

group and reaches 66.7 per cent for the low embedded group. This pattern prevails throughout all groups and local entities.

The initial question was whether being highly embedded includes members of the own group or also natives for immigrants and vice versa. The example of immigrants in the social housing complex Am Schöpfwerk with the highest share of highly embedded persons in general shows that co-ethnics play a major role here, with 40 per cent of the highly embedded respondents having only co-ethnic close relations in the neighbourhood. In contrast, all highly embedded immigrants in Laudongasse have mixed networks. For the low embedded immigrants the respective share of merely co-ethnic close relations is zero in Laudongasse and Am Schöpfwerk, and very low in Ludo-Hartmann-Platz.

5 Conclusion

This report concerns itself with the question of whether the local context determines the interethnic relations within three Viennese neighbourhoods, in terms of how people with and without a migration background interact with each other. Thus, social contacts and their consequences for the respondents' local embeddedness were at the focus of our analyses. One main aim was to explore the mutual nature of relations: not only the contacts that immigrants maintain with the indigenous population, but also the extent to which native citizens have contact with immigrants.

Our research neighbourhoods varied in a number of important contextual characteristics. Our comparing a typical inner district (Laudongasse) with a relatively high proportion of bourgeois population, a communal housing area (Am Schöpfwerk) and a neighbourhood in a traditional working-class district (Ludo-Hartmann-Platz) with a Founder's Period housing stock led us to interesting findings. As a very general result we can state that the differences between the three research areas are often much more accentuated than the differences between immigrants and natives who inhabit the same neighbourhood. This can be evaluated as an indicator of a specific "local atmosphere", which generally influences social interactions in this place and which shapes neighbourhood embeddedness directly or behavioural bonds in terms of social ties that may determine embeddedness.

In order to answer our research questions it was of considerable interest to measure the degree of emotional attachment to the local context. A comparison of the three neighbourhoods revealed a pronounced contrast between Laudongasse and Am Schöpfwerk. Clearly, immigrants and natives as well report that social relations in the local context are the most harmonious in Laudongasse. Thus, a very low frequency of conflicts is typical for this area. Interpersonal relations are worst in Am Schöpfwerk, where, for example, the mental reservation against persons moving in is much higher among immigrants and natives alike, and there is a social climate of more frequent

conflicts than in the other neighbourhoods. Non-migrant respondents in particular disagree that collective efforts are going on to improve the neighbourhood. This picture contrasts with that of Laudongasse, for which one might presume an atmosphere of harmonious social interactions. Concerning intergroup tensions but also conflicts, Ludo-Hartmann-Platz lies in between the other two extremes. It is also important to note that in many respects the evaluations of immigrants are better than those of the native respondents.

Interethnic coexistence was a core issue of the project GEITONIES in general and of this research report in particular. Thus, we analyzed social networks as an indicator of interethnic coexistence. There were two basic parameters of social networks which were interesting for answering our main research questions: size and ethnic composition. As a general trend one can say that about half of the respondents in both groups in all research areas have from three to five close relationships. Group differences are statistically significant in the neighbourhood Am Schöpfwerk, where the proportion of immigrants who reported only very small circles of friends is 20 per cent higher than among natives. In Am Schöpfwerk in both groups the number of respondents with six to eight friends is very small compared with Laudongasse and Ludo-Hartmann-Platz. In Laudongasse a higher proportion of natives than immigrants reported limited friendship networks. In Ludo-Hartmann-Platz the analysis of the narrow circle of friends does not show significant group-specific variations.

Concerning ethnic composition the close relations of natives in all research units are by far dominated by natives (in Ludo-Hartmann-Platz and Am Schöpfwerk by more than 80 per cent, in Laudongasse by 76 per cent). In general, the immigrants' social networks are more heterogeneous, though we know nothing about the ethnic composition of the social networks. In Laudongasse about two thirds of the local immigrant population have close relations with persons of foreign as well as of non-migrant origin. In Am Schöpfwerk the majority of respondents with a migrant background maintain close relations exclusively with other immigrants. In Ludo-Hartmann-Platz, too, this is true for about one half of the immigrant respondents, but there are more mixed social contacts than in the 12th district research unit. The proportion of immigrants who have exclusive native circles of close relations is considerable, the highest rate being reached in Laudongasse, whereas in the other two neighbourhoods it ranges to at least 16 per cent.

