs in Cyprus, in order to assure longer-term stable incomes, they made also analogous choices for marriage partners. In Cyprus, the belief that East-European labour migrant women marry Cypriot men out of convenience is very common; it is believed that they exchange physical characteristics for socioeconomic resources of Cypriot men. This constitutes also a reason invoked by Cypriots against mixed marriage with foreigners in Cyprus, as was revealed by the questionnaire survey findings (see for details, Chapter IV).

How foreign women who entered mixed marriages, explained this presumed marital exchange? Lena, a Bulgarian woman married to a Cypriot man explains some disadvantages of a marriage out of material interest: “Many people from our countries: Bulgaria, Russia or Romania, want to marry foreigners in order to live a better life. Because they think that they will come here and find everything ready (because the situation is very bad in our countries). I am very happy that I didn’t get married for this reason, because if I got married for money and found whatever I found here in Cyprus, I would have felt worst than I feel now. Because…I don’t know…I don’t understand these things…to get marry to somebody…I knew cases (at the college and the university where I studied) who married guys from Palestine or Israel only to leave Bulgaria”. Once again, she is describing the East-European people’s incentive to leave home-country by any means; this incentive could conceal a so-called “dolce vita syndrome” of those who want to enter into mixed marriage with foreigners, mainly for material reasons.

47 The foreign workers in Cyprus obtain a working permit for a limited period of time: from six months to four years or up to six years in special cases. At the end of this period, their employer can decide to extend the duration of their work permit.
Material interests seem to be also the main incentive in case of divorce, not only in case of marriage. This point is illustrated, with some dose of humour, by a Romanian woman, Gabriela who married her Cypriot husband ten years ago:

“In general, what the Cypriots think about the Romanian women who came and got married here is that in case of divorce, they not only simply divorce, but take them even the sofa...this is their problem: not that you divorce and leave...they say you came here out of material interest. Then, they think ‘If she came out of interest, when she leaves, she must take something not to leave without anything...leaving back the interest (laughs)’. So, she must take something, a chair or something...thing that is true”.

None of the sample respondents declared that got married out of material interests or at least to secure a better living, even if all the male Cypriot spouses of the respondents in the sample have stable jobs with satisfactory earnings. At a first look, this case seems to illustrate that “who is going to marry whom” is merely a simple process of random meeting and spontaneous falling in love. It also contradicts the exchange perspective on mixed marriage that conceives it as a rationally and carefully guided transaction in which important economic and social considerations play a role. If one is to seek rationales for entering marriage, for each case separately, one could find himself/herself in the same dilemma mentioned by Dana, a Romanian woman married to a Cypriot man. Her ‘dilemma’ is illustrative for many cases invoked as examples by women interviewed:

“A first-cousin of mine is married to a Cypriot in Larnaca. She got married about ten years ago (...). I don’t know why she married him: their age difference is very big. She is 30 and he is 53 or 56 years old and he is not rich either. One might say that many times a woman could marry a man because he is rich; but he is not rich...neither rich nor handsome...”. An interesting point was made here: when neither socioeconomic status, nor physical appearance could be identified as reasons for mate selection (as the respondent mentioned), then one might speculate about many other reasons that are not so easy to be identified. The question here concerns the possibility to compare these marital relationships entered by East-European women (who came to work in Cyprus and then got married) to that ideal-type of relationship that Giddens (1992:49) calls “pure relationship”; this is a term that “refers to a situation where a social relation is entered into for its own sake, for what can be derived by each person from a sustained association with another; and which is continued only in so far as it is thought by both parties to deliver enough satisfactions for each individual to stay within it”. Also, Giddens remarks that nowadays marriage for many (but by no means all groups in the population) has veered increasingly towards the form of a pure relationship, with many ensuing consequences. It is hard to make such statements about all the previously mentioned relationships under study. To give an example: Lia, a Romanian woman married a Cypriot ten years ago and from what she says about their marital relationship, one could understand that this is a problematic one and is undoubtedly not the case of a ‘pure relationship’ mentioned by Giddens, as long as it
seems that it does not deliver enough satisfactions for each individual to stay within it. She confessed:

“It is easier to leave or to divorce when you don’t have children, you lost some years, but learnt something in order not to make again the same mistake; but when you got children is more difficult, you cannot decide to leave, you think about your children. I do the same, every family has fights and sometimes I say to myself that I cannot stay here anymore, I take my children and go back. I could go back, it would be harder since I got used to live here where the life is easier, but I lived also there (in Romania) and I would get used to it again. But I think of these children, if they wanted something here I had the possibility to offer them, but there (in Romania) I won’t have the same possibilities. Well, I didn’t have these kinds of problems…to leave …but I thought about it once or twice”.

Then, even if she makes some thoughts of returning back to her home-country, the children and a somehow better living standard in Cyprus keep her back. This is the case of many other Romanian women (as some Romanian women informed through everyday discussions with the author of this study) who live under the psychological tension and pressure of domestic violence: being hit, beaten and cheated by their Cypriot husbands; and they do not have the courage to leave because financially are not secure. In this sense, Lia referred to a former neighbour of her, also a Romanian woman who married a Cypriot man:

“I used to have as neighbour a Romanian girl married to a Cypriot. He is rich, 20 years older then her; she has everything she wants…but she is not happy. She stays with her child at home, he doesn’t let her to obtain a driving license or to work…she used to tell me: ‘If I have lived with my father, it would have been better than now that I live with him…”.” This extract illustrates how marital choices reflecting material resources-physical appearance exchanges do not guarantee a successful marital matching of the spouses involved. This case of a foreign woman who lives under the control of her husband is relevant for a certain type of marital relationship characterized by unbalanced relations of power and control between spouses being on subordinated positions.

5.2.1.2 Socioeconomic Resources of Euro-American Spouses

The Euro-American spouses interviewed did not come to Cyprus as migrant workers because in their countries the economic situation was poor (like in the case of the Eastern-European spouses). Four of them came to Cyprus as tourists and met their Cypriot partners; three of the Euro-American spouses met their Cypriot partners outside Cyprus, in their home-countries or abroad. By marrying Cypriot partners, sometimes they left jobs (that were better paid then are in Cyprus) and generally, for all of them, coming to live in Cyprus was translated into a downward mobility movement to lower socioeconomic statuses. This happens, to some extent, because of their inferior immigrant status and also, because of poor Greek language skills; this inequality between natives’ and
foreigners’ socioeconomic backgrounds is not gendered differentiated. In this sense, an example is illustrative: three foreign women and one man stopped working and remained home to care for children and to make housework. Therefore, irrespective of whether the Cypriot spouse is a man or a woman, he/she participates in paid employment.

Mayonee, an English woman married to a Cypriot husband described her economic background before and after her mixed marriage: "I’m actually more stable now than I was in England. I’m not working and it is very strange because in England I was earning a lot more money than my husband is here, but I’m more stable here because I think being single your value of money is obviously different from when you are married. So, now the money is going on the proper things, where they should go instead of clothes, make-ups…I feel more secure that is going on bills rather than…”. Mayonee shows how her perception on spending money changed once her marital status has changed and her material resources diminished. Her husband has a “good, stable job” on an English Base in Cyprus (a year after the interview, the author learnt that Mayonee got a job).

Family life with two children is valued more than a job; this is what Jane, an English woman married to a Cypriot declared: “I gave up my work. I used to work as a British tour operator and I was based in Larnaca. But it’s too difficult when you have children. I went back when my son was two and worked for a little while, but then when my daughter was born, I stopped work completely. It was too difficult with two children – the hours, the driving to the airport, you just don’t have family life at all.” She is now helping in her husband’s business and look after their children. Another example of housewife is that of Youta’s, a Danish woman who had a well-paid job in her country, left it and now has five children with her Cypriot husband: “I was working for the local government in Denmark- so, it was quite a good job”.

“Actually, I managed to do a lot in my work. (…) I quitted everything only to be with him (laughs). I took a chance and I said ‘I move down here’. Here I’ve never worked because of the children”. Her husband works as a welder and she declares is very happy with her family life.

A special case that has been already mentioned is that of Ron’s, an English man who married a Cypriot woman. It is a rare example of stay-at-home father in Cyprus:

“I’m sixteen years older than my wife, so, there’s a lot of difference there. I was educated in England, I had a good job and a good social standing. When I came to Cyprus where we married, my social status changed because I could only find part-time work here so it changed before we married. Prior to that I did a good job, well-paid, I was economically stable. Before I came I was a police officer in London and then left that job and worked as a sales manager before I came to Cyprus. Since I came to Cyprus, the only work I’ve been able to find- because I don’t speak Greek- is low-paid work”. An interesting point is made here about Greek language skills. A difference that is relevant (as resulted from the study) is that Eastern-European spouses are more proficient in Greek language than their Euro-American counterparts. Even if the latter have lived for longer in Cyprus, they have poor Greek language skills. This fact causes more difficulties in finding jobs, but it is not impossible since in Cyprus, English is the second widely spoken language.
Among all the participants, there is one foreign woman who succeeded in overcoming her inferior migratory status and assured a good socioeconomic standing. Her name is Pita, is Australian, divorced from her first Cypriot partner and entered a long-term relationship with a second Cypriot man:

“I went for my job which is swimming and I’ve done very well by myself in the end. I have a position and something I could work anywhere. And now, I’m wondering about my husband what’s going to do when his vinegar factory will close and he has nothing else to do.” The fact that she managed having a well-paid job is also invoked as one of the reasons that she divorced from her first Cypriot partner: “There’ve been a lot of small things in everyday life- he didn’t want me to go ahead in my job. I’m quite good in my job and I was making and I still make money on hour; so the money I make per hour my husband would never make that if he could get a job- doing what? Because I went ahead, that caused tension as well’. The point here is that foreign women’s resources and bargaining power are negatively influencing traditional beliefs about Cypriot masculinity and the man being the breadwinner and the head of the family. Even if considerable shifts in the gendered ideologies and practices of men and women in Cyprus have happened (see Chapter II about changing marriage patterns in Cyprus) there is still resentment about a wife’s incomes being higher then her husband’s. This situation is translated into a loss of control (less marital power) over the wife from the husband’s part. Many examples, particularly in this study, or in Cypriot society in general show that this fact may have ‘disastrous consequences’ for marital relationships between Cypriot men and foreign women. This topic will be also considered in the following sections, in relation to other aspects of mixed marriage in Cyprus.

A finding indicative of the cases investigated is that the mixed marital relationship foreign partner-Cypriot partner is an unequal power relationship. The Cypriot spouses have a superior position by virtue of their higher socioeconomic status translated into highest paying jobs by comparison to those of their foreign marriage partners. The foreign spouses (the majority being women in this sample) have an inferior position given by their low socioeconomic status translated into low-paying jobs or unpaid jobs as childcare and housework. In these respects, there is some difference between the two groups of foreign spouses’ nationalities: the percentage of East-European working spouses is higher than that of their Euro-American counterparts. Most of the East-European spouses came to Cyprus as migrant workers and continued to work after their marriages to Cypriots or entered employment after their marriages to Cypriot men (in the case that they came to Cyprus as tourists or spouses). Through employment in Cyprus, their socioeconomic status got improved compared to the socioeconomic status in their home countries.

Concerning the spouses from the West-European group of countries, the situation was opposite: they came to Cyprus as tourists and met their husbands or followed their Cypriot husbands leaving back in their countries a better socioeconomic status than they have succeeded to achieve in Cyprus (with one exception in the present study). As the
analyzed cases indicate, when these spouses managed to enter highest paying jobs, then their new socioeconomic status entered into conflict with the superior native status of Cypriots. This was often the situation when marital dissolution occurred. This difference between the two groups of foreign spouses’ nationalities is very well illustrated by their need to acquire Cypriot citizenship. All the East-European spouses have got or have applied for Cypriot citizenship at the time the interviews were taken. Meantime, none of the Euro-American spouses has applied for Cypriot citizenship. As, Genette, a Swedish woman put it: “I didn’t apply for citizenship, I don’t see any point”.

In contrast to the West-European women, the East-European spouses are aware of the opportunities they might have by being Cypriot citizens: better employment or access to higher paying jobs and then more marital power. Also, their aspiration for Cypriot citizenship is motivated by the fact that the nationalities they have need entrance-visas for Cyprus and residence permit to stay and work in Cyprus. This is not the case for the Western spouses who are not discriminated by the Cypriot immigration law because of their E.U. nationality. It's not the moment yet to discuss issues concerning discrimination between the West and the East of Europe, but the stigmatization of West-richness and East-poverty is present in all the aspects of social life and constitute the lenses throughout mixed marriage is judge at the level of Cypriot public opinion (as it has already revealed by the questionnaire survey findings presented in Chapter IV).

5.2.2. Cultural Resources of Cypriot and Foreign Spouses

While the importance of the socioeconomic resources is based on a preference to marry a resourceful spouse, independent of one’s own resources, the role of cultural resources is based on a preference to marry someone who is similar. Because the cultural similarity leads to personal attraction, it is a prerequisite for getting involved with someone (Kalmijn, 1998).

Cultural resources include: educational level, values, lifestyles, opinions, taste and knowledge. In this study, the cultural resources are considered as nonmaterial resources or relational assets together with psychological resources such as: love, esteem, approval and affection and also, resources referring to physical attractiveness or appearance. The influence of these three categories of relational assets (i.e. cultural resources, psychological resources and physical appearance) on marital decision in mixed marriage partner choice was investigated through questioning the twenty participants in this study.
5.2.2.1 Educational Level

Regarding cultural resources, it is known from previous studies (already mentioned in the literature review) that because of its instrumental effects, cultural similarity encourages people to establish long-term relationships. Let’s analyze how cultural resources have influenced marriage partner choice in the cases under study.

None of the respondents referred specifically to his/her partner’s educational level as an influential factor in spouse selection. In only one case, the foreign spouse referred to her husband’s education as to an unattractive factor that kept her back from entering into a relationship with him. This is the case of a Romanian woman married to a Cypriot man: «At the beginning, I tell you the truth, I didn’t feel attracted to him at all (she laughs). I had known him for some months, we weren’t together, but I couldn’t bear him because all the time he was talking about his college, about what he was learning at college…So that I was feeling myself inferior. I had come to Cyprus to work and earn some money, I have never liked school so that he made me nervous and I didn’t like him. After I decided to go out together and I got to know him better, I liked the way he was behaving towards me. If you could be invisible to see how our relationship is: how he behaves to me, talks to me, everything he does is wonderful! It is amazing!” (Dana). Since her husband’s educational level determined her to feel inferior, she felt attracted by his behaviour- an important psychological resource in a long-term relationship.

When the foreign spouses had a higher educational level than their husbands’, this fact didn’t translate into an impediment in partner choice process or in their marital relationships. This is how Youta, a Danish woman presented the imbalance of spouses’ educational levels in her case:

’’My education is quite good compared to my husband’s. I’ve been in an office and business school in Denmark, and then I’ve been in more specialized schools within the government as well. I was quite good, actually. I was better compared to my husband’s, but it is okay’’.

Eleven out of the twenty mixed marriages are not homogamous with respect to the educational level of spouses; in nine out of these eleven cases the foreign wives have higher educational levels by comparison to their Cypriot husbands’ and in only two cases are the husbands more educated than their wives. These inequality between spouses’ educational levels does not translate into higher socioeconomic resources for foreign wives because they are either unemployed or employed in lower paying jobs comparative to those of their Cypriot husbands. This is how higher educational resources do not determine higher incomes for foreign spouses in mixed marriages in Cyprus; in other words, educationally resourceful foreign spouses gain less material resources then their educationally less resourceful Cypriot spouses who gain more material resources. It could

---

48 See Appendix G for further details concerning demographic characteristics of the interviewees.
be a reason why participant spouses’ education did not influence partners’ marital choice in mixed marriage in Cyprus.

5.2.2.2 Similarity of Taste and Knowledge

Another cultural resource significant in mate selection is the ‘similarity of taste’; it is important because enlarges opportunity to participate in joint activities. This is how Valeria, a Russian woman expressed the similarity of taste with her husband’s and believed that it was one of the factors that attracted her to the partner:

“We have common interests: we both like to travel. He was interested to show me Cyprus and after I liked to show him Moscow”. 

A further cultural characteristic mentioned as an attraction factor is the similarity of knowledge that creates a common basis for conversation, enhancing mutual understanding. Evelina, a Bulgarian woman exposed how this type of cultural resources constituted a main attraction factor to her partner:

“As soon as I met him, he impressed me because he is very clever, educated and we can discuss a lot of topics together. We have nine years of marriage, but every time we have a conversation, I learn something new. We always have something interesting to discuss. (...) He is a smart and special man: this is why I felt in love with him”. 

This cultural resource about similarity of taste and knowledge does not constitute one of the main attraction factors in spouse selection processes that made the subject of this particular analysis. Moreover, respondents’ confessions attested that this similarity of taste and knowledge between the partners in mixed marriages has developed in time, along with a common marital lifestyle, a fact that influences the success of any mixed marital relationship.

5.2.2.3 Psychological Resources

There are two ideas expressed in the above-mentioned interview fragment: one is that cultural resources played an important role for spouse’s falling in love and the second is that this type of resources still plays an important role in their relationship. A common finding for all the respondents is that they mentioned cultural resources, psychological and physical characteristics (all relational resources) as constituting determinant factors for their falling in love with the partners. In this sense, an illustrative case is that of Youta’s, a Danish woman married to a Cypriot man: “When I met him, I didn’t have the intention to get married. That was like a fire: love at first sight. We are just happy to be together, so we’re still in love”.

“I’ve just married my husband out of love- I didn’t think of him as a foreigner or something like that. It was out of love”. 

Although the decision to marry is in part a pragmatic one, within the Western cultural tradition today, being ‘in love’ is seen as an essential precondition for marriage. Marrying
other than on the basis of free choice and romantic love, particularly the practice of arranged marriage specific to Muslim societies, may be judged very negatively from the standpoint of European culture. What is love, and when does it occur? According to various theories and literary traditions, “love can involve sexual passion, romantic idealization, affection, companionship, altruism, dependence, attachment, and shared experiences” (Cancian, 1994; Hendrick & Hendrick, 1996). Regardless of the type of love predicted or the stages that the love relationship is supposed to go through, most theories assume that love involves a ‘market exchange’.

Let’s see what kinds of resources were invoked by the respondents as attraction factors to their partners. The most often mentioned were their partners’ psychological resources and physical appearance. The psychological resources refer to personality and character traits that are most often valued as socially desirable traits in all individuals. It is interesting to show how the respondents see this matching of psychological traits (expressed by their definition of ‘good man’, a leitmotiv appearing in all interviews) influencing their partner choice and marital relationship. In this sense, Lia, a Romanian woman said about her husband:

“My man is a good man, of course he is not perfect, I am not perfect either, nobody is perfect, but at least we manage to understand each other and he is a good man: he doesn’t beat me and doesn’t go with other women”. In her definition of “good man” Lia referred to three psychological traits she valued: flexibility, non-aggressiveness and faithfulness. These are not enough to reach perfection, but she appreciated them and seems to be satisfied.

In another case, the attraction factor in mate selection was the difference in psychological characteristics. It is the case of a Cypriot woman (offspring from mixed marriage who self-identifies with her mother’s nationality) married to a Palestinian man: “Principally, I felt attracted because he is a naughty boy, more daring than I am. Actually I am the opposite: I do only whatever is correct (I used to be a serious student). Because he was different, I liked this difference between our personalities. And finally he proved to be a good man, a generous man who is always ready to give you everything” (Natasha). Like in physics, the opposites attract or an exchange in different psychological resources made the result attractive for each partner. In this case, the definition for “good man” is generosity.

Liana, a Romanian woman invoked more than one type of cultural resources that attracted her: “He is a very good man, very nice and has a very big soul. We’ve met each other 8 years ago… At that time he was very sincere and very interested about everybody… At the beginning, the idea to be married to a foreigner didn’t attract me…why? Before I got married, I had known two or three foreign girls married here and their marriages were not successful at all…but when I met Chris, my opinion changed…because his family and educational backgrounds are very different”. Here, the partner’s psychological resources (the definition of “good man” in this instance) as: generosity, sincerity, kindness are considered together with educational level and family background, factors that played a certain role in spouse selection.
What attracted Lena, a Bulgarian woman, to her partner? This is how she described her attraction feelings to the marriage partner: “It is written on his face that he is a good man, nothing else. From so many people in the bus station I went to ask him about the bus, and I didn’t know that he was a foreigner; simply, I asked him because he seemed to me a good man. And it showed out that I wasn’t wrong. I didn’t want somebody who is like me, contrary I wanted someone who is quiet, family-oriented and attached because I am very crazy” (she is laughing). Again, “good man” meant a spouse with attractive psychological resources. The definition of “good man” in this case is: quite, family-oriented and attached. All these psychological traits are valued as different from the other spouse’s resources. Another time, the difference in spouses’ psychological characteristics is valued as an attraction factor in mate selection.

In Alex’s case, a Palestinian man married to a Cypriot woman, the main attraction factor was mutual understanding as a shared, common psychological resource: “I feel attracted to my wife because she understands me; we understand each other, this is why we became friends at the beginning when we first met. Therefore, the main advantage is that we are satisfied with our relationship. Before getting married, we have lived together for three years. So, we got to know each other very well and nothing was against the marital decision we took together.” The common life before marriage strengthened the shared psychological resources that the spouses had in common at the beginning of their relationship. Therefore, mutual understanding as a main reason for love played a central role in spouse selection, in this particular case.

Mayonee, an English woman invoked ‘love’ as the determinant factor in mixed marriage decision: “I think I gave up a lot of friends and I think I knew…I thought a lot before I came that I would leave my family and my friends, that it would be very difficult for me here, being a foreigner…but obviously my love for my husband wanted me over so, I struggled a lot…but I don’t think I’ve lost.” She emphasized the conflict situation that each foreigner who marries in Cyprus must overcome: it is very suggestive called “struggle”. In this situation, the foreigner loses his/her family support and security; therefore he/she exchanges these psychological resources for similar psychological resources provided by partner’s “love”.

In opposition to difference in psychological characteristics as attraction factor in mate selection, it is the commonality of psychological traits as a factor of attraction. Gabriela, a Romanian woman argued why she matched with her Cypriot spouse: “We both have a good sense of humour. I think that’s why we match”. In the following instance, physical and psychological characteristics are jointed in a combination that deletes any perception of the marriage partner as a ‘foreigner’. These grouped characteristics succeeded in minimizing any “inconvenience” of being a foreigner and it appears to constitute the ideal situation when marrying a foreigner.

This is how Jane, an English woman talked about her husband: “I suppose physically he appeared to me, but it was his personality. He was very supportive of me when I was working. I
was having troubles with my job and I was a little unhappy. And he was very supportive and all
listening what was happening. Also, he has good sense of humour and I like to have a good laugh.
And as I said, I don’t really thought of him as a foreigner. And I didn’t think of that as being a
problem”. This fragment reveals as attraction factors, personality traits such as: supportiveness and
good sense of humour together with physical appearance.

In another case, it is again personal traits such as supportiveness and kindness that
played a role in marriage mate selection. Olga, a Russian woman, divorced with one
daughter explained what determined her to feel attracted to her Cypriot husband:
“I had some troubles with the work here in Cyprus and my husband helped me a lot to cope with
these. He was very supportive of me”. She made her decision after weighted the personal
traits of her husband: “I think I’ll stay here for life, because my husband is a good man. He is
good and behaves well to me. I love him very much and he also loves me. He is also good friend
with my daughter”.

“My husband is not a bad man- he is correct, has a big hard and takes good decisions”.
The definition of “good man” in this case includes: desirable behaviour, kindness,
rightness in taking decisions and generosity. It is worth to note a particularity of mate
selection in the case of divorced spouses, with children from previous marriages. In the
present case, both spouses are divorced, with children and older than 45 years; then it is
a case of partners with decrease desirability in the marriage market. A motivation factor
invoked by the foreign spouse who fears to get old and be alone is suggestive:
“I am not old, I’m 45, and I’m strong enough to live on my own. And if you are not married, you can
go wherever you want, even to disco- nobody tells you something. But I grow older and when I’ll be
older then 50, I cannot stay alone. My daughter will leave, she has her life and I will be alone. I
cannot stand being alone, I cannot stay alone. When I’ll be 50 who will want me? We are well
together, we’ll grow old together” (Olga). The point here is the role of opportunity that
influenced marriage partner choice. Olga rationalized her choice and succeeded an
assortative mating in demographic characteristics such as: age proximity and marital
status. This female respondent did not have the intention to marry (as she declared), but
because the right occasion showed up, she made her choice.

5.2.2.4 Physical Appearance

Apart from the two cases foregoing mentioned that are assortative or homogamic
concerning demographical characteristics such as: age and marital status, another three
cases under the study are dissimilar regarding the same demographical characteristics.
Valeria, a divorced Russian woman married to a twelve years older Cypriot man (who was
not married before), felt attracted by his personal traits (psychological and physical) but
also, by structural factors such as contextual factors that will be referred in another
section.
‘He looks intelligent, I don’t know, maybe he is my type of looking: he is not short, not fat. He looks a little bit Italian, such type of Cypriot’.

‘When I met him and he told me that has no parents I thought it was an opportunity to get married too. When we decided to marry I thought it was very good that he has only one sister and no parents, because I had a bad experience with my ex-mother-in-law’. In this case, Valeria’s spouse’s physical appearance and family background constituted the attraction factors. Here, physical attractiveness is valued as an attribute of a potential partner in itself so that it might be a “taste” that is indulged independent of whatever pattern of behaviour is expected from that individual. In exchange theory’s terms, simply interacting with a physically attractive person might be seen as a benefit, perhaps substantial enough to offset any costs anticipated from the interaction.

Beauty and youth as criteria for mate selection is partly Ron’s case, an English man who married a Cypriot woman, sixteen years younger than him. This is how he presented some characteristics that made his spouse attractive to him:

“…she is just a very nice person! She was studying in England and she made an effort to go to English places, pubs etc. Her English is very good. (…) I wouldn’t say that I was attracted to her because she was English. But I would say that it made her more interesting to me. Also, a different culture, it made her interesting but it was not the reason. She is very attractive etc, so – I think anyone would be attracted… (laughs)”. The point here is that the female spouse is not only attractive, but also young. From the point of view of evolutionary social psychology (Cunningham et al, 1997) the specifics of what is experienced as attractive are said to be somewhat different for men and women. Granted women’s relatively short period of reproductive potential, youth is proposed as a particularly attractive attribute of women for men, while control over resources and a willingness to share those resources with a mate during vulnerable periods of pregnancy and early child care are proposed as particularly attractive attributes of men for women. The case in point is very suggestive in this sense, as Ron confessed: “…she is a teacher. So, her status is very good; it is considered a good job here; it’s very well-paid for the hours they do. So, I stay home and care for the baby we have and enable her to continue the career. I don’t think I saw somebody else, a husband to care for a baby here. Because the work I can find is very low-paid, it’s better to stay home and care for the baby.”

While this example leaves plenty of room for variation between cultures in the specifics of what is recognized as attractive in either sex, it does suggest that there are some broad constraints of culture in this respect. As the foreign male respondent mentioned, in the Cypriot culture there is not so much place for men’s involvement in child care and housework- resources that are valued by his wife whom he described as being ‘English in her mentality’. The following sections make more reference to the traditional gender roles as they appear in Cypriot culture, from the point of view expressed by foreign spouses married to Cypriots.
A third case of demographically dissimilar individuals (because of differences in age and marital status) is that of a single Bulgarian woman, Evelina, who married a Cypriot man twenty years older, divorced with two children from his previous marriage. The foreign spouse declared why she felt attracted by her partner:

‘I’ve just fallen in love with him and didn’t consider the fact that he is a foreigner. Even if he were from my country, I would have fallen in love with him, of course if he were the same person. I don’t care if he is Cypriot, African, English or Russian. I think is enough to be in love with somebody because of him/her personality. Usually, there are many girls who, in order to escape from poverty in their country (like in Bulgaria) marry foreigners, to improve their earnings and living. I am different, I didn’t marry for that reason, because I think that someone who want to change his/her life don’t need somebody else to do it’.

