

durch wohnungsmarktwirtschaftlichen Druck vermindert und in manchen Fällen sogar zur Gänze aufgelöst. Maßnahmen auf Seiten des Bezirks, also der Stadtregion, erleichtern es einzelnen Häusern, sich vom Stigma des Ausländerhauses zu befreien, wobei die Attraktivitätssteigerung des Bezirks als Wohnstandort eine wesentliche Rolle spielt und im Gefolge baulicher Aufwertungen auch Prozesse der Gentrification in Gang gesetzt werden können. Diese Prozesse spielen sich sowohl auf der kleinräumigen (Haus-) Ebene als auch im großräumigeren Kontext (baublock-, viertels- und bezirksbezogen) ab.

9. Die privaten Haushalten können in Orientierung an Rentabilitätskriterien für die in ihrem Eigentum befindlichen Wohnhäuser einen grundlegenden Paradigmenwechsel einleiten. Dieser Wechsel spielt sich in Form eines Übergangs von Einkünften aus der Vermietung an Zuwanderer zur baulichen Sanierung und Aufwertung ab. Sodann erfolgt die Vermietung der aufgewerteten Wohneinheiten an neue Nutzergruppen, wie junge, berufstätige Inländer, Mittelschicht- oder Elitemigranten. Die verbreitete Regelmäßigkeit „einmal Ausländerhaus – immer Ausländerhaus“ besitzt insbesondere in den Wiener Arbeiterbezirken ihre Gültigkeit. Sie wird räumlich nur dort durchbrochen, wo sich im großräumigeren Kontext, etwa auf Bezirksebene, positive Veränderungen in Form von baulichen Aufwertungen und wirtschaftlicher Belebung ergeben.

10. Generell sind die Möglichkeiten der Stabilisierung benachteiligter Häuser und Stadtteile mit hohen Anteilen immigrierter Wohnbevölkerung durch die kommunale Wohnungspolitik limitiert, da die Entscheidungsspielräume von privaten Hauseigentümern nur begrenzt beeinflusst werden können. In Wien besteht aber in Form der gelenkten Vergabe des großen Bestandes an Kommunalwohnungen ein im Vergleich zu anderen europäischen Metropolen größerer Spielraum der Stadt zur Einflussnahme auf urbane Segregationsmuster. Eine Kombination von Sanierungsmaßnahmen des Altbaubestandes (vor allem in den traditionellen Wiener „Arbeiterbezirken“ mit niedrigem Sozialprestige) mit dem Wohnungsneubau sowie mit Programmen der integrierten Stadtentwicklung ist in Wien vorhanden und dürfte die Stabilisierungsstrategie der ersten Wahl sein. Im Verbund mit wirtschafts- und arbeitsmarktbezogenen Maßnahmen könnte auf diese Weise auch eine Imageverbesserung der traditionellen Gastarbeiterbezirke erreicht werden.

4 Summary

Our research project analyzed the changes in the residential distribution of the migrant population from former Yugoslavia in the urban space of Vienna between 1981 and 2005. 750 questionnaires of the 1981-survey of E. Lichtenberger were available in the archive of the Institute for Urban and Regional Research. Because of comparability reasons it was possible to include 696 buildings in the recent analyses. Our sample consisted of the housing stock in all districts of Vienna in which one or more Yugo-

slavian “guest worker” households were living. In 1981 the sampling was done on the basis of data available from Immigration Police authorities. In accordance with the residential distribution of the former Yugoslavian guest worker population in Vienna the working-class districts compared with the cottage-districts are sharply overrepresented. With a proportion of 10.6% (74 buildings) Ottakring is dominating our sample. Our findings are ambivalent, though – and these are the good news – extensive migrant ghettos are not existing in Vienna. The bad news is that obviously the guest worker districts of 1981 could not improve their image basically during the last two and a half decades. The “migrants’ houses” in our sample showed a high degree of persistency with respect to their condition of repair and their tenant structure. Now, the main results as follows:

1. The maps on the basis of census 2001 data are showing that the migrants from former Yugoslavia all in all still remained true to “their” traditional guest worker districts. For the Croats, Serbs and Bosnians as the major ethno-national groups the map-based analyses showed stable tendencies of residential concentration in certain districts and statistical areas. In modest proportions households from former Yugoslavia have also settled down in Floridsdorf and Donaustadt and in the South of Vienna during recent years. These phenomena of concentration can be observed since the era of guest worker immigration and can be interpreted as indicators of ethnic segregation, a long-lasting exclusion of immigrants from certain segments of the Viennese housing market (e.g. communal housing) and some extent of economic marginalization. In Vienna as in other European metropolises this “underclass” component of immigration must settle in less attractive quarters of the city, as the alternative housing market possibilities in most segments are confined because of economic reasons. A recent trend of the spatial distribution of the foreign population in Cities of Germany and Switzerland can only be observed marginally in Vienna: Here the immigrants still concentrate in the districts in the south and west of the “belt”. In the German-speaking neighbouring countries an out-migration into the peripheral housing estates of the 1960ies and 1970ies can be observed.

2. The spatial analysis of the condition of repair (with the condition of the façades and of the rendering in the corridors as indicators) showed clear district-related variations. This result has to be interpreted in a connection with the district’s status as a “bourgeois” or “working-class” residential area. Most houses with ameliorated house-fronts and entrance halls can be found in the better-off districts, e.g. the inner city, followed by the well-to-do districts Wieden, Döbling, Landstraße and Hietzing. Though in traditional guest worker districts too some house-owners invested in the preservation of the frontage the general condition of repair of the houses situated there is worse. Thus, the status of the districts is obviously playing an important role.

3. Our 2005 survey proved that considerable deteriorations concerning the condition of repair of the houses (the house-fronts and the inner courtyards) took place since 1981. 2005 a significantly lower percentage (46%) of the façades than 1981 could be classified as completely kept in order. During the last 25 years there was a

sharp increase in the proportion of partially damaged façades. Concerning the condition of the entrance halls in 2005 only 37.5% could be classified as completely kept in order. This proportion was 8.2% lower than 1981. The proportion of partially damaged façades grew sharply. The presence of badly damaged corridors was more than one fifth of the sample of 2005 which means that it almost doubled since 1981. The condition of repair of the inner courtyards was worsening too. 2005 almost two out of three courtyards were partially damaged.

4. The spatial distribution of the buildings, differentiated according to four categories of the condition of repair shows that the completely renovated buildings are concentrated in the inner districts but can also be found at the northern and southern periphery of the city. Heavily damaged buildings are concentrated in the classical guest worker quarters of Ottakring, Hernals Rudolfshheim-Fünfhaus, Meidling and Favoriten, but can also be found in Leopoldstadt and in Brigittenau. Once again the renovation activities mirror a distinct spatial pattern. Completely renovated buildings are concentrated in the bourgeois inner districts in the South and Southwest of the Viennese city space. In the building-stock, which is situated in the working-class districts outside the "Belt-zone" no or only modest investments were made in renovation measures.

5. Now, what about the variations of the tenant structures of the former guest worker housing stock since 1981? 2005 in a quite great number of houses (221 or 35.4%) not a single former Yugoslavian household could be found. There was also a decrease in the proportion of building stock, in which only one flat was inhabited by former Yugoslavs (it shrank from 33.2% to 20.8%). This was obviously due to the fact that the number of "concierges" from former Yugoslavia has sharply decreased. A reduction also holds true for the case of two or three guest worker households (from 28.4% to 20.1%) per house. Thus, on the basis of our sample a clear trend of a decreasing numerical housing presence of former Yugoslavs in buildings in which only few households from former Yugoslavia could be found in 1981 can be observed. It was only in 89 cases (14.3%), that the number of flats inhabited by former Yugoslavs remained stable. In 66.4% of the housing stock a reduction of those households took place. The vacant flats did not completely disappear from the housing supply by amalgamation. Obviously in these buildings processes of ethnic succession by other ethno-national groups, i.e. Turks and Arabs as well as immigrants from South (Indians, Pakistani) or East Asia (mostly Chinese) and East-West-migrants (Poles, Hungarians, Slovaks, Romanians), happened. In lower figures also migrants from Black Africa and Latin America can be found there. Actually the former guest worker houses are characterized by a quite more heterogeneous ethno-national mixture of resident population than 1981. Today Vienna's population with a migratory background is much more heterogeneous from an ethnic perspective as during the early 1980ies and this fact is mirrored in the tenants' structure of our sample.

