



WILCO

Welfare innovations
at the local level
in favour of cohesion



CITY REPORT: BERLIN-FRIEDRICHSHAIN-KREUZBERG

Benjamin Ewert and Adalbert Evers
Justus-Liebig-Universität Giessen (Germany)

WILCO Publication no. 15

This report is part of Work Package 3 of the research project entitled "Welfare innovations at the local level in favour of cohesion" (WILCO). WILCO aims to examine, through cross-national comparative research, how local welfare systems affect social inequalities and how they favour social cohesion, with a special focus on the missing link between innovations at the local level and their successful transfer to and implementation in other settings. The WILCO consortium covers ten European countries and is funded by the European Commission (FP7, Socio-economic Sciences & Humanities).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introductory note: The background concept of "local welfare systems"	3
2. City Report Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg: one district, two histories and many Kieze	10
2.1. Introduction	10
2.2. Transformation in the labour market.....	10
Socio-economic trends.....	12
Public regulation	13
2.3. Demographic changes and family	16
Socio-economic trends.....	16
Public regulation	17
2.4. Immigration	19
Socio-economic trends.....	20
Public regulation	22
2.5. Housing	23
Socio-economic trends.....	24
Public regulation	25
References.....	29

Photo credit: "Global economy meets local needs": The O2-World, sited in the very heart of Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg, provides its huge digital billboards for information by the district council. Where normally mega events such as concerts from Lady Gaga or Madonna are promoted, a course offer called "Strong parents - Strong children" is announced.

1. INTRODUCTORY NOTE: THE BACKGROUND CONCEPT OF "LOCAL WELFARE SYSTEMS"

The following sketch of the local welfare system and its integrative and innovative capacities in Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg and Münster as a significant part of it is based on a broad understanding of this concept, conceiving it as constituted by three elements:

- A number of key social policy sectors, such as labour market- and childcare-policies;
- Socio-spatial urban policies such as housing and neighbourhood revitalization policies and
- Policies that communicate overarching *Leitbilder* und key concerns for the local urban community of citizens at large.

It is taken as a given that systems of local welfare and wellbeing or, correspondingly, local distress and cleavages are in many ways co-produced by a mixed and plural system. Therein, the strategies of central and local policy makers and administrations, the developments in the business sector, the lifestyles in private family and in community life, and finally the solidarities and debates in the local society and its public social spaces interact with each other in manifold ways. The political-administrative welfare system is therein part of a wider package. The following paragraphs give an overview of main aspects being peculiar for both local research fields.

(1) Large cities are often marked by harsh social cleavages between a minority of rich and a majority of relatively poor people as well as by a considerable cultural and ethnic heterogeneity. Complementary to the impulses that come from the economic realms, and to those that result from the manifold associations and projects in the social and cultural fields, there is the key role of state politics such as policies for work and social integration and policies in child and family care. It is to be sketched to what degree innovative concepts and projects facilitating access and participation and, in the widest sense, inventing new pathways and instruments can be seen as being supported by the policy makers and administrative systems in the respective policy fields.

Comparing Münster and Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg (but also Berlin in general) in this respect, strong social cleavage and cultural heterogeneity apply to the latter to a significantly higher degree. In order to promote integration, Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg is also marked by a high level of innovative projects and initiatives often getting considerable support by the local society and communities, even sometimes the business community. However, the manifold support programmes and projects co-designed with the local social administration do not only help their addressees and partners but as well contribute to the survival of the respective administrative bodies that would be in many instances unable to provide sufficient offers without such projects. The coexistence with the landscape of projects helps to go along further with administrative organisation that stayed largely unchanged. Münster, in contrast, is relatively well-off in economic terms, with a very high percentage of the population being students and academics. Though considered as a relatively "conservative" town in political terms, it is prominent for innovative policies in fields as migrants' integration and drug policy, deriving from pragmatic arrangements of cooperation between administration and civil society initiatives. Due to its specific social structure, childcare policy for example is challenged, besides the question of social integration, by the requirements of a high number of mothers combining family and work. Münster is regarded as a pioneer in this respect.