The female respondent invoked love and spouse’s psychological resources as attraction factors that determined her marital choice. She presented her argument in opposition to ‘what people might think in this situation’: that their marital choices constituted an exchange of material resources for physical attractiveness resources (youth and beauty).

Physical attractiveness is a personal trait that was very often invoked by the respondents as main factor in spouse selection. In this sense, the Cypriot men’s physical appearance is a theme that appeared in half of the interviews with foreign spouses. A case in point is that of Pita’s, an Australian woman who divorced her Cypriot spouse after eight years of marriage and a child. Now she has a long-term relationship again with a Cypriot partner. This is how she described why she felt attracted by her ex-husband and not only: ‘I’ve never been attracted to blond, white or pink people- you know, the English some of them are pink to me. So, when is about characteristics that would be probably the first thing: the dark-hair men are particularly handsome’.

The literature on physical attractiveness is very rich in findings from many empirical studies. One of these findings refers to the fact that ‘high physical attractiveness as an attribute of an individual being considered as a partner in an ecology of opportunities might be used as diagnostic of responsible, cooperative behaviour from that individual’ (Mulford et al, 1998). This is also Genette’s case, a Swedish woman married to a Cypriot man; she invoked physical appearance and kindness as two personal traits which influenced her spouse selection:

‘I don’t really know what attracted me to my partner in the first place. He is handsome and tall (laughs). I don’t know really; maybe it was his kindness: he is a very kind man’.

She didn’t stress these two characteristics as decisive in her choice for marriage partner. This is because she perceived love as an unmotivated attraction factor to her partner: ‘I didn’t marry him because he was a foreigner, I married him because I loved him; it was like no other way’.

In some of the cases under the study, it seems that perceived physical attractiveness as determinant factor in mate selection does not constitute a guarantee for a stable marital relationship, since both foreign women that invoked it as the main reason for
choosing their partners, have divorced. This is the foregoing mentioned Pita’s case, an Australian woman and also, Marian’s case, a German woman who has divorced from her Cypriot partner and had other two long-term relationships with Cypriot men. This is why she felt attracted to her ex-husband:

“I would say that I was attracted (in the first place) by his appearance and the easy-going”.

How could one describe the type of Cypriot male physical attractiveness that constituted the attraction factor in foreign women participants’ marital choices? “The dark-hair men are particularly handsome” (Pita), “he is handsome and tall” (Genette) or “he is very handsome, he is tall, handsome” (Mayonee); these citations show that the most attractive physical traits of Cypriot men, as perceived by foreign women are: dark-hair, tall and handsome. If “dark-hair” and “tall” are, in a certain extent, more objective personal traits, “handsome” is a physical trait culturally determined, in the last instance is a question of taste. Just why physical attractiveness might be a widespread “taste” is sometimes explained in terms of cultural learning. Wolf (1991), for example, has proposed that the societal value placed on physical attractiveness reflects a peculiarly Western “culture of beauty”, fuelled by the capacity of the media to surround people with images of flawless (particularly female) beauty (Wolf, 1991). Within these terms, a preference for more attractive partners in sexual exchange would be a straightforward consequence of what people have been taught to value.

If one is to find out which attributes are considered by Cypriot men the most attractive physical traits of foreign women, it is worth considering the physical appearance of foreign female respondents married to Cypriots: the great majority have as physical characteristics: blond hair, light colours eyes and fair skin. These physical characteristics can be considered the most attractive beauty capital of foreign women who marry Cypriot men. In this sense, one of the respondents, a Czech woman married to a Cypriot tried to expose a suggestive kind of typology of Cypriot men who marry foreigners: “In my opinion, there are two categories of Cypriot men who marry foreign women. A first category is the Cypriot men who get married out of love. This is my husband. From what I know, my husband has never had any Cypriot girlfriend. When he was younger, he used to search for tourist women, as all the young Cypriot men do. Therefore, he had Czech or foreign girls, but never Cypriot girlfriends. As he told me: ‘I am afraid of them’ (of the Cypriot girls). Their way of thinking is very intolerable’. The second category of Cypriot men, who marry foreigners, does this because other men do the same. They don’t want Cypriot women and prefer foreign women because they say: ‘I got married to a Russian girl (for example) and she is a doll’

This fragment is very suggestive for foreign women’s opinions about Cypriot men who marry foreigners. It shows how, the first contacts that Cypriot men have with foreign women are those with tourist women. It is easier for them to have short-term relationships with tourist women and so proving themselves their ‘manhood’, then searching to get involved with Cypriot girls who are controlled by their parents. In Cyprus, the public
opinion criticize the foreign women (whatever they are tourists or not) for their "looseness". This is how other foreign women respondents exposed Cypriots’ opinions about foreign women:

"...a foreign woman it’s been always approached more on the sexual aspect, while a Cypriot is usually approached more on the marriage aspect. The first approach goes like that. But, again, once they talk with you, they respect your brain, they think you have a better brain, but in the same time they think the foreigners are a lot more easy-going; this is Cypriots’ approach of foreign women". (Marian, German woman, came to Cyprus 20 years ago).

In the same vein, Jane (an English woman who married her Cypriot husband twelve years ago) exposed some of the prejudices about foreign women and in particular, English women: “They (her parents-in-law) are very traditional Cypriots and simple people. And they had that bad idea that people in Cyprus may have about foreign women and English women: they are no good, they won’t be good wives, they don’t have reputable morals and ... some of these ideas people may have.”

According to respondents’ confessions, opinions about Eastern-European women in Cyprus are even more unfavourable than those about their Euro-American counterparts. Dana, a Romanian young woman married to a Cypriot described how she was perceived by her work colleagues:

“At the beginning they expected me to be something else from what I am. Most of the Cypriots when they hear that you are a Romanian, Bulgarian, Russian and so on, they put you something like a stamp- as they would know for sure that you are a prostitute because some other girls of the same nationality are. So, they didn’t expect it: a Romanian girl who is not a prostitute... Afterwards, when they got to know me better, slowly-slowly they started to behave well to me. The Cypriot women are worst: they didn’t talk to me at the beginning, but slowly-slowly we became friends”. Almost every foreign woman respondent from the Eastern-European group of countries addressed this issue about Cypriots’ perception of these nationals. These foreign women complained about the “prostitute” halo effect they have to face in the everyday process of social interaction. Also, they indicated Cypriot women as showing a more unfavourable opinion about Eastern-European women, in some cases refusing also any contact with them.

Nadejda, a Ukrainian woman married to a Cypriot, invoked an example of racist behaviour at her work: "I have a colleague at work, she is black. And everybody avoids her because of it. Also, some Cypriot women told her that: ‘You, foreigners come to Cyprus for money and to take our men’. This is what they (the Cypriot women) think about us who are from Romania, Ukraine, Russia or Bulgaria; they hate us because they see us as a danger”.

It is expressed here a syndrome of “woman fear of woman” that masks a kind of insecurity of native women in front of foreign women perceived as more attractive because of their physical appearance. It is the predominant opinion about Eastern-European women, at the level of Cypriot public opinion. The literature review showed that physical attractiveness is a major asset in sexual exchange and is associated with upward
economic mobility in particular for women. It is the case of the second category of Cypriot men who marry foreign women (see the foregoing “typology” of Cypriot men who marry foreign women) because other Cypriot men do it and “because that Russian girl is a doll” (Ana, Czech woman).

Gabriela, another Romanian woman married to a Cypriot, referred to some recent changes in Cypriot women’s sexual behaviour (addressed also by other foreign women respondents) that could not enable native women to have a bad opinion about foreign women: ‘‘I came here ten years ago and this problem existed also before: ‘why marry that girl since she is a foreigner?’ They used to consider all of us (i.e. the foreign girls) prostitutes. And I reply them (to the Cypriots) now: ‘Even if we are prostitutes, we do it because- as you say- we faint out of hunger, but your Cypriot girls, why do they go with one or another? And also, about the girls who work in cabaret, there are some who like this job, but also there are a lot who don’t like and do it because maybe have children in Romania who need to be fed, so they must make some money’. This is what I tell them: ‘we are prostitutes under the stress of circumstances, but your women, why do they go?’ I know two married women who are my mother’s-in-law neighbours and they have lovers. I saw them with their lovers’’. The respondent invoked the economic motivation that pushed women from East-European countries to make easy money from prostitution. She also asked rhetorically about the motivation that determines Cypriot women to have lovers since their economic background does not constitute a reason. The rhetorical question here is why these foreign girls choose to work as prostitutes in cabaret since there are other jobs they could do? One of the women respondents in the sample lived this experience of working in a cabaret; her testimony coincides with what the foregoing cited respondent said about women who work in cabaret. This is an issue that will be further addressed in following sections.

5.2.2.5 Other Non-material and Structural Resources

It is interesting to mention one more factor that determined (in this case) only the Russian respondents to search for foreign spouses. They invoked the alcoholism that in Russia (as they said) is a national problem. One of the Russian women respondents confessed that before she married her Cypriot husband, she had made her decision to search for a foreign marriage partner:

“I was married before in Russia for only one year. I had many problems with my Russian husband. After I had this bad experience with my ex-husband in Russia, I decided I won’t marry a Russian again. I was thinking that is better to search for a foreigner, to see how it is. The Russians now, they drink too much and now also the women started to drink there. It’s a real problem. Maybe, some Cypriots are not very good and they have some problems of course, too, but not the alcohol. In three years, I’ve never seen my husband drunk”. (Valeria) She also invoked as a non-material factor that influenced her marriage decision the fact that Cyprus is a safe place by comparison to another problem that she mentioned as being specific for Russia (and
not only, as other nationalities put it); it is the high rates in crime to which she was a victim, as well:

“In Russia we have the problem with crime. Here you can walk at night alone, is very safe. There we have killing, rape. They took from my friend her bag with her salary- it happened three times. And also, it happened to me, in an elevator they attacked me with a knife and asked my money and jewellery. Here is safer. And there they stop you on the street and kill you for a gold chain or money”. (Valeria)

Cyprus, as a quiet and safe place with sunny weather has attracted many foreign spouses from the Euro-American group of countries who took it into account in making their marriage decision for Cypriot spouses. This is how an English girl, Mayonee addressed this structural factor:

“I think I wanted to get away from England, the busyness- it was very busy. Nobody ever had time to stop and to think, everything was …So obviously, when you come to Cyprus is like having good time to relax...it is wonderful! It’s good to get away from that busyness. Here you have an opportunity to become creative, when you are so busy, you can’t be creative, can you?” and “Moving away from England and being in Cyprus is wonderful! Is very exciting- a lot of sun here!”. Mayonee used to live in London and the life she now has in Cyprus, in a village from Larnaca district made a lot of difference in her lifestyle. And she perceived this as an attraction factor in marrying a foreigner.

In response to the question “what attracted you in the idea of marrying a foreigner?” many of the Euro-American spouses declared that an attraction factor in Cypriot spouse selection was also the favourable weather conditions in Cyprus and a more relaxing way of life. In opposition, foreign spouses from the East-European countries did not appreciated the same structural factors relative to Cyprus as those invoked above – except for the Russian spouses who mentioned factors linked to a safer way of life in Cyprus.

The previous mentioned resources represent the non-material assets including: cultural resources, psychological resources and esthetical resources that were invoked as factors influencing foreign women’s choices in Cypriot marital partner selection. If these factors (material and non-material resources of partners) are considered as influencing marital choices in all marriages, there is one factor, addressed in the following section, which highly influence mate selection only in the particular case of mixed marriage. It gives the specificity in the approach of mate selection adapted to the particular case of mixed marriage between foreigners and Cypriots. In this sense, it is worth to analyze how the factors that relate to the foreign spouses’ previous life experience influenced their marital choices. It is the foreign influence exposure that plays an important role in mixed marriage mate selection.
5.2.3. Foreign Influence Exposure of Mixed Marriage Spouses

The high foreign influence exposure constitutes a factor that can influence marital choices translated in a preference for choosing foreign spouses. This is a question to be investigated through the present qualitative study (and was also, addressed in the quantitative investigation). In this context, the author analyzed how the preference for a foreign spouse is shaped by an individual motivation/or predisposition such as a previous experience of high exposure to foreign influence. In this study, the foreign influence exposure conceived as an experience of having social interaction/contacts with foreigners is measured through some indices which account for different life experiences. These indices are translated into an index of questions about: (1) Foreign relatives (upbringing in a mixed family, relatives married to foreigners, contacts with foreign relatives); (2) Life abroad (work abroad, studies abroad); (3) Previous relationships with foreign partners (possible cohabitation with foreign partners); (4) Attitudes and sentiments about the foreigners in one’s home country. The author questioned each respondent about these topics in order to find out if any previous foreign influence exposure influenced their marital choices for foreign partners. Respondents’ answers revealed that each foreign spouse married to a Cypriot partner had previous contacts with foreigners under different circumstances; fact that is true also, for their Cypriot husbands. Let us analyse all the cases grouped on the above-mentioned index of foreign influence exposure measures.

5.2.3.1 Foreign Relatives

Regarding the upbringing in a mixed family, three of the twenty respondents are offspring from mixed marriages. One could assume that their family background helped them to overcome possible difficulties resulting from the “mixed” nature of their marriages. They are bilingual and brought up into a mixed cultural heritage. This is how Lia, a Romanian woman married to a Cypriot man described the experience of living into a mixed family:

“My father is German (from the German ethnic minority leaving in Romania) and my mother Romanian. They divorced when I was a child. Then, my father married a Hungarian woman (from the Hungarian ethnic minority leaving in Romania) and I was raised by them (...). This is the way I grew up, among many ethnicities. I had German and Hungarian schoolmates (Lia is from Transylvania, a region of Romania, is a melting pot of ethnicities and cultures)”.

Natasha is another example of mixed marriage offspring:

“My mother (who is Russian) married a Cypriot. I am married to a Palestinian who has different religion. But this fact doesn’t constitute any problem in our family life”.

“I have never thought of my husband as a foreigner or something like this, because my mother is also a foreigner here in Cyprus, I have always been in good terms with foreigners and never had any problems because of this”. In spite of all the advantages of experiencing both mixed
marriage and mixed family, this fact might develop into an identity problem for the protagonists: “Here in Cyprus I have always felt the difference; the difference that I am perceived as a foreigner. This could be also because of my physical appearance - they always considered me a foreigner (the Cypriots). With my sister, it happened the other way round. She looks like Cypriot girls, her ideas are Cypriot, and mine aren’t: my ideas are different, I cannot accept some things”. Mixed identities seemed to be problematic since they determined Natasha to feel as a foreigner in her father’s country and to be accepted as a native in her mother’s country where she went for her tertiary studies. Anyway, Natasha does not identify herself as being a Cypriot or a Russian, even if she is more likely to adopt the second identity. Alex’s case (he is married to a Cypriot young woman) is not similar from this point of view. He identifies himself categorically as being a Palestinian even if his mother is a Cypriot: “My father is Palestinian and my mother is Cypriot. I was born and raised in Dubai. In our family we spoke Arabic, Greek and English and I feel I am Palestinian, not Cypriot. I’ve come to live in Cyprus 7 years before when I was 20”.

Concerning foreign relatives, six foreign spouses married to Cypriots declared that have brothers or sisters married to foreigners as well, and all the interviewed foreign spouses have friends who are married to foreigners.

5.2.3.2 Life Abroad

Regarding life abroad, all the respondents lived or travelled abroad. There is a difference here, between the spouses from East-European countries who only worked abroad (in Cyprus or Greece) before marriage and the spouses from Euro-American countries who only travelled abroad before marriage (with two exceptions). Out of eleven spouses from Eastern-European countries, only two didn’t work in Cyprus before their marriages. The rest of nine spouses have worked in Cyprus before their marriages to Cypriots and did not travel abroad. One of these nine spouses worked also in England and two worked in Greece as well, before coming to Cyprus. Lena, a Bulgarian woman described her work experience in England: “I’ve worked in England for one year and a half. It is very different from Cyprus: lifestyle, behaviour, work and wage, everything is very different. With the wage they pay you in England you feel like a human, not as a black slave. In England, even if they don’t accept you, they have always the smile on their lips, but here nobody cares about anything”.

The spouses who worked and lived abroad are able to compare things that surprised them as being different in Cyprus from what they learnt working in other countries.

One Euro-American spouse worked in Cyprus before her marriage and another one worked abroad; the rest declared that had contacts with foreigners in their home countries, usually through their works and also travelled in many countries before their marriages. Youta, a Danish woman confessed about her experience of travelling abroad:
‘I used to travel a lot; I’ve always been travelling since I was a child. I’ve always had contact with foreigners and went for holidays abroad, three times a year’.

‘I used to come twice a year in Cyprus (in summer or spring time) and for Christmas we used to go to some of the big cities like: London, Rome, Paris; so, it was totally different from my life now’.

Now she is married to a Cypriot, is a housewife and has five children.

5.2.3.3 Previous Relationships with Foreign Partners

Eight out of the twenty foreign spouse participants declared that had previous relationships with partners of other nationality than theirs or with other Cypriots. For example, Genette, a Swedish woman ten years older than her Cypriot husband, confessed about her long-term relationships with foreign partners: ‘I had a long-term relationship with a man from Scotland. And when I was living in Sweden I had an Italian boyfriend and also, I had an English-Cypriot here’.

An indicative interview finding is the greater probability for spouses who lived, worked, travelled abroad and also had previous relationships with foreigners to marry foreign partners. The above-mentioned findings regarding foreign spouses are also indicative for the foreign spouses’ Cypriot partners. Half of the Cypriot spouses, married to the foreign respondents, lived or studied abroad for more than two years; therefore, they had contacts with foreigners being abroad, fact that could be interpreted as corresponding to high levels of foreign influence exposure. There is a tendency for the foreign partners to perceive the Cypriot spouses who lived abroad prior to their marriage as different from other Cypriots who did not study or live abroad. One case in point is that of Ana’s, a Czech woman married to a Cypriot:

“I think I’ve changed Michalis very much. More precisely, the life in the Czech Republic changed him a lot- he has lived there for eight years. We had a Czech life there, with our friends, with the Czech lifestyle and the Czech language. Because of this experience, he changed a lot. Then, we came here and it seems that the Czech life was the one we loved, more precisely the first years. Therefore, he changed so that he is not a Cypriot anymore, not an authentic Cypriot, anyway! Of course, he got some imprinted things in his brain that he cannot change…also, I don’t want to change him because he is a Cypriot....”

“The Cypriots who lived or studied abroad are different; my husband’s best friend studied in England, he is a Cypriot, but actually his mentality is not Cypriot anymore because he changed. Since he has lived for enough time abroad, he cannot understand Cypriots anymore, is rather a foreigner” (Ana). Therefore, in the case of Cypriot spouses, mixing with foreigners abroad may enhance the probability of choosing foreign spouses by increasing opportunity to interact with possible foreign marriage candidates. Also, the preferences play a certain role in this process as long as the interaction with foreigners has as a result changes in lifestyle and systems of values and opinions, then in mentality.

Foreign relatives, life abroad and previous relationships with foreign partners are experiences that construct people’s systems of values and beliefs which are translated
into attitudes and sentiments about the foreigners in people's home countries. The author asked the foreign spouses about their attitudes and sentiments towards the foreigners in their home countries; their opinions are exposed in the following section.

5.2.3.4 Respondents' Attitudes towards Foreigners in Their Home-Countries

As an indicative finding, it is relevant that the attitudes of East-European respondents towards the foreigners in their home-countries are more favourable than those of their Euro-American counterparts. A possible explanation could be the difference in the immigration contexts of the two geopolitical regions. Nowadays immigration to East-European countries is a very recent phenomenon, which started after the crash of communist regimes and is formed mainly from African and Asian immigrants. Meantime, second and third generations of immigrants live in Euro-American countries.

Another important aspect when considering foreign spouses' attitudes and sentiments about the foreigners in their home countries is that more than half of them have lived in Cyprus for more than eight years at the date of the interviews. Thus, their responses envisage the situation in their countries at the time they were living there. Anyway, this experience is indicative of their marital choices for foreign spouses.

Lena, a 35 year old Bulgarian woman married to a Cypriot, confessed about her childhood dreams of marriage to a foreigner: "When I was a child I used to dream of a marriage to a foreigner, but afterwards I didn't do it anymore. Being a child and playing together with other small girls from my neighbourhood, we were dreaming of marrying ourselves to foreigners, leaving Bulgaria and going to live abroad...Afterwards, I didn't dream of it – don't you see? People are the same everywhere, in Bulgaria, in England or here...And when you marry somebody, it is a question of luck, his/her ethnicity or citizenship is not important". There are two ideas expressed in this extract: Lena's dreams as a teenager, during the communist regime in Bulgaria (about 17 years ago) and her experience of interacting with foreigners in the last 15 years when she was working abroad, in Cyprus and England. And again, it is expressed a kind of "idealization of the foreigner" complex that used to be specific at the level of the public opinion in East-European countries. It means that "foreign" used to be identified (a sort of positive stereotype) in people's minds with democracy, human rights, freedom and prosperity; in fact, that represented a kind of "foreignness dream syndrome" of Eastern-European citizens who have been not allowed to travel and have contacts with the West of Europe for a long period of time.

In the last sixteen years the situation changed and Eastern European people had the opportunity "to see their dream coming true"; in other terms, they gained the rights to travel abroad and have contacts with other cultures. For many of them, this experience constituted a disappointment because their "idealization of the foreigner" turned to be an inaccurate preconceived idea, since "people are the same everywhere" (Lena).
The same syndrome of “idealization of the foreigner” is expressed by another Eastern-European woman, Geta who married a Cypriot man eight years ago and came to work in Cyprus 11 years ago: “We (the Romanians) loved the foreigners, so that seeing a foreigner was like seeing a God. We lived with this impression that being a foreigner is something very nice, this is how we learnt to perceive foreigners. We loved the foreigners, we’ve always loved them”. Geta is disappointed because of the manner she is treated by Cypriots at work; in opposition to this, she presented how the foreigners were perceived in Romania eleven years ago.

A Russian spouse, Valeria who has married a Cypriot three years ago mentioned another aspect concerning interaction with foreigners in Eastern-European countries: “I had contacts with foreigners in Russia because I had friends who left and now live and are married abroad: in the U.S., Israel, Holland, Germany and Egypt”. Therefore, another factor indicative for the tendency to marry foreigners (in the case of East-European spouses) is their contact with co-nationals married to foreigners, fact that may represent for them a marital behaviour pattern to follow.

If the Eastern-European spouses expressed their attitudes and feelings about foreigners without having too much contact with them in their home countries, the Euro-American spouses interviewed do have as a background, everyday social interaction with foreigners living in their countries. This is how Youta, a Danish woman who has married a Cypriot sixteen years ago, described her contacts with foreigners and her feelings for them when living in Denmark:

“I had a lot of contact with foreigners in my country- we had a lot of refugees there, as well. It's normal, some of them you like, and some of them you dislike or some of them are too many like the Turks. My best friend back home, she was a foreigner from Pakistan. And I had also other friends, they were foreigners or a lot of them were from mixed marriages.”

Marian, a German woman who came to Cyprus twenty years ago, confessed that had no intention to ”mix” with foreigners when she was living in Germany, prior to her marriage to a Cypriot man: “I never thought that I would do such a thing when I was young- as a young woman- that I will mix with foreigners! No, such a thing I would never thought about. So, I don’t know- it was just the love”.

The last mentioned cases of spouses from the Euro-American group of countries attest the superior native status they had in their home countries and so the corresponding attitudes towards foreigners who were perceived as refugees or work immigrants “looking for a better life”. Even if all these respondents declared that had enough contacts with foreigners, they did not “mix” with them. Therefore, the meanings of “having contact” and “mixing” are different and express different social distances between natives and foreigners. “Mixing” with foreigners means shorter social distance and closer, direct social contact that increases opportunity for social integration; in the meantime “having contact” denotes the opposite situation of larger social distance and
more formal, indirect social interaction. Having an inferior status as foreigner in Cyprus is a contrary situation from the one foregoing mentioned.

This is the manner in which the foreign participants accounted for different resources, non-material and material of their Cypriot spouses and of themselves (i.e. individual level factors) that determined them, to a certain extent, to take their marriage decision for foreign partners. However, their marital choice does not represent a bilateral process were only the two parts involved make the decision. In this respects, it is worth taking into consideration group-level factors like third party agents’ influence in choosing a foreign spouse. These third party agents influence marriage decision at different levels where they are constituted and function as social control agents; to name them: at an individual level there are the spouses’ families and at a societal level there is the Cypriot state through legislation and its authorities, and the Cypriot Orthodox Church that aims at preserving the Christian Orthodox tradition in mixed families. To analyze the influence exerted by all these control agents constitutes a task to be accomplished in the following sections.

5.3. Third Parties’ Influence on Mixed Marriage Partner Choice

Marriage can be defined as a socially recognized “contract” to form a family. In almost every society, marriage is considered to be a very important social event, and marriage relationships are in general strongly regulated and protected by social control mechanism, family laws, and/or religious rules- all these constituting the group-level factors of marriage partner choice. Therefore, “who is going to marry whom”, is not merely a simple process of random meeting or spontaneous falling in love (as it is characteristic for Western societies), but also as primarily in non-Western societies, a rationally and carefully guided transaction in which important economic and social considerations play a role and many more persons than the partners and their close relatives may be involved. More specifically, in Western societies, the preferences of the partners are usually central in the process of partner choice, but in the Muslim and Asian countries other social group members, especially parents and relatives (who play the role of “matchmaker”) are much more involved in marriage decisions (as revealed by the literature review in chapters one and two).

Concerning the present study, there is an illustrative case for the role of “matchmaker” played by the friends of a Palestinian spouse who is married to a Cypriot woman. Both spouses were studying abroad when they decided to get engaged; this is how Natasha, the Cypriot wife accounted for third parties’ influence on her husband’s marriage decision: “After I declared him my feelings, he has been talking with his friends for three days, he thought of this and after three days he came and told me: ‘let’s get engaged!’. They have it as a custom: to
discuss and ask advices and opinions from friends, family and relatives before one decides to get married. The reason is that they want to find out if the future spouse is a good character, and then to decide for marriage. In our case, because his parents or relatives did not know me, he asked his friends' opinion since they knew me. So, he took the marital decision together with his friends who told him that I am okay (their opinion) and he may proceed to engagement”.

Arranged marriages and “matchmaker” agents are characteristics of the Cypriot traditional endogamous system where the marriage transaction was an equivalent of an economic transaction; these characteristics was proved to be still alive thirty years ago (see Chapter II, the section about ‘Traditional Cypriot marriage and family’): “Our investigations proved that even today family interest counts decisively in mate selection” (Markides et al, 1978, p.110). This observation stimulated further questions about the influence of family interests (or to symferon in Greek) in mixed marriage mate selection process. One of the tasks in the present study was to identify the influence exerted by the spouses’ Cypriot and non-Cypriot families on mixed marriage mate selection. One indicative finding is that traces of characteristics that were specific for traditional mate selection patterns in Cyprus are still alive in nowadays Cyprus: this is how the foreign respondents identified them when were questioned if they were accepted or not by their Cypriot spouse’s family.

