

Erasmus University Rotterdam, Leiden University, Technical University Delft
Erasmus School of Social and Behavioural Sciences, Department of Public
Administration and Sociology
Master's in Governance of Migration and Diversity – Public Administration

Governing Diversity: The Relationship between Funding, Design
and Social Contact in the Context of Encounter Initiatives in
Vienna

(Master Thesis)

Author: Verena Ulrich

Student number: 486634

Word Count: ca. 26,841

Date: 9 August 2019

SUMMARY AND KEY WORDS

This thesis is concerned with urban encounter initiatives implemented by NGOs and funded by the government. It investigates the rather novel subject of the relationship between governmental funding, encounter initiatives' designs and the social contact occurring between diverse participants. From the perspective of diversity governance, it connects public administration literature with sociology literature and thereby detects contradictions between the logic of governmental funding and the logic of designing for positive social contact. It therefore studies the relationship between funding, design and social contact in the context of two urban encounter initiatives in Vienna, a city with an active NGO landscape and nearly 50% of inhabitants with a migration background. Drawing on interviews with the initiatives' employees, interviews with the initiatives' participants and questionnaires filled in by the participants, the thesis aims at providing a qualitative insight into how said relationship is experienced in practice. First, the findings indicate that the design of encounter initiatives plays a role in how social contact between diverse participants develops and provide suggestions on what aspects of design are perceived supportive. Second, they indicate that encounter initiatives can effectively contribute to positive social contact between diverse participants. However, they also indicate that the potential of designing for positive social contact can be hampered through governmental funding requirements risking a less favourable participant composition, the loss of human resources and the inaccessibility of funding for informal encounter projects. Therefore, this thesis concludes that governmental funders can considerably support these encounter initiatives through their financial resources, however, that the potential mismatches in this funding relationship should be reflected on to further increase the effectiveness of diversity governance and the potential of encounter initiatives. It concludes with recommendations of how the indicated mismatches may be eased.

Keywords: diversity, diversity governance, encounter, funding, social contact, designing encounter, encounter initiatives, encounter projects, Vienna

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would have not been able to finalise my Master Thesis in the way it stands today without the substantial help and support of several people I want to thank.

First, I would like to thank my supervisor and first reader, Maria Schiller, for supervising me through this process and both Maria and my second reader, Zeynep Kasli, for their feedback pointing out the aspects in which my thesis could be substantially improved. Moreover, I also want to thank Maria, Zeynep, Peter Scholten and all other professors who provided such inspiring input during this master's programme and contributed in such a valuable way to the expansion of my knowledge in the field of migration-related diversity. I am deeply thankful for having been able to follow this programme.

Second, I want to thank the employees and participants of Fremde werden Freunde and of Station Wien, Verein für Bildung, Beratung und kulturellen Austausch for opening their doors for me and making my empirical research possible. Moreover, I want to thank the Abteilung für Integration und Diversität der Statdt Wien for also opening their doors for me and providing me such an interesting insight into the processes of governmental funding and diversity governance which accompanied my research phase.

Third, I want to thank my colleagues who provided constructive and also reassuring feedback, answered my questions and provided emotional support. My thanks for this go especially to Anna van Gelder and Lizzy Linklater. Lizzy, thank you for being such a reassuring sweetie and being patient with answering all my questions. I will miss you lots.

Schließlich und mit höchster Priorität, will ich meiner Familie danken – meiner Mutter Ingrid, meinem Freund Robert, meinem Vater Werner, meiner Schwester Christina, meiner Großmutter Christine und meiner Stiefmutter Claudia – dafür, dass all meine Entscheidungen auf meinem akademischen Weg unterstützt habt, mich emotional unterstützt habt und IMMER an mich geglaubt habt. Mein Schatz, danke für deine Riesengeduld, Unterstützung und deine unglaublich lieben Ermutigungen. Am allermeisten, will ich meiner Mutter Ingrid danken, nicht nur dafür, dass sie eine immense emotionale Unterstützung war, sondern auch dafür, dass sie so viel Zeit und Energie bereitgestellt hat, um eine Partnerin für Thesis-spezifische Diskussionen und Feedback zu sein, wann immer ich sie gebraucht habe. Mama, ohne dich hätte ich es nie geschafft, all die Hochs und Tiefs zu überstehen und schlussendlich tatsächlich eine Thesis abzugeben, mit der ich zufrieden bin. Dein Verständnis, deine unendlich große Geduld und dein bedingungsloser Beistand rühren mich zutiefst. DANKE! (Und bitte verzeiht mir alle für etwaige komische Formulierungen auf Deutsch...Ich hab es für euch aus dem Englischen ins Deutsche übersetzt.)

Table of Content

SUMMARY AND KEY WORDS 2

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS 3

1. INTRODUCTION 6

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK 9

 2.1 Diversity and Encounter 10

 2.2 Planning for Encounter 10

 2.3 The Relationship between an Initiative’s Funding and its Design 11

 2.4 The Relationship between an Initiatives’ Design and Social Contact 13

 2.5 The Complicated Relationship between Funding, Design and Social Contact 14

3. RESEARCH DESIGN 16

 3.1 Operationalisation 16

 3.2 Methods: Data Collection and Analysis 19

 3.2.1 Employee Interviews 20

 3.2.2 Participant Questionnaires and Interviews 20

 3.3 Case Study Design 22

 3.4 Case Selection 23

 3.5 Expectations and Aim of the Study 26

 3.6 Ethical Considerations, Reflection on Role as a Researcher and Limitations 26

4. FINDINGS 27

 4.1 Employees’ Perception on the Relationship between Funding and Design 28

 4.1.1 Access to Funding 29

 4.1.2 Administrative Requirements 32

 4.1.3 Target Group Requirements 34

 4.2 Participants’ Perception on the Relationship between Design and Social Contact 39

 4.2.1 Social Contact Between Diverse Participants 39

 4.2.2 A Supportive Design for Positive Social Contact 48

 4.3 Discussion 52

5. ANALYSIS 54

 5.1 Mismatches between Funding and Designing for Positive Encounter 54

 5.1.1 Access to Funding 54

 5.1.2 Human Resources 55

 5.1.3 Participant Composition 56

 5.2 Designing for Positive Social Contact 57

6. CONCLUSION 59

URBAN ENCOUNTER INITIATIVES	5
7. RECOMMENDATIONS	60
REFERENCES	64
APPENDIX A: Self-Completion Questionnaire	67
APPENDIX B: Interview Guideline for Interviews with NGO Employees (in German).....	74
APPENDIX C: Interview Guideline for Interviews with Participants (in German)	75

List of Tables

Table 1: List of All Interview Respondents	19
Table 2: List of Participant Interview Respondents	22
Table 3: <i>Repeated:</i> List of All Interview Respondents	28

List of Abbreviations

AMIF: Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund of the European Union

MDID: Municipal Department for Integration and Diversity

MEA: Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs

MEIFA: Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs

NGO: Non-governmental organisation

Governing Diversity: The Relationship between Funding, Design and Social Contact in the Context of Encounter Initiatives in Vienna

1. INTRODUCTION

In light of a permanently increasing migration-related diversity of urban populations, scholars and political actors in Europe have shifted much attention to the question of how people can live together in diverse societies (Caponio & Borkert, 2010; Zapata-Barrero, 2011). In this context, the fostering of ‘intercultural’ encounter has been put forward as a “way to promote cohesion in a diverse society” (Zapata-Barrero, 2015, p.10). The policy approach of ‘interculturalism’ suggests that encounter between diverse people creates trust and mutual understanding between people of different backgrounds and reduces misconceptions, prejudices and stereotypes (Zapata-Barrero, 2015). This expectation goes back to Allport’s contact hypothesis which suggests that intergroup contact projects, of which encounter projects are one form, bears much potential to reduce conflict between people of diverse backgrounds (Dovidio, Glick, & Rudman, 2005). Encounter projects are projects which aim at establishing contact between people of diverse backgrounds on a regular basis. Since Allport, various other scholars have researched encounter projects over decades and proposed that they can be an effective way to create positive social contact between people of different backgrounds i.e. contact which triggers intergroup relationships, increases mutual understanding and decreases negative attitudes such as prejudices (e.g. Amin, 2002; Dovidio, et al., 2005; Fincher & Iveson, 2008; Galinsky & Moskowitz, 2000; Matejskova & Leitner, 2011; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2005; Stephan & Stephan, 2005; Zapata-Barrero, 2015). Therefore, scholars such as Zapata-Barrero (2015), suggest that encounter projects may provide a promising answer to the question of how to live in diversity.

A trend relevant to the development of encounter projects has been that project implementation in several social governance fields, including diversity, has been shifted from governments to civil-society-organisations whereby governments play a role as a funder (De Graauw, Gleeson, & Bloemraad, 2013; Richmond & Shields, 2005). Therefore, encounter projects often take a form in which they are implemented by non-governmental organisations (NGOs) but funded by the government. This leads me to the focus of my research: encounter projects implemented by NGOs and funded by governmental institutions. I research this phenomenon in the context of a non-comparative in-depth study of two cases in Vienna: an encounter project implemented by *Station Wien* and an encounter project implemented by *Fremde werden Freunde*. I refer to the encounter project and the organisation implementing it as ‘encounter initiative’.

The question of how people can live together in diverse societies can be considered a relevant question in the context of the location of my study, Vienna: 45.3% of Vienna's inhabitants have a migration background (i.e. were born abroad or had both parents born abroad) (Statistik Austria, 2019). In the national context, this is relatively high as in Austria, as a whole, only 23.3% of inhabitants have a migration background (Statistik Austria, 2019). In Austria, NGOs play an active role in the social sector and government institutions at different levels may take on the task of funding them (Greiling & Stötzer, 2015). In the case of *Station Wien*, for example, the initiative receives funding from the Municipal Department for Integration and Diversity (MDID), the Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs (MEIFA) and the Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund of the European Union (AMIF). The initiative of *Fremde werden Freunde* is funded by the Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs (MEA). Considering that governmental funding of such initiatives often replaces the implementation of projects by the government itself, makes projects implemented by NGOs but funded through governmental institutions a relevant focus for public administration research. Moreover, in the context of encounter projects, the role of governmental funders seems to play a particularly curious role as previous research on the way funding can influence an initiative's design, on the one hand, and the way an initiative's design influences social contact, on the other hand, suggests tensions.

On the one hand, scholars suggest that governmental funding is mostly tied to certain demands which can influence the design of NGOs at an organisational level and the design of encounter projects itself (Fincher & Iveson, 2008; Richmond & Shields, 2005; Uitermark, 2012). These demands include formal designs of service provision with clear service-providers and service-recipients (Fincher & Iveson, 2008), orienting projects towards predefined target groups (De Graauw, et al., 2013) and administrative demands (Greiling & Stötzer, 2015; Uitermark, 2012). For example, a governmental funder can demand the provision of classroom-like language courses by professional teachers instead of a system of informal language buddies, where people with different native languages interested in learning the language of each other are matched to practice. In this case, the informal project design is undermined by a classroom-like setting and buddies have to be replaced by clearly defined service-providers (the teachers) and service-recipients (the students).

On the other hand, at the same time as funding can influence the design of NGOs and their projects, scholars have found that the design of encounter projects can influence the social contact occurring between participants of these projects. Authors propose that different aspects of design are crucial for positive social contact to occur. These aspects include a non-service-oriented informal design which allows for spontaneous encounter (Fincher & Iveson,

2008; Hoekstra & Dahlvik, 2018), a design which allows for sustained, regular and deep contact with a number of outgroup members (Matejskova & Leitner, 2011), and a design which engages participants of different backgrounds in common activities around shared interests (Allport, 1954; Amin, 2002; Amin, 2006). Considering these suggestions of a supportive design for social contact, in some cases, the way funding is argued to influence encounter initiatives seems to be counterproductive to the establishment of positive social contact. Requirements of formal classroom-like settings for language teaching, for example, contradict the supportive aspect of non-service-oriented informality (Fincher & Iveson, 2008).

Hence, public administration literature suggests that there is a relationship between funding and the design of NGOs and their projects and sociology and human geography literature suggests that there is a relationship between the design of encounter initiatives and social contact occurring there. At the same time, this interplay between governmental funding, design and social contact suggests complications: funding practices, i.e. how funding influences the design of initiatives seems counterproductive to the designing for positive social contact. Despite research suggesting a relationship between funding and design and between design and positive social contact, with potential contradictions, research which investigates this relationship in the context of encounter initiatives deeper seems to be missing. Therefore, in the context of my case studies, I combine these interdisciplinary considerations and engage with the following research question:

What is the relationship between governmental funding, an encounter initiative's design and the social contact occurring between participants of diverse backgrounds in the context of Station Wien and Fremde werden Freunde?

What motivates this research question is the theoretical assumption that governmental funding practices, i.e. how governmental funding influences the design of initiatives, may be counterproductive to the designing for positive social contact. By exploring the 'relationship' between governmental funding, an encounter initiative's design and the social contact occurring, I do not refer to a causal relationship but to the way these aspects may influence each other in the way theory indicates. To investigate this, I first, explore how the employees of the initiatives perceive the relationship between funding and their encounter initiatives' designs through interviews with both initiatives' employees. And, second, I explore how participants in each case perceive the design to influence their social contact with participants of different backgrounds (i.e. different countries of origin, primary languages and/or religious beliefs) through questionnaires and interviews with participants of the same two encounter initiatives. By bringing the results on the perceived relationship between funding and design and between design and social contact together, I want to create a discussion on potential

mismatches between funding practices and designing for positive social contact in the context of my case studies and thereby contribute insights relevant to the broader academic interdisciplinary debate. In this, the focus of my study does not lie on a comparison between the two case studies but on drawing from richer data to gain a broader insight into a yet hardly studied relationship between funding, design and social contact in the context of encounter initiatives. From a public administrative perspective, it is relevant to understand if funding encounter initiatives is a valuable governance strategy and how the funds to such encounter initiatives can be spent effectively. From a sociological perspective, it is relevant to better understand planned encounter in urban contexts; not only if urban encounter initiatives effectively contribute to positive social contact but also what may be a supportive design for this. From a public administrative perspective on the governance of migration-related diversity, it is relevant to understand this link between how governmental funding can be effectively spent to allow for a design of encounter initiatives which provides room for positive social contact – and thereby to contribute to answering the question of how to live in diversity. As Stephan and Stephan (2005) conclude from their research on social contact between diverse people, “more and better research” on the social contact occurring at encounter programmes and the factors that lead to it is needed “in order to refine and improve them” (p. 443). According to them (2005), “the increasing internal diversity of the world’s societies, and the continuation of longstanding prejudice, stereotyping, and discrimination, make the creation of effective intergroup relations programmes an issue of paramount importance for the future welfare of our world” (p. 432). It is this call for a better understanding of ways to govern diversity to which my thesis aims to contribute by applying an interdisciplinary angle and investigating my particular inquiry.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

As indicated above, theoretical considerations collected from interdisciplinary fields are central to my research. This chapter elaborates on the theoretical considerations underlying migration-related diversity and encounter, the role the government can play in funding encounter initiatives, the relationship between funding and the design of encounter initiatives, and the relationship between an encounter initiative’s design and social contact occurring between participants. The chapter concludes with a reflection on potential complications in the relationship between funding, design and social contact in the context of urban encounter initiatives.

2.1 Diversity and Encounter

Vertovec (2007) emphasised the ‘superdiversity’ of a growing number of European cities by revealing that there is an increasing diversity within and between migrants as well as of societies as a whole. Aspects in which an increasing diversification of populations can be observed include country of origin, migration channels, gender, age, legal status, religion, ethnicity, language, educational background, occupational status and transnational connections (Vertovec, 2007). Thinking of ‘diversity’, hence, implies perceiving people as different according to certain characteristics. Perceptions of similarity and difference between people can involve outsiders (other-identification) or oneself (self-identification) (Brubaker, 2013) and are based on distinctions between in- and outgroups. People tend to perceive themselves as part of a group of similar people (ingroup) along lines of various characteristics which can vary according to the context (Dervin, 2012). As people tend to perceive their ingroup as positive, this comparison can lead to negative attitudes about outgroup members (Dervin, 2012; Dovidio, et al., 2005). This risk of negative attitudes towards outgroups is what Allport’s contact hypothesis, on which many ideas of intercultural contact and diversity encounter are based, connects to. According to the contact hypothesis, intergroup contact decreases negative attitudes towards the outgroup and eases potential conflict (Dovidio, et al., 2005). Important indicators of decreased negative attitudes include trust, perceived similarity, identification with the ‘other’, reduced fear and reduced prejudices (Dovidio, et al., 2005). However, research has found that physical proximity of diverse people alone does not necessarily lead to intergroup interaction and moreover, that in the case of interaction, negative attitudes can manifest or even increase negative attitudes (Amin, 2002; Valentine, 2008). Hence, many scholars have argued that organised encounter projects with the ‘right design’ have a high potential to generate positive social contact, i.e. positive intergroup contact which diminishes negative attitudes (e.g. Amin, 2002; Dovidio, et al., 2005; Fincher & Iveson, 2008; Zapata-Barrero, 2015). Therefore, migration policy scholars such as Zapata-Barrero (2015) have proposed planned encounter as a tool of diversity governance.

2.2 Planning for Encounter

According to Fincher and Iveson (2008), in diversity policymaking, the planning for encounter is a vital stage which relies on the knowledge of multiple disciplines and a number of actors ranging from governmental to business and civil society actors, reflecting a complex governance network. Initiatives aiming to foster interaction require a certain set of (loose) rules, and realisation and provision of some material base—be it a community centre, a green area suitable for urban gardening, or a neighbourhood café (Fincher & Iveson, 2008). This is

where, according to Fincher and Iveson (2008), the government plays an important role when reallocating financial and/or material resources to encounter initiatives. The designing and implementation of an encounter project, on the other hand, they (2008) argue, heavily depends on local knowledge and, hence, is supposed to involve local government or non-government actors. Thus, encounter initiatives may take the form of projects which are designed and/or implemented by civil society actors and which cooperate with, and are supported by, the government (Eizaguirre, Pradel, Terrones, Martinez-Celorio, & García, 2012; Fincher & Iveson, 2008). In this form of governance, government institutions may take the role of a funder who interferes in the design and implementation of the initiative to a rather low or a rather high degree. Like Allport and other sociologists, Fincher and Iveson (2008) suggest that the design of an encounter initiative plays a substantial role in the way social contact is experienced. In turn, public administration scholars argue that the way an initiative is designed can be largely influenced by the governmental funding institutions. Thus, the interplay between the funding, the design and social contact at an encounter initiative is a topic of interest in the planning of encounter projects from both perspectives a sociological and a public administrative one.

