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Abstract

Greek Orthodox Christian Faith (GOCF) and religiosity are scrutinized herein as they ascribe to various psychosocial variables including age, socioeconomic status, educational level, traditional family orientation, parish sympathy, child abuse predisposition, shame, optimism, depression, alcoholism, and suicidal ideation. The study analyzes data from two distinct research projects: (1) a 2013-14 study of immigration in Australia with Greek Australians (n=123); and (2) a 2014 study on unemployment in Cyprus with Greek Cypriots (n=120). It is concluded that GOCF and religiosity are relative to parish sympathy, age, socioeconomic status, educational level, and identification with extended family but they are not in any way akin to child abuse intent, shame, optimism, or depression. Respondents also seem to favor a catalyst role of the Greek Orthodox Church in championing social justice undertakings. Limitations and implications of the findings and some future research priorities are spelled out.
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Religiosity is a vital component in comprehending human behavior (Hargrove, 2008). This plea is decidedly entrenched in the Greek cultural context. Today, the vast majority of Greeks (98%) affiliate with the Greek Orthodox Christian Church (Central Intelligence Agency-The World Fact Book, 2014) and tend to practice essential religious rituals (Fouka et al. 2012). The recent financial collapse of both Greece and Cyprus has resulted in heightened unemployment (Eurostat, 2014; Madianos et al., 2014), immigration to other countries (Madianos et al., 2014), and a public rediscovery of religion (Begzos, 2014). In this regard, religiousness has been found to operate as a protective factor against the adverse effects of various stressors (Pargament & Cummings, 2010) including unemployment (Shams & Jackson, 1993) and immigration (Mazumdar & Mazumdar, 2009).
Studies Associated with Greek Religiosity

In the US context, Crea (2012) found that Greek American church attendance was positively associated with greater children’s involvement in church and greater overall attention paid to faith practices. However, in this study individuals with higher stress did not participate as much in church unless they actually felt the presence of parish support. Crea (2012) also pointed out that even though Greek parishes were supportive for stressors such as death in the family, illness, or the birth of a child, they were not very beneficial for the stress associated with taking care of an elder parent or depression.

Lewis et al. (2012) examined Greek Orthodox churchgoers in London and inferred that they tended to be introvert and have a preference for structure and discipline in their lives. Moreover, Greek women appeared to be more thinkers than the general population in this study. Recently, Stefanaki and colleagues (2014) found in a rural Greek sample a strong positive correlation between religiosity and a sense of coherence which seem to be aligned with Lewis et al.’s (2012) findings. Similarly, Youtika (1999) studied a Greek Orthodox sample and found that religiosity was associated with lower psychoticism in men but not in women even after controlling for social desirability bias. In another study with Greek parishioners, Petropoulos (1979) found a weak correlation between GOCF and education.

The Generic International Literature on Religiosity

The general literature on religion has linked religiousness to manifold positive mental health outcomes (Moreira-Almeida et al., 2006). Religiousness has stress-buffering effects perhaps considering that people believe that God helps the faithful (Maltby & Day, 2003). Smith et al. (2003) and Lechner et al. (2013) found a negative correlation between religiousness and depression and Maniam et al. (2013) reported that religiousness is a reliable predictor for suicide prevention. Religiosity can be an integral therapeutic element in alcohol treatment (Delaney et al., 2009) and often shelters against nearly most substance abuse (Moscati & Mezuk, 2014).

Along similar lines, Thompson et al. (2012) link religiosity to higher self-esteem for both White and African-Americans and Myers (2000) reports that churchgoers are more optimistic about life while Hill (2010) unravels a close alliance between religiousness and social support. Stavrova et al. (2013) remind us that each country is different, and that religious people are happier and experience more life satisfaction in countries where religion is highly respected.

Lichter and Carmalt (2009) propose that shared faith practices strengthen marital quality. What’s more, for low-income single parent minority families, religious participation has been associated with positive parenting practices (Mahoney, 2010). On the downside, religiosity tends to be negatively associated with socioeconomic status (Brandt & Henry, 2012) and could in some
circumstances tie in with increased child abuse risk (Dyslin & Thomsen 2005). The latter evidence is equivocal, however, as other studies found that religiosity is negatively associated with child maltreatment (Reinert & Edwards, 2009).

