



GEITONIES

CITY SURVEY REPORT VIENNA

Josef Kohlbacher

Ursula Reeger

Philipp Schnell

**Institute for Urban and Regional Research
Austrian Academy of Sciences**

October 2010

Contents

- 1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY4**
- 2 INTRODUCTION.....5**
 - 2.1 THE CITY AND THE NEIGHBOURHOODS6
 - 2.1.1 *Migrant population in Vienna*.....6
 - 2.1.2 *The three neighbourhoods*.....10
 - 2.2 TECHNICAL DETAILS ON THE SURVEY15
 - 2.3 BASIC STRUCTURE OF THE SAMPLES IN THE THREE NEIGHBOURHOODS16
- 3 SETTING THE SCENE: PERCEPTIONS OF NEIGHBOURING AND THE NEIGHBOURHOOD.....22**
 - 3.1 GETTING ALONG WITH EACH OTHER: PERCEPTION AND EVALUATION.....22
 - 3.2 WHAT DOES THE NEIGHBOURHOOD AND THE PEOPLE LIVING THERE MEAN TO THE RESPONDENTS?26
 - 3.3 REPUTATION OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD: ASSESSMENT OF OUTSIDE PERCEPTION AND CHANGE OF THE REPUTATION DURING THE LAST YEARS.....32
 - 3.4 ASSESSMENT OF INFRASTRUCTURE34
 - 3.5 TRUST IN THE NEIGHBOURHOOD AND SOCIETY37
 - 3.5.1 *Trust on the neighbourhood level*.....38
 - 3.5.2 *Trust on the general level*.....41
 - 3.5.3 *Correlations between trust on the neighbourhood level and the general level*.....42
 - 3.6 ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE “OTHER” AND XENOPHOBIA43
- 4 DIMENSIONS OF INTERETHNIC COEXISTENCE.....47**
 - 4.1 CONTACTS WITH AND KNOWLEDGE OF PEOPLE IN THE NEIGHBOURHOOD50
 - 4.1.1 *General contacts*50
 - 4.1.2 *Social contacts*53
 - 4.1.3 *Interethnic contacts*57
 - 4.1.4 *Evolution of contacts – contact and quality*.....63
 - 4.2 CONTACTS IN THE WORKPLACE65
 - 4.3 SOCIAL NETWORKS – OVERALL DIMENSION AND ETHNIC COMPOSITION66
 - 4.4 SOCIAL NETWORKS – DIMENSION AND ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF MOST IMPORTANT MEMBERS71
 - 4.5 INTERETHNIC PARTNERSHIPS75
- 5 THE DEVELOPMENT OF INTERETHNIC RELATIONS77**
 - 5.1 CHARACTERISATION OF SOCIAL NETWORKS77
 - 5.1.1 *Characterisation of global social network*77
 - 5.1.2 *Characteristics of social network*84
 - 5.2 THE EVOLUTION OF (INTERETHNIC) CONTACTS.....87
 - 5.2.1 *Basic structures*87
 - 5.2.2 *The evolution of (interethnic) contacts*.....89
 - 5.2.2.1 1st contact after moving into neighbourhood, by neighbourhood and migration background.....90

5.2.2.2	1 st contact after moving into the neighbourhood, by migration background, neighbourhood and place of meeting	92
5.2.2.3	1 st contact after moving into neighbourhood, by migration background and type of contact	96
5.2.2.4	Outlook: The 1 st contacts as a multiplier effect?.....	97
6	EXPLORING “MODES OF COEXISTENCE”	100
6.1	THE MAIN DIMENSIONS OF COEXISTENCE	100
6.2	EXPLORING MODES OF COEXISTENCE – CLUSTER ANALYSIS.....	105
6.3	RESULTS: COMPARING MODES OF COEXISTENCE.....	110
7	CONCLUSION	113
7.1	REFLECTION ON THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS	113
7.2	LESSONS LEARNED: LOCAL AND NATIONAL POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS.....	121
	APPENDIX.....	124
	LIST OF TABLES	134
	LIST OF FIGURES	138
	LIST OF MAPS.....	139
	LITERATURE.....	140

1 Executive Summary

This report provides an overview of the analyses about the patterns of interethnic coexistence in three Viennese neighbourhoods. It starts with general considerations about immigration to Vienna during the last decades and a characterisation of the research areas. Then the sampling methods and the basic structures of the samples are explained in more detail. The main results of our survey are presented in four chapters: “Perceptions of neighbouring and the neighbourhood”, “Dimensions of interethnic coexistence”, “The development of interethnic relations” and “Exploring ‘Modes of coexistence’”.

From the methodical point of view the report starts out from univariate and bivariate analyses and steps forward to Kaplan Meier survival functions which were the basis for our assertions about the evolution of (interethnic) contacts. For the exploration of the “modes of coexistence” which have been the main research focus from the very beginning of the GEITONIES project, factor and cluster analysis were the instruments to provide us with the relevant results.