2.3 The Relationship between an Initiative's Funding and its Design

Funding, from the perspective of governments, is an administrative tool embedded in neo-liberal public management strategies which shifts the task of service delivery to the civil society sector (De Graauw, et al., 2013; Richmond & Shields, 2005; Uitermark & Duyvendak, 2008). Hence, what government actors are interested in is not simply financing a 'good cause' but, rather, the systematic funding of initiatives which fill a specific gap in their own service delivery. Moreover, part of these neo-liberal management strategies is to ensure that funds are spent efficiently according to the strategic planning and goals of the government (Greiling & Strötzer, 2015; Uitermark, 2012). For this reason, organisations which receive funding need to monitor and report their performance, often in the form of precise performance output measurements (Greiling & Strötzer, 2015). If the performance does not meet the agreed target, they run the risk of losing their funding as the government wants to make sure that the funds are allocated to the most efficient organisation (Uitermark, 2012). Therefore, if the government grants funding to civil society initiatives, it can be expected to tie the funds to certain formats of design of the initiative. According to existent literature on how public management strategies of funding influence NGOs, there are several aspects of the design of an organisation and its projects which may be influenced. These include the degree of

(in)formality and service orientation, the focus on administration and the target group orientation

First, projects offered may be adapted to fit specific formats of service delivery with clear service providers and service recipients. Fincher and Iveson (2008) found that in community centres, for example, the opportunity for informal encounter between volunteers and visitors as well as between visitors themselves was superseded by the priority assigned to social service meetings between visitors (i.e. service recipients) and social service providers. This shift towards service provision is closely linked to a shift from a setting of informality towards a setting of formality. Whereas projects not tailored to service delivery leave more room for informal and spontaneous interaction, projects tailored to service delivery are often characterised by a higher degree of formality (Fincher & Iveson, 2008; Hoekstra & Dahlvik, 2018). The demand for precise output measurements, for instance, requires organisations which provide language courses to offer these in a rather formal classroom-like manner instead of a more informal home-like manner (Fincher & Iveson, 2008). According to Fincher and Iveson (2008), “neighbourhood houses are pushed towards becoming part of the formal educational sector, and the social interactions they facilitate informally are made to seem less significant than this formal role” (p.205).

A second aspect in which funding can influence an initiative’s design is the focus on administration compared to operative work, i.e. developing and implementing projects. According to Fincher and Iveson (2008), the people engaged in a civil society initiative often do so with the spirit of activists who want to civically engage and make a change through the realisation of their projects. However, when being funded by a government institution their role changes wherein “their new roles shape their previously political claims into the technical formats of strategic planning” (Fincher & Iveson, 2008, p.208). This may influence the organisational design and in turn the projects. The technical formats of strategic planning require a more formal administrative focus which may result in the need of investing more time in administrative work (Richmond & Shields, 2005; Greiling & Stötzer, 2015). Affording this time, can be particularly difficult for small NGOs (Greiling & Stötzer, 2015). Administrative requirements, such as writing reports, thus, often comes at the cost of operative work, such as actually developing or carrying out projects (Greiling & Stötzer, 2015; Richmond & Shields, 2005). This may lead to a “diversion of precious human resources” (Richmond & Shields, 2005, p.518), as operative work is a civil-society-organisation’s actual strength and purpose (Greiling & Stötzer, 2015; Richmond & Shields, 2005).

A third factor which may be influenced by governmental funding institutions is the target group orientation of an NGO generally or in specific projects. Whereas policymakers adhering to public management strategies usually tailor services to specific target groups (De Graauw, et al., 2013; Fincher & Iveson, 2008), civil society initiatives are often open to any member of society (Fincher & Iveson, 2008). Moreover, Fincher and Iveson (2008) emphasise that encounter initiatives specifically aim at attracting diverse participants overarching any predefined groups. If the government decides to allocate a certain fund to services for a specific target group like asylum seekers, for example, the organisation may be obliged to limit access to their activities and services to asylum seekers and thereby exclude members of society not fitting in this administrative category.

This sub-chapter summarised the theoretical considerations on the relationship of funding and the design of initiatives, i.e. NGOs and the projects they implement. Existent literature suggests that the aspects in which governmental funding can influence initiatives is the degree of (in)formality and service orientation, the focus on administration and the target group orientation. As mentioned before, while public administration scholars have suggested an influence of funding on NGOs and their projects, sociologists have suggested an influence of an encounter initiatives' design on the social contact occurring there. This relationship between design and social contact is what the next sub-chapter elaborates on.

2.4 The Relationship between an Initiatives' Design and Social Contact

As already indicated, scholars who have researched encounter projects have argued that the design plays a crucial role in the way social contact develops between participants. The social contact generated by participants at differently designed encounter projects has been found to differ in several aspects. As Matejskova and Leitner (2011) found, "varied spaces of encounters [...] facilitate and support different kinds of encounters—ranging from superficial and fleeting to close and sustained" contact and relationships (p.735). These different kinds of encounters differ in the quantity and quality of contact occurring, the quality and length of relationships participants develop and the degree to which they triggered changes in attitudes. The aspects which have been associated with the desired outcomes of encounter projects i.e. creating trust and mutual understanding between people of diverse backgrounds and reducing misconceptions, prejudices and stereotypes towards them (Zapata-Barrero, 2015), have been rather high quality and quantity of contact (Fincher & Iveson, 2008; Hoekstra & Dahlvik, 2018; Matejskova & Leitner, 2011), and high quality and length of relationships (Matejskova & Leitner, 2011). Based on this, when I talk of 'positive social contact' I refer to high quality and quantity contact, high quality and long relationships and a positive change in attitudes.

As the aim of encounter projects is usually to trigger positive rather than negative social contact (Zapata-Barrero, 2015), most research is focused on the way positive social contact can be triggered (Laurence & Bentley, 2018). In their search for ‘the right design’ to influence social contact positively, scholars made several suggestions of what design would be supportive.

First, as mentioned above, Matejskova and Leitner (2011) found that a design which allows for deep contact, regular contact, sustained contact and contact with a high number of diverse outgroup members was associated with outcomes of positive social contact.

Second, according to Allport and Amin, the nature and context of an encounter project’s activities are crucial in influencing social contact. Allport (1954) argues that encounter is more likely to result in positive social contact if a design provides for “equal status contact between majority and minority groups”, revolves around “the pursuit of common goals” and highlights “common interests” (p.281). Amin (2002) argues that encounter is most likely to lead to positive social contact when people are put out of their comfort zones into new settings of “cultural destabilisation” (p.970), i.e. settings where accustomed lines of cultural divisions are not apparent. Moreover, similar to Allport’s emphasis on ‘common interests’, Amin considers “engagement with strangers in a common activity”, “joint projects across ethnic divisions” (2002, p.970) and “work[ing] together in projects of common interest” (2006, p.1017) as supportive factors.

Third, a design which allows for informal interactions has been found to be of particular value in the establishment of positive social contact (Fincher & Iveson, 2008; Hoekstra & Dahlvik, 2018). In contrast, formalisation of activities has been found to impede social contact between diverse participants (Fincher & Iveson, 2008).

Thus, previous research suggests that an encounter initiatives’ design influences the social contact occurring there. The aspects argued to be supportive of positive social contact are first, allowing for deep, regular and sustained contact and including a high number of diverse participants; second, assigning equal status to all participants, undermining lines of cultural divisions, engaging participants in common activities, around common interests and the pursuit of common goals; and third, allowing for informality.

2.5 The Complicated Relationship between Funding, Design and Social Contact

Comparing the theory on how funding can influence the design of an initiative and the suggestions of how the design of an initiative can positively influence social contact, there seem to be certain contradictions in it. The restriction of a target group, for example, seems to contradict the demand for contact with a high number of diverse outgroup members. The

distinction between service providers and service recipients, for example, seems to contradict the demand for equal status encounter. And the formalisation of activities, for example, seems to contradict the demand for an informal design.

In the research of Fincher and Iveson (2008), complications in planning for informal encounter in drop-in centres, in their case, while governmental funders demand formal service delivery have gained some attention. They (2008) emphasise the distinction between informal encounter and formal service provision when they argue that drop-in centres

seem safe and their form is transparent or readily comprehended, and the expectation of informal social behaviour there (though the centres are always run by an organization, and clearly so) gives a degree of control by participants over their interactions, different from what would occur in a formal classroom for example.

(Fincher & Iveson, 2008, p.201)

Fincher and Iveson (2008) highlight that the form of contact happening in rather informal settings is different from contact in more formalised settings such as classrooms. The informal setting, however, has been described by them (2008) as “valuable for itself” (p.200) and particularly supportive in triggering deep contact. They therefore refer to Conradson (2003) who argues that encounter projects with an informal design “should not be held to account because they don’t offer more ‘services’ – it is significant that there are such places where people can just ‘relate to others and simply be” (Fincher & Iveson, 2008, p.204).

Still, in their (2008) research, they notice the trend in governmental funders demanding an increased formalisation and service orientation of such informal encounter projects. What Fincher and Iveson (2008) conclude from this is that “to allow places of successful encounter in cities to be what they are [...] is important. To load these places up with other more purposeful activities is a temptation to be avoided” (p.212).

The complications Fincher and Iveson (2008) highlight in their research between designing for informal encounter supportive for social contact and trends of governmental funders to tie resources to more formal service provision are indicative of a conflicting relationship between funding, design and social contact in the context of encounter initiatives. It is this seemingly conflicting relationship my research aims at investigating further through the in-depth study of two initiatives which both aim at creating positive encounter and are funded by governmental institutions.

In summary, my theoretical framework combined literature from the fields of public administration and sociology and thereby indicated a seemingly complicated relationship between an encounter initiatives’ funding, design and social contact occurring between participants there. By investigating this relationship and potential complications in the in-

depth study of two encounter initiatives, I want to contribute to a better understanding of this interplay to eventually inspire further academic research as well as practical reflection on the influence funding may have on encounter initiatives which aim at triggering social contact.

3. RESEARCH DESIGN

My research interest stems from the compilation of aforementioned literature combining literature from the fields of public administration and sociology with a focus on diversity governance. The trend of governments to fund encounter initiatives, the suggestion that governmental funding influences the designs of these initiatives which, in turn, is suggested to influence social contact and the potential contradictions of this relationship lead me to my research focus. By investigating the relationship between funding, design and social contact and potential complications in an in-depth study of two cases, I want to contribute to a better understanding of this interplay to eventually inspire further academic research as well as practical reflection on the influence funding may have on encounter initiatives which aim at triggering social contact. Therefore, I examine the following question: *What is the relationship between governmental funding, an encounter initiative's design and the social contact occurring between participants of diverse backgrounds in the context of Station Wien and Fremde werden Freunde?*

Recognising the specific dynamics of initiatives as being highly contextual, I do not aim at formulating causal relationships between governmental funding, the design of NGOs and their encounter projects and social contact. Rather, through explorative research which connects my empirical findings to the suggestions of other scholars, I hope to contribute to a further understanding of the relationship between these aspects in the context of urban encounter initiatives and as Schönwälder, et al. (2016) put it “enrich a field dominated by quantitative enquiries” (p.234) with qualitative insights. How I aim at doing this will be elaborated on in this chapter. In the operationalisation I first specify the core concepts of my research question and then I formulate the sub-questions guiding through my research. In the methods section, I explain which methods of data collection and analysis I use to answer these sub-questions. I then elaborate on my case study design and selection, followed by stating the aim of my study and finally I reflect on ethical considerations, my role as a researcher and limitations of my research.

3.1 Operationalisation

My research revolves around encounter initiatives. Encounter initiatives refer to encounter projects, i.e. projects which aim at establishing contact between people of diverse

backgrounds on a regular basis, and the organisations implementing them. Encounter initiative is thus, an umbrella term for an encounter project and the organisation realising it. My research is interested in the relationship between three core aspects of encounter initiatives: funding, design and social contact, which I specify in this sub-chapter. First, funding refers to a specific amount of money one organisation provides another organisation for a certain time-period and specific purpose. In the case of this thesis, the funding organisations are governmental institutions at the municipal (Vienna), national (Austria) or supranational (EU) level. For NGOs, governmental funding frequently constitutes a main source of financing (De Graauw, et al., 2013; Richmond & Shields, 2005), which also applies in my cases. Generally, the financial resources of non-governmental encounter initiatives can range from volunteer-run organisations which do not receive any funding, over organisations receiving small-scale and/or short-term funding for one specific project, to organisations receiving large-scale and/or long-term funding.

The second aspect, the design, refers to the design of the organisation and of its projects. The organisational design concerns its focus and orientation. The focus can range from an administrative to an operative focus. The orientation can range from being oriented towards an exclusive target group to being oriented towards society as a whole. The project design can range from offering encounter activities frequently and regularly (such as a weekly language café or chess evening) to offering activities infrequently and sporadically (such as two encounter festivals a year), from restricting activities to exclusive groups to being open to everyone, from having low-threshold access (such as being for free, not demanding an application, membership or anything else) to having strict requirements for participation (such as paying a fee, demanding an application, asking for membership or passing a test), and from a design allowing for deep and long conversations to a design with no room for deep and long conversations. Moreover, the project design can range from being informal to being formal including aspects such as being home-like (with couches, tables, food, etc.) or rather sterile, activities being offered in a service-manner (activities revolving around a service, having clear service-deliverers and service-receivers) or in a non-service-manner (activities not having a specific service in focus, having no clear service-deliverers and receivers), providing the participants with freedom over their actions or determining their actions through, for instance, authorities, and ascribing diverse participants an equal status where no differences are made (e.g. when both migrants as well as non-migrants can instruct and/or participate in an activity) or ascribing diverse participants different roles where non-migrants, for example, instruct activities and migrants are treated as students. Aspects such as the (absence of an)

orientation towards target groups and orientation towards service delivery can be present at both a general organisational and/or a project level.

The third aspect, social contact, refers to the contact patterns and attitudes participants of diverse backgrounds develop through taking part in activities of the encounter initiatives. Social contact patterns are distinguished by quality and quantity of contact and quality, quantity and length of relationships. The quality of contact ranges from superficial to deep contact; the quantity of contact ranges from no contact to sporadic (once a month or less) to frequent (at least once a week) contact; the quality of relationships ranges from superficial relationships (acquaintances) to deep relationships (friendships); the quantity of relationships refers to the number of acquaintances or friends made; and the length of relationships ranges from a few weeks to multiple months or years. Attitudes will be indicated by feelings held towards people with a different background, thinking and identification patterns and the perception of similarity or difference between oneself and them. I define people with different or diverse (migration-related) backgrounds as people with different countries of origin, primary languages and/or religious beliefs from each other. Moreover, by positive social contact I mean social contact between people of diverse backgrounds which was experienced as positive, resulted in sustained, deep and frequent contact, in friendships and in increasingly positive attitudes towards people with a different background.

To investigate the relationship between these three aspects in my case studies – the encounter initiative’s funding, design and the social contact occurring between participants –, I divided my empirical research into two steps, each constituting one sub-question of my umbrella research question, which is: *What is the relationship between governmental funding, an encounter initiative’s design and the social contact occurring between participants of diverse backgrounds in the context of Station Wien and Fremde werden Freunde?* In the first step, I explored the relationship between the encounter initiatives’ funding and design through qualitative interviews with the employees of both encounter initiatives. In this first step, I explored the sub-question of *how do the employees of Station Wien and Fremde werden Freunde perceive the relationship between funding and the organisational and project design of their initiatives?* In the second step, I explored the relationship between the encounter initiatives’ design and the social contact occurring there through a questionnaire and qualitative follow-up interviews with the participants of both initiatives. For this, I explored the sub-question of *how do the participants of Station Wien and Fremde werden Freunde perceive social contact at the two initiatives and what aspects of the design do they perceive as supportive of positive social contact?* I discuss the answers to these two empirical research questions, in the findings chapter. Subsequently, in the analysis chapter, I connect the answers

collected on each relationship with each other as well as with the relevant theory to establish how all three aspects relate to each other in my study and what these insights contribute to the academic debate. Therefore, for step one, I rely on the perceptions of the encounter initiatives' employees, for step two, I rely on perceptions of the participants and in step three, I rely on my analysis of the findings in connection with relevant theory. I decided to rely on different actors' perceptions resulting in this research design because I expected the employees to know best about how funding influences their encounter initiative's designs and because I considered the participants to be the most relevant actors in the experience of social contact and the design supportive for positive social contact. In the next sub-chapter, I elaborate on the methods I applied to answer these sub-questions.

3.2 Methods: Data Collection and Analysis

As discussed above, I approach my research with two sub-questions which I study by investigating two non-governmental encounter initiatives in Vienna: *Station Wien* and *Fremde werden Freunde*. My empirical research encompassed three data sets for each initiative: semi-structured employee interviews, a self-completion questionnaire filled in by participants, and semi-structured participant interviews. In total, I conducted six interviews and collected 49 questionnaires. Details of the interview respondents are listed in Table 1 below. To prevent the possibility of identifying the respondents, the employees' gender and countries of origin are omitted and for the non-Austrian participant interviewees, only the region of origin is provided.