Moreover, in the context of India, Aleem and Jaan (2011) did not find religiosity to shield against suicidal ideation. On the contrary, Sisak et al. (2010) found that subjective religiosity may defend against suicidal behaviors in particular cultures and Domino and Miller (1992) found that religious individuals saw suicide as unjustified, sinful, and associated with mental illness. Recently, Hoffman and Marsiglia (2014) in the study in central Mexico provided strong evidence that religiosity prevents suicide ideation.

Manning (2013) analyzes how religiosity predicts resilience in late life. Barry and Abo-Zena (2014) using psychological development theories advance the claim that religiosity increases with age and that it is challenged during emerging adulthood. In a time series study between 1980-1992, Argue et al. (1999) interviewed 1,339 adults on three different occasions and concluded that religiosity increases with age. On the other hand, Flere and Kirbis (2009) found that new age religion associated with the young generation is not only relative to religiosity but rather it associates very strongly with traditional religion.

Relevant Socio-Psychological Theories on Religiosity

According to structural functionalism theory (Parsons, 1975), society socializes its members into religion so that it can mold their personalities, promulgate moral limits on human behavior, and thus achieve and maintain order, harmony, and control. Instead, viewing it from a human need lens, rational choice theory (Stark, 1997) purports that people have an intrinsic, inevitable drive to have faith in the existence of a beneficial supernatural power that can control their quality of life and provide rewards as well as continue life after death. Similarly, Norris and Inglehart (2004) advance the insecurity theory claiming that individuals often turn to religion when confronted with various uncertainties in life. In parallel, social exchange theory (Homans, 1961) asserts that people may be more prone to religion and church attendance when the rewards linked to religious involvement outweigh the costs. Finally, attachment theory (Bowlby, 1960) argues that the quality of bond/attachment formed between an infant and his/her caregiver may streamline personality and future relationships later on in life. As such, people may flourish safer attachments to God if their earlier attachments to their caregivers were safe and secure.

Research Scope & Hypotheses

This paper is predicated upon data from two distinct studies recently implemented with Greek samples: (1) a study on Greek immigrants in Australia conducted in December 2013-January 2014; and (2) a study on unemployment in Cyprus with Greek Cypriots completed in the Summer of 2014.
Very little is known about the psychosocial impact of GOCF on Greeks in general and vulnerable Greek subpopulations such as Greek immigrants and unemployed individuals, in particular. In reference to Greek parishioners, Crea (2012) notes, “little research appears to address how life stressors impact religious involvement” (p. 227). Moreover, according to Crea (2012), to date few studies have assessed perceived church support among parishioners in the Greek Orthodox Church (Crea, 2012). Moreover, Krindatch (2008) found that the most important issue facing the contemporary Greek Orthodox Church is the issue of youth and young adults leaving the church and calls urgently for further research to check up this affair.

Given the foregoing empirical lacuna in the literature and in an effort to comprehend better within the Greek Orthodox context the relationship between priest sympathy and church attendance, as well as the impact of age, educational level, and socioeconomic status on GOCF, the repercussions of GOCF for child abuse tendencies, depression, shame, optimism, alcoholism, and suicidal ideation in adversity, and the expected role of the church in ameliorating social injustice, the following eight hypotheses were investigated herein:

1. Greeks are more likely to attend church if they like their priest;
2. Older Greeks attend church more, like their priest more, and have stronger GOCF;
3. Greeks who attend church more and like their priest more tend to be closer to their extended family because they are more traditional;
4. Greeks of lower socioeconomic status and education tend to attend church more, like their priest more, and have stronger GOCF because they may have more insecurities;
5. Greeks who like their priest more and attend church more are less likely to abuse their children and suffer from depression;
6. Greeks with higher GOCF are less likely to engage in suicidal ideation and alcoholism during adversity;
7. Greeks with higher GOCF experience less shame and more optimism in adversity; and
8. The Greek unemployed will expect the Greek Orthodox Church to have a catalyst role in deflating unemployment and curtailing social injustice.