(2) However, like in society in general, the ability of cities and local political entities to cope with the challenges of social cleavages, marginalisation and exclusion depend as well from socio-spatial traditions, developments and policies. The degree in which local inhabitants and citizens are able to live together with some respect for each other despite of socio-economic hierarchies and cultural diversity is enormously different. This depends on many factors, especially housing markets allowing milieus of co-existence and tolerance and restricting social segregation. To achieve a better situation on the housing market, there must necessarily be pursued housing policies that help to avoid a competition expelling the weakest groups, and strategies of urban revitalization cultivating and working in favour of a "convivial" climate. In this respect, social policies on the one and urban policies on the other hand depend on each other. In order to cope with exclusion, the capacity of urban and housing settings and policies are therefore critical. On the other hand, the heritage and potentials of highly integrative neighbourhoods may crumble and finally get destroyed when social policies fail.

Berlin with its long tradition of *Kieze* (the local word for integrative neighbourhoods and city districts) and a traditionally rather relaxed low price housing market could for a long time be seen as to be able to cope rather well with rising social inequalities; in the last decade, this delicate balance is questioned on both sides. On the social policy side, mainstream routines as well as innovative projects and policies are by far not strong enough to counterbalance polarization; on the other side, rising rents make it more and more difficult for parts of the majority of low income population to stay part of their *Kiez*. Münster in contrast consists of a relative small city centre and several suburbs without the specific urban character of the *Kieze* in Berlin. It is mainly these suburbs where the significant growth of population in the past decades found expression in both large housing projects providing relatively cheap accomodation and extensive areas of single-family houses. In the core city of Münster, with few exceptions, rents are relatively high and still rising as the living conditions are considered to be very attractive while the suburbs strongly vary in terms of housing quality, social structure and current development. As some of them are facing serious problems, the need to counteract the worsening situation at some "hot spots" is obvious to the administration while future strategies of public housing policy are discussed controversially.

(3) Politics overall, but as well on the local level, are more than the sum of what is said and done in the various policy sectors at place. Often the residential areas are condensed in one image, negative or positive, like that of "Gotham City" or "the Garden City". What is important is the degree in which overall grand designs are not just artefacts of a top-down image building but mirroring in credible ways the self-images and perceptions of citizens. Proud and scepticism may co-exist side by side.

As to Berlin, this can e.g. be seen in the popular slogan of its social-democratic mayor Klaus Wowereit who once said that Berlin is "poor but sexy". Of special importance is the degree, groups at the risk of exclusion can overall identify themselves with the city and/or the district or rather the *Kiez* they are living in, so that - in spite of a harsh presence - they can keep some expectations for the future and a degree of openness to concerns of the wider population. The increasing degree of an overall feeling of "exclusive" tendencies in Berlin, challenging the notion that its diversity finally offers some space for everyone, is visible in the slogans that actually dominate the state elections. In one way or the other, all parties conjure a vision where everyone should feel as an accepted part of the city. The popular slogan of a recent public campaign "Berlin needs You!" (see below) is directed especially to those inhabitants that feel distressed and decoupled from the world of labour and to whom the social administrations in various ways give a feeling to be useless and just a load for their co-citizens. In Münster, a definite public image strategy is pursued by an administrative unit called "Münster-Marketing", but there seems to be no functional equivalent to "Berlin needs You!". Münster-Marketing and also other institutions mainly

cultivate an image of high living quality, open-mindedness and cultural attractiveness. Slogans like "capital of bicycles" and "peace town" (referring to the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia), the titles "World's Most Liveable City 2004" and "most child-friendly city 2004" as well as cultural events like the open air sculpture exhibitions (*Skulpturprojekte*) and the European Capital of Culture 2010 application process, staged as a participatory mass-event, are extensively used to carry this image. A broad consensus however, explicitly named as *Leitbild* in social policy, could not be reached when regarding some fundamental issues of public infrastructure in the past decade. Though they had therefore to be decided by majority, the general orientation on consensus and on avoiding public polarisation on social issues seems to be persisting.

While in the following the city reports are presented separately, the figures 0.1 to 0.4 summarise the most relevant indicators for the policy-fields labour market, demographic change and family, immigration and housing both for Münster and Berlin-Friedrichshain.