5.3.1. Spouses’ Families Role in Mixed Marriage Mate Selection

As the literature review showed, because mixed marriages may threaten the internal cohesion and homogeneity of the group, “third parties” have an incentive to keep new generations from marrying exogamously. There are two ways in which third parties prevent exogamy: by group identification (Gordon, 1964) and by group sanctions (Kalmijn, 1998); the more people have internalized norms of endogamy, the more likely it is that they marry homogamously or endogamously. In this sense, most of the respondents’ confessions that they do not perceive their Cypriot spouses as foreigners are significant; therefore, they did not internalize that psychological sense of being different from others (group identification), fact that as has been already showed increases tendency for heterogamy and exogamy.

Even if people have not internalized norms of endogamy, they may still refrain from marrying exogamously because of the sanctions third parties apply. The three most important examples of third party agents that sanction mixed marriage are: the family, the church and the state. The present analysis accounts for the influence that each of these three institutions has on mixed marriage partner selection in Cyprus.

One of the tasks in the analysis was the identification of the ways in which spouses’ parents interfered / or not in their children’s marriage decisions. Overall, there were
identified two different patterns of behaviour: one for foreign spouses’ parents/families and another one for Cypriot partners’ parents/families.

5.3.1.1 Foreign Spouses’ Family Role in Cypriot Mate Selection

As a general observation, the content analysis revealed no accounts of interference in their children’s marriage decision for the foreign spouses’ parents. Sometimes, this favourable attitude towards their children’s foreign spouse was a consequence of their own experience of confronting with family’s strong sanctions on their mixed marriage. This is Natasha’s case: her mother is a Russian and her father is a Cypriot. They met in Russia and came to live in Cyprus more than thirty years ago when mixed marriages in Cyprus were almost inexistent and the traditional pattern of parents’ control over their children’s marriage choice was still strong enough. This is how Natasha accounted for her parents’ mixed marriage experience:

“My mother’s marriage was confronted with very strong objections coming from my father’s Cypriot family. But my father supported and encouraged her and this is why until now they are still inseparable. One cannot live without the other”.

“Concerning my own marriage, my parents agreed with this because both of them are also two foreigners. They couldn’t be against it. My mother would have liked a wealthy husband for me – as any mother wishes for her daughter- but finally she accepted my husband and now she loves him as her son. My relatives had objections because my husband has another religion. But my parents and me didn’t give any importance to this fact.” (Natasha)

There is no case in the present study of foreign spouses’ parents who opposed their children’s marriage decision because of different faiths. It could be in part because all the partners are Christians with the exception of Natasha’s Palestinian husband who is Muslim.

There are many sample foreign spouses who mentioned their mothers’ favourable perception about Cypriot sons-in-law. For example, Genette (a Swedish woman) described her mother’s sentiments about her son-in-law: “My mother loves Stelios (Genette’s husband); she thinks he is the best thing that ever happened to anybody in the family. She really loves him. I don’t know what it is; it is maybe because we are not there, we are here”.

The stands of foreign spouses’ parents on their children’s decisions to marry foreigners, and as a consequence to leave their home countries can be grouped in three categories, as following:

(1) A first category of parents who left their children taking marriage decisions without any objections about the fact of moving to live in a foreign country;

(2) A second category of parents who perceived their children’s choice of a foreign spouse as a loss since they also chose to live in a foreign country, but who accepted their children’s spouses;
A third category of parents who did not accept their children’s marital choices (there is only one case in the present study).

Concerning the second category, even if the parental control over foreign spouses’ marital decisions proved to be limited, their parents did show their dissatisfaction with their children decisions to live in a foreign country. In this sense, Jane, an English woman who has married a Cypriot thirteen years ago described her parent’s reaction to her decision to live abroad and to marry a foreigner: ‘I don’t think we actually thought about marrying a foreigner- I mean ourselves. For our parents I think, it was different. My parents, they didn’t really say anything, they wanted not to be apprehensive. They thought they were going to loose me because we never thought of marrying in England, it was always just presumed and accepted by both of us that when we marry will stay here. So, my family thought they were loosing me which afterwards they realized they weren’t because we kept in contact, we visit them with the grandchildren’.

Another example for a similar attitude of concomitant disapproval and support for their daughter’s marital choice was manifested by Marian’s parents in Germany when she married her Cypriot husband: ‘my family didn’t like the fact that I married him, at all. It was very difficult for them, but they accepted him later and they highly-valued my ex-husband. And they didn’t like me to come to Cyprus either. But they accepted it in the end and they made the best out of it which I value very high. (...) they always used to come to Cyprus and used to encourage me when I was complaining about something- they used to say: ‘we have the same problem in Germany, don’t tell me it’s Cyprus”. It helped me a lot, that kind of approach’.

The first category of parents mentioned above chose not to interfere at all and left to their children the responsibility for their personal marital choices. They accepted their children’s choices for foreign marriage partners without having any objections. One of these examples is that of Liana’s parents, a Romanian woman who has married a Cypriot eight years ago:

“My parents had no objection to my marriage…they always have had this opinion: ‘you decide, you are mature girls (Liana and her sister), have your heads and can decide for yourselves’. They also told me: ‘If you believe that you’ll be happy and live a good life is better for you…instead of being with us and not being happy, is better as you decide’”

Also, Youta’s Danish parents trusted their daughter’s choice for a Cypriot partner, having again no objections: ‘My parents agreed with my marriage; there was no problem because they like the life here and knew he will make me happy. (...) it is help that you have your family supporting you as well”.

As showed through the foregoing mentioned examples, this kind of favourable attitude of foreign spouses’ parents towards their children’s marital choices is appreciated as being very supportive and also necessary to help spouses who decide to live in a foreign country.

The third previously-mentioned category of parents who did not agree with their children’s marital choice has only one case of a foreign respondent’s parents (in this
The respondent is Evelina, a Bulgarian woman who has married a Cypriot man nine years ago: “It was somehow difficult with my family- because actually, my parents are not much older then my husband. They couldn’t believe that I decided to get marry so quickly, after only two months from the time we met, given the fact that usually, in order to make a decision I need some time. This thing astonished them, but I was independent and they couldn’t tell me what to do or forbid me anything. Of course, they didn’t like it- my father still doesn’t like it, even that so much time passed.” The age difference between the spouses in this case is twenty years—this constituted one of the reasons why Evelina’s family did not agree with her marriage decision.

This is how the foreign spouse participants accounted for their parents’ attitudes, opinions and reactions to their marital choices for Cypriot mates. With only one exception, they all have accepted the mixed marriages entered by their children. The respondents’ confessions showed a very limited parental control over children’s marriage decisions. In almost all the cases, the parents’ reasons to accept their children’s marriage decisions were of a psychological nature: the wish to assure their children’s happiness and successful marriage. On the other hand, their objections to mixed marriage concerned structural factors, such as the consequence of a life abroad for their children who had to move to a foreign country in order to live together with their spouses.

5.3.1.2 Cypriot Spouses’ Family Role in Foreign Mate Selection

In many cases, respondents’ accounts about their Cypriot spouses’ families revealed the influence of family interests in mixed marriage spouse selection and the strong control exerted by the Cypriot mother-in-law. Another pattern of behaviour, as resulted from the respondents’ confessions is that Cypriot parents are not so likely to allow their children to marry foreigners even when it is not the case for their children to move to a foreign country. This attitude changes once they have to accept the fact of marriage; in some cases under study, Cypriot spouses married foreigners in secret or abroad, therefore without their parents’ agreement and afterwards, the latter accepted the mixed marriages. Sometimes, Cypriot parents accepted foreign partners but didn’t provide the mixed couple with support. In other cases, Cypriot parents didn’t accept the foreign spouses and showed their resentments in an open, direct way.

An indicative finding is that statistically (in the present analysis) there are more cases of unaccepted (by Cypriot parents) marriages of Cypriots to foreign women from Eastern-European countries, than to foreign women from Euro-American countries.

If in the previous case concerning the influence of foreign spouses’ parents on mixed marriage mate selection, it was not found as indicative any differentiation between Eastern and Western foreign spouses, but in the context of Cypriot spouses’ parents
influencing marriage decision the differentiation is important. This is the reason why the analysis undertaken in the following sections considers separately the two groups given by the nationalities of foreign spouses: the East-European and the Euro-American groups of spouses.

A) Cypriot Family’s Influence on Eastern-European Spouse Selection

There are eleven cases of mixed marriages between East-European women and Cypriot men in this study. In four cases out of eleven there is no mother’s-in-law influence, only father’s-in-law or other relatives’ influences on foreign spouse selection. Liana, a Romanian woman married for eight years to a Cypriot mentioned about her husband’s family: “My husband’s family was always very positive about Chris’ marriage decision; they were very happy with this. My mother-in-law died before we’ve got married, but we were already together before she died. Also, my father-in-law is a very good man and so is his sister.” This case provides no evidence for any resentment or disagreement with this Cypriot man’s marriage decision for an Eastern-European woman.

An illustrative case for Cypriot mother’s-in-law disapproval of her son’s choice of a foreign spouse is that of Geta’s, a Romanian woman who has married a Cypriot man eight years ago. She related how her husband’s parents did not agree with their son’s marriage: "We got married in secret, without his parents’ agreement (we had a civil marriage). We rented an apartment and lived together. I met his mother only after 10 months from the time we got married; but I knew his father. The biggest problem was that my husband used to work together with his father – at that time (and they still work together). And all that period of 10 months they haven’t been talking to each other. I understood that he was suffering, he was hurt". Her husband’s family changed attitude towards their son’s mixed marriage because Geta got pregnant and when grandchildren are at stake, usually Cypriot parents don’t retrieve support of the couple (behaviour confirmed many times in the present study). Therefore, the couple had a religious wedding because, again, most Cypriot parents do not recognize a couple as being married unless they have an Orthodox religious wedding.

It is very illustrative the way in which Geta managed to explain the reasons for her mother’s-in-law resentments: “He (Geta’s husband) is the first-born child and is the only boy. His parents’ plans were to marry him to a rich Cypriot girl. Mother’s-in-law big problem is the fortune (she stresses it). Every time we talk she reproaches me that I had nothing, my mother didn’t give me something, didn’t do something for me. I had no dowry…(...) Another reason was that she knew from other people that most of the Romanian girls, who come to Cyprus, work in cabarets and go for money; they are prostitutes and she wanted to protect her son. She meant that she had nothing personally with me. One more reason she didn’t accept me regarded the tradition that a Cypriot man must marry a Cypriot woman…because of the fortune, the fortune…The father-in-law built two houses, he has two daughters and then he built two houses to give them as dowry. So, they expected their son to marry a Cypriot girl with a house…".
The three reasons mentioned above are characteristic of the Cypriot mother’s-in-law disagreement with mixed marriages between Cypriots and foreigners. At least one of these three reasons is expected to be encountered in any motivation of the Cypriot mother’s-in-law disagreement with mixed marriage: The economic background of the foreign spouse; The moral reputation of the foreign spouse; The necessity to prevent exogamy translated into the tradition “that a Cypriot man must marry a Cypriot woman”. These constituted also characteristics of the Cypriot traditional endogamous system (where monetary and non-monetary factors came into play in mate selection processes - as mentioned in Chapter II) and indices of a considered successful marital match. In this context, matches of Cypriot men with Eastern-European women are not considered successful since in most cases, these women have poor economic background (they leave their countries because of economic motivations) and have bad moral reputation in Cypriot public opinion’s eyes as long as most of them come to Cyprus to work in cabarets. Another case very similar to the one mentioned earlier is that of Gabriela’s, a Romanian spouse: “We’ve lived with the mother-in-law for three years (laughs); three years of never-ending war between us. I was not bad to her, but I liked to tell her directly whatever I had to tell her…”.

It is significant to note that even if the two Cypriot mothers-in-law (in the previously-mentioned examples) did not accept their sons’ foreign wives, they didn’t withdraw support and didn’t have either strong sanction, even if their children decided against their will. Instead, they provided support to the couples through the form of common living arrangements for the newly weds, until the couples managed to get their own living place. In this sense, Gabriela appreciated her mother-in-law proposal to live together: “She (the mother-in-law) told us to live in her house, in order not to rent. And it was a good thing because if we had to rent, we wouldn’t be able to build our house. But I couldn’t resist very much there. So, we built the house and left.” On the other hand, this form of common living arrangements of the married couple together with the parents-in-law represents a way of control and interfering in couple’s life. Even if Geta and her husband do not live together with her parents-in-law anymore, her mother-in-law behaviour did not change: ‘Of course, my war with the mother-in-law is never-ending: to control me where I go, what I do, if I take care of her son! And we are married for ten years. She is still the same… and I am rude to her, I answer her impolitely. When I am bad to her, she is behaving well to me and when I’m good to her it’s like: you do whatever she wants or you leave…”

What kind of explanation could be found for this type of mother-in-law behaviour? Gabriela, the Romanian girl who passed through the same experience as Geta’s, seemed to have found the explanation for this syndrome of “overprotecting parents”:

“In general, the children here are very bound to their parents: the boys are bound to their mothers and the mothers are bound to the boys and girls (they interfere also for their daughters). They say that raise their children until the age of 100 years… so that the children are very tight bound to their
parents. They (the parents) live with the impression that they bring up their children until they die..."

In traditional societies where the family is a very important institution, its control and pressure over the members is also strong. The Cypriot society is characterized by the specialized literature of the domain as being a changing society where many traditional values have their place: one value of this type is Cypriot family. The chapter two of this study made lengthy points concerning this topic. There were illustrated the main traits of the traditional Cypriot family and marriage: arranged marriage as a rationalized partner choice process and dowry as materialized marriage exchanges. These traits are not present anymore in their traditional forms in nowadays Cyprus; they took other forms, adapted to a changing context of Cypriot society. In the case of marriage between foreigners and Cypriots, the family opposition of the latter part is based on the loss of opportunity to acquire suitable connections or possessions. Also, mixed marriages are perceived by Cypriot public opinion as diminishing parental power and ‘undermining’ Cypriot family values (as already mentioned in Chapter IV).

Another case in point is that of Nadejda’s, a Ukrainian woman who married a Cypriot man two years ago. Both of them have been married before and have children from previous marriages. She made a supposition about her mother-in-law who did not accept her son’s marriage, from the very beginning. Afterwards, the couple has lived for some time in the mother-in-law’s house and the relationship mother-in-law – daughter-in-law got improved. On the other hand, Nadejda’s relationship with her sister-in-law is a distant one: ‘His sister wasn’t very good to me. Usually, she didn’t speak to me; she spoke to me only a few things. She was not very friendly to me. One time he had a fight with his sister because of me. I understood something: she was telling him about Russian and Ukrainian girls that they come here to earn some money and get married out of interest. And he replied her: ‘Don’t tell something bad about my wife!’ They started to fight. I saw there were some troubles. He didn’t tell me something. And after some time he told me that his sister was not referring to me, exactly. But for a few days they didn’t talk: my husband with his sister. It was like fight’.

Ana, a Czech woman studied together with her Cypriot husband in her country where they met 15 years ago. She has passed through a similar experience with the other already mentioned cases of East-European women. She described how her husband’s family opposed to their son’s marriage to a foreigner: “The relations with my mother-in-law were very difficult until we got married. She didn’t want to let her son to marry me. But we got married 11 years ago in the Czech Republic and then she accepted me. From the experience of the foreign people I know this happens often: until the marriage takes place, all the Cypriot parents (and especially the mothers-in-law) are against the marriage with foreigners. Afterwards they change”.

Therefore, in most of the cases, Cypriot men overcame or ignored parental opposition and married Eastern-European women. Even if before the marriage ceremony, parental opposition used to be very strong, afterwards it weakened gradually or in some cases, as
already seen, took the form of a tensioned relationship Cypriot mother-in-law – foreign daughter-in-law.

In the present study, there are only two cases of Eastern-European women who declared that they are in very good terms with their mothers-in-law. Dana, a Romanian girl married a Cypriot man one year ago and she declared that was accepted by all her husband’s family, the relationships with her in-laws being excellent. Also, Evelina, a Bulgarian woman married to a twenty years older Cypriot man does her best in order to be accepted by her husband’s family. She got married nine years earlier and did not mention any reluctant behaviour from her husband’s family side.

**B) Cypriot Family’s Influence on Euro-American Spouse Selection**

In the group of seven Euro-American spouses participating in this study, there are two cases of foreign spouses who experienced tensioned relationships with their Cypriot in-laws. The common characteristic of the two cases is that both of them are examples of non-assortative matching between spouses with large age difference.

One case in point is that of Ron’s, an English man who married a Cypriot woman, sixteen years younger than him. At the time of the interview they had a one year old baby. He has also three children from a previous marriage. He characterized the relationship with his Cypriot wife’s family as being a ‘much tensioned’ one. His parents-in-law did oppose to their daughter’s marriage in all the possible ways; Ron described this experience as a real harassment:

“*We (Ron and his in-laws) are not close. I had many, many problems to begin with before I came here. My wife now, she was stopped from seeing me, stopped from contacting me in anyway. They tried to stop her from phoning me, contacting me in anyway…they threatened me, indirectly they threatened me, they tried everything they could to put her off and stop seeing me; including stealing her passport so she couldn’t fly to see me. It was quite stressful*”

The Cypriot wife’s family withdrawn support and stopped every contact with the couple after their civil marriage. Their attitude changed in some way when the couple’s child was born: “*It was only shortly before we married that I met her father. I met her mother once in England and again here, in Cyprus, but they wouldn’t talk to me or have anything to do with me for a long time. Now, ah…..they are OK, we go for lunch together. I think the baby changed everything. As soon as they knew my wife is pregnant. First, they still wouldn’t talk to me, her father wouldn’t talk to me or even to her until she was six-months pregnant and then he talked to her and slowly invited me to come around and it was as I said: the baby made the difference*” (Ron).

The couple’s child didn’t change much the relationship between the parents-in-law and their son-in-law, as Ron described it as a permanent conflict:

“*So, is reasonably friendly now, but still not good. We will never be good friends, it’s a shame. Again, I think it’s particularly Cypriot father and mother that overprotect the children.*” With the foreigner’s eyes, Ron described how parental control over his wife influences their marital
relationship: “Even now that she is married with a child, they still try to run her life, which they shouldn’t do. I think because I’m a little bit stronger I stop it so they don’t try too hard, but I think they would love for their daughter to marry a Cypriot, a young Cypriot who they could control as well”.

In this context, not having proper Greek language skills seems to be an advantage for Ron, as he perceives it as a way of preserving some necessary distance in his contacts with the in-laws: “…their ways are different from mine. I’m not saying I’m right and they are wrong; so, it’s better to stay to some distance. Her mother is very interfering and judgmental. And I would rather not know it if she is making rude remarks. Maybe if I knew what she was saying, we would fall out, would have more problems. So, I let them talking Greek and I ignore them. They speak English, but not very well. We can have a conversation. They are quite well-educated, work for the government.”

Another case of marriage in secret because of Cypriot parents’ disapproval is that between Genette, a Swedish woman and Stelios, a Cypriot man:

“We married (nobody knew anything) without his parents; they didn’t know (laughs). They found out, somebody told them (I don’t know how) and they were not very happy about that. As time goes by, they accepted us”.

In this case also, the marital union with a foreigner is not perceived as a positive one by the Cypriot partner’s parents. Gennette is not only a foreign woman, but is also ten years older than her Cypriot spouse; this is a paring between two individuals with dissimilar demographical characteristics: “His family is not so happy with our marriage. I’m ten years older than my husband; probably it has something to do with that. He is 35 years old. They wanted him to marry a Cypriot woman, like many Cypriots want for their children. His parents have been nice to me. We see them. They accepted me after we got married. His mother will never be my mother, no; when we are in Sweden, he feels like home in my mother’s house”.

Foreigners perceive the Cypriots as people who care about their “image” in the eyes of the other people and seem to be very preoccupied with what their social circle will think about them: ‘Even if I know that my mother-in-law is not happy that I married her son, if we go somewhere (for wedding or another party) she will kiss me and hug me: ‘Oh, my dear daughter-in-law’; not to show to their relatives that they don’t like me. Of course, it sounds like she loves me very much; of course she is happy, very happy (laughs). But I do know that deep down, she is not happy at all. But she cares about the image, about what the neighbour says, what the rest of the family says; she will never let them know that she is not happy: it is about keeping the image”.

In the same vein, Ron, an English man married to a Cypriot woman said: ‘What I could understand is that her parents worried more about their image, then about their daughter. I met all the other members of my father’s-in-law family before I met him. They were friendly to me, all the other members of the family; but he is still not, because of his image”.

Another significant aspect about the influence of Cypriot spouses’ parents on the marital relationship is the degree in which the children accept their parents’ control: ‘My husband is not influenced by his mother. She understood that she doesn’t have to tell us what to
do. Maybe it started when we didn’t invite them to the wedding. But she doesn’t have any foot in
my house; doesn’t come and go whenever she wants” (Genette).

Almost all the respondents commented the so-called “Cypriot mother-in-law syndrome” of control and interference in children’s marital life and suggested ways to cope with it. In this vein, Jane an English woman married for eleven years to a Cypriot man shared her experience:

“The mother-in-law is a big problem for many people here that that I talked to. I don’t have that problem, my mother-in-law although she is a very strong woman; she knows that my husband won’t let to interfere. He never did when he was younger, so he doesn’t allow it. She doesn’t try. They don’t do it now. But there are many, many here whose mothers tell them to do this and they do it. So there, I think you get a problem between the wife and the mother-in-law. I’m lucky enough, I don’t have that”.

Five out of seven spouses from the Euro-American group of countries declared that have been accepted by their husband’s families without any problems, percentage that is larger than in the other case of East-European spouses. In this sense, Youta a Danish woman who has married her Cypriot husband sixteen years ago described her relationship with her in-laws: “My parents-in-law are very, very good to me. Is not a rich family, actually is a poor family, but they have a very, very big heart. (...) my mother-in-law is definitely not interfering; she is very helping and friendly. She is very old, but is a very nice person. I’m surprised because she’s from mountains. She has no school, but she just accepted me like that. It was amazing, maybe she saw her son that he was happy”.

Many examples in this study have showed that marriage in Cyprus is not exclusively a private affair: it is proved by Cypriot families’ influence in these particular cases of mixed marriages. Even if in the case of mixed marriage, family’s influence is somehow limited (because of the foreign spouse’s opposition) the context given by the characteristics of a small-scale society is still very influencing on the mixed marital relationship. However, the present context in Cyprus is changing and because of the increasing number of mixed marriages (as proved by the statistical data analysis), Cypriot parents’ attitudes towards mixed marriages are expected to change in a favourable way. This trend is also proved by the cases under the study: the foreign spouses who have married to Cypriots more than ten years ago encountered much more parental opposition from the Cypriot side, than the foreign spouses who have married Cypriots more recently. This trend is true especially for Eastern-European spouses.

Therefore, Cypriot parents’ reactions to a mixed marriage vary according to the spouses’ nationalities and the prejudices about these in the public conscience; and also vary according to the social and family background or psychological and demographical characteristics of the foreign spouses. Their reticence and oppositions are expressed usually before the couple’s marriage and take the form of attempts to dissuade the son or daughter for not marrying a foreigner. Once the marriage is contracted (many times
without Cypriot parents’ agreement), the oppositions are not so strongly expressed even if they still exist. Undisguised oppositions are rare and concern scepticism about a possible success of the couple's marital life. These are the characteristics of Cypriot families' reactions to marriages with foreigners. The following section illustrates the role of the Cypriot Orthodox Church on mixed marriage in Cyprus.

5.3.2. Orthodox Church’s Influence on Mixed Marriage Partner Choice

The cases in study proved that the religion is not an important influence factor in a Cypriot family’s reaction to a mixed marriage. Moreover, only nine couples out of twenty had a religious wedding and also, ten out of twenty foreign spouses are Christian Orthodox (as the Cypriots are in their great majority) and East-Europeans; one foreign spouse is Muslim and another one is Maronite, and the rest of eight spouses are Christians, but non-Orthodox.

The literature review showed that somewhat stronger sanctions than those of the family are provided by the church, against mixed marriage. Unity of faith (i.e. a joint commitment to the Orthodox Church) is formally a condition of church marriage. During the years, many councils of the Orthodox Church 49 have forbidden marriages between an Orthodox and a non-Orthodox, and stipulated that such marriages, if concluded before civil magistrates, must be dissolved.

The Cypriots perceive a couple as being married only if they have a Christian Orthodox church wedding; in the case of divorce, the Orthodox Church must give its permission which is very difficult to obtain. Also, a special permission from the Orthodox Bishop is needed for having a marriage celebrated in church, in case the spouses have an age difference larger than twelve years. This is Ron’s case, an English man who is sixteen years older than his Cypriot wife:

"We had a civil wedding, but we always plan to have a religious wedding. Because of our age difference it is very difficult to get the permission from the Bishop in order to have a religious wedding. That’s why we had only the civil one, just to have it legal. The Church is not so important to me, but it is for Christiana and her family. They don’t see us as married until we have that marriage" (Ron).

Also, for a couple having a child without being married in church is considered to be a sin by the Orthodox church; this is the reason why, Cypriot parents rushed to marry their son in the church even if he got married civilly and secretly to a Romanian woman: "We’ve had the religious wedding a year after the civil marriage. After the civil marriage that we did in secret, I got pregnant and then they (the parents-in-law) rushed to marry us in the church because

---

it’s a shame to give birth without being married in church!” (Geta, a Romanian woman).

In order to get married in an Orthodox church, any foreigner must prove through a certificate that she/he was baptized Christian; otherwise the religious ceremony cannot take place:

‘I’m a Christian and I had to prove that I was baptized in the church to get married here in the church. I’m not religious at all and I don’t care about these things, whatever. I have no feelings. And the same when they wanted to baptize my daughter: for me, I don’t care, but they wanted to do it and I let them do it. And I don’t believe in making a fast of these things. I try to do it my way and let the foreigners to do it how they wanted to be happy’ (Pita).

Another condition of mixed marriage between Cypriots and foreigners who marry in the Cypriot Orthodox Church is that mixed couple’s children will be baptized Orthodox. In this sense, Youta, a non-Orthodox Danish woman mentioned: “I went to the church office and signed the papers there that the children will be baptized Orthodox and it was no problem because I was not Orthodox”.

Sometimes the foreigners refuse to marry into an Orthodox church or to baptize their children in the Orthodox faith and then, Cypriot family’s sanctions can be very strong. Genette, a Swedish woman declared that didn’t want to marry in an Orthodox church and she also mentioned a case of children from mixed marriages that were not baptized Orthodox:

‘I have a friend who is Catholic and didn’t baptize her children Orthodox (she is married to a Cypriot). And her mother-in-law didn’t speak to her because her children are also baptized Catholic, not Orthodox. She refused it; she actually goes to the church and believes and this is a very big topic. The mother-in-law put it behind because she wants to be part of the life: it’s the grandchildren, but it was very difficult’.

Therefore, religious mixed marriage entails the risk of losing members and may weaken church attachment in future generations; this is why the Orthodox Church accepted interfaith marriages on the condition that the children will be baptised and raised as Orthodox. This condition is not posed in the case of marriages between Cypriots and spouses from East-European Orthodox countries as: Bulgaria, Romania, Russia, Ukraine, Moldavia or Serbia. Concerning the religion of the spouses, this type of union Cypriots-foreigners from the previously mentioned countries is not a “mixed” one; this may be a reason why these Orthodox foreign spouses may be more easily accepted by Cypriot religious faithful families.