**Method**

Both studies were pre-approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of the University of North Carolina at Pembroke (UNCP). The first study was supported by a travel fund from the UNCP College of Arts & Sciences while the second by a UNCP Summer Research Fellowship Grant.
Study 1 Sampling Strategy: The Immigration Study in Australia with Greek Australians

Respondents were identified in four Australian cities, were all adults of Greek origin, and had to have lived in Australia for at least one year. Some respondents completed surveys left at a church, Greek restaurants, and a Greek doctor’s office and returned to a designated box or to a designated person and others selected by word of mouth were approached in person and kindly requested to complete the survey after being read informed consent information. From hundred fifty surveys handed out thirty-four were completed and returned resulting in a response rate of .23. To increase the sample size, the snowball method was applied. In this regard, the researcher collected contact information for Greek individuals in the community and called them to request their participation in this study kindly. The latter individuals were given the survey over the phone and fifty-seven out of sixty-three of these individuals agreed to do the study producing a response rate of .90. Some people who did not speak very good English and had vision difficulties were interviewed in person in the Greek language, and the researcher transcribed their responses. Thirty-four such individuals were contacted, and thirty-two consented generating a response rate of .94. In sum, two hundred forty-seven persons were summoned to complete the research and one-hundred twenty-three individuals did so culminating in an overall response rate for the study of .50.

Study 1 Data Collection Procedure

Appendix 1 shows the survey used for the study which was also used in the phone and personal interviews. It took respondents anywhere from about 10 minutes to about half an hour to do both the phone and personal interviews. The completed written surveys were returned either in designated boxes or to designated individuals who then returned them to the researcher.

Data Analysis Procedure

All quantitative data analyses were completed on SPSS. To describe the sample, descriptive statistics were computed. To examine various relationships between variables of interest, Pearson correlations were run for interval scale data, Spearman correlations for ordinal scale data and Chi-Square analyses for categorical variables. Qualitative data were typed into a word file and subsequently categorized into emerging themes; frequencies and percentages for each theme were calculated.
Study 1 Data Analysis Procedure

Quantitative data were entered into an SPSS file and subsequently descriptive and correlation analyses were performed. Qualitative data were typed verbatim into a word file and classified into emerging themes with frequencies and percentages counted for each surfacing theme.

Study 2 Sampling Strategy: The Unemployment Study in Cyprus with Greek Cypriots

For this study, unemployed Greek-Cypriot adults were identified by calling randomly selected phone numbers from the District Nicosia telephone directory or through the snowball method. Specifically, all pages in the directory were numbered, and a page was randomly chosen from www.random.org setting as requested range the number one to the total number of pages. All listings on the chosen page were numbered and once again a random number was drawn to nominate the household contacted. This procedure was repeated until the desired number of respondents was reached but proved to be quite strenuous. Still, a total of 104 unemployed persons were spotted this way of whom 76 consented to study participation. All persons called in association with additional contacts the researcher had in Nicosia helped single out another 63 unemployed individuals in the community with phone numbers. From this group, 44 persons agreed to participation. Altogether, 167 unemployed individuals were summoned to the research of whom 120 individuals conceded. The eventual response rate of this study was .72. Importantly, it is likely that during the screening process some unemployed individuals hid their unemployment status out of embarrassment and because they did not wish to participate in the study. In the event this speculation is true, the authentic response of the study could have been lower.

Data Collection Procedure

Data were collected by an original structure phone interview (see Appendix 2). The researcher designed the interview based on a literature review on unemployment. The initial interview contained twenty questions. However, following a pilot test with three prospective respondents, another question inquiring about the age of respondents was added. Phone interviews were completed in the Summer 2014 between 10 am and 12 pm and between 5 pm and 8 pm throughout the week except Sundays and it took respondents anywhere between 5 and 12 minutes to respond to all questions with the lengthiest interview being 22 minutes.

When called, respondents were first read an introductory statement clarifying how they were spotted, emphasizing that they had the right to refuse participation, and how all data would be protected to guarantee confidentiality. They were also given the right to pass up any questions
that made them uncomfortable and to exit the study at any point in the interview if they desired to do so. They were also alerted to the fact that the researcher was in a position to make referrals to local psychological support services if they felt the need for them either during or after the interview.