Table 1			
List with Details of all Six Interview Respondents			
Interview Name	Role in Organisation	Country/Region of Origin	Gender
Int.Org.1	employee of FwF	-	-
Int.Org.2	employee of SW	-	-
Int.Part.1	participant of SW	Austria	male
Int.Part.2	participant of FwF	Europe	female
Int.Part.3	participant of FwF	Austria	male
Int.Part.4	participant of SW	Europe	female
<i>Note.</i> Details are listed if made available and only to the extent that no identification is possible.			

Table 1. List of All Interview Respondents

In the remainder of the methods section, I elaborate on the data collection and analysis of the data sets used to explore my two sub-questions: first, the employee interviews I rely on to explore sub-question one, and second, the participant questionnaires and interviews I rely on to explore sub-question two.

3.2.1 Employee Interviews

To explore the first sub-question of how the employees perceive the relationship between funding and the design of their initiatives I conducted two semi-structured interviews, one with an employee of each initiative. Both interviews have been conducted between April and June 2019 and lasted approximately one hour. The interview guideline indicative of what kind of questions I asked the employees can be found in Appendix B.

Concerning the sampling, the interviews with the employees depended on: First, whether they possessed knowledge on the encounter project studied, thus, the language café in the case of *Station Wien* and the chess evening and story saloon of *Fremde werden Freunde*. Second, it depended on whether they possessed knowledge and experience on the governmental funding they receive. Third, it depended on their availability.

The employee interviews were recorded, transcribed and analysed by coding them. They were coded in Word due to access problems with Atlas.ti. The coding approach was mixed; some codes such as “administrative requirements” (connected to the core aspect of governmental funding) were based on the literature discussed above; additionally, codes concerning e.g. the way funding was perceived to influence the design were derived from the data itself. Moreover, I distinguished between lower-level concepts, middle-level concepts and higher-level concepts according to the level of abstraction of a code (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). After having coded both interviews, I grouped the codes of both interviews into higher-level categories to find connections and trends. References to the interviews are indicated by the interview name (Int.Org.1, Int.Org.2) and the code numbers.

3.2.2 Participant Questionnaires and Interviews

To explore the second sub-question of how the participants perceive social contact at the two initiatives and what aspects of design they perceive as supportive of positive social contact I collated data on the experience and perception of social contact by the participants of the two encounter initiatives. Although I generally follow a rather qualitative approach, I combine a rather quantitative questionnaire filled in by 49 participants in total (25 of *Station Wien* and 24 of *Fremde werden Freunde*) with four qualitative in-depth interviews (two participants of each initiative). I do so to provide both an overview of the extent to which a

larger number of participants perceived social contact which developed through the initiatives as positive as well as to provide an in-depth understanding of their perception on how it did so. Thus, first, I investigate the way social contact was perceived at the initiatives through the self-completion questionnaire and through the semi-structured in-depth interviews with the participants. Then I explore what aspects of the design of the initiatives were perceived as supportive for the development of positive social contact through the in-depth participant interviews.

The interviews and questionnaire have been conducted between April and June 2019. The participant interviews lasted between 45 minutes and 2 and a half hours. The questionnaire can be found in Appendix A and the interview guideline indicative of what kind of questions I asked the participants can be found in Appendix C.

Concerning the sampling, for the participant groups I aimed at having as many questionnaire respondents as possible for each initiative. Participants with sufficient English or German skills were asked to fill it in and whether or not they did so depended on their availability and willingness. Questionnaire respondents could voluntarily fill in their names in a list for a follow-up interview. The follow-up interviews were conducted several weeks after respondents had filled in the questionnaire. Primarily, the participation in an interview depended on the willingness and availability of participants. Furthermore, I purposefully sampled the respondents according to the following criteria. First, the country of origin: for each initiative respectively, I interviewed one participant originating from Austria and one originating from another European country to cover the range of likelihood of having contact with somebody of a different background when living in your country of origin as well as when being a migrant. Second, the length of participation needed to be a considerable amount of time during which development of relationships and attitudes could have occurred. Third, as a follow-up on the questionnaire, the sampling depended on the response the participants reported in the questionnaire part which provided a curious difference between the two initiatives. I pursued this difference to see if a further investigation could lead to a deeper understanding of the perceived relationship between the initiatives' designs and social contact. This third aspect of sampling and the related investigation will be further elaborated on when discussing the findings on my second sub-question.

Concerning the demographic information of the participant interviewees (see Table 2), the age of the respondents ranged from 34 to 65 years of age and their work situation ranged from low-skilled jobs to high-skilled jobs to retirement. All of them have been participating for at least one year and the frequency of participation ranges from average once per month to two times a week.

Table 2
List with Details of Participant Interview Respondents

Interview Name	Participant Name	Role in Organisation	Country/Region of Origin	Gender	Length of Participation	Frequency of Participation
Int.Par. 1	Participant 1	participant of SW	Austria	male	3.5 years	2 times a week
Int.Par. 2	Participant 2	participant of FwF	Europe	female	3 years	2 times a week
Int.Par. 3	Participant 3	participant of FwF	Austria	male	1 year	once per month
Int.Par. 4	Participant 4	participant of SW	Europe	female	3 years	≥ once a week

Note. Details are listed if made available and only to the extent that no identification is possible.

Table 2. List of Participant Interview Respondents

Concerning the analysis, as indicated above, the collected data was analysed in a qualitative rather than quantitative way. I analysed the questionnaire results in Excel and calculated the average result of every question for each initiative. The results reveal to what extent a larger number of participants of each initiative perceive social contact to be positive. The participant interviews were analysed the same way as the employee interviews (with the exception of the coding software). Like the employee interviews, all participant interviews were recorded, transcribed and analysed by coding them. They were coded in the software Atlas.ti. The coding approach was mixed; some codes such as “deep contact” (connected to the core aspect of social contact) were based on the literature discussed above; additionally, codes concerning e.g. supportive factors of the design for establishing positive social contact were derived from the data itself. Moreover, as in the employee interviews, I distinguished between lower-level concepts, middle-level concepts and higher-level concepts according to the level of abstraction of a code (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). After having coded all four interviews, I grouped the codes of all interviews into higher-level categories to find connections and trends. References to the interviews are indicated by the interview name (Int.Part.1, Int.Part.2, Int.Part.3 and Int.Part.4) and the code numbers.

3.3 Case Study Design

As mentioned above, my research leans more towards a qualitative approach of studying a small number of cases, i.e. two cases, in-depth and seeking to add new insights to the existent academic knowledge on the funding, design and social contact of non-governmental urban encounter initiatives for people of diverse backgrounds. It deviates from claiming

generalisability and universal applicability in order to provide qualitative and comprehensive in-depth insight into a yet to be much further explored field of research.

In my case study design, I do not apply a comparative approach in which the main aims are “to examine the operation of generative causal mechanisms” in two cases and “to establish the circumstances in which a theory will or will not hold” (Bryman, 2012, p.74). Due to the limited time and scope of my research, the complexity of my inquiry, the infancy of theory on the relationship between funding, design and social contact, and the novelty of this topic, I found that a profound comparative case study was neither feasible, nor appropriate. Instead, I believe that before establishing any ‘mechanisms’ between the three aspects of funding, design and social contact, an in-depth explorative research of whether and how this three-part relationship is experienced in ‘exemplifying cases’, can act as a more valuable contribution to the academic debate. According to Bryman (2012), an exemplifying case is a case which is selected not because it is outstanding but because it provides a “suitable context for a certain research question” (p.70). Acknowledging that in-depth studies of exemplifying cases usually comprise only one case study (Bryman, 2012), I found that, as Gustafsson (2017) emphasises, two cases “create a more convincing theory when the suggestions are more intensely grounded in several empirical evidence” (n.p.). Applying this to my inquiry, I believe that studying two cases which exemplify the phenomenon of urban encounter projects implemented by NGOs and funded by the government provides a richer base of evidence to draw conclusions from and provide directions for future research. Therefore, I study two cases, both of which I draw on to gain a better understanding of the relationship between governmental funding, design and social contact. In combining the empirical data of both cases, I do not lay a focus on the comparison of the two cases *per se* but on finding trends apparent in the two cases on the studied relationship.

3.4 Case Selection

As established above, I apply an in-depth case study design including two urban encounter initiatives for diverse people: The *Sprachencafé* (language café) of *Station Wien, Verein für Bildung, Beratung und kulturellen Austausch* (Station Vienna, Association for Education, Consultation and Cultural Exchange), and the chess evening and story saloon of *Fremde werden Freunde* (Strangers become Friends). I study two cases instead of one case to account for a higher variety of insights into my research topic. The criterion based on which I selected the two cases was that they are exemplifying my research focus and area: first, they are NGOs; second, they implement projects designed with the aim of creating encounter between people of diverse backgrounds; third, they involve a large number of migrants and non-

migrants; fourth, they receive funding by governmental institutions; fifth, they are based in Vienna, a city representing a high migration-related diversity (Statistik Austria, 2019) and an active NGO landscape (Greiling & Stötzer, 2015).

Station Wien was founded in 1997 and supports “respectful and equal encounter of people independent of their origin and social status“ (Station Wien, n.d.). The association has two project branches, the first one includes basic educational courses and consulting services for migrants, the second one, the *Kontaktetool* (contact pool) aims at connecting volunteers and migrants to form study and leisure time groups for and with migrants as well as it offers a language café. The language café is the project of *Station Wien* which I study in particular, participated at and derived my questionnaire and interview respondents from. It is organised three times a week for three hours in one of the locations of *Station Wien* in the district of Margareten and is open to everyone. It invites people to either offer to teach a language or to learn a language mainly through conversing with people. Each language guide sits down at one table with chairs around it and people are invited to join him or her and converse. Any language can be offered depending on the availability of volunteers. The location consists of several rooms in a row with open passages furnished with tables and chairs and a small food counter operated by volunteers. There is water and tea for free and small snacks and coffee offered at the counter for a voluntary donation. Mostly there is at least one employee of *Station Wien* who is there as a supervisor while the languages and food are offered by volunteers. *Station Wien* has 23 paid employees of which two are directly assigned to the contact pool (Station Wien, n.d.). Concerning their financing, *Station Wien* relies on governmental funding as their main income source. They have been funded, in descending order, by the Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs (BMEIA), the Asylum, Migration and Integration Funds of the European Union (AMIF), the Municipal Department for Integration and Diversity (MDID), to a small extent the Municipal Department for Culture for several years (Int.Org.2, Code 24). The *Erste Bank* as a sponsor and some donations collected during events comprise a very small part of their income (Int.Org.2, Code 24).

Fremde werden Freunde is an association which aims at societal inclusion and fosters encounter between people of diverse backgrounds and civic engagement (Fremde werden Freunde, n.d.). The NGO has also two project branches: the first revolving around different leisure time activities aiming at creating encounter between diverse people and the second revolving around corporate volunteering (Fremde werden Freunde, n.d.). The corporate volunteering branch aims at consulting enterprises in how to engage in the social sector and organising corporate volunteering events with them (Fremde werden Freunde, n.d.). The

organisation started as an initiative where volunteers offered German classes to migrants when a large number of asylum seekers arrived in Vienna in 2015. Out of these classes, soon other joint activities such as hiking or football and music groups developed (Int.Org.1, Code 1). Today, as part of their first project branch, they organise a variety of activities open to everyone such as chess, job coaching, singing, hiking, story saloons, cooking, barbeque and parties which aim at bringing together a diverse audience. The chess evening and story saloon are the activities of *Fremde werden Freunde* at which I participated and derived my questionnaire and interview respondents from. However, several of the questionnaire respondents (more than one third) reported to participate at multiple activities. The chess evening is organised once a week usually in the *Freunde Salon*, the location of the NGO in the district of Alsergrund. People are invited to come and play chess with each other and/or chat. The story saloon takes place bi-weekly usually at the *Freunde Salon* and invites people to converse and exchange experiences mostly in German so migrants can improve their German skills. During the story saloon, coffee and cake are offered and brought by the two volunteers who organise the saloon and sometimes a group of young men comes to cook a meal. The location consists of one large room including a fully equipped kitchen and is furnished with tables, chairs and couches. Usually there are drinks in the fridge and during both events, participants are free to use the kitchen, bring drinks with them and put them in the fridge or take drinks out of the fridge for a voluntary donation. All activities are organised by volunteers. The association has three paid employees, two sharing a full-time position and one having a 30 hours position (Int.Org.1, Code 36). In 2018, they have received their first large-scale funding from the Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs (MEA) and have sustained themselves largely through this source of funding (Int.Org.1, Code 18). Donations they collect at their events constitute a relatively small share of their income (Int.Org.2, Code 20).

Thus, concerning the length of funding, number of funders, age, size and the frequency of the studied activities offered, the two cases show differences. Concerning the structure, orientation, aim, design, location and main income source of the cases, the cases show many similarities. The knowledge on these similarities and differences is not the core of my study but will be drawn on to provide context when necessary. As my case study design is an in-depth design of two exemplifying cases, the most important characteristics of my cases are that they are both NGOs, implementing projects designed with the aim of creating encounter between people of diverse backgrounds in Vienna and receive funding by governmental institutions.

3.5 Expectations and Aim of the Study

As explained in my research design, the question my thesis engages with is: *What is the relationship between governmental funding, an encounter initiative's design and the social contact occurring between participants of diverse backgrounds in the context of Station Wien and Fremde werden Freunde?* What underlies this research question is the theoretical assumption that governmental funding practices, i.e. how governmental funding influences an initiative's design, can be counterproductive to the designing for positive social contact. Therefore, I explore how the relationship between funding and the initiatives' design is perceived by the employees, on the one hand, and how participants perceive social contact with participants of a different background and what aspects of design they perceived as supportive for positive social contact, on the other hand. Based on the literature, I expect that the way the funding is perceived to influence the designs stands in contrast to a design which is perceived as supportive of positive social contact. The aim of exploring these expectations and answering my research question is not to define a causal relationship between funding, design and social contact but to explore in what ways the logic of funding and the logic of designing for positive social encounter, and therefore the field of public administration and the field of sociology, may need to enter into further dialogue.

3.6 Ethical Considerations, Reflection on Role as a Researcher and Limitations

Before entering the discussion on my findings, I want to reflect on certain ethical considerations and the limitations of my research. My ethical considerations particularly concern the third core aspect of my research: social contact between diverse participants. As Brubaker (2013) and Fox and Jones (2013) emphasise, studying social contact between diverse people is problematic as it easily leads to the generalisation of groups and attributes, overemphasis of boundaries and essentialism. In my case, when applying theory related to contact with and attitudes towards 'outgroups', I assume that 'people with a different background', i.e. a different country of origin, primary language or religious belief, in my study resemble such 'outgroups'. I am aware of this pitfall, however, do not see a possibility of overcoming this presumption and going in-depth into the outgroup perception of each respondent within the scope and time frame of my research. To avoid essentialism at least, I try to avoid terms such as 'ethnic' or 'cultural' background in the questions asked to the participants and use rather clear categories of migration-related diversity such as country of origin, primary language and religious belief. Nevertheless, I acknowledge that religious belief, primary language and even country of origin may be contested concepts of inquiry and may not be as clear-cut as assumed. Moreover, through constant reflection of my role as a

researcher, I try to avoid pitfalls of exaggerating differences and boundaries between ‘people of diverse backgrounds’.

Besides my effort to avoid pitfalls, I acknowledge that my research has several limitations. First, the time and scope of this research were limited due to the provided framework for writing this master thesis. Second, the breadth of my research caused by the wide range of fields, aspects and cases I aim at shedding light on, is a strength and weakness of my research at the same time. On the one hand, this breadth will hopefully be able to establish connections within a broader context and topic overarching several fields of research. On the other hand, the exploration of the relationship between three aspects prevents the thorough investigation of each single one of them on its own. Although I tried to conduct an as thorough study of my research context as possible, it is no large-scale study which could take all influencing factors into account and its results should therefore be treated as indicative. Third, I want to highlight again that in my research I largely rely on perceptions of people, i.e. I reflect on “ways in which individuals interpret their social world” (Bryman, 2012, p.36) which should by no means be taken as an objective truth. My study and the data I rely on is therefore context-specific and cannot be generalised to other contexts. Whether the suggestions, my research brings forward apply in other settings too is subject to an in-depth investigation of each context respectively.

4. FINDINGS

As established in my research design, my research question of the relationship between *Station Wien* and *Fremde werden Freunde*’s funding, their designs and the social contact occurring between participants is divided into two sub-questions investigated through different data sets. The first sub-question on the perceived relationship between funding and design is explored through interviews with employees of the two encounter initiatives studied – one with an employee of *Fremde werden Freunde* and one with an employee of *Station Wien*. The second sub-question on the participants’ perception of social contact developed and the design perceived as supportive of positive social contact is studied through a questionnaire filled in by 49 participants of the initiatives – 24 of *Fremde werden Freunde* and 25 of *Station Wien* – on the extent of positive social contact which developed since their participation and qualitative follow-up interviews with participants – two participants of *Fremde werden Freunde* and two participants of *Station Wien* – which went into depth about the social contact experienced and the aspects of design perceived to be supportive of positive social contact.

Below in Table 3, I list again the details of the six interview respondents, including the interviews with the employees of the initiatives (Int.Org.) and the interviews with the participants (Int.Part.).

Table 3			
List with Details of all Six Interview Respondents			
Interview Name	Role in Organisation	Country/Region of Origin	Gender
Int.Org.1	employee of FwF	-	-
Int.Org.2	employee of SW	-	-
Int.Part.1	participant of SW	Austria	male
Int.Part.2	participant of FwF	Europe	female
Int.Part.3	participant of FwF	Austria	male
Int.Part.4	participant of SW	Europe	female
<i>Note.</i> Details are listed if made available and only to the extent that no identification is possible.			

Table 3. *Repeated:* List of All Interview Respondents

In the remainder of this chapter, I will first elaborate on the findings of sub-question one and then of sub-question two.