The mixed marriages between Orthodox Cypriots and Non-Christians were represented by one case of a marriage between an Orthodox woman and a Muslim man (the marriages between Cypriots and spouses from the Asian group of countries are not the subject of this study). In this case, no religious celebration of the wedding took place.
because (as the respondent motivated) is not the case of a religious family (with the exception of some relatives who made objections against it).
And also, the couple’s children are not baptised Christians, as it is the case for all the marital unions with Muslims.50

Since less than half of the mixed couples under the study had a religious wedding, all the couples had a civil marriage contracted in Cyprus or in foreign spouses’ home countries. The Cypriot law on marriage recognizes both types of marriages, civil and religious, as equally legal from 1989 onwards. Therefore, a couple may choose to have either religious or civil wedding, or both of them. Through the laws on marriage and immigration, the state influences mixed marriage in Cyprus; in this sense, the spouses talked about their experience in dealing with the state immigration authorities.

5.3.3. Cypriot State’s Influence on Mixed Marriage Partner Choice

The Cypriot Law on Immigration restricts the entrance in Cyprus of non-EU nationals and accession countries nationals (i.e. Romanians and Bulgarians from 2005 onwards). Therefore, the foreigners who come to Cyprus from third countries need an entry-visa and in order to stay in Cyprus they need a residence permit or a work permit based on a work contract. A residence permit (which is renewable) for these nationals can be obtained through a marriage to a Cypriot national; this fact also encourages “blank” marriages or marriage of convenience that are contracted with the only purpose to secure residence in Cyprus.

5.3.3.1 Foreign Spouses with Entrance-Visa Immigrant Status in Cyprus

In the cases under study, twelve out of the twenty respondents had to marry civilly their Cypriot spouse in order to obtain an Alien Residence Permit for living in Cyprus. In a way, the Cypriot Law on immigration obliged them to enter into a marriage, even if in many cases they were not ready to live into a marital relationship. This is also the case of Natasha’s Palestinian husband who couldn’t stay in Cyprus legally without being civilly married and then obtain a residence permit:

“We had only a civil marriage. We hurried up in order to get married. Of course we were engaged at the time we married civilly. We had a civil marriage because otherwise my husband couldn’t stay in Cyprus. Through civil marriage he obtained a residence permit issued for an unlimited period of time. This is a bad thing: the legislation in Cyprus forces you to marry. You might be not ready for marriage, or not be decided…We hurried up to get married fast, very fast; maybe we were not ready to get married at that time…but we were obliged to get married, otherwise how could we be

50 The present study didn’t adopt a perspective to account for religious mixed marriage and moreover, to refer to this special type of Orthodox-Muslim marital union that needs a specific approach. This problem has been approached theoretically— from juridical and religious perspectives— in the work of a Cypriot scholar, Demostenous-Pashalidou, A. 1996. The Dissolution of Marriage in Islamic Law: With Special Reference to Mixed Marriages and the Conflict of Laws, Nicosia.
together: me here and he somewhere else...you cannot even figure out if you match as spouses...". This is the case of all East-European spouses (except for those countries members of the European Union) who are obliged by the Cypriot legislation to pass through many formalities in order to obtain the legal papers that entail these nationals to live in Cyprus together with their Cypriot spouses. These legal procedures suppose contacts with the Cypriot Immigration authorities. The experience of having this kind of contacts was not always a positive one, as the respondents mentioned.

Lia, a Romanian woman who married to a Cypriot ten years ago spoke about her experience of applying for Cypriot citizenship: "The answer to my application for citizenship was delayed. At the time I applied for citizenship I had 5 years in Cyprus and two children and they interviewed me in order to find out if my marriage was real or 'fake'. This is what they told me so that I asked: 'after five years in Cyprus and two children, you want to find out if my marriage is true? 'This is our duty' they replied. I understand this is their duty, but you don't feel good...after five years and two children they are questioning me to find out if my marriage was real...". Before getting married to a Cypriot, Lia had worked in a cabaret for two months (as she declared). In those cases of foreign women who worked in cabarets, the Immigration authorities are suspicious about the authenticity of these marriages. Because of the high number of "blank" marriages between Cypriots and foreign nationals who need visa and work permit in Cyprus, the Cypriot legislation for obtaining Cypriot citizenship has changed over the time. If ten years ago the condition for obtaining Cypriot citizenship has been a civil marriage to a Cypriot citizen for at least one year, this period changed to two years and then in 2003 it was extended to three years.

Liana, a Romanian woman who is married to a Cypriot for eight years described the feelings about her contacts with Cypriot immigration authorities: "The only thing I was very scared has been the Immigration...it was disastrous the way they were behaving (and still behave) to all foreigners. Usually I avoided going there and instead I used to send my husband and my father-in-law to arrange for the papers. Especially my father-in-law was very willing to help with all these paper procedures. I didn't have any problems; I have been waiting for two years and then it was easy for me to obtain the citizenship".

Lena, a Bulgarian woman tried to find an explanation for the Cypriot immigration authorities' maltreatment of foreigners:

"They behaved to me very badly, as I would have been second-hand citizen: 'Look at her, the Bulgarian woman/ Boulgara (in Greek-with bad meaning) married one of us...'.It was something unbelievable, everywhere with hassle/ 'fasaria', cry and nervous tension. I was so stressed that I was trembling because of it. I thought that this maltreatment they showed to me was due to the fact that I was a foreigner. But afterwards, I learnt slowly-slowly that this happened because this is how they know to behave, their 'manners'...It is because there are some people without education working there, people who don't deserve to be there...".

Valeria, a Russian woman who married a Cypriot three years ago showed how Cypriot authorities' behaviour to the foreigners may change and they can become even friendly:
"You know what Immigration means; you have to wait there too much time. When we went to Nicosia, to the central office for Immigration, they were angry, shouted; but after my husband found a friend of him there, they became very friendly. It's like this in Cyprus".

Therefore, the East-European respondents characterized their inferior status as "second hand nationals"; they are suspected by the Cypriot authorities when they enter mixed marriages to Cypriot nationals and are asked many questions even when they come to Cyprus as tourists. Dana, a Romanian girl who married her Cypriot husband a year ago described her contacts with the immigration authorities:"I was afraid at the beginning when I came here for holiday, without working contract, as a tourist (after we met and my working permit in Cyprus expired, my husband invited me here). When I was working here with work permit I had no problems with the authorities. But when I came here being invited by my husband (without being married at that time) they asked me a lot of questions: why I came, at whom, where I'll stay, how we met...ah... many questions!"

Valeria, a Russian spouse indicated the reason why the Cypriot authorities are so suspicious about the mixed marriages between Cypriots and East-European spouses: "Here there are many Russians, Ukrainians and from other countries who are interested to get married only to obtain a passport and then to divorce, have a job here and work. That's why the procedure to get citizenship is becoming harder".

5.3.3.2 Contacts of Euro-American Spouses with Cypriot Immigration Authorities

In a comparative manner, it is interesting to take into consideration the Cypriot authorities' treatment of nationals from the Euro-American group of countries. In this sense, Mayonee, an English woman married to a Cypriot described her contacts with Cypriot authorities: "They are much unorganized. Personally, I haven't had to deal much with the authorities, but as I heard from a lot of friends who are foreigners, they had problems. When you are foreigner there have always been a sort of second...This is a shame because it doesn't give me much confidence to rely on them".

All the nationals of the Euro-American group of countries mentioned the fact that they did not need any visas, residence permits or Cypriot citizenship in order to stay in Cyprus. On the other hand, all the nationals of the East-European group of countries in this study applied for Cypriot citizenship which they need in order to leave and enter Cyprus without visas.

"Even now, I don't have official residence here. I was lazy to do the paper work; for everybody doing this is only spending of time. No one stopped me from coming or going"- declared Jane, an English spouse.

Therefore, these spouses from the Western European countries who enter into marriages with Cypriots do not have to go through paper formalities and interviews for obtaining Cypriot citizenship, experience that is lived by the East-European spouses. If the legal treatment of foreign nationals in Cyprus differs according to their nationality, the behaviour
of the state authorities’ employees to foreign nationals doesn’t discriminate any groups of nationalities from Eastern or Western Europe; this is the pattern that arises from the respondents’ testimonies. An example to illustrate this finding is mentioned by Genette, a Swedish woman who is ten years older than her Cypriot spouses:

“They are very rude. When we were in immigration (when I got a stamp in my passport saying that we are married) she asked my husband if he doesn’t mind that his wife is ten years older than him. Which he found that was a very rude question since we were married. And I don’t think that anybody could think that I married him for his money actually (laughs). But we both got very upset about that. I guess it was a kind of interview but it wasn’t really delicate ask, she could ask it another way”.

The only positive example about interacting with Cypriot immigration authorities was given by a Bulgarian woman, who married nine years ago, her Cypriot husband: ‘I have Cypriot citizenship. They behaved to me respectfully. They asked about my job, about my way of living. I didn’t give them the impression that I married to a Cypriot in order to get Cypriot citizenship. I got the Cypriot citizenship four years ago, but I didn’t go to get a passport, I’m not interested in getting it and don’t need it”. (Evelina)

She also confessed that they got married officially because they were forced by the Cypriot legislation on immigration: ‘I didn’t want to get married; I would have liked to live with him just like this, without marriage. But since we are married, it’s easier with the papers, with visas; this is why we decided to get married. I couldn’t stay in Cyprus without being married (since Bulgarian nationals needed visa to enter Cyprus). I think that a paper (because for me, our marriage is a paper) so, this paper won’t bring us the happiness, this paper cannot hold us somewhere, if we want to go or stay somewhere”.

Consequently, the Cypriot legislation constraints on East-European nationals (non-EU members) are very strong since they are pushed to enter into a marriage with a Cypriot spouse without having the opportunity (in many cases) to live in Cyprus together with their Cypriot spouse-to-be as an accommodation period (i.e. cohabitation) necessary in the case of making a marriage decision. This fact may have serious implications on marriage relationship quality that sometimes collapses leading to partners’ separation and divorce.

5.4. Contact Opportunities on Cypriot Marriage Market. The Structural Arrangements in Cypriots - Foreigners Mixed Marriages

So far, individual and group-level factors that influence the marital decisions of Cypriots and foreigners into mixed marriages have been analysed. The cases in study attested that the preferences of the mixed-marriage spouses are central in the process of partner choice- a pattern which is characteristic for any ‘European-like’ society. Besides the preferences of the partners, the outcome of marital decisions is also influenced by structural characteristics of the marriage market. As the literature review revealed
(Kalmijn, 1998), the contact opportunities of the people in the marriage market are shaped by several arrangements such as: (a) the demographic composition of the population as a whole; (b) the regional distributions of groups and (c) functional settings where partners may have contact opportunities.

(a) In Cypriot context, the local population’s demographic composition is been changing for the last fifteen years period because of an increase in immigrant sex ratio in favour of foreign women, especially women from Eastern-European and Asian countries (as the findings from statistical data prove). Therefore, in the Cypriot marriage market it has been an increase in contact opportunities (in the last fifteen years) between Cypriot men and foreign women coming to Cyprus for work or as tourists. These opportunities for contact have been materialized into a rising number of marital unions between Cypriot men and foreign women – as already showed in the present study (see for details, Chapter II).

(b) Concerning spatial segregation or regional distribution of foreigners in Cyprus, it does not constitute an important structural factor as the foreigners living in Cyprus are not concentrated in certain parts of the country; but, as the Census data for 2001 show, migrants are likely to live mostly in urban areas of Cyprus (see section 2.5.1, Chapter II).

(c) The cases in study revealed as the most frequent functional setting or meeting place of Cypriots and foreigners who entered into mixed unions: the pub, bar or restaurant. In eleven cases out of twenty, the couples’ meeting places were: pubs, bars or restaurants in Cyprus where the foreign spouses usually used to work (in six cases the foreign spouses’ workplace constituted spouses’ meeting place - see for details Appendix G, Table 5.1). In three cases, the spouses met in university or college abroad or in Cyprus. And in six out of twenty cases the foreign and Cypriot spouses met abroad. There is a specific particularity of Cypriot marriage market that concerns cabarets as meeting places for many mixed couples in Cyprus. There are no statistics available to show the frequency of this meeting setting by comparison to other settings. In this study there was only one woman who recognized and did not hide her reason of coming to Cyprus- she described her former workplace:

“I came to Cyprus to work…in a cabaret (…). I can tell you how the cabaret used to be ten years ago. Those who were going to the cabaret were like shepherds, dirty people, some…an educated man doesn’t go to the cabaret…they were all married men. So, I was asking them: “Are you married?” They were answering ‘yes’, of course they wore wedding rings and didn’t want to marry; it was not their purpose… I was telling them ‘in order to go with you I need 100 dollars and to get drunk, otherwise I cannot do it…’ and then I was adding: ‘is better for you to go home, to your wife, she might love you and make it out of love”. They used to go to my boss and tell her ‘She is crazy, look what she tells us!’ Then, the boss gave me the ticket to go home so that I left after two months. I felt pity for some girls: there are also among the Romanian girls some who are prostitutes, who have it in their blood (laughing). But there were some girls who used to get drunk
to be able to do it – they had children at home, left with grandparents, so that they came to make some money for them. Yes, they got drunk otherwise they couldn’t do it…they got drunk and used to say ‘I stay here for a year or two, make some money, then I go home, nobody knows where I was and what I did, so that I have money to raise my children’. I don’t know…this is very sad…but what could you do? ...I felt pity for these girls” (Lia). Generally, the foreign women working in cabarets are blamed by Cypriot women as being the reason of many Cypriot men’s divorces from their Cypriot wives.

5.4.1. Dating and Courtship.

Marital Intention and Decision of Mixed Marriage Partners

The content analysis of the twenty interviews revealed that the duration of dating and courtship period oscillated between two months and seven years. Regarding the cases of East-European spouses, this period was shorter than for their Euro-American counterparts – from two months to three years and from three months to seven years, respectively (see for details Appendix G, Table 5.1). This difference may be associated with the difficulty of visa-based entrance in Cyprus for the East-European spouses who usually ‘rushed’ to marry their Cypriot partners, as already mentioned in a previous section.

Dating with a Cypriot man constitutes a different experience for a foreign woman coming from other culture. An illustrative example for cultural differences in courtship is mentioned by Genette, a Swedish woman who married a Cypriot eight years ago:

“When you go on a date, the Cypriots are more like it used to be in Sweden 30 years ago: they pull out the chair, open the car and pay for you. I don’t know how is now, but it used to be like this ten years ago. In Sweden the men expect you to pay for your drink”.

Regarding the foreign spouses’ marital intention, many of them declared that had no intention of getting married at the time they met their spouse. It just happened to meet the right man and than the decision was made- most of the spouses who came for work in Cyprus shared this opinion. One of them is Olga, a Russian woman who referred to her marital intention: “I didn’t have any intention to get married at the beginning of our relationship because I didn’t come here in order to marry somebody. We’ve met two years ago and got married after a year”.

Sometimes, the marital intention and decision of foreign spouses were determined by the Cypriot men’s marriage proposal that pushed the women to decide under the pressure of some material gifts. This is Nadejda’s case, a Ukrainian woman: ‘After one month of dating he proposed me: if I want to marry him. I told him ‘I don’t know you very well. I can’t give you any answer because we know each other for such a short period. (...). And we continued dating and one day (I didn’t tell him ‘yes’ or ‘not’) he brought me a ring and some gold things and told me: ‘It’s for you and I ask you to be my wife’. It was a surprise for me (laughs). I said ‘I can’t accept
these things, it’s gold and is expensive’. He responded: ‘No, whatever your answer is, take them, it’s for you’. I said ‘OK’ and he asked ‘How long you need to think?’ And I said: ‘I don’t know, when I’m ready, I’ll tell you’ (laughs). So, we continued dating, he was very good to me’.

In some other cases, the marriage decision was the result of a pregnancy. A case in point is Pita’s, an Australian woman: ‘After we met, I remained pregnant and had to get married. It didn’t happen in our culture. My mother said to me when I was getting married (because I was pregnant) ‘don’t worry, have the baby, and get married afterwards if you want to. It’s no rush’. When I said that to my in-laws, they crossed themselves and it was obviously that we had to marry before having the child. So, we did the church wedding’.

There were also cases of mixed marriages between Cypriots and East-European women work migrants when the marriage decision of the foreign spouses was taken at the expiration date of their working contract in Cyprus.

The decision to marry a foreigner and to live in a foreign country constituted also, a result of the influence exerted by contextual factors such as, for example, less opportunity for the foreign spouse to have a career in her/his country. One of the examples under study is that of Valeria’s, a Russian woman who married a Cypriot: ‘In Russia, I was a singer in the opera at the time I met my husband. The only problem was that I have been for six years in the theatre, I had roles, but I understood that I would not take bigger roles. (...) Because to take these roles you must pay much money to the director or maybe you must sleep with him. I not did this and understood that I shall live with these small roles all my life. So, I decided to change this and come here’.

Except for the influence of contextual factors, as those related before, in each case the marriage decision was taken after accounting for spouses’ cultural and personal traits such as psychological characteristics and physical appearance.

As all the interviewees agreed, the marriage to foreign partners changed their whole life from many points of view; subsequent to making their choice for foreign spouses, they also had to integrate themselves into a foreign culture, undergoing processes of assimilation, acculturation and adaptation to new cultural systems of values, beliefs and opinions. In order to account for degrees of marital assimilation and integration of the foreign spouses in their host society and also to make some sense about mixed marriage mate selection level of success, the respondents were asked some questions about their employment in Cyprus, participation in social life (friends/social networks, participation in common activities together with natives) and about children from mixed marriage. Their experiences are presented in the following sections.

51 The respondents participating in the first interviews made lengthy points referring to these aspects of their life in Cyprus without being asked directly. It was proved that these references may help to understand their mixed marriages in the context of their migratory experience that implies major changes in these people’s lives.
5.5. Life in Cyprus as a Foreigner

By definition, culturally mixed marriages present those involved with a wider palette of cultural practices than culturally homogenous marriages, including such issues as gender roles, child-rearing, mores, language and general lifestyle by which to shape their lives. Sometimes, there may be little awareness of difference, or indeed the differences may be minimal. On the other hand, in the process of everyday life, differences can become clearer, forming a highly charged minefield of conflict, or a source of enriching diversity, or even both.

Because of the semi-structured nature of the interviews, the foreign spouses referred many times (without being questioned specifically) to their life in Cyprus and to the way their marital relationship had changed over the time. As a consequence, separate sections about children from mixed marriage were added to the interview schedule and also, some other topics that the respondents referred to, such as: friends, participation in social life and experience of working together with native Cypriots. It is important to account for all these aspects that may indicate in what extent the process of mate selection has influenced the subsequent common marital life of the mixed couples.

Life in Cyprus from the point of view of a British national is easier; this is how Jane, an English woman married to a Cypriot described the advantage of being an English foreigner in Cyprus: ‘I think that maybe it is easier for an English foreigner here because there are so many of us. We are quite easily accepted here. The Cypriots are used to us and the language. It’s not the same for other foreigners. I have a Swiss friend and it’s very difficult for her to keep any contact with Switzerland, to pass it on to her children, because nobody here is from Switzerland. They are very small number’. As the findings from the questionnaire addressed to native Cypriots have showed, their attitude towards British people (and Russians) is the most favourable amongst all the other foreign nationals living in Cyprus. Therefore, Jane’s suppositions are verified by the questionnaire findings that have been already commented in a previous chapter.

Jane described also Cyprus as a safe place for raising children, fact that constitutes an advantage of living in Cyprus, as well: ‘Living here is nice and better for the children: they have more freedom whereas in England now you cannot let the children go down around the corner without someone watching them. And that’s very different from when I was a child. I think the children do well here’.

The respondents were questioned about the way their children (as offspring from mixed marriage) are treated at school in Cyprus, about the languages they speak and their feelings about coming from a mixed marriage.
5.5.1. Children of Mixed Marriages in Cyprus

All the interviewed mixed couple spouses live in Cyprus, the partners being Cypriots and foreign nationals. Half of these couples have children together; two cases are specific: one case when the mother is Cypriot and the other where the mother is offspring of mixed marriage between a Cypriot man and a Russian woman. In the rest of eight cases (from a total of ten couples with children) the women are foreigners and the men are Cypriots.

There is a natural tendency of raising the children with the norms of mothers’ cultures - as long as the mothers are those who raise their children. Because the societal context of these mixed couples with children is Cyprus society, it is easier for the Cypriot fathers to impose their cultural model, as well. Therefore, in all the ten cases of mixed couples with children, there are two cultural and educational models coexisting in raising children. Besides the family, the school and the parents’ families represent two important socialization agents that play a role in the self-identification of these children from mixed marriage. It is significant to illustrate with respondents’ confessions how mixed marriage offspring identify themselves.

Lia, a Romanian woman gave an example about the way her son identifies himself as being a Romanian: “The teacher asked my son where from is he (because he looks like a foreigner) and he replied ‘I’m a Romanian-Cypriot’. The teacher replied ‘Are you born in Romania and then you came here?’ and he answered: ‘No, I was born here, but I am a Romanian’. So, if you ask him, he says he’s a Romanian”. Lia’s children are bilingual and they went for the first time to Romania last year.

5.5.1.1 Mixed Marriage Offspring’s Languages

An indicative finding is that those children from mixed marriages who were raised by their housewife mothers and had more contacts with their foreign mother’s relatives are more proficient in their mother’s language; also, they are more likely to identify themselves with their mother’s nationality, than the children with working foreign mothers who have frequented from a smaller age Cypriot nurseries or were raised by Cypriot women, as grandmothers or other relatives.

Liana’s example illustrates this case of working foreign mother, whose child speaks her language at a basic level: “My son, who is older then his sister doesn’t speak the Romanian language; he knows a little bit, I must start to speak him Romanian. When he was a baby I used to speak him only Romanian all the time, afterwards when he went at the kindergarten I stopped speaking to him Romanian. This is because he speaks there Greek and at that time I thought that is better to speak him the language he was speaking at the kindergarten.”

The case of children from mixed marriages who do not fluently speak their foreign mother’s language is typical for the marriages between Eastern-European women and
Cypriot men. One explanation is that the Eastern-European spouses are more proficient in the Greek language than their counterparts from the Euro-American group of countries as long as the language spoken at home by the first is the Greek-Cypriot dialect. In the families with spouses from the Euro-American group of countries, the dominant language at home is either English or foreign spouse’s language that is spoken also by the Cypriot men (or a third foreign language spoken by both spouses). In none of the cases investigated, the dominant language at home for the last-mentioned couples was Greek. Contrary, in the families with East-European spouses the dominant language at home is Greek (i.e. the Greek-Cypriot dialect) in all the cases, so that the children learn the Greek language from both parents.

Geta is a Romanian spouse who works and whose child speaks her native language. She explained how the children from mixed marriages East-European-Cypriot spouses learn their foreign mother’s language: “My daughter speaks Romanian because my mother has been looking after her for some months every year. Almost every year I used to bring my mother here for 6-7 months. Also, my father came for 8 months. This is the only way they can learn (the children) our language, otherwise they don’t learn it from us because we speak to them both languages and they cannot pick them”.

In mixed families of Cypriot and Euro-American spouses, the children learn the Greek language only from one parent because the Greek is not the dominant language at home: ‘We speak mainly English in the family. We try to use a little bit Greek now because both of our children are in Greek school. We had the boy in English nursery for a while, but he was becoming completely English and we didn’t want that. We didn’t want him to be a foreigner. So, we had them into Greek nursery, and then into Greek school. […] The younger one, she is learning Greek now, she went to school; she speaks the language, but she is not exactly up at the level of full Cypriots in the class.”. (Jane, an English spouse)

5.5.1.2 Mixed Marriage Offspring at School

The amount of children from mixed marriages is increasing every year (as the foreign spouses mentioned), fact that resulted into a change of attitude towards them: they are more accepted by their Cypriot peers who have at least a relative or a neighbour being offspring of mixed marriage. The respondents being asked whether their children have any problems at school gave different responses that emphasized a more favourable attitude towards children from mixed marriages.

Lia, a Romanian woman with two children in the primary school spoke about a silent discrimination that concerns all the foreigners in Cyprus: “My children don’t have any problems at school, at least they have never told me about it. I know that the Pontic Greeks have problems, they get racist nicknames. Even us, as adults, we don’t have any problems, nobody tells you something directly, but you can feel it, you know…also at work, when you search for a job, it is more difficult for us”.

Jane, an English woman referred to some racist nicknames her son got at school, but she does not perceive it as a problem because she mentioned that the children from mixed marriage do not represent a minority anymore, so that they do not feel to be very different from the majority of Cypriot children: “The children don’t have problems at school. Sometime they call him ‘Englezo’, my son. I think, the children might feel a little bit embarrassed, but they get over that. I can’t stand that the children do have a problem. The first school my son was in, there were a lot of foreign children there from the Russian-Greek community. So, there were also a lot of children struggling with language difficulties, because both of their parents were actually not Greek. In the school now my daughter starting out, I think it is a little bit hard at first because of the language- but she has never told me that she was unhappy”.

Some problems with the Greek language might cause trouble at school for children from mixed marriages. This is also Youta’s opinion, who mentioned as an advantage the fact that the amount of offspring from mixed marriages in Cyprus is very large: “They get treated as Cypriots at ‘dimotiko’/primary school, but later sometimes when they have some problems with the language, they get treated as children from mixed marriage. But that’s more in ‘gymnasio’/secondary school and ‘lykeio’/high school. They go to Greek school, but there are a lot of other children from mixed marriages.

I know many children from mixed marriages at the school where my smaller son is. The teachers do treat them all the same because they know now that they have to be more modern like everybody else abroad. Now is more mixed, than at the time I came here. It was a few, it was not that many foreigners and mixed marriages here; but now it’s a lot, a lot!” (Youta, a Danish woman)

Marian, a German woman came to Cyprus twenty years ago having a daughter of five with her Cypriot husband. She referred to a past period when being a child from mixed marriage was not such a frequent case as it is in nowadays Cyprus: “At that time, my daughter was the only foreigner in quite a big public school in Limassol- we are talking now about the period end of eighties and beginning of nineties, it was not common the fact of being a child from mixed marriage. They had a German subject and the other children were complaining to her like it was her responsibility what Hitler did.

And also, my children, both of them, they didn’t like very much when I used to go to the school; that was something I didn’t like as a foreigner. They both my children are quite Cypriot looking and they didn’t like me to go there and confront their friends, as a German mother”.

In this case, the two children from mixed marriage realized the fact that their foreign mother had an inferior status being a foreigner in Cyprus and tried to cope with it by identifying themselves as being Cypriots, and then adopting an identity they perceived as ‘superior’. 
5.5.1.3. Mixed Marriage Offspring’s Social Identity

An indicative finding of this study is that all the foreign parent participants deny for their children the inferior status they have as being foreigners (from whatever group of countries). This is the reason why many of them mentioned that their child is perceived as a Cypriot or that they do not want to raise their children as ‘foreigners’. They know, as foreign parents, that ‘foreign national’ means likely inequalities and discrimination that characterize foreigners’ migratory status; this is why they do not want their children to be considered foreigners in Cyprus; even if, many of these children have phenotypic characteristics that ‘differentiate’ them from the children of intramarriages of Cypriots.