GEITONIES also investigated the relevance of the local level for interethnic coexistence. Thus, we explored neighbourhood embeddedness in three selected Viennese neighbourhoods as well as the determinants of this embeddedness. In a synopsis that focussing on neighbourhood embeddedness we did a factor analysis that aimed at exploring dimensions of neighbourhood embeddedness with variables that have been defined after the explorative analysis. In the next stage we conducted a cluster analysis to develop a typology of embeddedness at the local level. The aim of cluster analysis was to use an exploratory approach for developing empirical types of embeddedness. We explored the communalities among group members within each cluster and de-

scribed the differences across groups. The major finding was that three distinct groups are observable: two polar cases characterized by a high and a low degree of embeddedness and the middle case with a medium level of embeddedness. While neighbourhood embeddedness has been approached in previous studies mainly as neighbourhood attachment, we argued that one should instead broaden the scope of this concept towards a multi-faceted model. Using a wider concept of neighbourhood embeddedness served to get a more detailed picture of what belonging to an urban setting entails in terms of both place and resident community.

Thus, in a next stage this report includes an analysis of some basic factors probably influencing the extent of local embeddedness, like age, sex, social class, length of residence in the neighbourhood, etc. We stated that socio-demographic characteristics correlate only weakly with neighbourhood embeddedness, which is in line with the results from other research. Thus, age is no predictor for local embeddedness. With regard to sex, only female natives in the social housing area Am Schöpfwerk are more highly embedded than males; for all the other groups there are no significant differences between males and females regarding local embeddedness. Other studies have reported that it does not matter what educational and social class background people have when it comes to local embeddedness. In our study, the length of residence in the neighbourhood is completely unimportant in the social housing area Am Schöpfwerk, whereas it does matter for natives in Laudongasse and even more strongly for immigrants in Ludo-Hartmann-Platz.

In the next step we took a look at the closest social relations and their role in the formation of local embeddedness. For this analysis we investigated the role of the closest contact persons people have named. The main results were that the number of close relations, irrespective of where they live, does not play a role for the degree of embeddedness. In contrast, the number of close relations living in the same neighbourhood has a strong impact (except for immigrants in the area Ludo-Hartmann-Platz): The more close friends and relatives live nearby, the more comfortable people feel in the local setting. Interethnic close relations living in the same neighbourhood matter only in the case of the well-off area in Laudongasse, where one finds pronounced differences for both immigrants and natives. In the other neighbourhoods having interethnic strong ties living in the same neighbourhood exerts no influence on the level of neighbourhood embeddedness.

We were also successful in detecting clear evidence that the presence of close relations is strongly related to the feeling of being embedded: Across all neighbourhoods and for both groups the degree of embeddedness falls with a rising share of persons having no close relations in the neighbourhood. This general pattern prevails throughout all groups and local entities.

Last but not least, we also investigated whether the category of high embeddedness included only members of the own group or also natives for immigrants and vice versa. The example of immigrants in the social housing complex Am Schöpfwerk with the highest share of highly embedded persons showed that co-ethnics play a major role

here with 40 per cent of the highly embedded respondents having only co-ethnic close relations in the neighbourhood. In contrast, all highly embedded immigrants in Laudongasse have mixed networks. For the low embedded immigrants the respective share of merely co-ethnic close relations is zero in Laudongasse and Am Schöpfwerk and also very low in Ludo-Hartmann-Platz. This result obviously proves the relevance of the local context for both the structure of the individual's social networks and in the context of embeddedness.

What general conclusions can be drawn from this report? First, we found that neighbourhoods are still important places for local residents. In all three neighbourhoods the majority of residents report high or at least medium levels of embeddedness. This holds equally true for natives and immigrants within each neighbourhood. Second, we explored the determinants of neighbourhood embeddedness. We found social networks within the neighbourhood are the major explanatory determinant for differences in the levels of embeddedness. We further found that, with an increasing number of closest ties in the neighbourhood, the likelihood of not feeling low embedded increases, irrespective of whether these close ties are interethnic or not. Finally, we detected significant differences across the three neighbourhoods, with the residential population in the inner city district showing greater levels of embeddedness compared to the remaining two research areas. Neighbourhood differences remain statistically significant even after controlling for individual level characteristics and variations in (inter-ethnic) ties. Again, group differences are not observable within the neighbourhoods.

There are some limitations to our results. We focused on three selected neighbourhoods in Vienna, so that caution must be employed when generalizing our findings to other locations. Our study ignored to some extent the physical environment of the neighbourhood and its impact on respondents' sentiments and emotional feelings concerning the neighbourhood. Nevertheless, our findings highlight the importance of investigating the relationship between neighbourhood embeddedness and interethnic relations.

To close with a recommendation for the political decision-makers: Promoting interethnic contacts on the local urban level by creating opportunities for meeting – even in a superficial way – may be a successful strategy on the way to a more cohesive society.