Data Analysis Procedure

All quantitative data were posted in an SPSS file, and afterward various descriptive and correlation analyses were performed. Qualitative data were all entered verbatim in a word file and were subsequently subject to content analysis. Qualitative data were reviewed by the researcher and a volunteer for emerging themes, and subsequently frequencies and percentages for each theme were calculated separately and then compared for accuracy and mutual agreement.

Results

The Immigration Study

Table 1 shows the socio-demographic attributes of the Greek Australian sample surveyed. As can be seen, it included 64 women and 58 men. Most respondents were first-generation immigrants; some were second-generation and very few were third generation. None was of low socioeconomic status with most considering themselves to be middle class. Most respondents were married (39%), divorced (18%) or widowed (16%), one fifth was single, and about one tenth in a serious non-marital relationship.
Table 1: Basic Sample Socio-Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Social Class (N/%)</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Middle Class</th>
<th>Rich</th>
<th>Very Rich</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38 (59%)</td>
<td>25 (39%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men*</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48 (83%)</td>
<td>9 (16%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>86 (71%)</td>
<td>34 (28%)</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Immigration Generation (N/%)</th>
<th>First Generation</th>
<th>Second Generation</th>
<th>Third Generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>36 (56%)</td>
<td>21 (33%)</td>
<td>7 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>42 (71%)</td>
<td>15 (23%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78 (63%)</td>
<td>36 (29%)</td>
<td>9 (7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status (N/%)</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>In a Relationship</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Divorced/Separated</th>
<th>Widowed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women**</td>
<td>8 (11%)</td>
<td>6 (10%)</td>
<td>17 (28%)</td>
<td>18 (30%)</td>
<td>12 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men***</td>
<td>16 (28%)</td>
<td>3 (5%)</td>
<td>29 (50%)</td>
<td>3 (5%)</td>
<td>7 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24 (20%)</td>
<td>9 (8%)</td>
<td>46 (39%)</td>
<td>21 (18%)</td>
<td>19 (16%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*men’s social class=1 missing data; **women’s marital status=3 missing data; ***men’s marital status=1 missing data.

Table 2 displays correlations between Church Attendance Frequency (CAF) and Priest Perception (PP) and between each of the foregoing and age, closeness to extended family, SES, child abuse risk, and depression. As can be seen, a very high positive correlation was found between PP and CAF. CAF also had very strong positive correlations with age and closeness to extended family and correlated negatively with SES. PP also had strong positive correlations with age and closeness to extended family and correlated negatively with SES. Neither CAF nor PP correlated in any way with child abuse risk and depression.

Table 2: Correlations between CAF and PP with Basic Socio-Demographic Variables and Other Dispositions and Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CAF</th>
<th>PP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priest Perception</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness to Extended Family</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Status (SES)</td>
<td>-.25** (Spearman)</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Abuse Risk</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*<.05, **<.01
The Unemployment Study

Table 3 exhibits the socio-demographic qualities of the sample linked to the unemployment research in Cyprus. As can be seen, the average age of these respondents was 42 years (SD=11.27, R=21-63 yrs) with two-thirds of respondents being above age 35 and 56% women. Nine out of every ten respondents had at least high school education, half claimed to be in dire straits, half were single, and on average respondents had at least 2 children.

Table 3: Basic Socio-Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>M (yrs)</th>
<th>SD (yrs)</th>
<th>Range(yrs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>11.27</td>
<td>21-63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group (yrs)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-63</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary Education and Beyond</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socioeconomic Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediocre</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married (engaged or in a serious relationship)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single (or divorced/separated or widowed)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0-5 children</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 reveals correlations between Christian Faith Strength (CFS) and age, education, SES, shame, optimism, suicidal ideation, and optimism. As can be seen, CFS had a very negative correlation with suicidal ideation, alcoholism, and age, and correlated positively with education and SES. CFS did not correlate significantly with optimism and shame.

Table 4: Correlations Between Christian Faith Strength and Basic Socio-Demographic Variables and Certain Unemployment-Related Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Christian Faith Strength (CFS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suicidal Ideation</td>
<td>-.80**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcoholism</td>
<td>-.60**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.43**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Status (SES)</td>
<td>.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shame</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimism</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*<.05, ** <.01

Lastly, Table 5 poses the chief church-related solutions to unemployment espoused by respondents. As can be seen, tangible/monetary support to needy unemployed families topped the list followed by outreach to strengthen the unemployed person’s spirituality, advocacy to sway government to enact more humanistic policies, and inception of new jobs.