On the other hand, all the respondents agreed that being a child from mixed marriage constitutes an advantage from different points of view enumerated below:

“I think is nice for the children as well because they get the best from the both worlds- they have the family here, but they also have another family in England. We spend time there in the summer and they really enjoy it. So, they get the best of both worlds, in a way”. (Jane, an English spouse)

“Being children from mixed marriage, sometimes they know more about life and I think they like that. But sometimes they don’t like it because I remember- some years ago- I remember my daughter saying that I could just act as a normal mother. Now what is a ‘normal mother’ I don’t know; it must be a Cypriot mother!” (Laughs). (Marian, a German spouse)

As the respondents mentioned, being children from mixed marriages means many advantages rooted in the process of participation in two cultures, but can constitute also a disadvantage as long as mixed identities sometimes might cause a conflict situation. The disadvantage then is a consequence of the social environment reaction to “mixed” or to “otherness” (as it was mentioned by respondents) that used to be very negative in the Cypriot context twenty years ago (as some interviewees mentioned). This is what every foreign mother fears for her child: not becoming a victim of prejudice about foreigners and in the last instance, racism (not in the sense of ‘colour racism’). In this sense, Natasha invoked her experience of being a child from mixed marriage, twenty-five years ago in Cyprus: "When I went to school, here in Cyprus, my schoolmates knew that my mother was a Russian and they were mocking on me: ‘A…your mother is a Russian’. They reacted, telling me that I am Russian. At that time, because I was small, I couldn’t understand why they were behaving like this, I couldn’t understand the difference”. She is married to a Palestinian man and their son goes to an English school, where many pupils are offspring from mixed marriages.
5.5.2. Work in Cyprus as a Foreigner

The experience of working in Cyprus as a foreigner (even as a foreigner with a certain “privileged” status being Cypriots' spouse) is described by the respondents as a frustrating experience because they are discriminated and considered as inferior only for the fact of being foreigners. Foreigners are not hired even if accomplish the required criteria, are underpaid, don’t enjoy their civil rights and above all, they are badly treated by Cypriot work colleagues; in other words, the respondents pictured a palette of adverse employment conditions. In this vein, Lia a Romanian woman who has Cypriot citizenship, lives in Cyprus for ten years and has two children, described her contacts with the state authorities regarding her working rights: "I was working for a year part-time without any right to a leave period. I went to the social insurance office to ask if I could become full-time employee. They gave me a negative answer and the second day they phoned and told that I may work on full-time basis. (...) You must do something, because nobody tells you something, because you are perceived as a foreigner, not as one of them…” (Accentuated).

Ana, a Czech woman who met her Cypriot husband fifteen years ago, tried to explain the difficulties of being a foreign woman at work in Cyprus; therefore, being twice inferior: “I do earn money…but as Michalis (her husband) told me from the very beginning, ‘it will be always very hard for you to work in Cyprus because of the Cypriot mentality- it will be very hard for you to work here!’. I have been working in an advertising office for five or six months, but it was very hard for me. In general, it is very hard for foreign women to work in Cyprus because they are women. You work, do your job and the boss comes and says: ‘Make me a coffee!’ In my opinion, since I do my job why am I obliged to go and make coffee? In my country this is excluded: your boss to come and order you to make a coffee for him! But in Cyprus this is normal. They didn’t ask me to make coffee, but they ask other Cypriot girls. (...) for them (for the Cypriot women) this is not something strange, this is what they learnt and this is their role…This is their role and they want to play it “.

Ana mentioned a difference in gender socialization patterns of Cypriot women and foreign European women: in this sense, even when they work outside their home, in the public sphere, the Cypriot women transfer their traditional gender role characteristic to the private sphere.

Geta, a Romanian woman who has married a Cypriot eight years ago invoked many aspects of foreigners' discrimination at work that are specific for Cypriots' foreign spouses: “In these ten years I've been working in Cyprus I changed a lot for working places; everywhere they considered me and other foreign girls married here as foreigners. So that they wanted to take advantage of us: to pay us less, to put us working more hours or work during weekends without paying us twice (...)”.

The spouses from Western European countries invoked very often the proficiency in Greek language as a condition for job in Cyprus: "I think it's difficult here as a foreigner to get a decent job really, unless you are familiar with Greek which the majority of us are not”. (Jane, English spouse).
Valeria, a Russian spouse who teaches music and has come to Cyprus three years ago, described the experience of working in Cyprus as a foreigner through the lenses of a low professional level that, as she said, characterizes the work relations in Cyprus: ‘I’m not sure the Cypriots work well. In the music school I don’t like how they teach; I don’t think is very professional level the way they teach (...). In the music school I’m not satisfied with the level there because I know too many Cypriots there who didn’t finish a university, only some private music schools, not even a college and they teach music’.

‘I don’t like the work they do here. I went to the doctor for glasses and to fix my teeth and I didn’t like their work. This is a problem that there are not many professional people here and in the music schools is the same’.

Evelina, a Bulgarian woman who has come to Cyprus as spouse of a Cypriot nine years ago, described how her case contradicted her husband’s opinion about life and work as a foreign national in Cyprus. She is one of the three foreign women respondents who managed to have well-paid jobs in Cyprus: ‘I am one of the luckiest foreigners in Cyprus because from the very beginning my husband gave me the impression that the people here would never accept me, I will always be a foreigner, I won’t be able to do my job and I would never have the chance to do my job here. It turned to be a big mistake. As soon as I came here I found a job as interior decorator and still work in the same job’. Evelina is a singular case in the sample respondents who made an effort to integrate in Cypriot society and not to be perceived as a foreigner (as she mentioned). As she declared, she adopted the Cypriot way of life, values and ways of thinking so that she identified herself with a foreigner in her own native country:

‘What is bizarre is that after I’ve been working and living here for five years, I went to Bulgaria and I felt a stranger there and wanted to return. I know many Bulgarian women who don’t feel like this. I am lucky because of my working milieu. I believe that in whatever country you go, if you try not to consider yourself as a foreigner, not to react like a foreigner and not to think that the other people are different, they would not see you like a foreigner. I am considered here as a Cypriot, they don’t see me as a foreigner from Bulgaria. I’m very happy with the way the Cypriots look on me’. As already mentioned, this is a case that contradicts all the other confessions of the foreign spouses interviewed who supported the fact that “they look as foreigners and act like foreigners” (Marian). This is a case of assimilation and moreover, acculturation that will be further discussed later on.

In conclusion, working in Cyprus as a foreign national (for the majority of the sample respondents) constituted an occasion to face discrimination because of their inferior status as foreigners: they faced undermining of their working rights, bad treatment because of a double inferior status (as foreign women at work), discrimination concerning wages and behaviour of Cypriot work colleagues, the necessity of good Greek language skills for finding a job.
5.5.3. Friends in Cyprus and Cypriot Mentality

Usually, the people who live in a foreign country have more intense patriotic feelings than their co-nationals living in their home country\textsuperscript{52}. This is how many respondents described their experience as foreigners living in a foreign country. An illustrative example is that of Genette’s, a Swedish woman who has married to a Cypriot eight years ago. She invoked patriotic feelings and also expressed foreigners’ home sick feeling: “I’m very patriotic. Actually, I find it that the longer you live abroad, the more patriotic you get (...). Sometimes, because I get home sick I want to see my family in Sweden and I miss the Christmas time and then I want to go home. And I also refer, which I think it is normal, the Sweden as home and my husband gets upset. I don’t know anybody who doesn’t do it. For me, Sweden is home, always”.

Almost all the respondents declared that they miss their home countries, their families and the moments they used to spend together being home. This is the reason why many of them communicate with their homeland: have relatives visiting them or living in Cyprus, visit their countries and also socialize with their co-nationals.

5.5.3.1 Friends in Cyprus

An indicative finding reveals that all the respondents (with one exception of a Bulgarian spouse) declared that they do not socialize with Cypriots and do not have real Cypriot friends. They also explained the different reasons that motivated their choices.

Lia, a Romanian spouse mentioned that there is no open discrimination of foreigners, but an invisible barrier in the social interaction with Cypriots that makes impossible their very close contacts with foreigners: “[...] I am here for 10 years, but I have no Cypriot friends: I do have acquaintances, but not friends. I meet them, our children play together, we go for a coffee, go to birthday parties, but we are not real friends. Therefore, I cannot trust them and in turn, they hesitate to be openhearted, there is in the air something untold, something that nobody tells you, but you feel it… (Laughing) You feel yourself as an intruder (accentuated).”

Natasha, a Cypriot-Russian woman married to a Palestinian man described a foreigners’ mechanism of native Cypriots’ rejection, as an answer to their discrimination: “When my husband tried to find a job, he was not accepted because he is a foreigner, and therefore, we have to exploit foreigners- this is the Cypriot mentality. And because of this, on time, an antipathy/aversion is developing. This is the reason why we don’t have Cypriot friends”.

Ana, a Czech woman who met her Cypriot husband fifteen years ago referred to the fact that the Cypriots are xenophobes; they do not like any foreigners, even if in many cases they do not declare it and are tolerant to foreigners: “The Cypriots don’t accept foreigners at all. In my opinion, the Cypriots are among the greatest racists- not racist against black

\textsuperscript{52} In the literature on migration, this is the theme of “home-making”, the tendency of migrants to idealize their homes in a migratory context.
people, but racist against the foreigners in general. If I don’t bother them, they allow me to do whatever I want to- we are like the bees and the fly- as soon as I entered their beehive, they don’t kill me, but they will never accept me as a Cypriot, I will always be a foreigner for them. Even if they allow me to live my foreign life the way I want, they won’t accept me, and I will always remain a foreigner…."

Ana motivated also, why she does not have any Cypriot friends; she said she could not find any common interests with Cypriot women because of cultural differences in their systems of values and beliefs: “I don’t have any Cypriot friends. It is very hard. What I like is very different. My best friends are all foreigners. I do know Cypriot girls and they are good girls, good I cannot say that…but…they are the wives of my husband’s friends. They have other preoccupations and interests, for example they cannot understand why I am torturing myself doing university studies at this age… (She graduated from a second university of international relations in Prague). Another thing they cannot understand is why I clean the floor only twice a week and not three times a day. I consider there are more interesting things in life to do; it is better if I take and read a book instead of cleaning the house so often. I am not the slave of my house, but the house works for me, to make me feel good. The Cypriot women were raised in other way than I was, so that it is hard to find some common interests, to stay for a coffee together”.

Jane, an English woman confessed also that she does not have any close Cypriot female friends because again, she perceives them as different and don’t have common interests: ‘The people here, they are very interfering and gossipy. I don’t like that. Actually, I get along with people, I’m quite plastic, but I can’t say that I have any close, close female Cypriot friends. I don’t have that. People that I see socially are people- English people again, married to Cypriots who’ve got children- that we have things in common with them really. But, outside of the family here I don’t have a lot of Cypriots. Only a few, through school contacts that we’ve got to know- some of them are very, very nice ladies, but generally not, I don’t have”.

Also, Genette, a Swedish woman confessed that does not have any Cypriot friends because of differences in mentality and due to Cypriot women’s perception of foreign women: ‘None of the girls I know or of my friends have any Cypriot girl friend: they don’t like us, they say we take their men, they see us as a threat, they do’.

This reason invoked by Genette (and many other respondents) why the Cypriot women don’t accept foreign women was confirmed by findings from the open-ended questions of the questionnaire survey addressed to Cypriot respondents.

Trust is a condition of friendship and generally, the participants in this study do not perceive Cypriots as trustworthy people. This is also, Marian’s opinion, a German woman who lives in Cyprus for twenty years; she declared: “I find it difficult in Cyprus to find friends. I have German friends. I have Cypriot…frie…nds…it depends what somebody describes- I don’t think they are really friends. I find that we, the Germans, when we say something, we mean it. When the Cypriots tell you something, they don’t mean it: I can give you many examples”.

Evelina, a Bulgarian woman is the only foreign woman in this study who declared that she managed to integrate herself in Cypriot society and to cope with discrimination...
resulting from her inferior status as foreigner in Cyprus. She confessed about her experience as a foreigner who tried to find a way to communicate with her host-society and subsequently, she declared that has no problems in her marital relationship that result from cultural differences: “We don’t have any problems because I am a foreigner since I learnt to live and think the way Cypriots do. So, I changed a lot without even understanding it. I didn’t have any problems because I am a foreigner (not even at the beginning). But I know a lot of foreigners who have problems. I respect and accept the Cypriot way of life, I learnt to live with Cypriot norms because if you don’t live their Cypriot life, you feel like a foreigner, you are different and have problems”.

Evelina’s case confirms what Natasha, a Cypriot-Russian woman married to a Palestinian, said about the foreigners married to Cypriots: “… the foreigners, who are married to Cypriots, if they live here for long time, they adopt the Cypriot mentality…this is what happens always…”.

Basically, at an individual level this is a process of social imitation translated at a societal level into processes of integration and assimilation (inevitable and many times unconscious) throughout foreigners adapt to the context of their host society.

Therefore, with one exception, the foreign respondents do not have Cypriot friends, even if many of them have been living in Cyprus for more than ten years. Their reasons are mainly of a cultural nature emphasizing: differences in mentalities, the lack of common interests and xenophobic sentiments that make Cypriots and foreigners incompatible as friends. They mentioned that do not have real Cypriot friends because even if there is no open discrimination against foreigners, in their everyday social interaction with Cypriots, there is an ‘invisible barrier’ that makes difficult every contact between the two parts. In turn, the foreigners developed a mechanism of natives’ rejection as an answer to their discrimination. One main reason why the foreign women do not have any Cypriot female friends is the latter’s perception of foreign women as a threat since “they came to Cyprus to take our men”53. In the following section, it is exposed an account of Cypriot mentality from foreigners’ perspective.

### 5.5.3.2 Cypriot Mentality

Communication, imagination and tolerance are the essential ingredients of the mixed couples’ everyday life. If these conditions are not achieved by the two spouses having different mentalities and belonging sometimes to very dissimilar cultures, then many problems might arise in their marital relationship. In this respect, it is worthy revealing how the foreigners living together with Cypriots perceive the latter. Many studies of social imagery support that foreign people living in a host country are able to give the most precise accounts about the native people, because they have the opportunity to live together and perceive them from a sort of “neutral” stand/ or with ‘the foreigner’s eyes’.

53 This is a so-called theme of “stolen men, foreign women”; that appears in all the contexts of studying mixed marriage between foreigners and natives.
The foreign spouses who were interviewed gave many accounts of what they called "Cypriot mentality". In general, through this expression they named all the behaviours, ways of thinking, values, beliefs and lifestyles which were perceived as different from theirs and specific to Cypriots. In this sense, Ana, a Czech woman characterized Cypriots as people who refuse to learn from the others, do not care for the natural environment and are interested in acquiring properties:

"The Cypriots have a big problem: they know everything, the Cypriot is the centre of the world, they don’t need to learn something else- ‘I know, I know better, don’t tell me something’ this is what they use to say. They don’t care about the natural environment: there is nothing here, only dust, dried soil and nothing green. They build houses because they want to sell them. Or they own big houses that they close and live in a small kitchen – I’ve seen this many times”.

She also referred to an oriental habit that was mentioned by many other respondents and it appear as unfamiliar for any non-Muslim foreigner:

“I’ve first came in Cyprus 15 years ago. I know my husband’s friends from the time we were students. For example, we used to go out for dinner. At the restaurant, I used to stay together with my husband and his friends and the friends’ wives were staying separately. Therefore, the men sat separately from the women. I asked: ‘What’s this? Are we Turks?’ The women were telling me: ‘Let’s sit together with us!’ I was replying: ‘No, I want to sit together with the men’. What men talk is more interesting: they talk about social issues, Internet, their work and about other interesting things. The women talk about babies’ nappies, when they washed the floor and about last fashion…’.

Also, Ana and other respondents considered as specific for Cypriot society the traditional sex roles that are assumed by men and women. As an example, Cypriot men refuse to do housework chores which they consider as a specific feminine task. Ana mentioned (as many other foreign women) that she was raised seeing her father doing housework. Many of the foreign women participants mentioned that their Cypriot husbands learnt how to adopt also feminine gender roles and are not ashamed to show it, as many other Cypriot men do because they fear social pressure and control exerted through gossip:

“When our friends visit us, Michalis comes and asks us ‘Do you drink a coffee?’ and he goes and makes coffee for us. My husband also washes the floor. My sister-in-law’s husband doesn’t help her at all. The only thing he makes is to crack nuts for cookies and when he makes it, he closes all the blinds in order not to be seen by somebody…the man!” (Ana).

Genette, a Swedish woman put the blame on Cypriot mothers who raise their children in a very protective manner: “Generally, the Cypriot men don’t help around the house; my husband does nothing in the house, of course I don’t work, but even if it would be the other way round- and this is the fault of the Cypriot mothers. They run around the boys, they spoil them from the beginning. And they are the pride and the joy of the house”.

Also, Genette characterized Cypriot men as being very authoritarian husbands, who want to control their wives: “Sometimes, the men here are more old-fashioned- like my husband. When I want to go out with my friends to have a drink with the Swedish girls I know (the first couple
of years he wouldn’t let me go, but now I deal with it) we fought a lot every time if I was going out. Now I put my foot down, but my friends’ Cypriot husbands are the same, they fight to go out. He used to say: ‘as a married woman, you shouldn’t go out with your friends’. But he still doesn’t like it, he accepted it, doesn’t fight with me, but doesn’t like it’.

Olga, a Russian woman married to a Cypriot, characterized the Cypriots as being very temperamental, losing their temper very fast: ‘Generally, the Cypriots have a character- how to tell you- they get angry very quickly. But the wife must know how to react- not to say something back, only to wait and after five minutes everything goes away. So, he gets angry very quickly, but I found the way to calm him down.”

Pita, an Australian woman described the Cypriots as being very friendly, ready to help, curious and interested in other peoples’ lives- without qualifying this as an indiscretion: ‘They ask you all these questions. A Turkish Cypriot work colleague of mine told me: ‘It’s that they are interested. They don’t mean it- the curiosity gets the better of them’. It’s their way of making conversation. It’s how they are. When you accept them, you don’t see it like- to put an example: he came to repair the TV and asked ‘how much you paid for this house?’ or ‘how much money you take?’ For them is not an embarrassing question, is not a taboo subject, but just their way to make conversation. They are so ready to help and friendly. And you have to ask their questions. The classic example is ‘how much you paid for the house?’- In Australia you’ll never ever ask even your best friend. And here everybody walks into my house and ask about this”.

Marian, a German woman gave an extensive account of the Cypriot mentality; she referred to the Cypriot family as a very powerful control agent, and characterized the Cypriots as being not very straight in conversation:

“I think also that the Cypriots are very sweet talkers: they have honey on their lips. I used to have a problem as a German because we are very straight people and I didn’t notice sometimes that I said something wrong. So, I learnt what you can say to a Cypriot or to an English person. The Cypriots will never ever come up to you and say ‘you did that wrong’. They will just tell you ‘you know, koumbare (in Greek means best man) it is not really working’- so, they packed it up. It has also its good because sometimes you don’t hurt the other person”.

“The Cypriots are big liars. And I think it comes out from what I said before: they always like to talk about everything covered up somehow. They don’t think this is a lie (they speak about white lies) for me a lie is a lie. And this is a big problem in a relationship”.

Marian was married to a Cypriot for fifteen years; than got divorced and had other two relationships with Cypriot men. She mentioned mentality problems: as narrowed education and lack of communication which constitute reasons for broken relationships. Marian mentioned also another characteristic she perceived as being specific to Cypriots, that they see violence as indicative of manhood:

“Some Cypriot men are violent and they believe they have the right to be violent. And they think this is their manhood. They have to show, to be a man and they just want to be violent. I experienced that also with my last partner (that’s why I finished). (...) And I talked to several people (foreigners and Cypriots) about what happened and they told me ‘this is Cypriot, is normal’. The things that I see violent they say ‘this is the way the Cypriots act, don’t worry it’s quite normal’.”
Briefly summarising, in a foreigners’ perception the Cypriots are people who refuse to learn from others, have narrowed education, do not care for natural environment, are very sweet talkers, big liars, untrustworthy, very gossipy and interfering. Also, they are perceived as conservative, very traditional (in this sense, they maintain some oriental habits, like women and men sitting separately in informal reunions). Also, Cypriot men are considered as very traditional men who refuse to assume a more egalitarian identity, including involvement in housework, child care and faithfulness to one’s spouse; moreover, they do not allow spouses to be more social (e.g. go out with their friends), sustain a strict gender roles division in the marital relationship based on a lack of communication and perceive marital violence as indicative of their manhood. In many cases, the foreign spouses confessed that their husbands contradict this pattern.

On the other hand, the Cypriots are described as being very friendly, ready to help, curious and very interested in other people’s lives (in a positive sense). Also, the Cypriot family is perceived as a very powerful control agent, with authoritarian father and very protective mother.

Cultural differences resulted from different ethnic backgrounds and therefore mentalities is an issue that characterizes any mixed marital relationship between Cypriots and foreigners; they try to cope with the difference, consciously or not, and this is where the three ingredients already mentioned: communication, imagination and tolerance are more necessary than ever.

“Sometimes we fight because of the ethnicity; he says: ‘The Cypriot does this…’ and I reply: ‘Is the Arab better?’” (Natasha)

“Our personalities match very well. […] We get along very well. But I still don’t really think of him as a foreigner… I don’t think of it as a big issue.” (Jane)

These citations describe the two levels of any mixed marital relationship: difference and similarity. In other words, as long as the mixed couple partners are similar as concerning personality traits, any conflicts deriving from cultural differences (which are inevitable for such a relationship) can be solved.

In this sense, Marian who is a German woman seems to have found the solution to cope with mentality difference in the mixed marital relationship:

“One your partner understands that this is your mentality and this is his mentality, you can handle it. To give an example: when they eat, the Germans lick the plate to show that they liked it and the Cypriots leave something in the plate to show that they had enough. So, tell me what’s good? If people get aware of that fact that it is not wrong either to finish the plate or to leave something in the plate: it’s like a different way of doing things, it’s no reason to fight up.”

When the spouse participants were asked if they regret entering a mixed marriage, their responses addressed also the two issues: the difference at a cultural level and the
similarity of psychological traits revealed as fundamental for any mixed marital relationship:

“If I regret that I married a foreigner? Yes, when we fight, I do regret…Look, we have difficulties because of differences (in general, people are different because of their personality); even for the marriages between Cypriots, if they have different personalities, they will have troubles. As for the marriages with foreigners there is an additional problem that concerns cultural customs and habits. For example, the Muslims don't allow women to wear short sleeves or stretch pants – this is a religious custom; there are also differences in many respects”. (Natasha)

These lengthy points regarding the themes concerning life in Cyprus as a foreign national help to achieve a better understanding of the respondents' reasons for choosing a foreign partner. Overall, the spouses interviewed declared that they chose their Cypriot partners on the basis of psychological characteristics (personality traits) and physical appearance. They interchanged non-material resources in order to reach a match or a certain level of homogamy at the individual level. Once the similarity is reached at a personality level, the spouses believe they can manage to deal with the cultural differences. This is why the sample foreign spouses usually mentioned that they never thought of their Cypriot spouses as foreigners and they have always referred to similarities that could narrow the distance between the two partners: this is what the studies in the domain revealed as a tendency to homogamy that people always have had.

The next chapter presents the conclusions, discussing the phenomenon of mixed marriage between foreigners and Cypriots from a combined methodology perspective, and integrating the conclusions of statistical data analysis, qualitative and qualitative investigations presented in the previous chapters. In this sense, both points of view will be addressed: the one expressed by the Cypriot public opinion about mixed marriage and another one exposed by those who are the protagonists of mixed marriages in Cyprus, i.e. the foreign spouses (participants in the study).
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Motto:
"The sociologist investigating our patterns of 'courtship' and marriage soon discovers a complex web of motives related in many ways to the entire institutional structure within which an individual lives his life- class, career, economic ambition, aspirations of power and prestige. The miracle of love now begins to look somewhat synthetic. Again, this need not mean in any given instance that the sociologist will declare the romantic interpretation to be an illusion. But, once more, he will look beyond the immediately given and publicly approved interpretations".


**INTRODUCTION: An Exploratory Research**

In the specialized literature, there is no strict etymological delineation in the usage of "mixed marriage" and "intermarriage" as denoting a marital union between two partners from different social groups: ethnic, linguistic, religious, national or cultural. In this sense, the term "intermarriage" is more often used by American theoreticians as adapted to the United States’ “melting pot” societal context where it indicates unions between partners from different ethnic and racial groups. The term "mixed marriage" is more often employed in the European tradition of research and usually denotes marital unions between natives and foreign nationals in a certain country – in this case, the mixed marker is “nationality”.

The degree of mixed marriage/intermarriage between the members of different groups in a society is an important indicator of the strength of social boundaries between those groups. From the first half of the twentieth century on, information on intermarriage/mixed marriage has been used to gain insights into the structure of ethnic and racial relationships and into the social cohesion of societies (e.g. Merton, 1941; Gordon, 1964; Blau and Schwartz, 1984; Alba and Golden, 1986; Kalmijn, 1998). Within this literature, however, no study focuses on mixed marriage between Cypriots and foreign nationals in Cyprus.

In this sense, the sociological literature review revealed that there is no prior research available on the topic concerning marriages between Cypriots and foreign nationals in Cyprus. The increasing propensity of Cypriots to marry non-nationals/foreigners constituted a new social phenomenon in Cyprus in the early nineties. Sixteen years later, this tendency is still increasing even more than a decade ago, adding to the motivation and the importance of the present inquiry.
Mixed marriage in Cyprus is a multi-layered phenomenon with a broad typology that accounts for the sender-sources of foreigners to Cyprus. Briefly, there are two main factors that have impacted on changes in the demography of local marriage markets and constitute sources for foreign spouses: tourism and the greatly increased flow of migrant women from the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe who come to Cyprus through various employment agencies to work for a limited period of time (determined by regulations of local legislation on immigration). A third source of foreign spouses is represented by the countries where many Cypriots go for tertiary studies and then enter into marriages with spouses from these countries.

The present inquiry has both a descriptive and an exploratory character. Therefore, the primary aim was to define and describe the social phenomenon of interest. Some of the central questions here were “Who is mixed married?” and, “How many people are mixed married?” A first answer to these questions was given by an analysis of statistical data (from official Demographic Reports) about mixed marriages and immigration in Cyprus. This analysis quantified the increasing tendency of native Cypriots to marry foreign nationals for the period 1989-2004. The raw percentages analysis resulted in a typology of mixed marriages in Cyprus which accounts for: (a) gender specific differences in Cypriot men’s and women’s preferences in the foreign mate selection process (the Cypriot men had more mixed marriages than their female counterparts); and (b) a regional pattern in choosing foreign spouses (Cypriot men chose mainly Eastern-European spouses and Cypriot women chose mostly Euro-American spouses). For analytical purposes, the nationalities of foreign marriage partners were clustered according to socio-economic, cultural, geographical and racial characteristics in three groups: Euro-American (grouping Western European countries, the United States and Australia), East-European (grouping former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe) and Asian (Middle and Far East countries).

As for as methodology is concerned, the analysis of statistical data from Demographic Reports employed specific statistical coefficients (Spearman’s rank correlation and Pearson’s r) in order to identify some of the categories of the above-mentioned mixed marriage typology in Cyprus. These findings about mixed marriage in Cyprus, yielded by the statistical data analysis, constituted the starting point for an empirical investigation of the phenomenon employing a mixed (or combined) methods approach: quantitative (a questionnaire survey about Cypriots’ Perceptions, Opinions and Attitudes towards Mixed Marriage in Cyprus) and qualititative (semi-structured interviews with mixed marriage foreign spouses about Mate Selection in Mixed Marriage).

The present investigation went beyond description and sought to find out how people get along in the settings under question, what meanings they give to their actions, and what issues concern them. The goal of the study was to identify non-Cypriot spouses’
reasons in the mixed marriage mate selection process in Cyprus. This task was undertaken by conducting exploratory research at each of the levels of the individual-group-society model that identified the determinants of the decision-making process in mate selection for mixed marriages as being:

a) Individual motivations (or individuals’ preferences and tastes for quantifiable and non-quantifiable resources in a partner), the “taste and exchange factors” investigated through semi-structured (or standardised open-ended interviews);

b) Third party agents (or the influence of social groups) - attitudes determined through a questionnaire social survey and addressed in the interviews conducted with mixed marriage spouses;

c) Marriage market mechanism (or the opportunity for matching) described by an analysis of statistical data on mixed marriage and immigration in Cyprus from official Demographic Reports (and addressed in the semi-structured interviews).