6. From a spatial perspective the housing stock which was characterized by rising numbers of former Yugoslav tenants since 1981 is mainly situated in the traditional guest worker housing areas of the "Belt-zone" and in the working district Simmering

and can only rarely be found in the middle-class housing areas. Concerning the stock with a decrease in the guest worker population a more uneven spatial distribution can be observed. Particularly in the working-class districts the reduction was sharp. This holds true for the 11th as well as for the 10th and 5th districts. A certain exception to this rule is the 22nd district, which cannot be classified as a typical guest worker quarter, though the Yugoslavian inhabitants left the local housing stock in great numbers. Considerable reductions could also be observed in the bourgeois districts 3 and 13 and in the 23rd district. The middle-class inner districts and the cottage district Hietzing are characterized by high proportions of buildings from which the single Yugoslavian household of 1981 (mostly the caretaker) moved out.

7. Though, with the exception of single cases, the era of extremely devastated guest worker houses is over in Vienna, the condition of repair of many guest worker dwellings was suboptimal. Obviously clear empirical correlations between the number of former Yugoslavian households and the condition of repair of the houses exist: Simultaneously with an increase of the number of guest worker households the condition of repair becomes worse. Even if only from two to five guest worker households are settled there the proportion of undamaged buildings is shrinking. The need for renovation is the most urgent in that stock with the highest numbers of former Yugoslavian and other immigrant residents. Bivariate analyses and chi² tests statistically proved a strong connexion between the proportion of tenants with migration background and the condition of renovation of the buildings. A rising proportion of migrants' households usually corresponds with a worsening condition of repair of the house-front, the corridor and the inner courtyard.

8. The question after the persistence of Vienna's guest workers' houses and after the stability of their quarters must be answered with a clear „yes“. This persistence is even very strong in the traditional working-class districts near the “Belt”. Mostly in the bourgeois districts near the inner city the pressure resulting from housing market mechanisms is able to weaken this stability of immigrants' housing areas and, in some cases, can completely annihilate it. Measures from the district authorities makes it possible for single houses to escape from the stigma of a “migrants' ghetto”. In this process the increased attractivity of a given district as an housing area is playing a fundamental role. Simultaneously processes of gentrification can be initiated by renovation activities. These processes can be observed on the small spatial scale of the house as well as on the levels of building blocks, quarters and districts.

9. The private house-owners are initiating a basic change of paradigms. This change brings with it a move from gaining one's income on a rental basis from migrants to a renovation and revaluation of the building stock. Afterwards the revaluated dwellings are rented by other groups of tenants, as for example young local professionals, middle-class or elite migrants. The simple rule “once a migrants' ghetto – forever a migrants' ghetto” still holds true particularly in Vienna's working-class districts. This rule is spatially interrupted only where on the level of districts too posi-

tive changes because of renovation activities and a revival in the economy can be observed.

10. In general, there are only limited possibilities for a stabilisation of the housing stock and quarters with high proportions of migrant resident population by the communal housing policy because the decision-making powers of private owners can only hardly be influenced. In Vienna the chance of manipulating patterns of urban segregation by a distribution of communal dwellings is better than in other European metropolises. A combination of renovation measures of the Founder's Period building stock (particularly in the traditional Viennese working-class districts with a low social prestige) with a programme of an integrated urban development already exists in Vienna and seems to be the optimal strategy for stabilization. Combined with economic and labour market oriented measures an improvement of the image of the traditional guest worker districts could be realized.