4.1 Employees’ Perception on the Relationship between Funding and Design

This sub-chapter revolves around the findings on the sub-question of how the NGOs’ employees perceived the relationship between funding provided by the governmental institutions and their organisational and project designs. Before going further into my findings, I want to remark that both employees reported on supportive aspects of funding in terms of it providing them resources to realise their projects and develop them further. However, my research aims at going beyond the establishment that financial resources provide room for action and focuses on the aspects of funding practices discussed by previous scholars which may be counterproductive to a design which supports positive social contact. As discussed in the theoretical framework, the theory on the relationship between governmental funding and an initiative’s design suggests that an influence can occur in terms of their formal service orientation, their administrative focus and their target group orientation, these are the aspects of the employee interviews I elaborate on. Concerning the first aspect, formal service orientation, previous research has highlighted contradictions

between designs aiming at informal encounter and designs aiming at more formal service delivery such as classroom teaching (Fincher & Iveson, 2008). However, at the same time it has been suggested that governmental funders tend to tie their funds to the provision of rather formalised services (Fincher & Iveson, 2008). Therefore, the first section discusses how the employees explain the designing of their encounter initiatives and their experience of attracting governmental funding for this. It is concerned with whether informality is an aim of their encounter projects and if so, how they experienced the attraction of funding for this.

4.1.1 Access to Funding

This section discusses how the employees explained the designing of their encounter initiatives and their experience of attracting governmental funding for this. It is concerned with whether their encounter projects are oriented towards an informal setting and if so, how they experienced the attraction of funding for this. Concerning the (in)formal orientation of the NGOs' projects, both employees perceived informal encounter as an aim of both their projects and organisations as a whole. As the *Station Wien* employee explained:

[Interviewer:] And is Station Wien rather service-oriented or rather oriented towards informal encounter?

[Person:] I would say the aim is informal encounter. (Code 23)

Concerning the encounter project studied, the interviewee described that the language café is supposed to mix migrants of any background with “settled” inhabitants and create encounter between them at an equal level:

And the language café also started like this because we wanted to create a centre, a space for encounter where all people can get together and do something together. [...]
And we also want that as many Austrians as possible join because the contact to the inhabitants, I will call them “settled” or people who have been here longer, is very, very important for people who have not been here for a long time. [...] For us it is also important that they [Austrians] join too, so that everything happens on equal terms as well as possible. (Codes 19, 21, 22)

Thus, at *Station Wien*, the employee's replies on the focus of their organisational and project design shows that the respondent perceives the NGO to be oriented towards informal encounter. The project design of the language café seems to align with this focus as it aims at being “a space for encounter” for “all people” “on equal terms”.

At *Fremde werden Freunde*, the employee described that, from the beginning, the aim of the organisation was “to provide people who fled, the opportunity to immediately establish contact with Viennese people” (Code 3) and meanwhile the interviewee feels that with their

encounter activities they “really managed to create a living room where people feel comfortable” and are open to engage with each other on equal terms (Code 47). Thus, according to the employee, the focus of the NGO and its encounter activities seem to be the creation of an encounter space. Moreover, the accomplishment of creating a “living room where people feel comfortable” indicates a rather informal than formal encounter design.

Moreover, both encounter projects developed from the reason that a demand for encounter between diverse people was perceived. The *Station Wien* interviewee described that the contact pool project branch, which includes the language café, started based on the demand for encounter expressed by participants of their educational project branch:

There in the German courses the demand was expressed where the attending women said well, we learn German but where should we practice it, and nobody talks to us. And then we looked for Austrians who could be interested in this and this is how the first contacts were established. And the project continued to grow, so, increasingly more people signed up for it, both German native speakers as well as non-German native speakers. (Code 17)

The *Fremde werden Freunde* employee described how their initiative started due to the demand perceived after a large number of refugees arrived in Austria in 2015:

FwF started after the chaos that prevailed in 2015 in Austria when many people arrived here from different countries and many people started to engage because they felt they needed to do something in the situation back then. These were partly German courses and out of this fast other activities such as hiking trips, a football group, a music group emerged. There were many different groups as people had different interests. (Code 2)

The interviewees' quotes on how their initiatives started indicates that in both cases employees or volunteers perceived that there was a practical demand from the side of existent participants or new members of society and therefore responded with practical solutions to these demands.

Concerning the access to funding for their encounter projects, both employees reported that although their projects were in demand, the NGOs had difficulties in attracting funding for them. The *Station Wien* respondent explained that initially the governmental funding institutions did not fund the language café (Code 38). According to the employee, the problem is that “you really have to come up with facts and numbers” to convince the governmental funders that a project is effective. In the case of *Station Wien*, the NGO found a way to convince the governmental funders by providing some “facts and numbers” to incorporate the

language café into the funding plan (Code 38). Currently, *Station Wien* is facing the same problem of not getting funding for another encounter project:

Now we are at the same problem, this Encounter Space which has actually been working for a year and has been working well and where demand for it exists, but we didn't succeed in getting funding for it. (Code 38).

Concerning the funding in the case of *Fremde werden Freunde*, remarkably, the employee noted that the funding the NGO receives by the MEA is actually not directed at the encounter activities but at their other project branch revolving around corporate volunteering (Codes 29, 52). Although the existent encounter branch has worked well over several years, the employee reported that it was difficult to get governmental funding for it (Codes 29, 33). According to the employee, the problem is that usually, governmental funding is for projects on topics predefined by the funder – like ‘labour market integration’ in the case of their funding by the MEA, – and the money the NGO receives is “only for the new project you submit” (Code 33).

As both employees reported to having had problems in their access to funding for their encounter projects, I asked them what they did when they could not attract funding. Both employees reported different strategies they applied. The *Station Wien* employee replied: “[When we cannot attract funding], then we try it through private donations, which unfortunately does not always work, or with volunteers, or we just do not do it” (Code 37). In the case of the Encounter Space in which they could not attract funding, the employee explained:

What we do is that we permanently look for one [funding] as it would be sad for us if the project could not be continued. On the other hand, it is also stressful as many of my colleagues also work in the Encounter Space voluntarily in addition and in the long term this is not a good solution. (Code 38)

The *Fremde werden Freunde* employee explained that although their funding is not directed at the encounter project branch, they “try, so to say, to link this to each other as well as possible” (Code 29). For example, they try to incorporate their “base” – the encounter activities – in the social team events they organise in their corporate volunteering branch (Code 29). Thus, although both NGOs experience difficulties in the attraction of funding for projects aiming at informal encounter, they continued implementing them even when they do not get funding through means such as alternative income sources, volunteering or incorporating parts of their encounter projects into other project branches.

Summarising this first section on the design of the initiatives’ encounter projects and the access to funding, both employees indicated that their encounter projects have an informal focus and developed out of a practical demand. However, both employees perceived

difficulties in the attraction of funding for their informal encounter projects. While the *Station Wien* interviewee perceived that the funders' demand for measurable facts and numbers was a problem, *Fremde werden Freunde* interviewee perceived the need to fit predefined topics as a problem.

4.1.2 Administrative Requirements

A second aspect of funding which may influence the design of encounter initiatives are administrative requirements. According to theory, the logic of accountability led governmental funders to tie their funding to administrative requirements which prevent employees from pursuing their mission and developing and implementing their projects (Greiling & Stötzer, 2015; Richmond & Shields, 2005). Therefore, this section discusses how the employees perceived administrative requirements to influence their initiatives' designs.

As the employee of *Station Wien* explained, the high administrative demands of the governmental funding institutions influence the work focus of the organisation:

The disadvantage is that often...or that there are phases where it [funding] keeps us from operative work or limits it a lot. This is when new applications have to be written, when reports have to be written. Although, we have to submit three mid-term reports, these are not that wild, but the final report is very substantial, this is a very thick report. In the basic education [branch] I think they have huge difficulties right now and are in the phase of accounting reaching back to 2015. The difficult part is, of course, also the controls where you have to find the bills they want and send it to them. This takes away a lot of time and also a lot of energy. (Code 40)

As the employee reported, an aspect in which funding affected *Station Wien* is the expansion of their administrative workload including reporting and accounting. According to the employee, as the amount of funding and funders increased, their share of administrative work increased too, and their administrative staff grew to nine people (Code 43). The employee further explained that employees who are normally only partly responsible for administration, work at peak periods full-time on funding administration instead of project work (Code 43). According to her, if the office staff of the organisation was smaller than the current nine employees, they would not be able to handle the administration required by the funding institutions (Code 43). Thus, at an organisational level, the administrative requirements on the one hand, led to the expansion of administrative staff and an increased capability and professionalism in handling administrative work. On the other hand, it shifted away their focus and resources from operative work, i.e. developing and implementing their encounter projects. According to the employee, if everything was funded by a foundation with less administrative

requirements, they could work in a more efficient way: “I think we could work in a more relaxed way or more time efficient and resource efficient as these reports are simply time consuming” (Code 42).

The employee of *Fremde werden Freunde* also emphasised the pressure funding puts on their organisation and how this influences a shift of priorities:

And that's also an important aspect, that you have to put a considerable amount of time into this [seeking funding] to secure money...in order to have leeway to continue doing the things which are the association's purpose originally. Seeking funding is not the association's purpose, of course, it also matters what eventually happens with it. And this is often a bit difficult, generally, for organisations as there is always pressure and because it is annoying because funding doesn't run for a very long time and you fast get into the same situation where you have to shift your priorities towards something which actually is not your primary goal. I think this is something all organisations struggle with. (Code 19)

In the case of *Fremde werden Freunde*, the administrative effort and the subsequent shift of priorities towards work unrelated to the NGO's purpose, combined with the difficulty to secure funding is perceived such a high price that they try to become independent of governmental funding:

And we actually also try to slowly...this will not work that quickly but that we get away from this dependency on funding. So that we try to offer something on the market which makes sense and we are also on this I have to say. [...] [We try to get away from funding] because it is insecure, also due to the political situation, especially at the national level. This of course also depends on the political level. It is insecure if you get it, whether EU or national or city or provincial or district level – they get increasingly smaller, the amounts of funding, which is clear anyways. Insofar, increasingly more work for increasingly less money, so to say, which you have to dedicate only to the application for funding. (Code 19)

In the quotes, the *Fremde werden Freunde* employee highlighted the trade-off between the NGO's purpose and the demands of funding they perceive to be pushed towards when entering governmental funding flows. The interviewee emphasised how funding administration is not the NGO's purpose but just a mean to live up to their original purpose and realise their goals, which are creating encounter and civic engagement. The employee thought that “this is something all organisations struggle with”. *Fremde werde Freunde*, therefore, started seeking income sources in the private sector because they see it as more efficient for them, especially if funds are connected to much work and insecurity.

Summarising the findings concerning the influence of administrative requirements on the initiatives, both employees highlighted how funding expanded their administrative workload and thereby shifts away focus from realising encounter projects. At *Station Wien*, their funding has increasingly pushed the organisation into expanding their office staff which still rather works at its limits. Independent of the number of office employees, both organisations perceived the administrative requirements of governmental funding institutions as decreasing their efficiency as an encounter initiative.

4.1.3 Target Group Requirements

Besides the problems perceived in the access of funding and in administrative requirements, a third way in which funding may influence encounter initiatives are target group requirements. According to theory, there is a second contradiction between practices of governmental funders and practices of encounter initiatives: While government actors usually allocate resources directed at specific target groups (De Graauw, et al., 2013; Fincher & Iveson, 2008), encounter initiatives aim at attracting diverse participants overarching predefined target groups (Fincher & Iveson, 2008). Therefore, this section discusses how the employees perceived target group requirements to influence their initiatives' designs.

In the case of *Station Wien*, funding institutions provide certain guidelines of how the encounter projects funded need to be implemented. According to the employee, this affects their target group orientation:

[Interviewer:] And what role do the funding institutions play, not financially but content wise?

[Person:] Yes, they do play a role. Due to the AMIF, there are certain guidelines of how the projects need to be implemented and these we have to adhere to. So, this concerns the target group, for example, we are not allowed, for example, to put a study assistant in contact with an Austrian child with Austrian parents. (Code 25)

Remarkably, the target group requirements differ from governmental institution to governmental institution. The employee explained that while the AMIF and MEIFA set this target group requirement, the MDID has no requirements concerning the target group (Code 27). According to the AMIF and MEIFA *Station Wien* is only allowed to

offer services to people with a NAG [Settlement and Residence Act] residence permit, a refugee status or subsidiary protection, or EU citizens who are directly related to one of the former groups. This means if a child has the Austrian nationality but the mother not yet, she would mostly have a permanent residence or family residence permit, then the child is still part of the target group. (Code 29)

Thus, the NGO as a whole is rather oriented towards migrants as a target group, excluding asylum seekers, whom they “are not allowed to offer services to” (Code 29). According to the employee, this exclusive target group orientation they only adapt due to the guidelines provided but it does not represent the organisation’s actual viewpoint:

[Interviewer:] Would you like to have asylum seekers at your events too?

[Person:] Well, for us, the managers of the association, all people are equal.

[Interviewer:] So, that you have to adhere to this [target group requirement] is really just due to the funding, so to say?

[Person:] Yes. The funding institutions argue that for asylum seekers there are separately financed projects and such projects, where also lots of money flows in, and then it happens that they can’t stay and all the means for integration would have been blown for that. (Code 31)

The account indicates how the logic applied at the governmental funding institutions is different from the logic of the NGO. Whereas the governmental funders apply a logic of dividing projects and allocating resources according to legally defined target groups, the NGO employees apply a logic of everyone being equal regardless of their legal status or background.

Besides representing a different logic, the employee perceived target group requirements as constraining an NGO’s freedom. According to the employee, on the one hand, the financial resources available through funding provide freedom; “on the other hand, it [funding] takes away freedom as, depending on what you plan, if you plan something super nice or also concerning the target group it constrains, of course” (Code 44).

Remarkably, although *Station Wien* generally needs to adhere to the target group requirements in their encounter project branch, the contact pool, at the language café they are exempted from this requirement:

[Interviewer:] And how do you do this [adhering to the predefined target group] at the language café or events?

[Person:] The thing is that also the funding institutions know that we cannot precisely control who comes. And I think as mainly people with a refugee status know of our project because they maybe first sign up for the contact pool for a contact and I tell them either they still need to wait until they have the positive decision...so, I think most of them are not asylum seekers anymore but we also don’t check this. I mean this would also be...you were at the language café, this would be quite impossible to check this. And this would take away the whole low-threshold setting if we want to see the identity card of everyone who enters. This is very deterring. (Code 30)

This excerpt reveals that the employee finds open access without target group constraints an important aspect of the language café's design. According to her, having to adhere to a predefined target group would undermine the low-threshold design, which, in turn, would prevent people from coming.

Thus, *Station Wien* needs to adhere to a predefined target group at a general organisational level and some encounter projects. However, at the project level of the language café, funding institutions understand that strictly checking who participates is impossible and therefore, the rigid target group requirement does not apply there.

In contrast to *Station Wien*, the employee of *Fremde werden Freunde* explained that their funding provider, the MEA, has not set a strict target group requirement:

[Interviewer:] Do you think it depends on the funding offer what is required concerning the target group or categorisation?

[Person:] It depends on what is funded. If the funding institution is responsible for a certain group this happens easily. But this was not the case for us because it came from the Ministry for Economic Affairs which is concerned with labour market integration. (Code 35)

In the quote, the employee argued that governmental funding institutions tend to restrict their funding to an exclusive target group they are responsible for. Similar to the account of the *Station Wien* employee above (Code 31), it indicates a logic of public administration which distinguishes target groups and assigns them to different governmental institutions which, in turn, are supposed to restrict their funded projects to the target group they are assigned to. Furthermore, the *Fremde werden Freunde* employee highlighted that not having a narrow target group requirement is an advantage of the funding they receive. Similar to *Station Wien*, they perceive target group requirements as negatively influencing the design of encounter initiatives:

One advantage of our case was for sure that in the framework of our funding we did not really have to categorise a lot which is often the case with funding, I think...as I said we don't have that much experience with funding...But what plays a big role for us is that in the context of our spaces for encounter it actually doesn't matter who it is, it doesn't matter whether one has a positive or negative asylum decision or no asylum at all or is waiting or someone born in Vienna...doesn't matter. So, for us the only difference between people is whether someone is disadvantaged or not but it is much less about the asylum status or so and this provides a lot of leeway, I would say. And it is good that this exists because this is often very constraining when receiving funding if you think you have the possibility to do something but only asylum seekers can take

part and refugees not and so and then you start dividing things where you suddenly realise that this destroys all this low-threshold togetherness as you let in those and those not. So, this was also a big advantage of our funding. (Codes 31, 32)

Concerning the target group categorisation, the employee explained that *Fremde werden Freunde* distinguishes between disadvantaged members of society and not disadvantaged ones “only”, which leaves them much room. Apparently, this rather loose distinction is not perceived to influence the design of the encounter projects negatively. Moreover, the administrative categorisation of participants does not prohibit the participation of non-disadvantaged inhabitants in the encounter activities and hamper a design where “everything is so open” (Code 41). In contrast, a project design which separates people according to more narrowly defined categories such as asylum seekers versus refugees versus Austrian-born people is perceived as counterproductive to low-threshold encounter by the employee.

Summarising the findings on the employees’ perception of target group requirements, in the interviews the two employees explained that several funding institutions, especially when assigned a specific target group, set strict target group requirements for the organisations or projects they fund. In the case of *Station Wien*, at an organisational level and at some projects, two of the three big funding institutions – the EU institution and the national ministry, not the municipal department – set target group requirements. As the employee reported, these requirements have influenced the NGO to orient their organisational focus and the design of most of their projects to migrants with a residence permit only, thus excluding Austrians and asylum seekers. The encounter project of the language café is exempted from this requirement and thus, has no target group restriction. The governmental funding provider of *Fremde werden Freunde* does not set a restriction on participants of encounter activities which is perceived as very positive by the employee. Both interviewees emphasised that a target group restriction would damage the low-threshold design and informal encounter of the encounter projects studied.