6.1. MIXED MARRIAGE in CYPRUS: Theory and Methodology. A Brief Summary

The present study aimed at highlighting the pattern and social context of “mixed marriage” in Cyprus. Mixed marriage, as used in this study, is defined as the marriage between one overseas born partner from foreign parents and one Cypriot born partner (i.e. in this case, the characteristic considered as a marker of difference between spouses is ‘nationality’).

There are two usages (legal and social) which characterize the term “mixed couple” and also reflect the two sided-realities lived by this type of union: an official, legal and administrative usage and a social and mediated usage based on representations of “Otherness”. The later significance given to the “mixed” is the most variable, subjective, sensitive to prejudice and, also, the most frequent in everyday life.

The study analysed the social aspect of the mixed marital partnership in Cyprus. More specifically, it focused on issues related to mate selection. One of the questions to be answered was: Why the marital partners chose “the difference”? The study explored two large categories of reasons: those invoked by foreigners who married Cypriots (subjects’ arguments) and those reasons given by Cypriot nationals (third parties’ opinions) in general. Each of the two sets of arguments required different methods of investigation, a fact that implied choosing a mixed methodological approach.

Therefore, in order to investigate first-hand experiences of mixed marriage spouses, qualitative techniques were employed (i.e. the author conducted twenty interviews with spouses from mixed marriages in Cyprus). Moreover, in order to obtain a wider picture of how mixed marriages are perceived at a societal level, an opinion survey (N=400) about Cypriots’ perceptions, opinions and attitudes towards mixed marriage was conducted. Of
the three plus one (as a factor proposed in the present study) factors central to the propensity for exogamy (attitudes, opportunity and exchange, plus taste), attitudes are the most theoretically intriguing. The Cypriot public opinion on mixed marriage constituted an unknown social field since there is no prior investigation of perceptions and representations about marriages between foreigners and Cypriots55.

The hypotheses used in both qualitative and quantitative empirical investigations were formulated on the basis of the statistical data analysis about the amount of mixed marriages (between Cypriots and fourteen foreign nationalities living in Cyprus) and immigration to Cyprus. At a theoretical level, exploratory research questions formulation is based both on social exchange theory assumptions and aesthetical sociology assumptions about choices based on taste in relation to mate selection in mixed marriage. The study aimed to determine rationales for entering mixed relationships in Cyprus, by identifying the determinant elements of mixed marriage mate choice. Therefore, another research aim was to find out whether spouses entered marital relationships under the condition of assets exchanges as the classical exchange perspective on mixed marriage shows; and whether mate selection implied choices made on the basis of pure taste dispositions. Moreover, the study explored possible patterns of hypergamy or hypogamy resulting from the type of resources being exchanged by mixed marriage partners.

The multifaceted sociological perspective about partner choice (adopted in the present study) supports the position that, since partners choose each other on the basis of multiple characteristics, it is important to analyse more than one factor in marriage choice. Theoreticians emphasized three factors as central to the propensity for exogamy (i.e. mixed marriage): attitudes, opportunity and exchange (Lieberson and Waters, 1988).

**Attitudes** encompass both group members’ views towards endogamy in general and towards exogamy with a particular out group. Out-groups, in turn, are perceived as arranged in a hierarchy reflecting their desirability as mates. These generalizations about attitudes, however, are subject to qualifications. For instance, an indicative finding of this study was that Cypriot men and Cypriot women ranked foreign nationalities differently. Finally, attitudes are malleable. Factors such as youth, education, and urban residence heightened tolerance and acceptance towards mixed marriage, as questionnaire survey findings have confirmed.

A second critical determinant of mixed marriage is opportunity or the chance that men and women of different backgrounds will become acquainted. Opportunity is primarily a structural phenomenon, driven by such factors as sex ratio, group size, and segregation; each of these factors was determined through the analysis of statistical data on mixed marriages entered by Cypriots and immigration to Cyprus (two interrelated phenomena in this case) and through interview data.

---

55 As far as it has been possible to ascertain.
A third factor associated with mixed marriage is *status hypergamy* or “up-marrying” that denotes a practice throughout mostly women tend to use marriage to improve their overall social standing, a traditional gender pattern in marriage that provides a strong confirmation of the exchange hypothesis. The assumption that women select men primarily for economic rather than for such non-economic reasons as physical attractiveness or personality is a strong hypothesis that rests on several facts. First, historical research (especially in the United States) on marriage patterns has almost universally emphasized the primacy of men’s rather than women’s economic circumstances in nuptiality and family formation (Landale and Tolnay, 1991). Second, attitudinal studies of marital preferences generally agree with an exchange model of mate selection in which women trade physical attractiveness for economic security (England and Farkas, 1986; South, 1992). Compared with men, women have stronger preferences for spouses with job stability, high earnings, and more education than their own (South, 1991). In contrast, men are more likely to emphasize physical attractiveness and youth in evaluating potential partners.

The operation of exchange presupposes favourable attitudes and opportunity for contact. In this sense, exchange is more a catalyst than a precondition for attraction. Still, all three factors are associated with the propensity for mixed marriage. But how could one measure “propensity” for mixed marriage? In addition to favourable attitudes and opportunity for contact, there are also issues of *taste, need* and *pleasure* in spouse selection, as the present study proposed. These factors constitute a more subjective element in the choices individuals make. Are these choices, made on the basis of taste, strategies for distinction as Bourdieu formulated the problem? Furthermore, one can assume that since people do not learn in educational systems the way to choose their spouse, this marital choice is a question of taste. Attitude, opportunity, exchange and taste are the factors considered in this study, when investigating mixed marriage empirically. Therefore, the question to be answered was: “Are these factors (i.e. attitudes, opportunity, exchange and taste) changing in ways compatible with an increase in marriages between Cypriots and foreigners?”

In this sense, the present work focused on identifying Cypriots’ attitudes towards marriages between natives and foreigners by using a self-report method, i.e. the above-mentioned questionnaire. Some of the questions answered here were: “Which are Cypriots' sentiments about marriages with foreigners?”, and “Do Cypriots perceive foreigners as arranged in a hierarchy reflecting their desirability as mates?”

The other two plus one factors (i.e. opportunity, exchange plus taste) influencing the propensity for exogamy were explored: (a) using qualitative interviews of mixed couple partners; and (b) by analyzing the open-ended questions used in the previously mentioned questionnaire.
At the individual level, the practical investigation had as subjects eighteen foreign individuals married to Cypriots and two offspring from mixed marriages between Cypriots and foreigners who are married to foreign nationals as well. The focus was to analyse their mixed marriage partner choice and to set out a starting point for further research on topics related to mixed marriage in Cyprus.

In conclusion, the theoretical support of the empirical research presented here is provided by a multifaceted sociological perspective on mate selection adapted to Cypriot context and then enriched with specific particularities. The originality of the present point of view is given by the modality through which this multifaceted sociological perspective about partner choice is modelled on exchange theory assumptions and aesthetic sociology’s theories about “taste”; both outlooks are adapted to study the social process of partner choice in mixed marriage phenomenon in Cyprus.

The findings of the mixed methods empirical investigation regarding the phenomenon of mixed marriage in Cyprus are summarized and presented in the following sections (the main findings of the study are briefly presented in Table 6.1, Appendix H for Chapter VI).

6.2. Summary for FINDINGS of MIXED MARRIAGE between FOREIGNERS and CYPRIOTS in CYPRUS questionnaire survey

6.2.1. Cypriots’ Opinions about Foreigners and Cypriots’ Exposure to Foreign Influence

Finding 1) Cypriots’ Opinions about Foreigners in Cyprus

(a) The Cypriot respondents considered that the number of foreigners in Cyprus is ‘large’ and ‘extremely large’ (the Cypriots living in rural areas are likely to have this opinion) and classified it as ‘bad’ and ‘very bad’ given the small size of the Greek-Cypriot community. More Cypriot women share this opinion.

(b) Even if both the numbers of foreigners and of foreign workers in Cyprus were estimated as ‘large’ and ‘very large’, respondents’ attitude was more favourable in the case of the foreign workers in Cyprus who come to fill out workforce needs of Cypriot economy (the Cypriots with medium incomes are more likely to share this opinion about foreign workers).

Finding 2) Cypriots’ Exposure to Foreign Influence

These findings accounted separately for those respondents who lived abroad (maximum exposure to foreign influence) and for those having relatives who married foreigners (high exposure to foreign influence).
(a) The Cypriots who are or were exposed to maximum foreign influence are those who lived abroad as students, in one country, between one and five years.

(b) Confirming the statistical data analysis findings, the survey findings showed that mixed marriage is a new phenomenon in Cypriot society, since most of the Cypriots aged between 25-54 years old have a cousin, an aunt or uncle or a sister/brother who married foreigners; in the meantime, only a few respondents declared that have parents married to foreigners and none of the respondents have mixed married grandparents.

(c) Overall, more than half of the people interviewed have relatives married to foreigners, and almost half of these have a cousin married to a foreigner. The Cypriots between 15-34 years of age are more likely to have an aunt/uncle married to a foreigner and those aged 35-54 years old to have a sister/brother married to a foreigner.

(d) More than half of the respondents who have relatives married to foreigners considered these marriages as 'successful' and 'very successful'.

6.2.2. Cypriots- Foreigners Social Distance, Opinions and Attitudes towards Mixed Marriage and Contact/ Preferences for Foreign Nationalities in Cyprus

Finding 3) Cypriots-Foreigners Social Distance

(a) The most favourable attitude is towards the foreigner as visitor in Cyprus and the most unfavourable attitude is towards the foreigner as spouse. The social distance increases from left to right, as follows: Foreigner as visitor/Foreigner as neighbour/Foreigner as work colleague/Foreigner as relative/Foreigner as citizen/Foreigner as spouse. The Cypriot men are more likely to accept a foreigner as citizen in Cyprus, to his family as a relative and as his work colleague.

(b) Attitudes towards the foreigner as spouse: The Cypriots who are most favourable about their own hypothetical mixed marriage belong to at least one of the following demographic categories: man, educated (of tertiary education), intellectual or artist, with medium to high income, aged between 15-34 years old and inhabitant of urban areas. These demographical categories coincide with those categories of Cypriots who are most likely to have lived abroad (i.e. were exposed to maximum foreign influence). Also, the Cypriot men who have relatives married to foreigners are most likely to agree with their own hypothetical marriage to a foreigner.

On the other hand, those Cypriots who are less likely to accept their own hypothetical marriage to foreigners belong to at least one of the following categories: woman, of primary education, worker, constructor or farmer, with low annual income, older than 65 years, inhabitant of rural areas of Cyprus. Once again, these categories coincide with those of Cypriots who have never lived abroad. Also, the Cypriots (either men or women)
who have never lived abroad are more likely to ‘disagree’ and ‘strongly disagree’ with their hypothetical marriage to a foreigner. Moreover, the percentage of Cypriot respondents who would marry foreign nationals (26%) coincides with the overall rate of mixed marriage entered by Cypriots (for 1989-2004 it was 27%, as resulted from statistical findings). Overall, the Cypriots are more likely to disagree, than to agree with their hypothetical marriage to foreigners, in spite of their increased exposure to foreign influence (see e.g., the increase in immigration flow to Cyprus).

A) Cypriots’ Opinions and Attitudes towards Mixed Marriage at Societal and Personal levels

Finding 4) Opinion about the number of mixed marriages in Cyprus

(a) More than half of the Cypriot respondents estimated the number of mixed marriages in Cyprus as being ‘extremely large’ and ‘large’. Given the size of the Greek-Cypriot community, both Cypriot men and women are likely to classify this number as ‘neither good, nor bad’.

Finding 5) Attitudes towards hypothetical mixed marriages of the respondents’ relatives and friends

(a) On the whole, the respondents are not likely to accept their relatives to enter mixed marriages, although they appreciated favourably their relatives’ mixed marriages (58% for ‘very successful and successful’). Most of them would not want their parents to enter mixed marriages. More than 60% of the respondents would do not accept their siblings, children, and aunts/uncles to enter mixed marriages. Cypriots with less education and those with low incomes are more likely not to accept their parents marrying foreigners; also, Cypriots living in rural areas tend not to accept their aunt/uncle to mixed marriage.

(b) On the other hand, more than half of the respondents are most likely to accept their friends and cousins to enter mixed marriages. As they have already reported, the most frequent relative married to a foreigner is ‘the cousin’. One out of four respondents has a cousin married to a foreigner and one out of two respondents would be willing to accept his/her cousin to marry a foreigner. Moreover, more than three-quarters of the respondents would not agree with the fact of not accepting their relatives or friends to marry a foreigner. The Cypriot men, those educated and middle-aged Cypriots are more likely to accept their friends and relatives to marry foreign nationals. The young Cypriots and those living in urban areas tend to accept their cousins to mixed marriage.
Finding 6) Attitudes towards mixed marriage at a societal level

(a) Gender-specific differences: A significant finding is that Cypriot men are more favourable to mixed marriage than their female counterparts; as the statistical data on mixed marriage showed, there were more Cypriot men than women who entered into marriages with foreigners. Moreover, the Cypriot men who have relatives married to foreigners are more likely to agree with their own hypothetical marriage to a foreigner and generally, with the idea of mixed marriage per se. An indicative finding is that half of the Cypriot male respondents approved of mixed marriage. The Cypriot women are not so likely to agree with mixed marriage and they gave more reasons against mixed marriage.

(b) Reasons against mixed marriage: (b1) The "difference" is the major reason against mixed marriage. These reasons gravitate around the following perceptions regarding 'difference': foreigners have different cultures, languages, and religions. All these differences determine a mentality gap that leads to conflict. The belief is that in the case of mixed marriage, the conflict is more likely to arise than in the case of marriage between two Cypriots and then, mixed marriage will be more likely unsuccessful. Moreover, because of all these differences, mixed marriages are not only destined to dissolution, but have also disastrous societal consequences.

(b2) Reasons that emphasise material motivations of foreign spouses; this category supports exchange theory assumptions that mixed marriage spouses trade material and non-material resources.

(b3) A category of reasons that accentuate xenophobic motivations.

(b4) Reasons that reflect some insecurity felt by Cypriot women because of Cypriot men's preferences for foreign spouses.

(c) The most frequent reasons in favour of mixed marriage emphasise:

(c1) The free choice of marriage partner, love and mutual understanding as motivations of mixed marriage, the equality of human beings (irrespective of their ethnicity or religion), and the assortative matching of partners.

(c2) Reasons that describe mixed marriage as a beneficial change at the level of Cypriot society.

(c3) Reasons of a biological/genetic kind that conceive mixed marriage as a way of renewing the genetic code of the native population.

(c4) A category of reasons that support mixed marriage as encountering opposition from third parties. In this sense, partners’ mutual feelings and choices are put above any other opposition.

(c5) Reasons that stress an anti-xenophobic perspective on mixed marriage.
B) Cypriots' Contacts with and Preferences for Foreign Nationalities living in Cyprus

Finding 7) Opinion about the importance of spouse's foreign nationality in mixed marriage

An indicative finding is that the majority of the people questioned (70%) considered that foreigner's nationality is 'important' and 'very important' in mixed marriage between Cypriots and foreigners in Cyprus. The Cypriot women, inhabitants of rural areas and respondents older than 55 years and less educated are more likely to share this opinion.

Finding 8) Contacts and preferences for foreign nationalities in Cyprus

(a) According to the findings about the respondents’ preferences for eleven foreign nationalities living in Cyprus, there are four groups of nationalities: the most preferred nationalities living in Cyprus: Greek, British and Russian; Preferred nationalities: German and Romanian; Less preferred nationalities: Bulgarian and American; Least preferred nationalities: Israeli, Iranian, Filipino and Lebanese.

(b) The most preferred and well-know (equal percentages) nationality living in Cyprus is the Greek one. The majority of the respondents met and know ‘very well’ and ‘well’ Greek nationals living in Cyprus. The percents of those respondents who prefer and those who know Greek nationals are identical.

(c) The findings show differences in Cypriots’ preferences by ‘respondents’ sex (i.e. a gendered difference in Cypriots’ preferences for different nationals). Cypriot men prefer Russian, Romanian and Bulgarian nationals, and Cypriot women prefer British, German and American nationals living in Cyprus. Therefore, the quantitative data confirm the registered statistical data that revealed similar differences in the marital choices made by Cypriot men and women.

(d) The least known and preferred by Cypriots are the Israeli and Iranian nationals. Lebanese nationals are the most preferred among Asian nationals living in Cyprus. Cypriot women are not so likely to prefer Iranians and Filipinos living in Cyprus. The greatest social distance is between Cypriots and the Asian group of nationalities: there is less contact with and preference for non-European nationals.

6.2.3. Cypriots' Preferences for Foreign Spouses' Nationality in Mixed Marriage

Finding 9) Preferences for foreign spouses’ nationality

(a) The male respondents would marry mostly Russian brides (40%); it represents also the most frequent mixed marriage combination for Cypriot men. They chose also,
British (31%), German (30%) and Romanian (29%) brides. As statistical data show, when Cypriot men entered marriages with East-European brides they chose more often Russian and Romanian brides, and less often Bulgarian brides. From the Euro-American brides, Cypriot men chose British, American and German brides.

(b) The Cypriot female respondents’ preferences match the existing statistical data on mixed marriage entered by Cypriot women (like in the previous case of Cypriot men); they would marry British, American and German grooms and also married the same nationalities most frequently (same hierarchies for both Cypriot women’s hypothetical mate choices and registered mixed marriages entered by Cypriot women).

(c) Regarding the group of Asian countries, statistical data on mixed marriage show that Cypriot men more often married Filipina women while Cypriot women chose Lebanese grooms. The least frequent mixed marriages are those between Israeli or Iranian nationals and Cypriot men or women. Once again, the people questioned answered in concordance with statistical data on mixed marriages. The great majority of the respondents said “no” to Israeli and Iranian grooms and brides, whereas for Lebanese nationals there were registered the smaller percentages (in the Asian group of nationalities) for “no” answers given by both male and female respondents.

Therefore, a significant finding is that the Cypriot men are more likely to marry Eastern-European women while the Cypriot women are more likely to choose Euro-American men. Also, Cypriot men prefer mostly Russian brides (less German and Romanian brides) and Cypriot women prefer British and American grooms. Neither men, nor Cypriot women prefer Israeli, Iranian and Filipino brides and grooms. Young Cypriots would marry Lebanese and Israeli nationals.

**Finding 10) Opinions about the influence of foreign nationality on Cypriots’ marriage decision**

(a) Almost three quarters of the respondents believed that foreign nationality is ‘important’ and ‘very important’ in mixed marriage. More than half of the people questioned answered that spouse’s foreign nationality influences marriage decisions taken by Cypriots.

(b) The categories of reasons in favour of the opinion that foreign nationality influences Cypriots’ marriage decision are:

(b1) Difference as disadvantage, commonality as advantage and prejudices about foreign nationalities are the most invoked reasons. These reasons coincide with those given in order to show the disagreement with mixed marriage. Different cultures, mentalities, economic backgrounds and religious faiths might affect the children resulted from mixed marriage, and also influence marital behaviour and attitudes towards divorce.
That is why, as respondents argued, it is better for Cypriots to choose those nationalities with which they have some commonalities.

(b2) Reasons that concern characteristics of an individual nature in spouse selection: preferences and tastes.

(b3) The preferences for material resources are invoked as reason why foreigners’ nationality influences marriage decision. These reasons support assumptions of the exchange theory about resources exchanges between spouses.

(b4) Reasons about prejudice and xenophobia and reasons regarding third parties’ influences.

(b5) Reasons that emphasize opportunity for contacts on the marriage market (e.g. foreign spouses for those with decreased desirability on the marriage market).

(b6) Reasons about third parties’ (i.e. close family and relatives) influences on mate selection.

(c) Only a quarter of the people questioned shared the opinion that foreigners’ nationality does not influence Cypriots’ marriage decision. These reasons coincide with those invoked as reasons to agree with mixed marriage.

(c1) Love, psychological traits and free choice of marriage partner are the categories with the most frequent reasons that emphasize the primacy of personal decision without any other interference.

(c2) Reasons that emphasize the high frequency of mixed marriage in contemporary Cyprus (as respondents’ estimations about the number of mixed marriages in Cyprus already showed).

(c3) Nationality is not a determinant factor for Cypriots’ marriage decision when mixed marriage is perceived as a second chance for those individuals who belong to the category of people with declined desirability in the mate selection process.

(d) A considerable number of respondents (almost a quarter) do not know if there is any influence of foreign nationality in Cypriots’ marriage decision-making process. These reasons expose a two-sided reality of mixed marriage and of mixed marriage decision, as it is perceived at the level of Cypriot public opinion. There is a socially accepted mixed marriage out of love and a mixed marriage that is usually an extreme “blank” marriage between Cypriot men and work migrant women who afterwards are entitled to a renewable residence permit in Cyprus.

The above-mentioned findings about opinions, attitudes and perceptions at the level of Cypriot public opinion on mixed marriage are supplemented with the following quantitative findings resulted from the interviews (n=20) conducted with foreign spouses involved in mixed marriages with Cypriots.
6.3. Summary for FINDINGS of MATE SELECTION in Cypriot-Foreigner MIXED MARRIAGE qualitative investigation

6.3.1. Preferences of Foreign and Cypriot spouses: Socioeconomic and Non-material resources, Foreign influence exposure

Finding 1) Preference for socioeconomic resources
(a) The qualitative findings revealed that the foreign women’s paid labour is a reflection of economic needs of their families. They usually are employed in low-paying jobs and most of them work to pay loans taken for paying a property, to save some money to buy a property or to pay for their children’s education.

(a1) Findings for East-European spouses: From the group of eleven East-European women interviewed, eight came to Cyprus as migrant workers and this is how they met their Cypriot husbands. What was it that pushed them to search for work abroad? They invoked reasons about the bad socioeconomic situation of the East-European countries after the crash of communism. Apart from economic needs to be fulfilled through working abroad, living in a foreign country constituted also their ‘dream to come true’: the wish for contact with other people and cultures abroad, given the fact that their right to free travel was forbidden by communist regimes.

What was their rationale for entering marriages to foreigners? In Cyprus, the belief that East-European women marry Cypriot men out of convenience is very common at the level of public opinion: it is believed that they exchange physical characteristics for socioeconomic resources of the Cypriot men. This constitutes also a reason invoked by Cypriots against mixed marriage with foreigners in Cyprus, as it was revealed by the quantitative findings.

How did the foreign women respondents explain their reasons to marry Cypriots? The common point for all the respondents is that none of them mentioned that they married their partners out of material interests or at least to secure a better living, even if all the male Cypriot spouses in the sample have stable jobs with satisfactory earnings. On the other hand (as some Romanian women informed through everyday discussions with the author) there are many East-European women, married to Cypriots, who live under the psychological tension and pressure of home violence; and they don’t have the courage to leave their Cypriot spouses because they are not financially secure. Also, many respondents mentioned examples of mixed couples where the marital choice was made under the circumstances of exchanges of material resources-physical appearance, but the success of matching in this type of marital relationship was not guaranteed: these constitute cases of foreign women who live under the control and power of their husbands (an empirical hypothesis that needs further research).
(a2) Findings for Euro-American spouses. These spouses didn’t come to Cyprus in order to work because in their countries the economic situation was poor. Four of them came to Cyprus as tourists and met their Cypriot partners; three of the Euro-American spouses met their Cypriot partners outside Cyprus, in their home-countries or abroad. By marrying to Cypriot partners, some of them left jobs (that were better paid then in Cyprus) and generally, for all of them, coming to live in Cyprus was translated into a downward mobility movement to lower socioeconomic statuses (because of poor Greek language skills and inferior immigrant status).

Finding 2) Non-material Resources: Cultural, Psychological and Physical resources

(a) Regarding educational level as a spouse’s cultural resource, none of the respondents referred specifically to his/her partner’s educational level as an influential factor in spouse selection. The findings showed that higher educational resources didn’t determine higher incomes for foreign spouses; in other words, educationally resourceful foreign spouses gain less material resources than their educationally less resourceful Cypriot spouses who gain more material resources.

(b) Concerning similarity of taste and knowledge as a cultural resource, it didn’t constitute one of the main attraction factors in spouse selection. Moreover, the respondents’ confessions attested that this similarity of taste and knowledge between the partners in mixed marriages has developed in time, along with a common marital lifestyle, a fact that influences the success of any mixed marital relationship.

(c) The most often invoked reasons in mate selection were partners’ psychological resources and physical appearance.

(c1) The respondents indicated as a factor that influenced their partner choice and marital relationship the following psychological traits: flexibility, non-aggressiveness, faithfulness, generosity, sincerity, kindness, family-orientation, attachment, sympathy, straightness, good-sense of humour, supportiveness. Also, both similarity and difference in spouses’ psychological traits were mentioned as attraction factors in mate selection. In this sense, an important finding regards an ideal combination of physical and psychological characteristics that undermines any perception of the marriage partner as a ‘foreigner’. In many cases, these grouped characteristics succeeded in minimizing any “inconvenience” of being a foreigner and it seems to constitute the ideal situation when marrying a foreign national.

(c2) Another finding regarding psychological resources exchanges between mixed marriage partners emphasized the conflict situation that each foreigner who comes to Cyprus in order to get married to a native Cypriot must overcome. This was very suggestive called (by one of the respondents) “struggle”. In this situation, the foreigner
looses his/her family's support and security and expects to be compensated with similar psychological resources by his/her spouse.

(c3) *Physical attractiveness* was very often mentioned as a main factor in spouse selection. In this sense, the Cypriot men's physical appearance is a theme that appeared in half of the interviews with foreign spouses. The most attractive physical traits of the Cypriot men (as being perceived by foreign women) are: dark-hair, tall and handsome.

(c4) Even if in Cyprus the foreign East-European and Euro-American women are perceived as more attractive physically than native women (who have Mediterranean physical characteristics), the public opinion criticise the foreign women (even if they are tourists, work in cabarets or not) for their "looseness". From the respondents' confessions resulted that the opinions about East-European women in Cyprus are even more unfavourable than about their Euro-American counterparts. Almost every foreign woman respondent from the East-European group of countries addressed this issue: they complained about the "prostitute" halo effect they have to face in social interaction with native Cypriots. Also, they indicated Cypriot women as showing a more unfavourable opinion about East-European women, in some cases refusing also any contact with them.

(c5) Other non-material resources that have influenced mate selection process in mixed marriage between foreigners and Cypriots were mentioned: the non-desirability of Russian men as spouses because of alcoholism, Cyprus as a safe place and Cyprus as a quiet place with sunny weather. Also, many of the Euro-American spouses mentioned the favourable weather conditions in Cyprus and a more relaxing way of life.

Finding 3) Foreign Influence Exposure

If material and non-material resources of partners are considered as influencing marital choices in all marriages, spouses' previous foreign influence exposure plays a role in the particular case of mixed marriage mate selection. It gives the specificity in the approach of mate selection adapted to the particular case of mixed marriage between foreigners and Cypriots.

(a) Contacts with foreigners: The respondents’ answers revealed that each foreign spouse married to a Cypriot partner had previous contacts with foreigners under different circumstances: being offspring from mixed marriage, having foreign relatives, living, working or travelling abroad, or having previous relationships with foreign partners.