Table 5: Church-Related Solutions to Unemployment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Church Solutions</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investment of Part of its Vast Available Wealth to Support the Unemployed and their Families</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritually Strengthen/Reach out to the Unemployed</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocate for More Humanistic Governmental Policies for the Unemployed</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create New Jobs for the Unemployed</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote Public Education Campaign to Dispel Myths/Stereotypes about the Unemployed</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

Hypothesis 1: Greeks are more likely to attend church if they like their priest.

The present data buttress this hypothesis. Greeks who liked their priest tended to attend church much more often than those who did not. This finding is in line with Crea’s (2012) observation with Greek Americans that those who perceived more parish support were the ones to attend church during stress peak times. The positive correlation between parish liking and church attendance is also corroborated by previous research with Catholics (Plante & Boccaccini, 1997).

Hypothesis 2: Older Greeks attend church and like their priest more, and have stronger GOCF.

The first study concludes a strong positive correlation between age and church attendance and age and the liking of the priest. This could be because the priests tended to be older having perhaps more in common with the older respondents. Older respondents may also seek out the church more as they battle more end of life insecurities. In this regard, this finding may support insecurity theory (Norris & Inglehart, 2004). It also corroborates Barry and Abo-Zena’s (2014) claims and Argue et al.’s (1999) evidence on the positive relationship between age and religiosity.

However, the second study does not support the age hypothesis. Instead, it detects a negative correlation between age and religiosity. Nevertheless, this latter finding must be interpreted with caution as the second study’s focus was on unemployment. It may be that older unemployed people have spent longer periods in unemployment, and this may have dwindled their GOCF. This result may therefore not be descriptive of the general population of older Greeks. Still, this study lends support to Flere and Kirbis’s (2009) deduction that new age is not necessarily foreign to religiosity or traditional religion.

Hypothesis 3: Greeks who attend church more and like their priest more tend to be closer to their extended family because they are more traditional.

The third hypothesis is supported by these data. Greeks with traditional Greek family values including affinity to the extended family tend to display higher GOCF and more church attendance. This evidence may ally with the generational impact on religiosity among immigrants with first generation immigrants being more religious and adhering more to traditional family values than second or third generation immigrants (Harris & Verven, 1998; McAndrew & Voas, 2014).
Hypothesis 4: Greeks of lower socioeconomic status and educational level tend to attend church more, like their priest more and have stronger GOCF.

The fourth hypothesis is partially supported by the data. Specifically, in the first study socioeconomic status was negatively correlated with both church attendance and sympathy towards priests. This supports previous research (Brandt & Henry, 2012). However, the second study negates these findings by concluding a strong positive correlation between socioeconomic status and GOCF as well as between education and GOCF. The latter finding negates Petropoulos’s (1979) evidence of no correlation between Greek religiosity and education. Given the ambiguity of the relationship between socioeconomic status and GOCF and educational level and GOCF, future research will need to shed more light on these associations.

Hypothesis 5: Greeks who like their priest more and attend church more are less likely to abuse their children and suffer from depression.

The current data do not support this hypothesis as religiosity in this study was found to correlate neither with child abuse tendencies nor depression. As such, the current data refute previous research on the connection between religiosity and child maltreatment (Dyslin & Thomsen 2005; Reinert & Edwards, 2009) and between religiosity and a decrease in depression (Lechner et al., 2013). The study’s finding on depression may confirm Crea’s (2012) observation that Greek parishioners do not usually receive needed support from parishes for their depression.

Hypothesis 6: Greeks with higher GOFC are less likely to engage in suicidal ideation and alcoholism during adversity.

The data very affirmatively endorsed the hypothesis. The second study revealed a very strong negative correlation between both religiosity and suicidal ideation and religiosity and alcoholism. These observations are in compliance with former evidence pinpointing religiosity as a strong predictor of suicide prevention (Maniam et al., 2013), substance abuse prevention (Moscati & Mezuk, 2014) and alcohol treatment (Delaney et al., 2009).