Concluding the findings revolving around the first sub-question – how the employees perceive the relationship between funding and their encounter initiatives’ designs, several trends have been apparent. First, both employee interviews indicated that both NGOs are oriented towards informal encounter both at a project and at an organisational level and have therefore implemented encounter projects with a rather informal design where encounter happens in a rather non-service-oriented manner. Remarkably, both employees perceived difficulties in the access to funding, *Station Wien* due to the governmental funders demand for output measurements and *Fremde werden Freunde* due to governmental funders demand for fitting predefined topics of funding. Both organisations experienced difficulties in the access

of funding for their encounter projects although their projects were in demand. Moreover, both employees reported to apply individual strategies when not being able to attract funding. These include seeking private donations, volunteering and finding ways to incorporate parts of the encounter project into other projects which are funded. By applying these strategies, both NGOs were able to continue implementing their informally designed encounter projects even in the absence of funding.

Second, both employees reported that their organisational focus was influenced by high administrative requirements demanded by the governmental funders. In both cases, the interviewees perceived that these administrative shifted their resources and focus away from their purpose of their realising encounter projects and that they decreased their efficiency as an encounter initiative. Furthermore, they highlighted that the size of the NGO and the office staff plays a role. *Fremde werden Freunde*, which are smaller, therefore try to find ways out of governmental funding dependency and seek strategies to attract income sources from the private market.

Third, *Station Wien* reported that two of their governmental funders set target group restrictions. At an organisational level, the employee therefore perceived that they adapted a limited target group orientation at an organisational level although this does not reflect the logic of equality the NGO itself pursues. At the project level of the language café, the *Station Wien* employees were able to explain to their funders that a target group restriction would not be possible and therefore, they got exempted from it. Thus, when the NGO perceived restrictions counterproductive to their aim, they counteracted it through negotiating with the governmental funding institutions. The *Fremde werden Freunde* employee reported that they do not have to adhere to a target group restriction. Generally, both employees highlighted that governmental funders tend to apply a logic of target group restrictions and that this would be counterproductive to an informal encounter design.

In sum, none of the NGO employees perceived restrictions at a project level, while influence was perceived at the organisational level, primarily through administrative requirements and secondarily through target group requirements. However, it seemed that when the NGOs perceived restrictions which would infringe the design or implementation of their encounter projects, they applied preventative strategies. The general trends that became apparent from the interviews were that access to funding was perceived difficult due to the demand for output measurements and the predefinition of topics by governmental funders, administrative requirements were perceived as limiting the ability to implement the encounter projects and target group requirements were perceived as reflecting the logic of governmental funders but infringing a supportive design for encounter.

Having elaborated on the findings on how the employees have perceived the relationship between funding and their encounter initiatives' design, the next sub-chapter will discuss the findings on how participants perceived social contact and its relationship to each initiative's design. By having information on the way social contact is experienced and what design seems supportive of this, and on how funding seems to influence this design, I will be able to create a discussion on potential mismatches between funding practices and designing for positive social contact.

4.2 Participants' Perception on the Relationship between Design and Social Contact

The first sub-chapter elaborated on the relationship between the initiatives' funding and their designs, while this sub-chapter discusses the relationship between the initiatives' design and positive social contact. As established in theory, the way funding is expected to influence the initiatives' design may be counterproductive to a design supportive of positive social contact. The extent to which the designs of the initiatives are (counter)productive to the social contact experienced between participants is what I explore in this chapter. I therefore engage with the question of the extent to which positive social contact was perceived at the initiatives and what aspects of design were perceived as supportive of positive social contact. In the first section, I provide an overview of the extent to which participants perceived positive social contact, with a focus on the quality of contact, the quantity of contact, the quality and length of relationships and attitudes. In the second section, I explore what aspects of the design of the initiatives were perceived as supportive for the development of positive social contact.

4.2.1 Social Contact Between Diverse Participants

As explained in theory, different designs of encounter initiatives have been found to trigger different social contact (Matejskova & Leitner, 2011). Moreover, several aspects in which the design is suggested to be influenced through funding are considered counterproductive to the establishment of positive social contact between participants (Fincher & Iveson, 2008). Therefore, it is relevant to explore to what extent the participants of the governmentally funded initiatives perceived social contact as positive. I combined two methods to investigate participants' social contact: a self-completion questionnaire filled in by 25 participants of the language café of *Station Wien* and 24 participants of the chess evening and story saloon of *Fremde werden Freunde*, and follow-up in-depth interviews with two participants of each initiative. I did so to provide both an overview of the extent to which a larger number of participants perceived the initiatives to have triggered positive social contact as well as to provide a more in-depth understanding of how they did so. As explained in my research

design, by positive social contact I refer to social contact between people of diverse backgrounds which was experienced as positive, resulted in sustained, deep and frequent contact, in friendships and increasingly positive attitudes towards people with a different background. Furthermore, from the perspective of sociologists, the establishment of positive social contact is the main aim of encounter projects (e.g. Zapata-Barrero, 2015). Thus, this section will discuss to what extent these positive contact patterns and attitudes were apparent in the accounts of the participants of the encounter initiatives studied.

Quality of Contact

Concerning the quality of contact, the average of the 24 *Fremde werden Freunde* respondents perceived the contact experienced with participants of a different background at the initiative as positive. In the follow-up interviews, both *Fremde werden Freunde* participants associated their contact to participants with a different background with positive values. Participant 2 described it as “amicable”, “always fun”, “informative and refreshing” (Codes 8, 9). Participant 3 ascribed the contact with participants of a different background a particular value in his identification with them and the overcoming of his loneliness:

For me it is, yes, an interruption of my loneliness. Because if you are at the margins of society it means...also socially at the margins of society...you don't belong to the happy, beautiful people. [...] But for me it is of course, I have people in a similar situation as mine and it is nice for me that I can share this with them. (Code 15)

Moreover, both participants reported to have experienced deep contact with people of a different background where they share personal and emotional stories (Int.Part.2, Code 13; Int.Part.3, Code 8).

The average of the 25 *Station Wien* questionnaire respondents perceived the contact with the initiative's participants of a different background as rather positive or positive and thus as slightly less positive than the *Fremde werden Freunde* group. The responses in the in-depth interviews, however, revealed the experience of high-quality contact similar to the responses of the *Fremde werden Freunde* interviewees. Both *Station Wien* interviewees reported to have experienced deep contact with participants of a different background (Int.Part.1, Code 43; Int.Part.4, Code 13). According to Participant 4, “it is very difficult to be superficial” at the language café as everyone talks about their personal life and experiences (Code 13). Furthermore, like Participant 3 of *Fremde werden Freunde*, Participants 1 and 4 also ascribed the contact with participants of a different background a value in identifying particularly well with them. Participant 4 felt particularly comfortable in her contact with participants from Arab countries and perceived them as being “near to [her] character” (Code 17). Participant 1

reported that the contact with participants of a different background “is more easy-going” for him than contact with people of the same background as they fit “[his] profile” and “story” better (Code 88). Moreover, he also described the contact with participants of a different background as valuable in overcoming his loneliness and his depression (Int.Part.1, Codes 100, 148). In addition, both *Station Wien* interviewees described the contact with participants of a different background as being more interesting than contact with people of the same background (Int.Part.1, Code 88; Int.Part.4, Code 28).

Hence, concerning the quality of contact, both the questionnaire respondents as well as the interviewees of both initiatives perceived the quality of contact with participants of a different background as rather high. The participants of both initiatives reported the experience of (rather) positive contact, valuable contact and deep contact with people of a different background. Remarkably, the reported experiences of both initiatives largely resemble each other.

Quantity of Contact

Concerning the quantity of contact with participants of a different background, the average of the 24 *Fremde werden Freunde* respondents reported that they have frequent contact (at least once a week) with 1 to 4 participants with a different background. The follow-up interviews revealed that for both *Fremde werden Freunde* participants, this contact reaches beyond the initiative as they regularly meet participants of a different background outside the initiative (Int.Part.2, Code 6; Int.Part.3, Code 1). Participant 3, for example, regularly meets participants to go for a walk, to go out eating, to go swimming and even celebrated last Christmas with a friend from Somalia and one from Afghanistan he met at the initiative (Codes 1, 16, 17).

The average of the 25 *Station Wien* questionnaire respondents reported that they have frequent contact with 2 to 5 participants with a different background. The number is slightly higher than the one of the *Fremde werden Freunde* group. The slight difference could be due to the language café of *Station Wien* being offered three times a week, while the chess evening of *Fremde werden Freunde* is offered only once a week and the story saloon of *Fremde werden Freunde* only once bi-weekly. The in-depth interviews with the *Station Wien* participants also revealed that they regularly meet participants of a different background outside the initiative to go to restaurants or cafés, for example (Int.Part.1, Code 150; Int.Part.4, Code 2). Participant 1, for instance, reported to usually have a pool of around five participants whose composition changes and with whom he meets regularly outside the initiative (Code 150).

Hence, concerning the quantity of contact, both the questionnaire respondents as well as the interviewees of both initiatives reported to have frequent contact of at least once a week with participants of a different background. Moreover, the interviews in both cases revealed that this contact extended the participation at the initiative and participants additionally organise private meetings. Again, the responses provided by the participants are similar.

Quality and Length of Relationships

Concerning the relationship quality with people of a different background, both the average of the 24 *Fremde werden Freunde* respondents and of the 25 *Station Wien* respondents reported to have made 1 to 4 friends of a different background at the initiative. The interviews ascribed a high quality to the relationships and revealed that friendships with participants of a different background lasted over sustained period. In the follow-up interview, Participant 2, for example, explained that she has one friend from Iran with whom she has been friends for three years (Code 6). She described that through the high quality of the relationships with the participants, they feel to her like a “huge Viennese family” (Code 15). Participant 3 has one friend from Afghanistan and one from Somalia with whom he has been friends for over six months (Code 16). To him, the relationship with his new friends has the quality of being a permanent “contact point” (Code 19), which he ascribed importance to because his “loneliness gets increasingly bigger” due to the decreasing contact with relatives and others (Code 28).

The *Station Wien* interviewees also reported a high relationship quality and sustained friendships with participants of a different background. Participant 1 reported that he had had a close friendship with one participant from Uruguay for over six months (Code 66). Participant 4 also explained that she had had a close friendship with a participant from Syria for three and a half years (Code 8). Both participants described that they felt that they could contact their friends if they had problems and that these friendships were particularly valuable because they had almost no friends besides these participants (Int.Part.1, Codes 60, 104; Int.Part.4, Code 10).

Thus, concerning the relationship quality and length, both the questionnaire respondents as well as the interviewees of both initiatives reported to have made friends with a different background at the initiative. Moreover, the interviews indicated that these friendships are perceived as valuable and that they had already been sustained over a longer period. One interviewee of each initiative reported of a friendship of at least three years and one interviewee of each initiative reported of friendships of at least six months. Again, the responses provided by the participants of the two initiatives are largely similar.

Attitudes

Concerning attitudes towards people of a different background, 52% of the 24 *Fremde werden Freunde* respondents reported a change in attitude concerning trust towards and/or perceived similarity of people with a different background since their participation. While around 30% reported a change in their trust, 40% reported a change in the perceived similarity of people with a different background since they started participating. The descriptions of how their attitudes changed, in both cases, were positively. One respondent, for example, described his change in trust as follows: “Positively. It is easier for me to trust someone because I better understand how these people [people with a different background] think”. Of the 25 *Station Wien* respondents only 32% reported a change in attitude in terms of their trust towards and/or their perceived similarity of people with a different background since their participation. Whereas concerning trust, remarkably, the same share (around 30%) of the respondents reported a change, only 20% of the 25 *Station Wien* respondents reported a change in perceived similarity since they started participating. As the two initiatives’ questionnaire and interview results largely resembled each other in terms of quality and quantity of contact as well as quality and length of relationships, this difference in the reported change in attitude appears as an outlying result. Considering that concerning the other aspects of positive social contact, the results of the initiatives resembled each other largely, this difference cannot be related to other relevant differences in social contact reported and is puzzling. A possible interpretation of this is that the *Station Wien* participants had had more contact with people of a different background prior to their participation at the language café already and therefore, a change in attitude due to their contact at the initiative itself was less likely. The vast majority (92%) of questionnaire respondents at *Station Wien* stated a country of origin different from Austria, whereas the slight majority of *Fremde werden Freunde* respondents (54%) stated Austria as their country of origin. Therefore, it would be plausible if people from a different country of origin than Austria who have been living in Austria would have had more contact with people of a different background than Austrians living in Austria. Another possible interpretation of the difference in results is that this reflects a social desirability bias, i.e. that participants reported a result which they felt to be desirable. It could be that the participants of the smaller organisation, *Fremde werden Freunde*, feel more part of the organisation, identify more strongly with it and therefore report the result they think to be desirable for the organisation as a whole.

Besides these possible interpretations of why this outlying difference occurred, I aimed at investigating this difference further in the follow-up interviews to see if it could be related

back to aspects of the initiatives' designs. As indicated in the sampling section of my research design, I therefore sampled the participant interviewees dependent on whether a change in the perceived similarity of people with a different background was reported or not. For *Fremde werden Freunde*, I interviewed two people who reported a change and for *Station Wien*, I interviewed one who reported a change and one who did not. However, two of the four participants provided a different answer during the interview than in the questionnaire. Therefore, a possible third interpretation of this result is that attitudes are difficult to capture in questionnaires taken at one particular point in time because they are inconsistent. This interpretation is supported by previous research of Matejskova and Leitner (2011) who argue that attitudes are highly inconsistent.

Both of the *Fremde werden Freunde* participants reported a positive change in perceived similarity at the questionnaire. However, when I asked Participant 3 of *Fremde werden Freunde* in the in-depth interview, whether "anything changed" in terms of his "perception concerning the similarity or difference of people with a different background" since participating at the initiative, he replied: "No, actually not" (Code 22). He further explained that through business trips he had been in contact with people from many different countries before and therefore already "knew" other groups, such as "the Muslim world" (Code 22). His reply indicates that he perceived that as he had much contact with people of a different background before his participation, his attitude, i.e. how he "knew" people with a different background, had consolidated already.

Participant 2 of *Fremde werden Freunde*, reported some change in the perceived similarity of people of a different background both in the questionnaire and interview. In the interview, she described that for her, differences largely disappeared during her contact with people of a different background at the initiative: "You sit down, you play chess and you realise there is no difference, there simply is no difference. There is someone who immediately has the same humour, or you realise you laugh about the same thing [...]" (Code 5).

Besides the increase in perceived similarity reported by one of the *Fremde werden Freunde* participants, they described changes in attitude since their participation concerning fear, prejudices and tolerance. Participant 2 perceived that she was not "immune against" the fear fanned that young men who came in 2015 and 2016 would be dangerous. However, through her participation at the initiative, her fear decreased

because nothing ever happens. Never any man in any way of these new men in Austria...nobody looks at me so that I feel in danger or constrained in my opinion or anything. Because it never is confirmed that due to any reason, any skin colour or any age I need to be more afraid, or any religious affiliation. (Code 31)

Moreover, Participant 2 described that she has experienced a difference in her prejudiced opinion about women wearing a headscarf:

I realised when I walk on the street and I see a headscarf I do have an opinion already. And it is not fully formulated on my mind but still that this woman is in a certain dependency, that this woman is not allowed to precisely do, and think, and say what she wants. And I had to realise that this cannot be concluded from this headscarf. There is already a difference in how it is worn, how much is really veiled. Some wear this scarf very loose and you see hair. There is also a difference in how this is exercised. But, in my opinion, even about those who wear it very strictly you cannot say what her situation of freedom looks like and if she is oppressed, hit or whatever by her husband or brothers or father. This I definitely learned. This is for sure a difference. (Code 21)

In the quote Participant 2 described that she reconsidered her ready-made opinion wherein she attached prejudices such as that women with a headscarf are oppressed as she started differentiating women with headscarves and detaching these prejudices.

The aspect in which Participant 3 of *Fremde werden Freunde* perceived that his attitude towards people of a different background had changed through the participation at the initiative, was an increased tolerance towards life choices of immigrants. Before getting to know his new contacts, he explained to have adopted an ideal-type vision of how to fight for one's country instead of escaping and establishing a better life somewhere else (Code 21). After being in contact with his two refugee friends he realised that it was "inhumane" to apply this same standard to everyone and "became more liberal" and less "dogmatic" towards them making different life choices (Code 21). Furthermore, Participant 3 extended the hypothetical consequences to Austrians who emigrated during worse times in Austria:

[...] now, do you wanna say they are all traitors or what? That's stupid, you simply need to accept them and it was okay that they did it. Thus, you also need to accept it with the people who come to Austria now. And this I also do but I have to say this I owe to the association, on my own I think I would not have got this [laughs]. And I also feel more comfortable like this, I have to say, I feel more comfortable. (Code 21)

Hence, in the case of applying idealised standards to migrants, the contact with his new friends led to Participant 3 increasing his tolerance not only towards his two friends but to Austrian emigrants and further to today's Austrian immigrants. Moreover, he emphasised that this was a positive change as he feels more comfortable with this new attitude.

Thus, concerning attitudes, the *Fremde werden Freunde* interviewees both perceived that their attitudes have changed. While Participant 3 described how his tolerance towards life

choices of immigrants increased, Participant 2 described that the perceived similarity of people with a different background intensified, her prejudices towards women wearing headscarves decreased and her fear of young men who had recently arrived in Austria was diminished.

In the case of the *Station Wien* participants, only one of the *Station Wien* participants reported a positive change in perceived similarity in the questionnaire, while in the in-depth interviews both of them reported such a change. Participant 4, who did not report such a change in the questionnaire, explained in the interview that her perception of Arab men changed through her participation. When asking whether this perception also changed in terms of “how similar they are to [her]”, she replied:

Well, in fact I am very surprised because I never think the Arabic people are so similar to Mediterranean, [omitted: nationality] people. They are really, really similar and I feel very, very comfortable with these people because I feel this is more near to my character than the people from Germany or another place. And that I discovered here. And I told everybody, 'Really, the Arabic people are like the [omitted: nationality] people.' (Code 17)

In the quote, the respondent explained that she was surprised when she discovered at the initiative that Arab people are so similar to her and she feels so comfortable with them.