(a1) An indicative finding is the greater probability for spouses who lived, worked, travelled abroad and also had previous relationships with foreigners to marry foreign partners. These findings regarding foreign spouses are also indicative of the Cypriot partners of foreign spouses. Half of the Cypriot spouses married to the foreign respondents have lived or studied abroad for more than two years; therefore, they had
contacts with foreigners being abroad, a fact that could be interpreted as corresponding to high levels of foreign influence exposure.

(a2) There is a tendency for the foreign partners to perceive the Cypriot spouses who lived abroad prior to their marriage as different from the Cypriots who did not study or live abroad. Therefore, in the case of Cypriot spouses, mixing with foreigners abroad may enhance the probability of choosing foreign spouses by increasing opportunity to interact with possible foreign marriage candidates. Also, the preferences play a role in this process as long as by choosing to interact and to have more contact with foreigners, the result is changes in lifestyle and systems of values and opinions, therefore in mentality.

(b) **Attitudes towards foreigners**: the attitudes of the East-European respondents towards the foreigners in their home-countries are more favourable than those of their Euro-American counterparts.

A factor that was found as indicative for the tendency to marry foreigners, in the case of the East-European interviewees, concerned their contact with co-nationals who married foreigners, a fact that represented for them a marital behaviour pattern to follow.

### 6.3.2. Third Parties’ Influence on Mixed Marriage Partner Choice

**Finding 4) Foreign Spouses’ Families’ Role in Cypriot Mate Selection**

(a) The content analysis of the twenty interviews revealed no accounts of interfering in their children’s marriage decision for the foreign spouses’ parents. Sometimes, their favourable attitude towards their children’s foreign spouse was due to their own experience of confronting with family’s strong sanctions on their own mixed marriage. As a general finding, there is no case in the present study of foreign spouse’s parents who opposed their children’s marriage decision because of spouses’ different religious faiths. Also, many of the foreign spouse respondents mentioned their mothers’ feelings of affection showed towards Cypriot sons-in-law.

(b) The stands of the foreign spouses’ parents on their children’s decisions to marry foreigners and as a consequence to leave their home countries can be grouped in three categories:

(b1) The parents who had no objections against their children’s decisions to marry foreigners and to live in a foreign country;

(b2) The parents who perceived their children’s choice of a foreign spouse as a loss as long as they had to settle down in a foreign country, but who accepted their children’s spouses;

(b3) The parents who disapproved of their children’s marital choices (there is only one case in the present study).
(c) On the whole, the foreign respondents’ confessions showed a very limited parental control over their children’s marriage decisions. In almost all the cases, the parents’ reasons to accept their children’s marriage decisions were of a psychological nature: the wish to assure their children’s happiness and successful marriage. On the other hand, their objections to mixed marriage were due to structural factors as the consequence of a life abroad for their children who had to settle down in a foreign country in order to live together with their spouses.

Finding 5) Cypriot Spouses’ Family Role in Foreign Mate Selection

(a) The respondents’ accounts about their Cypriot spouses’ families revealed (in many cases) the influence of family interests in mixed marriage spouse selection and also, the strong control exerted by the Cypriot mother-in-law. Another identified pattern of behaviour is that the Cypriot parents are not so likely to allow their children to marry foreigners even when it is not the case for their children to move to a foreign country.

(b) An indicative finding is that statistically, in the present analysis, there are more cases of unaccepted (by Cypriot parents) marriages of Cypriots to foreign women from East-European countries, than to foreign women from Euro-American countries.

(c) Cypriot Family’s Influence on Eastern-European Spouse Selection. Three reasons were identified as being characteristic of the Cypriot mother’s-in-law disagreement with mixed marriages between Cypriots and foreigners. At least one of these three reasons is expected to be encountered in any motivation of the mother’s-in-law disagreement with mixed marriage: (1) the economic background of the foreign spouse, (2) the moral reputation of the foreign spouse and (3) the necessity to prevent exogamy translated into the tradition “that a Cypriot man must marry a Cypriot woman”. These constitute also characteristics of the Cypriot traditional endogamous system where monetary and non-monetary factors came into play in mate selection process and also, indices of a considered successful match (Markides et al, 1978; Anthias, 1992). In this context, the matches of Cypriot men with Eastern-European women are not considered as being successful since these women have poor economic background (they leave their countries mainly, because of economic motivations) and have bad moral reputation in Cypriot public opinion’s eyes as long as the majority come to work in cabarets (sex and ‘entertainment’ industry) which in Cyprus is the covered name for prostitution. In the majority of the cases under study, the Cypriot men overcame or ignored parental opposition and entered into marriages with Eastern-European women. The parental opposition was very strong before the marriage, but afterwards it weakened gradually or in some cases it took the form of a tensioned relationship Cypriot mother-in-law- foreign daughter-in-law.
(d) Cypriot Family’s Influence on Euro-American Spouse Selection

(d1) In the group of seven Euro-American spouse participants, two foreign spouses were not accepted by their Cypriot in-laws. The common characteristic of the two cases is that both are examples of non-assortative matching between spouses with large age difference. These foreign spouses motivated their in-law's reasons of disagreement as resulting from (i) the fact that the Cypriots are people who care about their “image” in the eyes of the other people and (ii) that they are very preoccupied with what their social circle would think about them; this is the issue of social pressure and control excited through gossip (as a characteristic specific for small-size societies).

(d2) Another significant aspect about the influence of Cypriot spouses' parents on the mixed marital relationship is the degree to which the children accept their parents’ control. Almost all the respondents in the present study commented the "Cypriot mother-in-law syndrome" about control and interference in children’s marital life and also suggested ways to cope with it.

(d3) On the whole, the foreign spouses who have married Cypriots more than ten years ago encountered much more parental opposition from the Cypriot side, than the foreign spouses who married Cypriots more recently. This trend is true especially for Eastern-European spouses.

Finding 6) The Cypriot Orthodox Church’s Influence on Mixed Marriage Partner Choice

(a) In general, the Cypriots perceive a couple as being married only if they have a religious wedding in the Orthodox Church, which in the case of divorce must give its permission which is very difficult to obtain. Also, for a couple having a child without being married in church is considered to be a sin by the Orthodox Church; this is the reason why in many cases in the sample, the Cypriot parents rushed to marry their sons religiously even if they have got married civilly and secretly to foreign women.

(b) Some of the conditions of mixed marriages between Cypriots and foreigners who marry in the Orthodox Church were invoked by the respondents: every foreigner must prove through a certificate that they were baptized Christian, otherwise the religious ceremony cannot take place; and that mixed couple’s children will be baptized Orthodox. Sometimes foreigners refused to marry in an Orthodox church or to baptize their children in the Orthodox faith and then Cypriot family's sanctions were very strong. This is not the case of marriages between Cypriots and spouses from Eastern-European Orthodox countries such as: Bulgaria, Romania, Russia, Ukraine, Moldavia or Serbia. Concerning the spouses' religions, this type of union Cypriots-foreigners from the above-mentioned countries is not a "mixed" one; this is a reason why these Orthodox foreign spouses are more easily accepted by Cypriot religious faithful families.
Finding 7) The Cypriot State’s Influence on Mixed Marriage Partner Choice

(a) In the cases under the study, twelve out of twenty respondents had to marry civilly their Cypriot spouse in order to obtain an Alien Residence Permit for staying in Cyprus. In a way, the Cypriot Law obliged them to enter a marriage, even if in many cases they were not ready to live into a marital relationship. This is the case of all the East-European spouses in the sample. These legal procedures suppose contacts with the Cypriot Immigration authorities. This experience was not always a positive one because, as the respondents mentioned, they were confronted with maltreatment. Also, in the cases of the foreign women who have worked in cabarets and then married Cypriots, the Immigration authorities are suspicious about the authenticity (if spouses live together) of these marriages.

(b) All the nationals of the Euro-American group of countries mentioned that they didn’t need any visas, residence permits or Cypriot citizenship in order to stay in Cyprus. If the legal treatment of foreign nationals in Cyprus differs according to their nationality, the behaviour of the immigration authorities’ employees towards the foreign nationals does not discriminate any groups of nationalities from Eastern or Western Europe.

(c) An important indicative finding showed that the constraints of Cypriot legislation on Eastern-European nationals are very strong since they are pushed to enter into a marriage with a Cypriot without having the opportunity, in many cases, to live in Cyprus together as an accommodation period necessary in the case of making a marriage decision. This fact may have serious implications on the marriage relationship’s quality that sometimes is more likely to collapse leading to the partners’ separation and divorce.

6.3.3. Contact Opportunities on Cypriot Marriage Market.

The Structural Arrangements in Cypriot-foreigner Mixed Marriages

Finding 8) Meeting places of mixed marriage partners

(a) The cases under study indicated as the most frequent functional setting or meeting place of Cypriots and foreigners as spouses in mixed unions: the pub, bar or restaurant. In eleven cases out of twenty, the couples’ meeting places were: pubs, bars or restaurants in Cyprus where the foreign spouses usually used to work. In three cases, the spouses met in university or college abroad or in Cyprus. And in six out of twenty cases the foreign and Cypriot spouses met abroad. There is a specific particularity of the Cypriot marriage market that concerns cabarets as meeting places of entertainers/artistes’ and Cypriot men. The cases investigated are indicative of the sources of foreign spouses in Cyprus (as mentioned in the Chapter II).
Finding 9) Dating and Courtship. Marital Intention and Decision in Mixed Marriage

(a) The content analysis of the twenty interviews revealed that the duration of dating and courtship period oscillated between two months and seven years. Usually, in the cases of East-European spouses this period was shorter than for their Euro-American counterparts: from two months to three years and from three months to seven years.

(b) Regarding foreign spouses’ marital intention at the time they met their Cypriot spouses, many of them declared that had no intention of getting married. It just happened to meet the ‘right man’ and than the decision was made (most of the spouses who came for work in Cyprus shared this opinion). In other cases, the marital intention and decision of foreign spouses was determined by the Cypriot man’s marriage proposal that pushed the woman to decide under the pressure of some material gifts. In some other cases, the marriage decision was the result of a pregnancy. There were also cases of mixed marriages between Cypriots and East-European women where the marriage decision of the foreign spouses was taken at the expiration date of their working contract in Cyprus. The decision to marry a Cypriot and then, to live in a foreign country constituted also a result of contextual factors such as, for example, less opportunity for the foreign spouse to have a career in her/his country.

6.3.4. Life in Cyprus as Foreigner Topics: Children from Mixed marriages, Employment, Friends and Cypriot mentality

Finding 10) English foreigners living in Cyprus

Many respondents revealed the fact that life in Cyprus from the point of view of an English foreigner is easier because of the language being widely-spoken in Cyprus and also, for the reason that a great amount of British (mostly English) nationals live in Cyprus. As the questionnaire findings showed, the Cypriots’ attitude towards English people (and Russians) is the most favourable by comparison to attitudes towards all the other foreign nationals living in Cyprus.

Finding 11) Children from Mixed Marriages in Cyprus

(a) Those children from mixed marriages who were raised by their foreign stay-at-home mothers and had more contacts with the foreign mothers’ relatives are more proficient in their mother’s language and also identify themselves (to a greater extent) with their mother’s nationality than the children with working foreign mothers who have frequented from a smaller age Cypriot nurseries or were raised by Cypriot women, like grandmothers or other relatives.

(b) The case of children from mixed marriages who do not fluently speak their foreign mother’s language is typical for the marriages between Eastern-European women and
Cypriot men. In the families with spouses from the Euro-American group, the dominant language at home is either English or the foreign spouses’ language being spoken also by the Cypriot male spouses; in none of the cases under the study the dominant language at home for these couples was Greek. Contrary, in the families with East-European spouses the dominant language at home is Greek in all the cases, so that the children learn the Greek language from both parents. In those mixed families where one of the spouses is from the Euro-American group of countries and one is Cypriot, the children learn Greek only from one parent because the Greek is not the dominant language at home. On the other hand, for the childless couples with Eastern-European and Cypriots spouses who met abroad (usually at institutions of higher learning), the dominant language at home is the foreign spouse’s language spoken also by the Cypriot spouse.

(c) The respondents who were asked whether their children have any problems at school (as children from mixed marriages) gave different answers that emphasised a more favourable attitude towards these children. Also, the parent respondents addressed issues such as: a silent discrimination that concerns all the foreigners in Cyprus, some racist nicknames calling and problems with the Greek language.

(d) All the foreign parents interviewed deny for their children the marginal status (in the sense of being disadvantaged) they have as being foreigners (i.e. lower socioeconomic status and opportunities, less language skills and social networking etc), from whatever group of countries. This is the reason why many of them mentioned that their child is perceived as a Cypriot or that they don’t want to raise their children as foreigners. As foreign parents, they know that natives’ perception of foreigners in Cyprus is imprinted with prejudice and stereotypes (that result in more discrimination) and do not want their children to be considered/perceived as ‘foreigners’. In this sense, they invoked the difference between the two contexts of being an offspring of mixed marriage in the past and nowadays when their number is considerably higher (and as identified by quantitative findings attitudes towards foreign nationals are more favourable).

(e) As the respondents mentioned, being children from mixed marriage means many advantages rooted in the fact of participation within two cultures; also this may constitute a disadvantage as long as mixed cultural identities sometimes might cause a conflict situation. The disadvantage then is a consequence of the social environment reaction to “mixed” or to “otherness”, as it was shown, that used to be extremely negative in the Cypriot context some years ago. This is what every foreign mother fears for her child: not becoming a victim of prejudice about foreigners.

Finding 12) Work in Cyprus as a foreigner

(a) The experience of working in Cyprus as foreigners (even as a foreigner with a certain “privileged” status as being Cypriots’ spouses) is described as a frustrating
experience because their rights are undermined and they are considered inferior for the fact of being foreigners (this is true also for spouses having Cypriot citizenship).

(b) Working in Cyprus as a foreigner (even if the East-European spouses in the sample are Cypriot citizens- they are perceived and identified themselves as foreigners, with only one exception), for the majority of the sample respondents, constituted an occasion to face discrimination because of their inferior/marginal status as foreigners; they faced undermining of their working rights, bad treatment because of a double inferior status as foreign women at work (i.e. because of their gender and their marginal status as foreigners), discrimination concerning wages and unfriendly behaviour of Cypriot work colleagues, and the necessity of good Greek language skills for finding a decent job.

Finding 13) Friends in Cyprus and Cypriot Mentality

(a) All the sample respondents (with one exception) declared that they do not socialise with Cypriots and do not have real Cypriot friends (even if many of them live in Cyprus for more then ten years). They also explained the different reasons that motivated their choices. These reasons are mainly of a cultural nature emphasising: differences in mentalities, the lack of common interests and the xenophobic sentiments of the Cypriot side that make Cypriots and foreigners incompatible as friends. They emphasised that even if there is no declared discrimination of foreigners, in their social interaction with native Cypriots there is an invisible barrier that makes difficult every contact between the two parts. In turn, the foreigners have developed a mechanism of Cypriots’ rejection as an answer to their discrimination. One main reason why the foreign women do not have any Cypriot female friends is the latter’s perception of foreign women as a threat since “they came to Cyprus to take our men” (as a female respondent answered the questionnaire survey).

(b) According to a foreigners’ perception, the Cypriots are people who refuse to learn from others, have narrow education, do not care for the natural environment , are very sweet talkers, big liars and untrustworthy, very gossipy and interfering; they are perceived as conservative and very traditional. Also, some Cypriot men are considered as being very traditional men who refuse to assume a more egalitarian identity, including involvement in housework, child care and faithfulness to their spouse; moreover, they do not allow spouses to be more social (e.g. go out with their friends), sustain a strict gender roles division in their marital relationship based on a lack of communication and perceive domestic violence as indicative of their manhood- all these being indices of patriarchal marital power. In many cases, the foreign spouses confessed that their husbands contradict this Cypriot-specific pattern. On the other hand, the Cypriots are described as being very friendly, ready to help, curious and very interested in other people’s lives. Also, the Cypriot family is perceived as a very powerful control agent, with authoritarian father and very protective mother.
6.4. Conclusions or Two Ways of Conceptualizing the Cypriot – Foreigner Marital Relationship. Two Patterns of Mixed Marriage Mate Selection

The present inquiry aimed at identifying mate selection patterns of foreigner-Cypriot mixed marital relationship in Cyprus by considering the influence of different factors at the individual-group-society levels of analysis that give the specificity of a sociological approach of this social phenomenon.

The motivations for choosing the topic under study are both subjective and objective in nature. On one hand, there is a subjective motivation that determined the author (being herself a foreigner married to a Cypriot man and living in Cyprus) to search for spouses’ reasons in mixed marriage mate selection process in Cyprus. On the other hand, there is an objective motivation of this inquiry stemming from an observable fact in present-day Cypriot context: an increased number of mixed marriages between Cypriots and foreigners in Cyprus.

The first step of this inquiry was to map out the mixed marriage phenomenon in Cyprus, a task that was undertaken by conducting a statistical analysis of data on mixed marriage and immigration in Cyprus, from official Demographic Reports (for the period between 1989-2004). The raw percentages analysis resulted in a typology of mixed marriages in Cyprus which accounted for: (a) gender specific differences in Cypriot men’s and women’s preferences in foreign mate selection process (the Cypriot men entered more mixed marriages than their female counterparts); and (b) a gender-differentiated regional pattern in choosing foreign spouses (i.e. Cypriot men chose mainly spouses from the East-European group of countries and Cypriot women chose mostly grooms from the Euro-American group of countries).

The entire research design was modelled and expanded around the statistical data findings that constituted a starting point of the present inquiry’s assumptions on mixed marriage in Cyprus (given the premise that there is no available local prior research on this topic). When the inquiry accounted for the nationalities (as they are tabulated in the Demographic Reports) that entered marriages to Cypriots, the main sources of foreign spouses for Cypriots were identified. These sources are: tourism (mainly for the spouses from the Western European countries), employment-seeking migration (mainly for the spouses from the Former Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, Asia and Africa) and a third category of spouses who met their Cypriot partners abroad (usually, at institutions of higher learning, in Europe and the United States). These sources of foreign spouses were found as being, to a certain extent, indicative of the spouses’ reasons for entering into mixed marital relationships with Cypriots.
In this sense, since tourism means people who can afford to spend money on leisure time activities and migration (i.e. employment-seeking migration) means people who leave their home countries in order to make a better living, the individuals who belong to the first two categories of sources for foreign spouses in Cyprus are dissimilar regarding their average socioeconomic backgrounds. Therefore, the spouses from these two different sources were expected to have, to a certain extent, different criteria for choosing their Cypriot spouses. In this conditions, two theoretical perspectives were considered suitable for interpreting these different contexts: a classical theoretical perspective on mixed marriage that accounts for spouses as entering mixed marital relationships under the conditions of assets exchanges, as the exchange theory predicts; and an aesthetic sociology's perspective about choices based on taste, need and pleasure adapted to spouse selection process, that represent a challenging assumption proposed by the present study in order to account for all the facets of the phenomenon under study.

The study findings revealed that tourism in Cyprus constituted the main source of foreign spouses from Western European countries before the fall of communism in Eastern Europe. However, in the last sixteen years, the prevalent source of foreign spouses for Cypriots has been the employment-seeking immigration/migrant workers, especially from Eastern European countries. This is true if one accounts for the Cypriot men’s marital choices, because in the case of the Cypriot women, their choices for spouses concerned mainly the Euro-American (or Western) group of nationalities. The statistical data registered for the year 2004 indicate more civil marriages between Cypriot women-Asian/Arab men (especially Syrians and Egyptians). This gender specific pattern in non-Cypriot mate selection was confirmed through a survey investigation of the Cypriots' attitudes, perceptions and opinions about marriages between foreigners and Cypriots in Cyprus that revealed how the Cypriots do perceive foreign nationalities as arranged in a hierarchy reflecting their desirability as mates. In fact, the study indicated two hierarchies at the level of Cypriot public opinion: (1) a foreign nationals’ hierarchy given by the racial categorization white-non-white and the religious separation Christian-Muslim and (2) a foreigners’ hierarchy that accounts for economic differences and inequalities between the nationalities of the Euro-American group of countries perceived as superior, and the nationalities of the East-European and Asian-African groups of countries perceived as inferior from the point of view of their general low economic standing. This leads to a hierarchy of acceptable and non-acceptable ‘foreign-ness’ meaning that not all groups of ‘outsiders’ appear equally ‘strange’; some groups seem more familiar, their presence is more tolerated and their cultural practices perhaps even admired.

The point here is that different categories of foreigners living in one country overlap each other empirically, as has been pointed out by several analysts. For example, in
modern-day France the word “immigrant” is a “catch-all category” under which all foreigners are labelled indiscriminately; as Balibar noted: “(...) there is a hierarchy of immigrants. In Paris a Portuguese is more an immigrant than a Spaniard, although less so than an Arab or a black. A Briton or a German will rarely be an immigrant, although a Greek is one as compared to them. If Spanish and Moroccan workers are invariably immigrants, the Spanish business man or even the Algerian business man need not be” (Balibar, 1991:221). This is an accurate description of the relationship between race, ethnicity and social class. If this description is paraphrased into the conceptual terms employed in the present study, it would result in the following propositions. First, some nationals (or ethnics), that is, foreigners in Cyprus (e.g. British and Germans) are considered equals or superiors, but others (e.g. Russians, Bulgarians or Romanians) are considered unequal vis-à-vis the native population, that is, the Cypriots; on the other hand, the Russian business man in Cyprus is not considered as an immigrant, but as a superior. The unequal nationals (or ethnics) experience greater difficulty in de-stigmatizing themselves as immigrants compared with the equal or superior ethnics, but they can and often they do, especially if they belong to the middle or upper social classes. Second, a category of foreign nationals that is different in terms of race (e.g. the non-whites) and/or religion (e.g. non-Christians, as Muslims or Jews) will find it very difficult to overcome de-stigmatization, although this is partly possible if they are in the upper class. Thus, an immigrant’s class status is inextricably intertwined with other identities, notably race and religion. At the level of the Cypriot public opinion about foreigners and their marriages to Cypriot nationals, social class was not identified as a determinant factor of their stands about different foreign nationals; as such, religion and race were identified as playing a certain role in foreigners’ stigmatization. The hierarchy of foreigners as Cypriots’ spouses that accounts for racial and religious lines of segregation is given by Cypriots’ mate choices concentrated mainly on spouses from the two groups of countries with white and Christian people, respectively the East-European and Euro-American group of countries. Concerning both the hierarchies of foreigners in Cyprus, the questionnaire survey findings showed that the Cypriots are likely to perceive mixed-marriage foreign spouses according to prejudices and stereotypes (positive and negative) about each nationality. The general criteria are: religion, economic standing and racial characteristics such as skin colour. A nationality that has many similarities with the Cypriots on these markers is most likely to be perceived as closer in terms of social distance and implicitly acceptance.

A significant survey finding is that Cypriot men are more favourable towards mixed marriage than their female counterparts. This is supported by the fact that Cypriot men married foreigners more often than Cypriot women. Overall, the study finding sets (from statistical data analysis, questionnaire survey and interviews with foreign spouses) picture two opposite and gendered stands of Cypriots on mixed marriage: of Cypriot women and
of Cypriot men. It is significant to present them separately, as they were identified by the findings reported earlier: Cypriot men have entered into more mixed marital relationships than their women counterparts (during the period 1989-2004) and their first choices have been for spouses from the Eastern-European group of countries. As the questionnaire survey findings attest, the Cypriot men are generally more likely to adopt a favourable attitude towards mixed marriages: their own mixed marriage, their relatives’ mixed marriage and the number of mixed marriages at a societal level.

Moreover, the Cypriot men who have relatives married to foreigners are more likely to adopt a positive attitude towards their hypothetical marriage to a foreigner and to approve of mixed marriage, in general. Furthermore, the Cypriot men who have never lived abroad are more likely to adopt an unfavourable attitude towards their marriage to a foreigner, but meantime they are more likely to agree with the idea of mixed marriage per se.

Besides, more Cypriot men gave reasons for approving mixed marriage. They emphasized free choice of marriage partner, love and mutual understanding as motivations of mixed marriage, the equality of human beings (irrespective of ethnicity or religion) and the assortative matching of partners. This constitutes a liberal and free-minded perspective on mixed marriage, based on the universal principles of liberty and equality applied to mate selection process. On the other hand, the qualitative data described some Cypriot husbands with foreign spouses as adopting a conservative and dominant stand in their mixed marital relationship. These constitute cases of foreign women who live under the control of their husbands, unbalanced relations of power and control between spouses being on unequal positions. Also, the qualitative data described some Cypriot men as being very traditional men, who refuse to assume a more egalitarian identity, including involvement in housework, childcare and faithfulness to their spouses, sustain a strict gender roles division in their marital relationship based on lack of communication and perceive violence (verbal and physical) in marital relationship as indicative of their manhood. Also, many Cypriot men married their foreign spouses without their parents’ agreement, a fact that somehow proved their relative independence from their families’ control.

In conclusion, the two sets of qualitative and quantitative findings revealed two different images of Cypriot men, as they relate to mixed marriage: on one hand, they agree with mixed marriage giving reasons that emphasized a prejudice-free attitude and many foreign spouses described them as adopting an egalitarian stand in their marital relationship; on the other hand, some Cypriot men were pictured as often adopting a dominator position when involved in mixed marital relationships. A possible explanation for this double standard concerns two patterns of mixed-marriage mate choice in Cyprus, as identified by the study. Before moving on to discuss this topic, let us first expose
Cypriot women’s stand on mixed marriage that is constructed in contrast to that of Cypriot men’s, as previously mentioned.

As the findings reveal, in the period under study (1989-2004), Cypriot women have entered less mixed marital relationships than their male counterparts. Their first choices were for spouses from the Euro-American group of countries. As the questionnaire findings showed, the Cypriot women are likely to be less favourable about mixed marriage in Cyprus: be it their own mixed marriage, their relatives’ mixed marriages and the amount of mixed marriages at a societal level. The Cypriot women who have relatives married to foreigners are more likely to adopt an unfavourable attitude towards their hypothetical marriage to a foreigner and, also, to disagree or to adopt a neutral stand about the idea of mixed marriage per se. Furthermore, the Cypriot women who have never lived abroad are even less favourable towards mixed marriage: they are more likely to disagree with a hypothetical marriage to a foreigner and also to disagree with the idea of mixed marriage between a Cypriot and a foreigner.

Also, more Cypriot women gave reasons disapproving of mixed marriage. They invoked ‘difference’ as the main reason against it, because differences lead to conflict, the conflict leads to divorce, the divorce means family dissolution and all these factors together have negative societal consequences: destruction of the Cypriot ethnicity, culture and tradition. This constitutes a deterministic perspective on mixed marriage reflecting all the negative factors that may influence it as structural factors projected to a societal level. Also, the Cypriot women are more likely to agree that the foreigner’s nationality influences a Cypriot’s marriage decision and gave the majority of reasons to support their opinion. In this sense, the questionnaire survey findings attested that if the Cypriot men are likely to prefer Russian, Romanian and Bulgarian nationals, the Cypriot women would prefer British, German and American nationals living in Cyprus. Also, the Cypriot men would marry mostly Russian women and the Cypriot women would marry mostly British men (with the exception of the Greek nationals who constitute the first marital choice for both women and men – but who are not considered by the people questioned as having the status of a ‘foreigner’ in Cyprus).