Hypothesis 7: Greeks with higher GOFC experience less shame and more optimism in adversity.

Contrary to expectation, Greeks with stronger GOFC did not demonstrate less shame or more optimism when faced with the adversity of unemployment compared to other unemployed Greeks. This finding may be in antithesis with evidence suggesting that religiosity is associated with more optimism and psychological stability (Myers, 2000) and resilience (Manning, 2013).
Hypothesis 8: The unemployed will expect the Greek Orthodox Church to have a catalyst role in deflating unemployment and curtailing social injustice.

This hypothesis was sharply held up by the data. Specifically, the respondents saw the Greek Orthodox Church as having a crucial role in supporting the unemployed and championing their causes. Respondents wished that the seeming affluence of the Greek Orthodox Church be generously translated into tangible support for the unemployed and their families and that the Church creates jobs for the unemployed, helps reconnect them to their spirituality, and exerts paramount pressure on the government to launch more humanistic policies that curb unemployment and advance social justice.

Study Shortcomings

Both studies had relatively small samples. The first study relied exclusively on a convenience sample and the second on a partially randomized sample. This implies that the external validity of these findings may be quite limited. They were also threats to the internal validity of the findings as standardized measures were not employed. Another threat to internal validity in both studies is social desirability bias due to the self-report nature of the data which was not controlled.

Conclusion

The study of religiosity as it relates to cultural dynamics and psychosocial dispositions, trends, and outcomes appears to be in its infancy. Some of the findings appear equivocal and much extrapolation is called for as there are not many studies that address various psychosocial constructs and outcomes in specific cultural contexts relative to specific religious practices and traditions. As Crea (2012) remind us, very little is known about the impact of religiosity on Greeks and best practices that parishes and churches may employ to draw in Greek parishioners as well as empower them in hard times. The present study confirms some of the stress-buffering effects and resiliency outcomes of the Greek religiosity but remains silent about others. Future research needs to explore further the associations reviewed herein as well as best practices that churches can employ to reinvigorate faith, magnetize new parishioners, and provide the necessary supports so that the latter can lead happy, meaningful lives and remain resilient during adversity.
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Appendices

Appendix 1. Research Questionnaire/Interview used for all Data Collection

Hi, my name is Dr. Savvas Georgiades. I’m a social work professor at an American University interested in the history, experiences, and opinions of Greek Australians. Completing this survey, which usually takes about 10 minutes, indicates that you provide consent to participate in this voluntary study. You can skip any question you feel uncomfortable answering. The study results will be summarized and may be anonymously published and/or shown online. Confidentiality for all the information you share in this survey is guaranteed; all surveys will be kept locked in my desk and destroyed once the data have been analyzed. Please do not write your name anywhere on here.

1. When did you or your family move to Australia? _________
2. Who moved first to Australia? (please circle one)
   - Myself
   - My Parents
   - My Grandparents
   - My Great Grandparents
3. What do you consider yourself more to be? (please circle one)
   - Australian
   - Greek
   - Other (please explain)______________
4. What is the nationality of your significant other (e.g., husband, wife, boyfriend, girlfriend)? (please circle one)
   - Greek
   - Australian
   - Other ____________ (please explain)
5. How often do you go back to Greece (or Cyprus)? (Please circle one)
   - Every year
   - Every 2 to 4 years
   - Every 5 to 8 years
   - Every 9 to 15 years
   - Less than once every 16 years
   - Never
6. To what extent do you maintain Greek customs in your family?
   - A lot
   - Somewhat
   - Very Little
   - Not at all
7. How often do you go to the Greek Orthodox Church?
   - Very Often
   - Often
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never
8. How helpful do you find the priest of your church to be? (please circle one)
   - Very Helpful
   - Helpful
   - Not very Helpful
   - Not at all Helpful
   - Non-applicable
9. Overall, how close are you to your extended family which lives in Australia? (cousins, aunts, etc)
   - Very close
   - Close
   - A little close
   - Not at all close
   - Non-applicable
10. Have you ever been helped by a social worker and/or a psychological counselor in the past?
    - Yes
    - No
11. If you were to be helped by a social worker and/or a psychological counselor, how would you like them to treat you? Please describe in detail how a social worker would ideally treat you?
12. How much do you trust social workers in Australia? (please circle one)
   A lot       Somewhat       Very Little       Not at all
13. To what extent do you believe children should be disciplined through spanking?
   A lot       Somewhat       Very Little       Not at all