Participant 1 of *Station Wien* also reported that through his participation at the language café he realised that people from the Middle East are not different from “us”, his ingroup:

...and through the language café which I originally not even planned or which I didn't even expect, that there were quite many people from the Middle East and [...] through this, when you talk to people then you see...slowly you realise... 'well, hello, they are not different from us' because they...some of them know about German philosophy, we have a shared history as the philosophy has been relocated to the Middle East while there was nothing here at ours there was much going on there and they have partly conserved it for us and it came back to us in the Middle Ages. And when you learn these things [...] our thinking patterns change because you see 'they are not different from us', they have it more difficult as they have to learn our language. And like this your own fear vanishes, of course, because when you have personal contact and friendships...even a certain extent of proudness emerges because you think 'look, I did it. I don't have this fear anymore and I have contact with those people and I don't need to be afraid of anyone, whether from Syria or Afghanistan, and can still admit that I am a fearful person in some aspects'. (Codes 111-115)

He described that when talking to people he realised that people from the Middle East are not different. He referred to aspects such as having a shared history and philosophy. Moreover, in the quote, Participant 1 highlighted another aspect in which his attitudes changed: he connects the perceived similarity to a decrease in fear of people from the Middle East. As he continued he explained:

If you have such thoughts [about individual people from the Middle East being dangerous], through the language café this fear got less for sure. This fear of the unknown. [...] ...In any case, if you have contact with such people and are constantly in touch with them in a conversation or really touch them in a friendly way, I would argue that a certain basic caution remains but the fear substantially decreased through this. Because through almost daily contact you win confidence and through this confidence...There's such a beautiful saying: Love replaces fear. It really gets less if you have confidence with a person and you cultivate this. If I have friends from Syria and I see that there are people who are truly good...[...]...where you realise they are really great people, there is nothing left to be afraid of. And this affects the general thinking patterns. (Codes 117-121)

In this account, Participant 1 argued that through frequent contact with people of a different background differentiation happens and appreciation and confidence develop, which in turn, positively impact general thinking patterns and decrease fear.

Besides the increase in perceived similarity reported by both *Station Wien* interviewees and the decrease in fear reported by Participant 1, Participant 4 explained that her prejudices especially against people from Arab countries decreased. She emphasised that through the contact with Arab people, she got a “different perception of the men from Arabic places” and the role of “women of these countries” (Code 17). According to her, “a lot of stereotypes fall down when you know the people” (Code 17). She explained that in European countries many stereotypes exist about people from the Middle East and that

...when you come here and you speak with him you can see why he, they, are doing some things concerning women or so and you can understand some things, and this is good. Because this is the reality, not your imagination you have because somebody has told you or you have read, no no, this is true [...] (Code 17)

According to Participant 4, talking increased her understanding and changed her opinion.

Summarising the perception of participants' changes in attitudes, also in the case of the *Station Wien* interviewees, both participants perceived that their attitudes changed. Both participants explained that their contact increased the perceived similarity towards people of a different background. Moreover, Participant 1 perceived a decrease in fear of people from the

Middle East and Participant 4 perceived a decrease in prejudices about Arab people. Hence, despite the difference in the questionnaire result on perceived similarity, when comparing the *Station Wien* interviewees' replies on the perception of attitudes to the replies of the *Fremde werden Freunde* interviewees, the accounts seem to resemble each other in several aspects. First, the participants of both initiatives perceived that their attitudes had changed in some aspect. Both *Station Wien* interviewees and one *Fremde werden Freunde* interviewee reported an increase in the perceived similarity of people with a different background. One *Station Wien* respondent and one *Fremde werden Freunde* respondent perceived that their fear of people from the Middle East diminished as well as one of each initiative perceived a decrease in prejudices. In addition, one *Fremde werden Freunde* participant perceived that his tolerance increased due to his participation.

Summarising this section, remarkably, the perception of social contact at both initiatives was largely similar. At both initiatives participants reported to have experienced a broad range of aspects of positive social contact, including a high quality of contact, a high quantity of contact, a high quality of relationships, sustained relationships and several aspects of positive changes in attitudes towards people with a different background.

4.2.2 A Supportive Design for Positive Social Contact

The section above on the perception of social contact at the two initiatives revealed that interviewees at both initiatives reported multiple aspects indicating positive social contact and the replies of the two participant groups largely resembled each other. As suggested by theory, the experience of social contact is influenced by an initiatives' design (e.g. Fincher & Iveson, 2008; Matejskova & Leitner, 2011). Scholars have suggested several aspects of design to be supportive of triggering positive social contact of which some seem to be contradicted by the influence funding is suggested to have on designs (Fincher & Iveson, 2008). Thus, this section engages with the aspects of the initiatives' designs which participants perceived as positively influencing social contact. For this, I rely on the four in-depth interviews with the participants.

Allowing for Long Conversations and Deep, Regular and Sustained Contact

The first aspect of design, participants in my interviews perceived to positively influence the establishment of social contact was that the designs allowed for deep, regular, sustained contact and long conversations. This was reported by interviewees of both initiatives.

Participant 4 of *Station Wien* said that the factors she perceived as positively influencing

social contact were long conversations and regular and sustained contact which allow for deep contact:

[Interviewer:] And what factors do you think have influenced this positively that your attitude changed?

[Person:] I think the factor is talking to the people a lot of time, not only one day, but every week you can see [each other], and you can see the evolution of these people and you are feeling with these people, [...] you are involved emotionally with these people, and you are looking [forward] to the next week and you have the evolution in this story, [...] (Code 18)

She continued by highlighting that one-time or sporadic contact does not result in this deep involvement:

Because you have an intimate relationship with these people and because you can stay during the time. That's the point for me. Because in another case, you can talk with another people and you didn't see them again and see this history, so, I don't know what happened with these people. But here, you can come and 'ooh, why didn't come the last week what happened?' - 'Naah, I have a problem, I am sick, blablabla' and you can continue this history. (Code 18)

Similarly, Participant 2 of *Fremde werden Freunde* suggested that one factor at *Fremde werden Freunde* which influenced that contacts can be established well was that “you have the chance to really talk” to people of a different background (Code 32). Participant 1 of *Station Wien* also suggested that having “no time limit” is a supportive factor of design.

Involving a High Number of Diverse Participants

The second aspect which was mentioned by one participant concerns the participant composition of the project. Participant 2 perceived the design which enabled interaction with a high number of diverse participants to be supportive of developing positive social contact:

At Fremde werden Freunde it is particularly concentrated of course. There you have the chance to really talk to many different people and this is nice compared to if you only say you work in a restaurant and the dishwasher or cook is from Turkey and I know one Turk. At Fremde werden Freunde, at once you know a bunch of people from Afghanistan, from Iran, from Somalia. The pool is bigger and thus you can establish a broader picture. (Code 32)

Engaging in Common Activities around Common Interests / Nature and Context of Activities

The third aspect interviewees of both initiatives perceived as supportive of the establishment of positive social contact was the nature and context of the activities concerning the way they engaged participants around a shared interest and in common activities.

Participant 1 explained that the focus on and the shared interest of communication at the language café supports the establishment of contact:

Because there it is really easy, it is not like in a disco bar where everyone lives in their bubble...this is how I as a man perceive it at least [laughs]...and in the Sprachencafé, you go there and nobody would say 'Hey, why are you talking to me?' or so. [...] It concentrates on the communication and this is what should be the case. [...] exactly those people go there who like communication, who are interested in languages, mostly also in geography and where people come from. Thus, there you have exactly this range of similar people who fit exactly this (Codes 16, 137)

Besides perceiving the focus of the language café on contact and communication as supportive, Participant 1 explained that participants consist of “exactly those” “who like communication”, are interested in languages and mostly in geography. According to him, this results in participants being “exactly this range of similar people” engaging in an activity of similar interests. Similarly, Participant 2 explained that for her, engaging in common everyday life activities and seeing “the manner in which it is dealt with” positively influenced a change in attitude:

[Interviewer:] And that attitudes of yours changed, what do you think are factors at Fremde werden Freunde which influenced this positively, that such a change of attitude or thinking patterns could take place?

[Person:] [...] There is a small kitchen, there are drinks, there is the possibility to make tea, and the manner in which it is dealt with this, and especially the men, how careful they often are, [...] The men are very fast in getting a broom if something drops or ask whether someone wants more tea or wash the dishes or yes, much more than I am used to with us Europeans. So, it appears to me as much stronger. (Code 28)

Informality and Homeliness

A final aspect which was perceived as supportive by the interviewees of both initiatives were informality and homeliness. This is the aspect by far most of the supportive factors mentioned were connected to and which was apparent in all four interviews. The comfortable home-like living-room feeling, the freedom and spontaneity allowed for in the activities and

the open atmosphere have been emphasised as beneficial to establishing and continuing contact.

Participant 1 argued that what he perceives as supportive is the “nice atmosphere” and that people feel “comfortable and good” and “feel safe immediately and are ready to open up” (Codes 36-38). Moreover, he highlighted the importance of the non-involvement of the supervisors, being free to join or leave any conversation as well as to choose not to teach or learn a language but to simply seek fun conversations are all factors which benefit the willingness to and likelihood of interaction and the development of relationships (Code 91, 15, 146). In the following quote he highlighted these aspects:

The supervisors...they don't involve. They have never said 'this person can't talk to this or that person'. And this is the beautiful thing that it is all free and easy-going. [...] I think it is still better like this if everyone looks after what is most fun for them and if everyone does this according to their own assessment, then it is more likely to have a chance to be something sustainable. If everyone had to surmount themselves and does something which does not fit their type it would break down anyways, wouldn't it?
(Codes 91, 146)

Participant 1 suggested that what makes the design beneficial is that participants have the freedom to choose whom to talk to and what to do and not to “surmount themselves” with tasks they do not feel like doing. Similar to this suggestion of providing freedom in the activities, Participant 3 argued that just being with each other and “enjoy[ing] life with each other” “without a pedagogical assignment” may be the “best format anyways” to generate sustained interaction (Code 4).

Participant 2 also highlighted how she perceived an informal design with no staff involvement as supportive:

*[Interviewer:] And that attitudes of yours changed, what do you think are **factors** at Fremde werden Freunde which influenced this positively, that such a change of attitude or thinking patterns could take place?*

[Person:] Maybe strongly in the Salon, the cool thing is that it is a kind of shared flat. There is no staff, it is no café but there is a small kitchen, there are drinks, there is the possibility to make tea, and the manner in which it is dealt with this [...] (Code 28)

The setting of being like a shared flat, the absence of staff as well as doing activities of everyday life make it possible to experience positively perceived behaviour which may otherwise not have been thematised and which may be more effective than solely talking about it.

Participant 4, who had also participated in the educational project branch of *Station Wien*, compared the language café of the encounter branch to the German course of the educational branch. She highlighted that during the German course, which is only 3 months, she found it difficult to maintain contact with other participants and did not establish any relationships there:

During the course you can speak with the people but usually when the course is finished you can't see the people again. I had 3 or 4 courses and I have no contacts. It is not easy to maintain the contact. So probably I would have no friends [if I had not participated at the language café], only my boyfriend or just the people of my boyfriend but not really friends. Because it is not the same like when you come here and you can speak about your life and your experience for three hours, English, Deutsch, German, Arabic. And I went to stay 3 hours in the German course but it is not the same you don't speak all the time, only in the break five minutes and it's not the same, the relationship, you can take here or in the German course. And I don't have any relationship with other people in the German course. (Code 10)

She highlighted how, in contrast to the language café, the design of the German course allows for little interaction, no deep contact and no sustained relationships. She continued by saying that “in the job or the German course” you “speak about the grammar or another subject. Here you speak about you and your situation and this is more easier making a personal relationship” (Code 13). Thus, Participant 4 highlights a distinction between the supportive informal design of the language café and the unsupportive design of other settings such as the more formal German course.

Concluding this section on the aspects of design participants perceived as supportive of the establishment of positive social contact, first, it can be said that most aspects suggested were mentioned in the context of both initiatives. Second, in sum the aspects of the encounter initiatives' designs the participants perceived as supportive are a design which allows for long conversations, deep, regular and sustained contact, a design which involves a high number of diverse participants, a design which engages diverse participants in common activities and around common interests and a design which provides for informality, homeliness and a high degree of freedom in the participants' actions.

4.3 Discussion

In the above sub-chapters I have discussed the relationship between funding and the design of the differently funded encounter initiatives, on the one hand, and the perception of positive social contact and its relationship to the initiatives' designs, on the other hand. I here want to

summarise the findings and what they mean for answering my sub-questions of *how do the employees of Station Wien and Fremde werden Freunde perceive the relationship between funding and the organisational and project design of their initiatives?* and *how do the participants of Station Wien and Fremde werden Freunde perceive social contact at the two initiatives and what aspects of the design do they perceive as supportive of positive social contact?* as well as indicating how they relate to the existent literature. I will build on this discussion to finally bring these findings together and come back to my umbrella research question in the analysis chapter following this section.

Concerning the relationship between funding and the organisational and project design of the two encounter initiatives, both employees perceived funding to influence their organisational focus by shifting it away from implementing encounter projects and to handling administrative work. In both cases this was perceived to decrease efficiency and distract from the encounter initiative's purpose. Also, *Station Wien* perceived funding to influence their target group orientation at an organisational level. At a project level, none of the employees perceived funding to influence their encounter initiatives' designs. In both cases the employees had to apply strategies alternative to governmental funding at several points to secure the implementation of their encounter projects. Generally, both employees perceived tendencies in governmental funding practices responding to the existent literature: the tying of funds to output measurements, high administrative requirements and target group requirements. I will therefore discuss these trends in more detail in my analysis section.

Concerning the relationship between the initiatives' designs and social contact, remarkably, the findings of the two cases largely resembled each other. In both cases, participants perceived the social contact occurring between them and participants of a different background as largely positive, including a high quality and quantity of contact, quantity and length of relationships and positive changes in attitudes. All these aspects align with expectations of literature on 'intercultural' and intergroup encounter that encounter between diverse people can effectively trigger positive social contact. Going beyond this, my research explored how such positive social contact is perceived to be related to the encounter initiatives' designs. Again, the perceptions on the aspects constituting a supportive design for positive social contact, largely overlapped between the two initiatives as well as with existing theory which reflects a high coherence. The aspects of the initiatives' designs reported as supportive of positive social contact were, first, an informal design providing freedom to the participants in line with Fincher and Iveson's (2008) and Hoekstra and Dahlvik's (2018) suggestions; second, allowing for long conversations and deep, regular and sustained contact, involving a high number of diverse people which aspects are in line with Matejskova and

Leitner's (2011) findings; third, engaging participants in shared activities and around common interests which is in line with suggestions by Allport (1954) and Amin (2002; 2006). Moreover, the participant interviews underlined Fincher and Iveson's (2008) argument that an informal design allowing for deep and sustained contact, which is perceived as supportive of positive social contact stands in contrast to a more formalised service setting, sometimes demanded by funding institutions. This point on the complication between a logic of informal encounter and a logic of formalised service provision as well as the curious points raised by the employees concerning the way requirements for accessing funding, administrative requirements and target group requirements may interfere in the designing for positive social contact I elaborate on in the following analysis chapter.

5. ANALYSIS

In my findings chapter, I have discussed my two sub-questions on the relationship between the initiatives' funding and their designs as perceived by the employees and the relationship between the initiatives' designs and social contact as perceived by the participants. In this chapter, I want to bring these findings together and discuss them in relation to relevant theory, to come back to my umbrella research question of the relationship between funding, design and social contact and the underlying assumption that governmental funding practices can be counterproductive to the designing for positive social contact.

5.1 Mismatches between Funding and Designing for Positive Encounter

5.1.1 Access to Funding

My findings suggest that indeed, mismatches between funding, design and social contact can occur at several levels: concerning the encounter initiatives' access to funding, the potential of their human resources and the composition of participants at the encounter initiatives. The first mismatch concerns the access to funding. The demand for measurable outputs and fitting predefined topics seems to cause complications for initiatives in attracting funding for their encounter initiatives. The *Station Wien* employee highlighted that governmental funders usually need measurable facts and numbers to be convinced of the effectiveness of a project. The argument that governmental funders tend to require measurable outputs aligns with the findings of other scholars (e.g. Greiling and Stötzer, 2015). Measuring performance outputs may be possible when offering a typical service, however, informal encounter in itself may not easily fit such criteria of measurement. One cannot measure performance outputs in the way possible in typical service settings. While one can measure the number of migrants who succeeded a German test in a language class or the number of

people who have been successfully employed after referring them to a new job at job counselling, the performance output of encounter can hardly be quantified. Fincher and Iveson (2008) suggest that being held accountable for precise output measurements may force employees to adapt informal activities towards the measurement of some output and thereby formalise activities and infringe an informal design supportive of social contact. This suggests that, if governmental funders demand precisely measured performance outputs, they may jeopardise the informal character of an encounter initiative or even exclude informal encounter projects from access to funding.

Moreover, the *Fremde werden Freunde* employee highlighted that the attraction of funding for their informal encounter project was difficult due to the rigid predefinition of funding themes by the governmental funders. The necessity to fit a predefined topic to receive funding largely limits the possibility to receive funding for existent encounter projects even if they work well and are in demand. On the one hand, strategically tying financial resources to predefined topics seems logical from the perspective of policymakers as it increases control over content areas and makes the allocation of resources according to political interests easier. On the other hand, as Uitermark and Duyvendak (2008) emphasise, political interests may not overlap with the needs of society and can therefore distract from the demands of civil society. The participants' perceptions of *Fremde werden Freunde* clearly revealed that their encounter activities are in demand and additionally contribute to the establishment of positive social contact between people of different backgrounds. However, as the employee reported, despite the demand and effectivity, they cannot attract funding for the encounter activities *per se*. This suggests that if governmental institutions predefine themes for the allocation of their funding, they risk the *a priori* exclusion of encounter initiatives despite them being in demand and contributing to the development of positive social contact.