Therefore, what this study revealed, is the significance of various boundary-ranking measures; that is, indicators of perceived ‘social distance’ in influencing the marital decisions about which groups could provide potential spouses, and which groups were simply not considered by Cypriot men and women. In the main, the latter is the case with nationalities in the Asian group. For example, a Cypriot woman might consider marrying a British, Greek or American man, but under no circumstances would she consider marriage to a Filipino man, because of the various hierarchies of acceptability of ‘foreign-ness’ combined with the socioeconomic status of the ethnic group to which the man belongs. Moreover, the questionnaire survey findings picture Cypriot women as being very hostile
in their interaction with foreign women because they perceive the latter as coming to Cyprus “to steal our men”. Also, some Cypriot women show a more unfavourable opinion about Eastern-European women, in some cases refusing even any contact with them. A syndrome of “woman’s fear of woman” is expressed here, that masks the insecurity of native women in front of foreign women whom they perceive as more attractive because of different physical characteristics that are not specific in the case of native women. The literature review showed that physical attractiveness is a major asset in sexual exchange and is associated with upward economic mobility in particular for women. This applies in the case of the Cypriot men who marry foreign women because “other Cypriot men do it and because that Russian girl is a doll” (Ana, a Czech woman respondent).

In order to account for foreign spouses’ reasons in Cypriot mate selection process, it is suggestive to refer to the above-mentioned statement made by one of the women interviewed. She invoked a typology of the Cypriot men who marry foreign women and explained that there is a category of Cypriot men who marry foreign women out of love and another category who marry because “other Cypriot men do it and because that Russian girl is a doll” (Ana). This typology ‘hides’ two patterns of mixed-marriage mate selection in Cyprus (or two ways of conceptualising mixed marriage in Cyprus), as the finding sets of the present study show: (a) a pattern of mixed marriage mate selection where the partners made their choices based on reasons regarding an ideal combination of cultural, physical and psychological characteristics overarched by love that undermined any perception of the marriage partner as foreigner; and (b) another pattern of mixed marriage mate selection where the partners would have exchanged non-material (e.g. physical attractiveness) and material resources, as quantitative and qualitative findings revealed in many cases when Cypriot men have married economic migrant women from the East-European group of countries. Even if these two patterns of mate selection seem to be dissimilar, they both presuppose exchanges of different types of resources. Let’s analyse them separately in order to show how the three sets of findings (from statistical data, questionnaire survey and semi-structured interviews) intertwine in explaining motives for entering mixed marital relationships in Cyprus.

The first pattern of mixed-marriage mate choice presupposes that partners have chosen each other on the basis of cultural resources, psychological and physical characteristics (all relational resources) which were invoked by the interview respondents as determinant factors for their failing in love. This set of reasons coincides with the reasons invoked (by the questionnaire survey respondents) as supporting mixed marriage between foreigners and Cypriots and also with the reasons in favour of the opinion that the foreigner’s nationality does not influence a Cypriot’s marriage decision. Mate selection process in this case could be explained from an aesthetic sociology’s perspective that evolves around the concept of “taste”. According to the aesthetic sociology, taste always
refers to the preferences and choices of an individual and is totally private by its very nature. Everyone is supposed to choose what feels good, but this is relative. According to the famous antinomy of taste formulated by Kant in his *Critique of Judgment*, taste or the judgment power is both totally private and universal, both individual and social, subjective and objective. Moreover, matters of taste are beyond dispute because there could not be any general rules governing them. If they were to be disputed, there would have to be presuppositions that there were some general standards, which could be criticized, questioned or defended. Bourdieu (1984:56) adopted one possible empiricist solution to the antinomy of taste by claiming that the choices one makes are also strategies of distinction: ‘*taste is the basis of all that one has- people and things- and all that one is for others, whereby one classifies oneself and is classified by others*’. Also, he considered that all these choices based on taste fall largely outside the formal schooling and educational system. They are made on the basis of pure taste dispositions rather than following any explicit rules and norms of conduct. Moreover, when referring to the “choice of spouse”, Bourdieu suggested that in explaining homogamy, the use of the notion of ‘habitus’ is necessary, but “*the surest guarantor of homogamy (…) is the spontaneous affinity (experienced as a feeling of friendly warmth) which brings together the agents endowed with dispositions or tastes that are similar, and thus produced from similar social conditions and conditionings*” (Bourdieu, 1990:71). In other words, Bourdieu has allowed the individual to exercise choice, to be masters of the game of marriage and to act strategically. This perspective about choices made on the basis of pure taste dispositions rather than following any explicit rules and norms of conduct, is suitable to understand the motivation invoked for the marital choices made by the foreign spouses interviewed (under the condition of findings biases because of sample respondents’ possible cognitive dissonance).

The second pattern of mixed-marriage mate selection (that corresponds to a possible way of conceptualizing mixed marriage in Cyprus) is somehow stigmatised (in the sense of being imprinted with negative stereotypes) at the level of public opinion because it is perceived as an exchange of material resources and non-material assets such as physical attractiveness (as revealed by questionnaire findings). It is more likely to occur between Cypriot men and East-European female worker migrants and it is believed that the latter marry the first out of convenience, as long as work permits for migrants in Cyprus are issued on a limited time period; and moreover, through marriage to a Cypriot national, a (non-E.U.) work migrant is granted a renewable residence permit in Cyprus. This constitutes a reason invoked by Cypriots against mixed marriage with foreigners in Cyprus and also, one of the reasons in favour of the opinion that the foreigner’s nationality influences a Cypriot’s marriage decision. The explanation of the mate selection process in this case employs an exchange perspective on mixed marriage that conceives it as a
rationally and carefully guided transaction in which important economic and social considerations play a role. Even if this is supposed to be the case, the interviews conducted and also, other informants who discussed with the author the aim of the research, revealed the fact that these marital relationships constitute unbalanced relations of power and control between spouses who are unequal as concerning their statuses (an inferior/marginal and disadvantaged migrant status strictly regulated through the Immigration law and a superior native status characterised by citizenship rights and then more access to resources, participation and belonging to community). In this sense, as some respondents’ narratives accounted, some foreign spouses are subordinated to their Cypriot husbands’ control, living under the psychological tension and pressure of domestic violence (verbal and physical); moreover, they don’t have the courage to leave the marriage because they are not financially secure or have not acquired yet Cypriot citizenship. Therefore, as the findings revealed, a basic characteristic of this second type of mixed marriage is that the mixed marital relationship foreign partner-Cypriot partner is an unequal power relationship. A clarification is needed here regarding the fact that the empirical investigation did not identify such cases, but the author was informed through indirect testimonies of some participants.

In most of the mixed marital relationships, the Cypriot spouses find themselves in a superior position given by their native status associated mainly, with a higher socioeconomic standing (that might be considered as a more quantifiable indicator) translated in better paying jobs compared to those of their foreign marriage partners. The foreign spouses are situated in an inferior position because of their immigrant status associated to a lower socioeconomic standing translated into low-paying jobs or unpaid work as childcare and housework.

In this case, even if exchange theory assumptions explicate the mate selection process, the mixed marital relationship cycle is better understood through what Therborn (2004) calls ‘post-patriarchy’ (p.126). He proclaims that “the European family system have entered a new historical stage, a post-patriarchy. (...) Post-patriarchy means adult autonomy from parents and equal male –female family rights- not just as proclaimed rights but as judicial claim rights. This is a major historical change, virtually unknown and unpractised anywhere before, and as we have just seen, it is a recent change. However, it does not in itself mean gender equality. Men and women, as family members as well as in their individual capacity, are embedded in social and economic relations of inequality, often of recently increasing inequality. (...) But an indicator of the magnitude of the problem as it impinges upon post-patriarchal family and gender relations seems to be called for. Perhaps the best available single indicator is a measure of female to male mean income. A post-patriarchal society gives men and women equal rights to act, but
their relative income taps their ability to act” (p. 127). This is also very illustrative for the situation of economic migrant women as spouses of Cypriot men.

Regarding the above-mentioned two ways of conceptualising mixed marriage between foreign nationals and Cypriots, together with their corresponding two patterns of mate choice, biases are introduced. One bias is given by a lag factor concerning two moments in time: T1 and T2; the first is the moment of mate choice process and the second is the moment of marital relationship. Therefore, this might account for a biased perception of mate selection process due to spouses’ present involvement in their relationship. Another bias may well be due to the lack of empirical data about the motives of Cypriot male spouses for mixed marriage mate selection. Gaining such insights in future research would help in understanding the second pattern of mate selection identified in the present thesis.

This is how the present study examines mate selection in mixed marital relationships between foreigners and Cypriots, proposing an original research design to investigate the phenomenon concerned. Because there are no prior studies of this relatively new phenomenon in Cypriot society, the present investigation had an exploratory character and aimed to throw some light on mixed marriage in Cyprus by investigating mate choice and using a mixed methods approach together with different sources of relating data. Specifically, the focus was on the reasons of mate selection in mixed marriages between foreign nationals and Cypriots in Cyprus. Three different sets of findings- demographical, quantitative and qualitative- portrayed two ways of conceptualizing the Cypriot-foreigner mixed marital relationship in Cyprus identifying two patterns of mate selection, as previously mentioned. The scope was not to make any value judgments and to refer to the two identified patterns as being superior or inferior, as they may appear. In fact, they both have a common point given by their “mixed” nature that emphasises difference. Acknowledging differences can help mixed couples comprehend the disturbing feelings of distance from one another they may experience.

But if mixed marriage spouses can come to “...accept that even between the closest human beings, infinite distances continue to exist, a wonderful living side by side can grow up; if they succeed in loving the distance between them which makes it possible for each to see the other whole against the sky”56, they will have found the true secret to mixed marriage. In this context it is suggestive to note that many of the foreign spouse respondents confessed that they never have perceived their Cypriot spouses as foreigners.

56 Rainer Maria Rilke, Letters. W.W. Norton, New York, 1954
6.5. Mixed Marriage in Cyprus and Feminist Perspectives

Using Gender as a Lens. This study is not a pure feminist one. There were a number of reasons the author chose not to adopt a feminist theory in conducting this research. The main reason is that the exploratory and descriptive character of the study lent itself to a more value-free approach of mate selection in mixed marriage in Cyprus, leaving more room for using diverse theoretical perspectives in investigating the phenomenon.

Of course, even if it was not intended to be a feminist study, it revealed gender-related aspects of mixed marriage in Cyprus, such as: gender specific attitudes at the level of Cypriot public opinion on marriage between Cypriots and foreign nationals (see the different positions adopted by Cypriot women and men regarding the phenomenon); gendered preferences for foreign spouses evidenced in statistical findings (i.e. there are more Cypriot men who married foreign women); and an unequal mixed marital relationship conceptualized as an instance of patriarchal domination (see a foreign woman’s position of inferiority when marrying a Cypriot man, due to her double-disadvantaged status: as woman and as migrant). This latter aspect is suitable to be further analysed using the concept of ‘marital power’ (not forgetting its criticisms) from a feminist perspective. Before moving to do so, it is necessary to address a certain limitation of the present study, from a gender-related perspective.

Given that the issues looked at and experienced are gender specific (as well as having ethnic, race, class and regional aspects), there is a bias here towards women’s view. This is not only because the study is written by a woman, but also because in the interviews conducted, most informants were female and so the case studies portray primarily foreign women’s experiences and concerns.

Models of Marital Power and the Feminist Perspective.

The most fervent criticisms of marital power researches come from feminist scholars. Feminist scholars have argued that research into marital power has failed to take into account the aspect of social structure that reinforces men’s privilege within the marital relationship. Ferree (1990) pointed out that feminists agree that “male dominance within families is part of a wider system of male power, is neither natural nor inevitable, and occurs at women’s cost” (p.867). She recommended that a gender perspective should be used that identifies the issue of domination as central to power relationship. This constitutes an aspect that might explain migrant women’s status in marital relationships with Cypriot men.

Feminists have been especially critical of those who unquestionably accept a social exchange model. Given the competitively based capitalistic economic system of Western industrial societies, it is not surprising that the dominant way in which power is viewed
within these marital systems is in terms of a self-centred social exchange. One should not even be surprised by the sociological preoccupation with a social exchange perspective in trying to make sense of marital power. However, feminists have urged that the time has come to realise the debilitating view that ‘our theories of power place on our perception of how power is used in marital and family relationships’ (Balswick and Balswick, 1995:307). As Szinovacz (1987) suggested, ‘To avoid interpretations which ‘eternalize’ present societal constraints, we may further profit from in-depth analyses of couples or families who have themselves at least to some extent transcended these constrictions’ (p.682).

Therefore, resource and social exchange theories may be useful because they explain the way marital partners usually utilize power. However, the social exchange model will be in danger of reification if it is seen as the normative or the ideal way for power to operate in marriage- this is also an aspect that the study took into account in conceptualizing mixed marriage. By not relying on the social exchange perspective in an exclusivist manner, the study placed no limitations on the development of a more constructive use of marital power.

In challenging models of structural inequality and exploitation, a feminist perspective is more consonant with an empowering model of marital power. When feminists criticise patriarchy as self-serving, they are implicitly suggesting that the basis of marital relationship should be one of mutual empowerment. From a feminist perspective, the goal in marriage must be equality. This will only be accomplished when non-oppressive structures are replaced by egalitarian ones. To what extent it would be possible to develop an empowerment model of mixed marriage in the Cypriot context is a question that merits more reflection by using a feminist approach to identify the destructive ways in which power can be used to suppress and control. Such a model is needed in order to transcend racism, classism, and sexism as they continue to have oppressive effects on society and family life worldwide.
6.6. Mixed Marriage between Foreigners and Cypriots: Implementation of findings, Additional research and Contribution to knowledge

Implementation of Findings. Practical suggestions for the implementation of findings result from analysing the Cypriot State’s influence on mixed marriage foreign partner choice. Also, the study qualitative findings offer some patterns of mixed marital relationship that help in marital counselling for these spouses. Let us expose these practical suggestions.

The Cypriot Law on Immigration restricts the entrance into Cyprus of nationals from countries other than those of the European Union, accession countries (Romania and Bulgaria from 2005 onwards) or the United States. Therefore, the third countries nationalities need a visa, and in order to stay in Cyprus for more than two months they need a residence permit or a working permit based on a working contract. These nationalities can obtain a residence permit (which is renewable) and then Cypriot citizenship only through a marriage to a Cypriot national; this fact also encourages convenience marriages or marriages that are contracted with the only purpose to secure a Cypriot residence permit (i.e. see the example of cabaret workers/’artistes’ who are entitled to a three-months working visa).

The interview findings revealed that the Cypriot Law on Immigration obliged the spouses (who needed entrance visa) to enter marriages to Cypriots, even if in many cases they were not ready to live into a marital relationship. This is mainly the case with the East-European spouses. Therefore, the constraints of Cypriot legislation on non-Euro-American nationalities are very strong since they are pushed to enter marriages to Cypriot spouses without having the opportunity (in many cases) to live with their Cypriot spouse-to-be together in Cyprus, as an accommodation period necessary in the case of making a marriage decision. This fact may have serious consequences on the marriage relationship quality that sometimes collapses leading to partners’ separation and divorce. In this sense, a practical suggestion would be for a legislative change regarding the chance for East-European nationalities (and nationals of other third countries that need entrance visa for Cyprus) to live together with their prospective Cypriot spouses for a determined period of time longer than two months (as it is the case in present days) as an (limited) accommodation/adjustment period (i.e. cohabitation) necessary before having a religious or civil marriage.

Although exogamy is strongly affected by formal and informal group rules, practices and stereotypes, the people involved are not passive: despite opposition, they may pursue their own interests, create their own identities, and have therefore agency, and in so doing, they challenge or subvert rules and contribute towards social change. Even leaving
aside specific financial problems, managing and negotiating other cultural resources within mixed marriages calls for compromise and commitment (as the preceding chapters show). Several informants described situations where they (as mixed couple partners) have fought hard to marry, suffering disapproval and pessimism from family and friends, and have adopted a zealous approach to making the marriage work. In this sense, the qualitative findings indicated that the mixed married couples, with foreign and Cypriot spouses participating in this study, belong to three marital models⁵⁷:

*incorporation, adaptation and agreement* that account for spouses’ enculturation, acculturation, adaptation and integration in each others’ cultures. As a practical suggestion, this categorisation can help in marital counselling interventions that many mixed couples might need by indicating the advantages and disadvantages of each marital model.

(a) *Incorporation*: the most frequent (and according to many people the most functional) marital model is that in which one partner submits to or incorporates him or herself in the culture of the other partner, almost abandoning or denying his or her own in doing so. A typical case, from the interviews conducted, was the one of a Bulgarian woman married to a Cypriot: they live in Cyprus and she has done her best to integrate herself into the Cypriot culture. Usually, in Cyprus this is the case with most of the East-European female spouses who are Christian Orthodox (same religion with Cypriots), are also proficient in the Greek language and come from similar cultures. In this case, it is the woman who defers to the man’s culture, she moves to his country, in many cases is much younger or may be insecure in her own identity. Even in the most progressive of societies, the main responsibility for the relationship is that of the woman- it is she who is expected to adapt to the man and his culture. It could be argued that the incorporation or integration of one partner into the culture of the other is the best and perhaps only way for the marriage to survive, because it reduces marital conflict. Theoretically speaking, incorporation also gives a clear identity to the children of mixed marriage, making them feel “rooted”. However, one could counter argue that a person is never totally successful at denying or losing his or her ethnic identity through adhering to another. People cannot erase the core of their being and, if they try, often find themselves living with confusion and contradiction. Frequently, a certain resentment for things/cultural identity which have been sacrificed will emerge (perhaps years later).

(b) *Adaptation*: another way mixed couples may handle their cultural differences is through adaptation or compromise. In this kind of arrangement, each partner gives up certain (often important) aspects of his/her culturally bound habits and beliefs to make room for those of the other. The interview findings showed that this was the case with

⁵⁷ The idea of discussing marital models adapted to mixed marriage as conceived in the present study has its sources in the Romano, Dugan’s book *Intercultural Marriage. Promises and Pitfalls*, Intercultural Press, 2001, p.171.
some Western European spouses who are not Christian Orthodox and many times they
accepted religious marriages in the Orthodox Church and also, their children to be
baptised in the Orthodox faith. On the other hand, most of the Cypriot husbands of these
spouses do not speak their native language at home, unless they have children, in which
case they speak Greek only to their children. Theoretically, this is a good solution; it
indicates equality, fairness, flexibility, and openness, all of which are essential to the
success of mixed relationships. There is an adjustment made on part of both, reached by
mutual concessions. However, the adjustment (or sacrifice) made for the sake of
coexistence, satisfies neither partner. Both have won little, but both may have lost a little
too, and sometimes the values or beliefs which have been compromised really mattered
to one or the other of the partners. The parent who never speaks his or her language in
the home may come to feel like an outsider in the family. If this is the case, then no one is
really happy. The sacrifice may be greater than the advantage gained. The issues are
never really resolved but ready to resurface again and again to be renegotiated or argued
over. For the children from these mixed marriages there are issues. They don’t know
where they belong, and they see parents who may simply be avoiding facing what may be
contradictions between the two cultures (or religions). In this case, both spouses can
claim to have done their part toward making the marriage work. If they keep at it long
enough, renegotiating and trying new solutions, they may eventually reach a compromise
satisfying to both.

(c) Agreement: it is considered an ideal mixed marriage model. In this ongoing search of
solutions, neither partner sacrifices anything essential to his or her well-being. If a solution
doesn’t work, or they realise that the sacrifice is too great for one or the other, they try a
different one. These partners have, or develop a solid sense of self, of their own ‘different-
ness’, and of their individual needs, principles, and expectations. They continue searching
for solutions that work for each individually and for both as a unit. Both are (or become)
strong and secure enough in themselves to allow their partners to be different, without
considering it a betrayal or a threat. The agreement-seeking relationship is a win-win
situation in which the issues are worked out until a harmonious resolution is found and
both partners emerge with their dignity intact. It requires creative solutions in which
humour, flexibility, and divergent thinking play an important role. Many times, the spouses
interviewed have responded in ways that accounted for such an agreement-seeking
relationship. This constitutes a topic that suggests the identification of the factors for
success in the mixed marriage relationship (this topic is addressed in the following
section, as well).
Additional Research. The present study aimed at examining the phenomenon of mate selection in mixed marriage between Cypriots and foreigners in Cyprus and at providing a basis for further, more specific research in the domain of mixed marriage, by pinpointing areas meriting supplementary investigations. Additional research on the topic of mixed marriage in Cyprus may be developed drawing on the findings obtained on issues concerning each of the factors influencing mixed marriage: at the individual, group and societal levels. These are some examples:

(a) This study identified factors related to the foreign influence exposure of mixed marriage spouses as influencing foreign spouse selection. More in-depth research should be conducted in this area, to determine to what extent foreign influence exposure factors of mixed married couples influence the quality of the marital relationship.

(b) Another finding of the present inquiry suitable for more in-depth study concerns the influence of group-level factors on mixed marriage, for example, ways in which the Cypriot mother-in-law influences the quality of a mixed marital relationship.

(c) One more topic to be investigated through additional research is that of the children from mixed marriage. The present study has touched on many indirect aspects of their life, as exposed by one of their parents (usually the foreign mother). Future research into children from mixed marriages topics could focus on how they are perceived at school and how they identify themselves as long as the study presented here revealed that their self-identification could be problematic.

(d) Further research that could provide many insights into the mixed marriage phenomenon in Cyprus is the mixed marriage dissolution process; in other words, a complete picture of this phenomenon is not possible without studying mixed marriage spouses’ reasons for divorce. Many other sub-topics regarding the theme of divorce, as identified in this study, could be: the violence in mixed marriage relationship, the experience of foreign spouses dealing with Cypriot Courts that was exposed by many foreign spouse respondents as constituting a real problematic issue.

(e) More insights into the mixed marriage mate selection process are necessary that would examine the motives of Cypriot male spouses involved into mixed marriages (i.e. interviews with Cypriot men married to foreign women). Even if the author took into consideration some accounts given by male Cypriot spouses, they were not expressly envisaged by the empirical research presented here. In this sense, men’s views could clarify aspects related to marital power in mixed relationships in Cyprus.

(f) The mixed marriage dimension of integration could be a further topic to be investigated empirically in relation to non-nationals’ integration in Cypriot society. In this sense, biographical interviews with foreign spouses in mixed marriage can reveal many aspects related to integration, assimilation and acculturation processes. Many sub-topics
related to ‘life in Cyprus as a foreigner’ subject matter merit further research to clarify the above-mentioned aspects; this could help also policy-oriented research in the domain.

(g) Moreover, future research could address the practical implementation of findings about the factors that might contribute to the success of mixed marriage between foreigners and Cypriots in Cyprus. An Australian woman participant suggested to the author the idea of a handbook on marriage between Cypriots and foreigners in Cyprus; in her opinion, such a handbook might help the foreign spouses and not only, to cope with this kind of marital mixed relationship. Some of these factors for success were addressed by the people interviewed, but each of them separately requires a more comprehensive investigation in order to determine their role in the making of mixed marital relationship. Some examples of these factors instrumental for success (as mentioned by the respondents) are: relationship commitment, communication skills, sympathy for each other’s needs, flexibility (being open-minded), respect for other’s culture, positive self-image (a sense of being different), love as the main marital motive, common goals (is tied to common values orientation), sense of humour (needed to confront the tension of any culture-crosser), and spirit of adventure and curiosity (as a predisposition for accepting foreign influence exposure).

Above all the success factors mentioned before, the experience of living with someone from a different culture, perhaps of raising bicultural children, of expanding one’s worldview and the ability to tolerate differences is a success in itself. Mixed married couples of foreigners and Cypriots have chosen a complicated route in life, one which takes more work, more time, more empathy, more patience, sympathy, honesty, more everything. They also have an advantage if they realise this and decide to do their best to make their marriage succeed, never forgetting that in the end they also have the opportunity of gaining more than couples who did not dare to be different.

Contribution to Knowledge. Before moving to discuss this topic, some clarifications are needed concerning the concept of ‘mixed marriage’ and its theoretical construction as being specific to its particular, larger social context (i.e. it is defined in a country-specific context). In this sense, ‘mixed marriage’ is a typical example of a so-called ‘issue expression’ (Philippe et al. 1998) of the social reality; therefore it is very difficult to give an ‘uncontested’ definition of the term ‘mixed marriage’. The studies about mixed couples or marriages are very isolated in sociological literature, and then the phenomenon lacks a strong explanatory theory. Therefore, there is enough room left for the reification of isolated studies with the aim of constructing a sociological theory of the phenomenon.

Taken as a whole, the present study can be said to constitute an original sociological work that contributes to knowledge in this field. Its originality consists in the
way it has approached mate selection in mixed marriage both at the levels of theory and methodology.

At a theoretical level, the present work challenges the classical exchange perspective on mate selection process in the specific case of mixed marriage, proposing as essential an aesthetic sociology’s perspective that relies on the concept of “taste” to explain people’s choices in social interaction. This theoretical proposal about conceptualising two patterns of mixed marriage mate selection in Cyprus is a new one in the field, as evidenced by the literature review. In this sense, the study envisaged both theoretical perspectives (i.e. exchange and taste in mate selection) and the manner in which it has managed to adapt them to the sociological model of individual-group-society levels in mate selection represents also an original framework constructed and employed in this work.

This theoretical framework was necessary for the operationalisation of the concept of “mate selection in mixed marriage” that formed the theoretical ground for the construction of the qualitative and quantitative investigation tools, i.e. the semi-structured interview schedule and the survey questionnaire interview schedule. As there is no prior research on the topic of mate selection on mixed marriage in Cyprus, the hypotheses formulation was based on theory, previous studies in the field and the findings yielded by an analysis of the statistical data on mixed marriage and immigration from Demographic Reports.

The study presented here has an explanatory character, a fact that made necessary the employment of different types of data (i.e. statistical/demographical, quantitative and qualitative) and implicitly the use of a mixed/combined methods approach. This is the first time in the specialised literature (as far as it was possible to ascertain) that a study employs all the previously mentioned types of data. The combined methodological approach suits the theoretical framework constructed in this study and provides three sets of findings that coincide to a great extent: the quantitative findings (from the questionnaire survey at the level of Cypriot public opinion) confirm the qualitative findings (from the interviews conducted with foreign spouses married to Cypriots) and vice versa; also, both quantitative and qualitative sets of findings coincide with results yielded by the analysis of the statistical data on mixed marriages and immigration in Cyprus. This way of “cross-checking” three types of findings (resulted from the mixed-methods approach) also represents an original contribution in the field and a way to validate the whole process of empirical research.

Therefore, even if the methods employed do not constitute an innovation in the field, the manner they were used in the empirical investigation made the course of this research smooth and logical. It is also important to remark that the use of a combined methodology approach is suitable to analyse the small-scale context of Cypriot society and may not be proper for analysing mate selection process in mixed marriage in large societies.
The present work also makes an original contribution to theory by accounting for a factor that was not found in the literature review as having been previously investigated both quantitatively and qualitatively in the same study analysing mate selection. This is the exposure to foreign influence: of Cypriot respondents representing Cypriot public opinion, of foreign spouses married to Cypriots and of Cypriot spouses married to foreigners. Therefore, prior and present exposure to foreign influence of those involved in mixed marriage (and of Cypriot natives representing public opinion) was found to play a key role in mixed marriage mate selection and in the perception of this phenomenon by third parties, in the sense that it enhances favourable attitudes and perceptions of foreign nationals, shortening the social distance Cypriots-foreigners and thus contributing to greater acceptance and tolerance towards foreign nationals.

Moreover, an important contribution of this study could be considered from an action research perspective, as was previously mentioned when referring to the implementation of findings and additional research. To a certain extent, the study has its advantage in fulfilling a pioneering task, as no previous sociological research is available. This is how it has been possible to provide a portrait of the phenomenon under investigation. However, some of the portrait’s features need to be approached separately and studied in more detail and in-depth in order to reach a greater accuracy of the image.
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