Now, the most essential outcomes in brief: The neighbourhood effect in the evolution of interethnic contacts (first and second contact after moving into the area) varies across the three compared neighbourhoods. The neighbourhood turns out to be a beneficial place for establishing contacts in AS¹ and LHP but not in the case of LG. Across all three neighbourhoods we found out that immigrants establish contacts faster to other migrants than to people of Austrian origin. Concerning natives we could not detect any difference in the time to establish contacts with people of Austrian or immigrant origin. Only in LHP the differences between the neighbourhood and other spaces were significant: More immigrants established a contact sooner to a person in the neighbourhood compared to other parts of the city or outside Vienna. Both, immigrants and natives, established their first contact faster in the neighbourhood as compared to other places. The only significant result for a second contact could be found in LG. Here, immigrants are slightly more likely to establish a second contact sooner than natives.

Concerning the “modes of coexistence”² we found significant differences between the neighbourhoods. Three clusters were formed according to the degree of social embeddedness (low, medium, high). The majority of people living in LG are medium or highly embedded in their neighbourhood. In the social housing area AS almost the same amount of people are either highly or low embedded. This means that there is a strong contrast between one group who expresses a positive evaluation of living together with their neighbours, have a good knowledge of the people living in the neighbourhood, have a strong attachment to their neighbourhood and a high exchange with people from the neighbourhood, and another group of the same size who shows exactly the opposite pattern. The group of people being “medium embedded” is the smallest when compared to the other two neighbourhoods. In LHP the highly embedded group is the smallest while the other two groups are both almost of the same size. These results remain valid if the migration background is taken into account. Natives and immigrants living in AS are either highly or low embedded in their neighbourhood. In LHP the change is enormous after separating the results by migration background. Immigrants living in LHP show a rather equal

¹ For practical reasons we denominate our neighbourhoods by the following abbreviations: LG = Laudongasse, AS = Am Schöpfwerk and LHP = Ludo-Hartmann-Platz.

² The analyses were based on four relevant dimensions: assessment of and contacts with the people living in the neighbourhood, attachment to the neighbourhood, trust and concrete contacts.

distribution across the three modes. Among the natives only 15 per cent are highly and 85 per cent medium or low embedded. We also compared the outcomes for immigrants and natives across neighbourhoods separately. Immigrants in AS are by far the most embedded. Every second immigrant has a good knowledge of the people and a strong attachment to the neighbourhood. Immigrants in LG and LHP do not differ significantly in the size of the highly embedded cluster.

2 Introduction

There are neighbourhoods in cities where the share of ethnic minorities is very high. Some policymakers perceive this as a problem because it might generate fewer opportunities for these minorities to have contact with natives and thereby hinder their integration. The question, however, is whether the ethnic composition of the neighbourhood influences interethnic contact. Living in ethnically concentrated neighbourhoods is often perceived to hamper contact with natives and thereby integration. The question, however, is whether or not there exists a neighbourhood effect on interethnic contact and integration. Do minority groups from neighbourhoods with a low percentage of natives indeed have less contact with natives *because* they live in these neighbourhoods? In segregated neighbourhoods, the chances of encounters with natives within the neighbourhood are lower, but this does not necessarily mean that minority groups also have less contact with natives in other domains of life, like work, school or leisure time.

This project tries to contribute to the literature by examining interethnic contacts in multiple social and spatial contexts, by studying interethnic contacts from the perspective of both immigrants and natives, by incorporating contacts people have with multiple immigrant groups, and by comparing processes of the development of interethnic contacts across several European cities and certain neighbourhoods in these cities. It investigates to what extent interethnic contacts are a function of structural opportunities for interethnic contact, people's preferences for someone who is culturally and economically similar, and the activities of third parties who hamper or promote social contacts between members of different ethnic groups.

This study is concerned with the question of whether the ethnic make-up of a neighbourhood determines the interethnic relations within that neighbourhood, both in terms of how people *interact* and how they *think* about each other. The study therefore includes both a behavioural component (actual contact) and an attitudinal component (mutual perceptions). The aim is to explore the mutual nature of these relations: not only the contacts that migrants maintain with the indigenous Austrian population, but also the extent to which native citizens have contact with migrants. The same applies for perceptions: we are interested both in how migrants perceive the indigenous people, and vice versa. The study also explores the contacts between members of different immigrant groups, and the perceptions that these groups have of each other. This is important, because neighbourhoods with high concentrations of ethnic minority residents ("concentration neighbourhoods") are in most cases multi-ethnic, with many different groups living together. This makes it all the more important to investigate how all these different groups coexist and what they think about each other. The questions raised here impinge on the research findings published some time ago by the American political scientist Robert Putnam. His assertion is not only that the focus on other ethnic groups declines in ethnically diverse neighbourhoods, but also that people in these neighbourhoods have less trust, willingness to help and contact within their own ethnic group.

This study seeks to provide some clarity about the status of interethnic relations in various neighbourhoods and on whether mixing population groups contributes to an improvement in