5.1.2 Human Resources

The second mismatch regarding the relationship funding and designing for positive social contact concerns how funding requirements can influence a mismatch at the human resource level. Both employees perceived funding to push their focus towards administration which on the one hand, is particularly difficult to realise for small organisations and on the other hand, pushes away human resources from designing for and realising encounter. First, according to my findings and to theory (e.g. Greiling & Stötzer, 2015; Richmond & Shields, 2005), due to a public management focus on efficiency and effectiveness, governmental funders tie resources increasingly to administrative requirements such as thorough reporting and output measurements. While from government's perspective, this may increase control and

accountability, these demands imply an extensive administrative effort which is especially difficult to handle for small NGOs (Greiling & Stötzer, 2015). The *Station Wien* employee argued that with increasing funding, their administrative staff grew and professionalised and that meeting the demands of their large-scale funding would not be manageable for a smaller, less professional NGO. The *Fremde werden Freunde* employee confirmed the difficulty for them to handle funding-related administrative work, starting from the application for funding. Thus, if funding is tied to work-intense administrative requirements, including the application and the implementation phase, it may be inaccessible for small organisations which cannot demonstrate the necessary professionalism or invest so much effort into administrative tasks. This in turn, may lead to the ceasing of encounter projects implemented by rather small organisations such as *Fremde werden Freunde* even if they contribute to the creation of positive social contact between diverse people.

Second, my findings and scholars (e.g. Greiling & Stötzer, 2015; Richmond & Shields, 2005) have highlighted that administrative requirements shift an organisation's focus away from operative work which means designing and implementing encounter projects. However, civil society organisations usually have an operative purpose and focus, i.e. they initiate projects as they see a demand and have an idea of how to respond to it, whereas administrative work is neither their focus, nor necessarily their expertise (Greiling & Stötzer, 2015; Richmond & Shields, 2005). Administrative requirements may therefore lead to a "diversion of precious human resources" (Richmond & Shields, 2005). This is what also became apparent in my employee interviews, where the employees perceived administrative funding requirements to distract from their purpose of realising positive encounter and decrease their efficiency in it. Perceiving the demand for and realising positive encounter, however, is one of the valuable competences of these employees. They possess a unique case-specific local knowledge and access to the demands of participants which governmental funding institutions may lack. Therefore, high administrative requirements may not only shift the focus of encounter initiatives' employees from their purpose of designing for positive social contact but also waste valuable human resources in the field of encounter.

5.1.3 Participant Composition

The third mismatch regarding the relationship between funding and designing for positive social contact concerns how target group requirements may limit encounter in itself. Both employees highlighted that the administrative logic of funding institutions tends to distinguish predefined target groups, often based on legal definitions, and allocate funds for target groups restricted to these distinctions. In the context of encounter projects, the employees highlighted

that adhering to a target group restriction would damage the low-threshold access of their projects, prevent participants from coming and be counterproductive to informal encounter. According to Fincher and Iveson (2008), being open to any member of society is a particularly valuable feature of many encounter projects. The restriction of participants to specific groups, such as only migrants, can prevent encounter between migrants and non-migrants, for example, and therefore be counterproductive to social contact between diverse people in general. However, even if a project is open to everyone, the requirement to orient the activities towards the needs of a specific target group may also hamper the opportunity for social contact between diverse participants. The kind of activities offered influence the motivation of people to participate in a project (Hoekstra & Dahlvik, 2018). For example, if a funding institution demands an NGO to design their activities around the needs of newly arrived refugees, it is likely that even in activities of encounter, non-immigrants and long-term migrants who have different needs and interests will not be motivated to participate. The diversity of participants, in turn, influences the opportunity for social contact between diverse participants. According to my participant interviews, the high number and diversity of participants, however, is important for the development of positive social contact and the establishment of a nuanced attitude towards people with a different background. The positive influence of contact to a high number of diverse people was also underlined by Matejskova and Leitner (2011). Therefore, this suggests that, if governmental funders require rigid target group orientations or even restrictions, this can limit the opportunity for and extent of positive social contact developing between participants of diverse backgrounds.

5.2 Designing for Positive Social Contact

Remarkably, in my case studies the suggested mismatches in the relationship between funding, design and social contact did not influence the initiatives in a way that positive social contact was prevented from occurring. Both initiatives managed to provide a design supportive of considerable positive social contact. As the participant interviews and questionnaires showed, concerning the quality of contact, participants perceived the contact with participants of a different background as being (rather) positive contact, valuable contact and deep contact. Concerning the quantity of contact, participants had contact with other participants of a different background at least once a week and organised additional meetings outside the initiative. Concerning the quality of relationships, all participant interviewees had made friends with participants of a different background sustaining over a longer period. Lastly, all participant interviewees perceived their attitudes to have positively changed, including an increase in the perceived similarity of people with a different background, an

increase in tolerance, a decrease in fear of and prejudices against people with a different background. These are all aspects, sociology and diversity scholars such as Stephan and Stephan (2005), Zapata-Barrero (2015) or Allport (1954) consider as effective outcomes of intergroup encounter. Although the initiatives' employees perceived certain difficulties in the relationship between governmental funding and their initiatives' designs, such as the access to funding when designing for informal encounter, they applied individual strategies, including negotiation with the funders, volunteering or seeking for other income sources, to still realise their informal encounter design. The initiatives thereby managed to create a design which was effective and perceived as supportive by the participants.

The aspects of the designs which participants perceived as supportive of positive social contact largely overlapped between the two initiatives. Moreover, remarkably, although I asked the participants to tell me openly about these aspects, most of the aspects they mentioned aligned with the supportive factors suggested by scholars. Aspects in the initiatives' designs perceived as supportive were first, allowing for deep, regular, sustained contact and long conversations, which corresponds to Matejskova and Leitner's (2011) suggestion of sustained, regular and deep contact rather than sporadic and superficial contact being more likely to trigger positive social contact. The second aspect perceived as supportive was the involvement of a high number of diverse people in a project, which also corresponds to Matejskova and Leitner's (2011) previous research. The third aspect perceived as supportive was the nature and context of the activities offered, namely that the designs engaged people around common interests and in common activities such as communication and languages in the language café or activities resembling a shared-flat context at the chess evening. Engaging diverse people in common activities and common interests were also proposed as supportive aspects by Amin (2002) and Allport (1954) and Amin (2006) respectively. The last aspect participants perceived as supportive of the establishment of positive social contact was the informal and comfortable design, providing for a large degree of freedom in the participants' actions. Fincher and Iveson (2008) and Hoekstra and Dahlvik (2018) also propose that informality and participants having control over their actions (Fincher & Iveson, 2008) is of particular value in triggering positive social contact. What my participant interviews highlighted is that the more formal service-oriented design occurring in German classes, for example, is perceived unsupportive of establishing positive social contact, which corresponds to Fincher and Iveson's (2008) argumentation. Therefore, my research suggests that a design supportive of positive social contact allows for long conversations, deep, regular and sustained contact, involves a high number of diverse

participants, engages diverse participants in shared activities around common interests and is rather informal, home-like and provides freedom in the participants' actions.

As discussed above, both initiatives, which managed to provide such an informal design allowing for a large degree of freedom in demand by participants, had difficulties in getting funding. According to Fincher and Iveson's (2008) argumentation and as indicated by my discussion, certain factors in governmental institutions' logic of funding tend to demand a formalisation of project designs and thereby counteract a supportive setting for positive social contact. Therefore, in my recommendations I will provide suggestions on how these potential mismatches may be eased and thereby the effectiveness of the relationship between funding, design and social contact in the context of urban encounter initiatives may be increased.

6. CONCLUSION

My research investigated the relationship between governmental funding, an encounter initiatives' design and social contact occurring between diverse participants of these initiatives in the context of two encounter initiatives in Vienna, a city with an active NGO landscape and nearly 50% of inhabitants with a migration background. My research showed that both initiatives effectively triggered positive social contact between participants of different backgrounds. Participants perceived the contact with participants of a different background as valuable and positive, their contact exceeded the participation at the initiative itself, they developed sustained friendships with participants of different backgrounds and they perceived positive changes in their attitudes such as decreased fear and prejudice towards people of a different background. Moreover, my research suggests that the design of the initiatives plays an important role in how social contact between diverse participants develops. At the same time, it indicates that the potential of designing for positive social contact can be hampered through funding in terms of a less favourable participant composition, the loss of human resources and the inaccessibility of funding for informal encounter projects. What may be important in easing these complications and increasing the effectiveness of encounter projects is that governmental funders deviate from a rather formalised service-oriented logic to allow for informal non-service-oriented designs, that they deviate from a target-oriented logic to allow for diverse participant compositions, that they adapt administrative requirements in a way feasible for both larger and small NGOs, that they minimise administrative requirements to prevent a loss of specialised human resources, that they take valuable local knowledge of employees into account, and that they allow for designs which engage diverse participants in common activities around common interests and provide room for deep, sustained and regular contact between them. These suggestions are the result

of my research combining literature and research in the fields of sociology and public administration to open the debate about, and gain a deeper understanding of, the logic of designing for social contact and the logic of funding. Due to the limitations in the time and scope of this thesis, my research should be seen as indicative and as an inspiration for further research to investigate if such divergence applies in the context of other encounter initiatives, the underlying reasons for this divergence and how a convergence between these two logics may be possible. Concerning the designing for positive social contact, my research aligns with scholars arguing that urban encounter initiatives can play an important role in establishing positive social contact between diverse members of society and provided suggestions of what such a design may look like. Concerning funding, my research proposes that governmental funders can considerably support these encounter initiatives through their financial resources which they heavily rely on as a source of income. However, it also suggests that there are potential mismatches in this funding relationship which should be reflected on to further increase the effectiveness of diversity governance and the potential of encounter initiatives to contribute to living in a diverse society.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the analysis of my research in combination with existent literature, in this chapter I formulate several recommendations mainly addressed to (governmental) funding institutions and policymakers but also to any organisation aiming at triggering positive social contact between diverse members of society. The recommendations concern performance output measurements, funding tied to service orientation, the predefinition of funding topics, target group limitations, administrative requirements and designing for positive social contact.

My first recommendation concerns the deviation from tying funds to precise performance output measurements. According to theory, funding underlies a public administrative logic, of outsourcing certain services to the civil society (Richmond & Shields, 2005; Uitermark, 2012). Consequently, the government is interested in achieving a certain output with the funding of civil society organisations, efficiently spending its funds and therefore, closely monitoring these organisations' performances (Greiling & Stötzer, 2015; Uitermark, 2012). However, equating effectiveness with quantitatively measured performance outputs can be misleading. The performance output of encounter in itself cannot be easily measured in a quantitative way and, as my research showed, still be effective. Moreover, as my analysis suggested, if governmental funders demand precisely measured performance outputs, they may jeopardise the informal character of an encounter initiative or even exclude informal

encounter projects from access to funding. Therefore, it seems important for policymakers and funding institutions to acknowledge that if an output cannot be measured with typical quantitative evaluations, it can still be effective. In order to prevent an infringement or exclusion of encounter projects from receiving funding, I recommend tying the access to funding not to the criterion of delivering precise output measurements and if so, to reflect on ways in which such a measurement would be possible in the cases of encounter projects without extensive effort and without infringing the informality of projects.

My second recommendation is connected to the deviation of a strict logic of service provision. As scholars have highlighted, funding underlies a logic of outsourcing public service delivery (Richmond & Shields, 2005; Uitermark, 2012) and therefore, tends to prioritise services or require the provision of services of non-service-oriented initiatives (Fincher & Iveson, 2008). My findings in accordance with literature (Fincher & Iveson, 2008) highlighted that more formal service-oriented designs occurring in German classes, for example, can be perceived unsupportive of establishing positive social contact. If policymakers and funding providers prioritise or require service-oriented designs, they risk to prevent non-service-oriented encounter designs, which seem more supportive of the goal of triggering positive social contact, from access to funding or push them towards service provision, which seems counterproductive to the goal of encounter. Therefore, I recommend funding institutions and policymakers to acknowledge the value of non-service-oriented projects which ‘merely’ aim at encounter and take them into account in their funding practices.

My third recommendation concerns the deviation from tying funds to predefined topics. My research suggests that governmental funding institutions tend to tie their funding to predefined topics according to which NGOs need to develop new projects or adapt their existent projects to in order to receive funding. The predefinition of funding topics therefore, on the one hand, risks the *a priori* exclusion of encounter initiatives despite them contributing to the development of positive social contact between diverse members of society. On the other hand, it risks a mismatch between the demand for social projects by members of the society and the supply by governmental funders. Although policymakers and public administrators possess a better overview of the projects already implemented and population statistics and therefore adapt the demand of predefined topics accordingly, they may not be as close to civil society and possess the specialised case-specific knowledge on the demand of civil society of as NGO employees. Therefore, I recommend two things: First, even if predefining some topics for funding, funding institutions should allocate a certain amount of

funding to very broad fields such as ‘diversity’ or ‘living together’. Second, funding institutions should implement mechanisms through which the valuable knowledge of NGO employees which are close to the demand of society can be shared and is taken into account for the definition of (new) fields of funding.

My fourth recommendation concerns the deviation from target group limitations. My research suggests that funding institutions frequently apply a logic in which they distinguish between predefined groups, often based on legal definitions, and allocate responsibilities and funding accordingly. Designing for positive social contact between diverse participants, however, follows a logic in which a diverse group of people should be attracted which overarches predefined groups. My analysis indicates that if governmental funders tie funding to rigid target group orientations or even restrictions, this can limit the opportunity for and extent of positive social contact developing between participants of diverse backgrounds. Therefore, to increase or even establish the opportunity of positive encounter between diverse members of society, I recommend to deviate from a logic of serving the need for a predefined group such as asylum seekers, for example, to a logic which does not separate groups but addresses society as a whole.

My fifth recommendation concerns the deviation from high administrative requirements. My research and existent literature suggest that funding institutions mostly tie funds to high administrative requirements, including detailed application forms, thorough reporting and accounting and. My analysis indicates two risks. First, if funding is tied to work-intense administrative requirements, it may be inaccessible for small organisations which cannot demonstrate the necessary professionalism or invest so much effort into administrative tasks and thereby may lead to the ceasing of effective encounter projects implemented by small organisations. Second, high administrative requirements may distract encounter initiatives’ employees from their purpose of designing for positive social contact and thereby waste valuable human resources in the field of encounter. Therefore, I have two recommendations: First, to increase the accessibility of funding to small organisations, I recommend adapting administrative requirements to the extent that both large and small NGOs can easily handle it. Second, to establish an efficient division of human resources, I recommend that governmental institutions which, in contrast to most NGO employees, are specialised in public administration install mechanisms through which public administrators can systematically assist NGOs in their administrative workload.

My last recommendation addresses any organisation aiming at triggering positive social contact between diverse members of society. The development and implementation of urban

encounter projects is not limited to NGOs but can be undertaken by governmental institutions, such as municipal departments, or even business organisations too. Regardless of who implements an encounter project, based on my findings and existent literature, I recommend considering following aspects in the design of an encounter project because these may be supportive aspects for triggering positive social contact. The recommended design for an encounter project allows for long conversations, deep, regular and sustained contact, involves a high number of diverse people, engage people around common interests and in common activities such as communication and languages in the language café or activities resembling a shared-flat context at the chess evening and provides an informal and comfortable setting which grants a large degree of freedom in the participants' actions.

Concluding my recommendations, I would like to highlight two points. First, I want to suggest that if the state outsources social work and services to civil society organisations, it also bears responsibility to at least make sure that these organisations have enough support, financially as well as with the administrative workload entailed in funding which NGO employees are mostly not used to. Second, I want to emphasise that with my recommendations, I do not suggest that funding oriented to services for specific target groups with specific needs should be ceased. Such services, for sure have their value as also suggested by scholars such as Fincher and Iveson (2008). However, my research and research of other scholars indicates that the practice underlying funding tends to apply a logic of formal service- and target group orientation and that this specific focus may result in mismatches with designs which are supportive for social contact between diverse participants. Therefore, my recommendation is that the logic underlying funding practices permits informal, non-service-oriented encounter projects to be taken into account too.

REFERENCES

- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The Nature of Prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Amin, A. (2002). Ethnicity and the Multicultural City: Living with Diversity. *Environment and Planning A*, 34(6), 959-980.
- Amin, A. (2006) The Good City. *Urban Studies* 43(5-6), 1009–1023.
- Brubaker, R. (2013). Categories of Analysis and Categories of Practice: A Note on the Study of Muslims in European Countries of Immigration. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 36(1), 1-8.
- Bryman, A. (2012). *Social Research Methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Caponio, T. and M. Borkert (Eds.). (2010). *The Local Dimension of Migration Policymaking*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of Qualitative Research (3rd ed.): Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- De Graauw, E., Gleeson, S., & Bloemraad, I. (2013). Funding Immigrant Organizations: Suburban Free Riding and Local Civic Presence. *American Journal of Sociology*, 119(1), 75-130.
- Dervin, F. (2012). Cultural Identity, Representation and Othering. In J. Jackson (Ed.) *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Intercultural Communication* (pp. 181-194). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Dovidio, J. F., Glick, P., & Rudman, L. A. (Eds.). (2005). *On the Nature of Prejudice: Fifty Years after Allport*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Eizaguirre, S., Pradel, M., Terrones, A., Martinez-Celorio, X., & García, M. (2012). Multilevel Governance and Social Cohesion: Bringing back Conflict in Citizenship Practices. *Urban Studies*, 49(9), 1999-2016.
- Fincher, R., & Iveson, K. (2008). *Planning and Diversity in the City: Redistribution, Recognition and Encounter*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Fox, J. & Jones, D. (2013) Migration, Everyday Life and the Ethnicity Bias. *Ethnicities*, 13(4), 385-400.
- Fremde werden Freunde. (n.d.). Retrieved May 1, 2019, from <https://www.fremdewerdenfreunde.at/about/>
- Galinsky, A. D., & Moskowitz, G. B. (2000). Perspective-Taking: Decreasing Stereotype Expression, Stereotype Accessibility, and In-Group Favoritism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78(4), 708.
- Greiling, D., & Stötzer, S. (2015). Performance Accountability as a Driver for Changes in Nonprofit–Government Relationships: An Empirical Insight from Austria. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 26(5), 1690-1717.