14. When people age and need care where do you think they should be best taken care of?
   (please circle one on next page)
   In their own home       With relatives       In Nursing Homes
15. How much do you trust the police in Australia? (please circle one)
   A lot       Somewhat       Very Little       Not at all
16. How safe do you feel it is to live in Australia? (please circle one)
   A lot       Somewhat       Very Little       Not at all
17. Have you ever been a victim of physical violence in Australia? (please circle one)
   No       Yes
   If yes, by whom? __________________________________________(please explain)
18. As an immigrant in Australia, if applicable, what were the biggest adjustment challenges
   that you faced?

______________________________________________________________________________

19. Have you ever been convicted of any crime in Australia?
   If yes, what crime? ________________ When? ______
20. How easy is it in Australia for someone to improve his/her financial situation if he/she
   works hard? (please circle one)
   Very Easy    Easy    Not very easy    Not easy at all
21. How often did you feel depressed in the last year?
   Very Often    Often    Sometimes    Rarely    Never
   If applicable, what caused you to be depressed?

______________________________________________________________________________

22. What are the things you are proud of in the Greek Culture, if any?

______________________________________________________________________________

23. What are the things you are ashamed of in the Greek Culture, if any?
24. How would you describe your financial situation?
   Very Rich    Rich    Average    Poor    Very Poor
25. What is your gender? (please circle one)    Male    Female
26. What is your age? __________
27. What is your marital status?    (please circle one)
   Married    In a relationship    Single    Divorced    Widow/er

Thank you for participating in this study, all the best!
Appendix 2. The Interview Protocol Used to Collect Data in the Unemployment Study in Cyprus

Hello, I am social work professor at an American University and I’m conducting a study to evaluate the psychosocial impact of unemployment in Cyprus. Are you or any other adult above age 18 in your household currently unemployed and has been so for at least a month? (If yes): (As I stated earlier ) I am conducting a study on unemployment and I am hoping to generate findings that may be useful to the Cyprus Government in clarifying the psychosocial impact of unemployment so that hopefully more supportive services can be put in place for the unemployed. The phone interview takes about 10 minutes to complete and all information you share will be maintained strictly confidential. Even though parts of your answers may be published, there will be no identifying information that will personally relate you to the information published. You have the right to avoid answering any question by asking me to move on to the next one. All data will be kept locked in a cabinet and will be destroyed as soon as they are analyzed. If at any point during the interview you wish a referral to a psychological support center, please advise me accordingly and I will give you a couple of local numbers. Moreover, if you wish to know the results of this study you can contact me in about a year at an email that I can provide to you at the end of the interview. Would you like to participate in this study?

1. How long have you been unemployed?
2. How do you cope with your unemployment?
3. Have you received any government assistance? If yes, what help did you receive? How good was the quality of the help you received? Please explain.
4. Have you received any other assistance, other than from the government? If so, what type of help and by whom? How good was the quality of the help you received? Please explain.
5. How does your unemployment impact you and the rest of your family? Please explain.
6. Do you feel shame to be unemployed? Please explain.
7. What do you think the government needs to do to help the unemployed in Cyprus? Please explain.
8. What do you think society in general needs to do to help the unemployed? Please explain.
9. Any other suggestions that you have for lessening and/or eradicating the problem of unemployment in Cyprus?
10. How optimistic are you about life in general? Please explain.
11. Have you thought about immigrating to another country? Please explain.
12. Do you use alcohol or drugs? If yes, when did you start using alcohol and drugs?
13. Have you ever thought about harming yourself or anyone else because of your unemployment? If yes, how serious were these thoughts? Please explain.
14. Are you Greek Orthodox? If yes (go to question 8, if no go to question 9)
15. How strong is your Christian Faith?
   Weak   Average   Strong
16. Gender?
17. Age?
18. What is your marital status?
19. Do you have children? If yes, how many?
20. What is the highest level of formal education that you have achieved?
21. How would you describe yourself?
   Poor   Middle Class   Rich
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