- Gustafsson, J. (2017). Single Case Studies vs. Multiple Case Studies: A Comparative Study (Literature Review).
- Hoekstra, M. S., & Dahlvik, J. (2018). Neighbourhood Participation in Super-Diverse Contexts: Comparing Amsterdam and Vienna. *Urban Research & Practice*, 11(4), 441-459.
- Laurence, J., & Bentley, L. (2018). Countervailing Contact: Community Ethnic Diversity, Anti-Immigrant Attitudes and Mediating Pathways of Positive and Negative Inter-Ethnic Contact in European Societies. *Social Science Research*, 69, 83-110.
- Matejskova, T., & Leitner, H. (2011). Urban Encounters with Difference: The Contact Hypothesis and Immigrant Integration Projects in Eastern Berlin. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 12(7), 717-741.
- Pettigrew, T. F., and L. R. Tropp. (2005). Allport's Intergroup Contact Hypothesis: Its History and Influence. In: J. F. Dovidio, P. Glick, and L. A. Rudman (Eds.) *On the Nature of Prejudice: Fifty Years after Allport* (pp. 262-277). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Richmond, T., & Shields, J. (2005). NGO-Government Relations and Immigrant Services: Contradictions and Challenges. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, 6(3-4), 513-526.
- Schönwälder, K., Petermann, S., Hüttermann, J., Vertovec, S., Hewstone, M., Stolle, D., Schmid, K., & Schmitt, T. (2016). *Diversity and Contact: Immigration and Social Interaction in German Cities*. London: Springer.
- Station Wien. (n.d.). Retrieved June 29, 2019, from <https://www.stationwien.org>
- Statistik Austria. (2019). *Bevölkerung mit Migrationshintergrund nach Bundesländern (Jahresdurchschnitt 2018)* [Data file]. Retrieved from https://www.statistik.at/web_de/statistiken/menschen_und_gesellschaft/bevoelkerung/bevoelkerungsstruktur/bevoelkerung_nach_migrationshintergrund/index.html
- Stephan, W. G. & Stephan, C. W. (2005). Intergroup Relations Program Evaluation. In J. F. Dovidio, P. Glick, & L. A. Rudman (Eds.), *On the Nature of Prejudice: Fifty Years after Allport* (pp. 431-446). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Uitermark, J. (2012). *Dynamics of Power in Dutch Integration Politics: From Accommodation to Confrontation*. Amsterdam University Press.
- Uitermark, J., & Duyvendak, J. W. (2008). Citizen Participation in a Mediated Age: Neighbourhood Governance in the Netherlands. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 32(1), 114-134.
- Valentine, G. (2008). Living with Difference: Reflections on Geographies of Encounter. *Progress in Human Geography*, 32(3), 323-337.

Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and racial studies*, 30(6), 1024-1054.

Zapata-Barrero, R. (2011). Anti-immigration populism: can local intercultural policies close the space?, Discussion paper. *Policy Network* (London).

Zapata-Barrero, R. (2015). Interculturalism: Main hypothesis, Theories and Strands. In: R. Zapata-Barrero (Ed.) *Interculturalism in Cities: Concept, Policy and Implementation*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.

APPENDIX A: Self-Completion Questionnaire**Sample of Questionnaire Conducted at *Station Wien***

Note for reader: Questions 1. to 2.1 refer to quantity of contact with people of a different background within and outside the initiative. Questions 3. to 4.1 refer to quality of relationships with people of a different background within and outside the initiative. Questions 5. to 7. refer to quality and quantity of contact while visiting the initiative. Questions 8. to 9.2 refer to attitudes (i.e. trust and perceived difference) towards people of a different background, whether this attitude is perceived to have changed and if so, how. The question of how was intentionally left as an open-ended question.

Was ist dein Geschlecht? *What is your gender?*

männlich

weiblich

nicht definiert

Was ist dein Herkunftsland? *What is your country of origin?*

Was ist/sind deine Erstsprache(n)? *What is/are your primary language(s)?*

Wie alt bist du (ungefähr)? *How old are you (approximately)?*

Arbeitest du? Wenn ja, was? *Do you work? If yes, what is your work?*

Was ist deine Religionszugehörigkeit? *What is your religious affiliation?*

Buddhismus

Christentum

Hinduismus

Islam

Judentum

keine

andere: _____

An welchen Veranstaltungen von Station Wien nimmst du teil? *Which events of Station Wien do you participate in?*

Seit wann nimmst du an Veranstaltungen von Station Wien teil? *Since when have you been participating in events of Station Wien?*

Wie oft nimmst du an Veranstaltungen von Station Wien teil? *How often do you participate in events of Station Wien?*

1. Mit wie vielen Menschen hast du selten (einmal im Monat oder weniger) Kontakt, die ein anderes Herkunftsland, eine andere Erstsprache oder eine andere Religionszugehörigkeit als du haben?

How many people with a different country of origin, primary language or religious belief than yours do you have sporadic (i.e. once a month or less) contact with?

- O keinem
- O bis zu 10 Menschen
- O 11 bis 20 Menschen
- O 21 bis 40 Menschen
- O 41 bis 80 Menschen
- O mehr als 80 Menschen

1.1 Wie viele dieser Menschen, hast du durch Station Wien kennengelernt?

How many of these people did you meet through Station Wien?

- O niemanden
- O weniger als die Hälfte
- O ungefähr die Hälfte
- O mehr als die Hälfte
- O alle

2. Mit wie vielen Menschen hast du oft (mindestens einmal pro Woche) Kontakt, die ein anderes Herkunftsland, eine andere Erstsprache oder eine andere Religionszugehörigkeit als du haben?

How many people with a different country of origin, primary language or religious belief than yours do you have frequent (i.e. at least once a week) contact with?

- O keinem
- O bis zu 5 Menschen
- O 5 bis 10 Menschen
- O 10 bis 20 Menschen
- O 20 bis 40 Menschen
- O mehr als 40 Menschen

2.1 Wie viele dieser Menschen hast du durch Station Wien kennengelernt?

How many of these people did you meet through Station Wien?

- O niemanden
- O weniger als die Hälfte
- O ungefähr die Hälfte
- O mehr als die Hälfte
- O alle

3. Wie viele Bekanntschaften (Menschen, die du kennst, aber mit denen du nur eine oberflächliche Beziehung führst) mit einem anderen Herkunftsland, einer anderen Erstsprache oder einer anderen Religionszugehörigkeit als deiner/m hast du?

How many acquaintances (i.e. people whom you know but with whom you have a superficial relationship) with a different country of origin, primary language or religious belief than yours do you have?

- keine
- bis zu 10 Menschen
- 11 bis 20 Menschen
- 21 bis 40 Menschen
- 41 bis 80 Menschen
- mehr als 80 Menschen

3.1 Wie viele dieser Menschen hast du durch Station Wien kennengelernt?

How many of these people did you meet through Station Wien?

- niemanden
- weniger als die Hälfte
- ungefähr die Hälfte
- mehr als die Hälfte
- alle

4. Wie viele Freunde (Menschen, die du gut kennst, zu denen du dich nahe fühlst und mit denen du wichtige persönliche Dinge besprichst) mit einem anderen Herkunftsland, einer anderen Erstsprache oder einer anderen Religionszugehörigkeit als deiner/m hast du?

How many friends (i.e. people whom you know well, whom you feel close with and with whom you discuss important personal matters) with a different country of origin, primary language or religious belief than yours do you have?

- keine
- bis zu 5 Menschen
- 5 bis 10 Menschen
- 10 bis 20 Menschen
- 20 bis 40 Menschen
- mehr als 40 Menschen

4.1 Wie viele dieser Menschen hast du durch Station Wien kennengelernt?

How many of these have you met through Station Wien?

- niemanden
- weniger als die Hälfte
- ungefähr die Hälfte
- mehr als die Hälfte
- alle

5. Wenn du bei Station Wien bist, wie viel deiner Zeit dort verbringst du in Interaktion mit Menschen mit einem anderen Herkunftsland, einer anderen Erstsprache oder einer anderen Religionszugehörigkeit als deiner/m?

When you are visiting Station Wien, how much of the time you spend there do you engage in interaction with people with a different country of origin, primary language or religious belief than yours?

- keine
- weniger als die Hälfte der Zeit
- ungefähr die Hälfte der Zeit
- mehr als die Hälfte der Zeit
- die ganze Zeit

6. Wie würdest du den Kontakt, den du mit Menschen bei Station Wien hast, beschreiben? Seid ihr in Aktivitäten mit einem unterschiedlichen Ziel involviert oder seid ihr in kooperativen Aktivitäten mit demselben Ziel involviert?

How would you consider most contact you have with people through Station Wien? Are you engaging in activities with a different rhythm and goal or engaging in cooperative activities with the same goal?

- Wir arbeiten an Aktivitäten mit einem unterschiedlichen Ziel.
- Wir arbeiten an Aktivitäten mit einem eher unterschiedlichen Ziel.
- Beides gleichermaßen.
- Wir arbeiten eher kooperativ am selben Ziel.
- Wir arbeiten kooperativ am selben Ziel.

7. Wenn du bei Station Wien bist, würdest du den Kontakt mit Menschen mit einem anderen Herkunftsland, einer anderen Erstsprache oder einer anderen Religionszugehörigkeit als deiner/m als negative oder positive Begegnung beschreiben?

When you are visiting Station Wien, do you consider the contact with people with a different country of origin, primary language or religious belief than yours as positive or negative encounters?

- negativ
- eher negativ
- beides, positiv und negativ
- eher positiv
- positiv

8. Denkst du, man kann Menschen generell vertrauen?

Do you think people can be generally trusted?

Ich denke, man muss sehr vorsichtig sein und kann Menschen schwer vertrauen.

I think one has to be very careful and can trust people only with difficulties.

Ich denke, man muss eher vorsichtig sein, als Menschen zu vertrauen.

I think one must be rather careful than trusting people.

Ich bin unentschieden.

I am undecided.

Ich denke, man kann Menschen eher vertrauen als nicht.

I think one can rather trust people than not.

Ich denke, den meisten Menschen kann man vertrauen.

I think most people can be trusted.

8.1 Wenn du mit Menschen mit einem anderen Herkunftsland, einer anderen Erstsprache oder einer anderen Religionszugehörigkeit als deiner/m zu tun hast, denkst du, man kann ihnen vertrauen?

When dealing with people with a different country of origin, primary language or religious belief than yours, do you think they can be trusted?

Ich denke man muss sehr vorsichtig sein und kann Menschen mit einem anderen Herkunftsland, einer anderen Erstsprache oder einer anderen Religionszugehörigkeit schwer vertrauen.

I think one has to be very careful and can trust people with a different country of origin, primary language or religious belief only with difficulties.

Ich denke, man muss eher vorsichtig sein, als Menschen mit einem anderen Herkunftsland, einer anderen Erstsprache oder einer anderen Religionszugehörigkeit zu vertrauen.

I think one must be rather careful than trusting people with a different country of origin, primary language or religious belief.

Ich bin unentschieden.

I am undecided.

Ich denke, man kann Menschen mit einem anderen Herkunftsland, einer anderen Erstsprache oder einer anderen Religionszugehörigkeit eher vertrauen als nicht vertrauen.

I think one can rather trust people with a different country of origin, primary language or religious belief than not.

Ich denke, den meisten Menschen mit einem anderen Herkunftsland, einer anderen Erstsprache oder einer anderen Religionszugehörigkeit kann man vertrauen.

I think most people with a different country of origin, primary language or religious belief can be trusted.

8.2 Denkst du, deine Meinung, ob man Menschen mit einem anderen Herkunftsland, einer anderen Erstsprache oder einer anderen Religionszugehörigkeit vertrauen kann, hat sich verändert seit du bei Station Wien mitgemacht hast?

Do you think your opinion on trusting people with a different country of origin, primary language or religious belief has changed since you participated in Station Wien?

- Ja
 Nein

8.3 Wenn ja, wie?

If yes, how?

9. Nimmst du Menschen mit einem anderen Herkunftsland, einer anderen Erstsprache oder einer anderen Religionszugehörigkeit als deiner/m als dir ähnlich oder als anders wahr?

Do you perceive people with a different country of origin, primary language or religious belief than yours as similar or different from you?

- anders
 eher anders
 beides, ähnlich und anders
 eher ähnlich
 ähnlich

9.1 Denkst du, dass deine Wahrnehmung über die Ähnlichkeit oder Andersartigkeit gegenüber Menschen mit einem anderen Herkunftsland, einer anderen Erstsprache oder einer anderen Religionszugehörigkeit sich verändert hat seit du bei Station Wien mitgemacht hast?

Do you think the perceived similarity or difference of people with a different country of origin, primary language or religious belief has changed since you participated in Station Wien?

- Ja
 Nein

9.2 Wenn ja, wie?

If yes, how?

Vielen herzlichen Dank fürs Ausfüllen des Fragebogens! Du hilfst mir damit sehr bei meiner Forschung!

Möchtest du an einem **Folgeinterview** teilnehmen? – Wenn ja, schreibe bitte deine **Telefonnummer in meine Liste**.

APPENDIX B: Interview Guideline for Interviews with NGO Employees (in German)**Entstehungsgeschichte****Organisationsstruktur**

Habt ihr ein Büro? Wie viele?

Was sind die Aktivitäten, die ihr anbietet?

Wie viele MitarbeiterInnen habt ihr und in welchem Bereich? Wer davon ist bezahlt, wer davon ist freiwillig?

Wie setzt sich eure Finanzierung zusammen? Wer sind die Fördergeber? Wie viel bekommt ihr von welchem Fördergeber? (z.B. für 2018)

Wie viel machen die Spenden aus? Wer sind die Spender (private Einzelpersonen, größere Organisationen, etc.)?

Aktivitäten & TeilnehmerInnen

Wie viele TeilnehmerInnen ca. pro Veranstaltung?

Wie viele ÖsterreicherInnen, wie viele MigrantInnen pro Veranstaltung?

Förderungen

Rolle der Förderung/der Fördergeber

Gibt es Vorlagen? Von welchen Fördergebern? Welche Vorlagen sind das?

Seit wann werdet ihr von ... gefördert? Warum werdet ihr von ... gefördert?

Habt ihr bei der ersten Anfrage eure Zusage bekommen oder habt ihr es mehrmals versucht?

Nimmt es Freiheit? Was sind deiner Meinung nach die Vor- und Nachteile davon, gefördert zu werden?

Wie wirkt sich die Förderung in den angebotenen Aktivitäten aus?

Wie wirkt sich die Förderung auf das Zielpublikum aus?

APPENDIX C: Interview Guideline for Interviews with Participants (in German)Kontakt mit Menschen mit diversen Hintergründen

Wie oft hast du Kontakt mit Menschen aus einem anderen Herkunftsland, mit einer anderen Erstsprache oder einer anderen Religionszugehörigkeit als deiner?

Wo hast du Kontakt mit Menschen aus einem anderen Herkunftsland, mit einer anderen Erstsprache oder einer anderen Religionszugehörigkeit als deiner?

Gibt es Menschen aus einem anderen Herkunftsland, mit einer anderen Erstsprache oder einer anderen Religionszugehörigkeit als deiner, mit denen du eine persönliche Beziehung hast (Bsp. die deine Freunde sind)?

Wo hast du diese kennengelernt?

Gibt es Menschen aus einem anderen Herkunftsland, mit einer anderen Erstsprache oder einer anderen Religionszugehörigkeit als deiner, mit denen du öfters Kontakt hast?

Trefft ihr euch zufällig oder abgemacht, um etwas gemeinsam zu machen?

Hast du FreundInnen aus einem anderen Herkunftsland, mit einer anderen Erstsprache oder einer anderen Religionszugehörigkeit als deiner?

Station Wien/Fremde werden Freunde

Wie bist du zu Station Wien/Fremde werden Freunde gekommen? Deine Motivation?

Seit wann bist du bei Station Wien/Fremde werden Freunde?

Wie oft bist du bei SW/FwF?

Hast du außerhalb von SW/FwF mit den Leuten, die du dort kennengelernt hast, Kontakt?

Mit wem?

Welche Art von Kontakt (Whatsapp, Persönlich, Telefonate)?

Wie oft?

Sind das Freunde oder Bekannte?

Wie würdest du den Kontakt beschreiben?

Haben diese Kontakte etwas verändert für dich?

Wie haben sich deine sozialen Kontakte durch das Mitmachen bei SW/FwF verändert?

Hat sich auch etwas an deiner Denkweise gegenüber Menschen aus einem anderen Herkunftsland, mit einer anderen Erstsprache oder einer anderen Religionszugehörigkeit als deiner verändert?

Welche Faktoren an SW/FwF haben dazu beigetragen, dass diese Kontakte entstanden sind?

Welche Faktoren haben dazu beigetragen, dass sich deine Denkweise verändert hat?

Gibt es Faktoren, die das Kontakte-Knüpfen verhindert oder erschwert haben?

Auf welche Art würdest du gerne noch mehr Kontakte zu Menschen mit einem anderen Herkunftsland, einer anderen Religionszugehörigkeit oder einer anderen Erstsprache haben?
Z.B.: mehrere tiefe Freundschaften, mehrere oberflächliche Bekannte?

Was sind die perfekten Rahmenbedingungen, unter denen eine Begegnung zu so etwas führen kann?

Bist du bei anderen Veranstaltungen/Organisationen, die wie SW/FwF Kontakt zwischen Menschen mit diversen Hintergründen schaffen?

Was für eine Rolle spielt SW/FwF im Vergleich zu diesen?