Figure 1 - Most relevant indicators for Münster and Berlin in the field of labour market

Indicator	Indicators Labour_Market												
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Source	
unemployment rate:	9,6	9,4	9,8	10,5	10,5	11,7	10,8	9	7,8	8,2	7,7	b	
Germany													
unemployment rate:	6,7	7,3	7,8	8,3	9,1	8,4	7,1	6,4	6,5	6,5	6,6	b	
Münster													
unemployment rate:	16,1	16,9	18,1	17,7	19	17,5	15,5	13,8	14	13,6	14	b,c	
Berlin													
unemployment rate:						25,3	21,4	18	16,7	16,6	16,1	b,c	
Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg													
unemployment rate: 15- 25 years	9,5	9,1	9,7	9,9	9,9	12,5	10,8	8,5	7,1	7,8	6,8	b	
Germany													
unemployment rate: 15- 25 years												b	
Münster													
unemployment rate: 15- 25 years												b	
Berlin													
unemployment rate: 15- 25 years												b	
Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg (Berlin Mitte)													
long-term unemployment % 6	37,4	35,1	33,7	34,8	38,2	36,2	41,6	40,8	37,4	30,7	32,5	b	
Germany													
long-term unemployment % 7							35,1	40,9	38,6	34	32,3	29,4	b
Münster													
long-term unemployment % 7								41,6	42,8	39,2	36,6	34,1	b
Berlin													
long-term unemployment % 7												b	
Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg (Berlin Mitte)													
GDP per inhabitant (euro)	25100	25700	26000	26200	26800	27200	28200	29600	30200	29300	30600	a	
Germany													
GDP per inhabitant (euro)	36000	36800	37300	38500	39500	39900	42100	43300	44800	44200	44200	a,d,e	
Münster													
GDP per inhabitant (euro)	23200	23200	23200	23000	22900	23400	24200	25300	25700	26700	27400	a,c	
Berlin													
GDP per inhabitant (euro)													
Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg													
labour force agriculture %2	2,4	2,4	2,3	2,3	2,2	2,2	2,1	2,1	2,1	2,1	2,1	f	
Germany													
labour force agriculture %2	1,1	1,2	1,2	1,2	1,2	1,1	0,9	0,9	0,9	0,9	0,9	f	
Münster													
labour force agriculture %2	2,4	2,4	2,3	2,3	2,2	2,2	2,1	2,1	2,1	2,1	2,1	f	
Berlin													
labour force agriculture %2													
Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg													
labour force manufacture %3	28,9	28,3	27,6	27,0	26,4	25,9	25,6	25,5	25,4	24,8	24,8	f	
Germany													
labour force manufacture %3	15,6	15,3	14,6	14,0	14,0	13,7	13,3	13,0	13,2	12,6	12,6	f	
Münster													
labour force manufacture %3	28,9	28,3	27,6	27	26,4	25,9	25,6	25,5	25,4	24,8	24,8	f	
Berlin													
labour force manufacture %3													
Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg													
labour force sale, tourism, traffic %:Germany	25,1	25,1	25,2	25,1	25,2	25,2	25,1	25,1	24,9	25,0	25,0	f	
Germany													
labour force sale, tourism, traffic %:Münster	23,9	24,0	23,7	23,5	23,3	22,9	22,7	22,8	22,5	22,9	22,9	f	
Münster													
labour force sale, tourism, traffic %:Berlin	25,1	25,1	25,2	25,1	25,2	25,2	25,1	25,1	24,9	25	25	f	
Berlin													
labour force sale, tourism, traffic %:Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg													
Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg													
labour force other services %5	43,6	44,2	44,9	45,6	46,1	46,7	47,2	47,3	47,6	48,0	48,0	f	
Germany													
labour force other services %5	59,4	59,5	60,5	61,3	61,6	62,2	63,0	63,2	63,4	63,6	63,6	f	
Münster													
labour force other services %5	43,6	44,2	44,9	45,6	46,1	46,7	47,2	47,3	47,6	48	48	f	
Berlin													
labour force other services %5													
Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg													
a eurostat													
b Bundesagentur für Arbeit													
c Statistik Berlin Brandenburg													
d Amt für Stadtentwicklung, Stadtplanung, Verkehrsplanung Münster													
e it.nrw													
f destatis													
1 Unemployed in per cent of the economically active population													
2 labour force agriculture (A-B) in per cent of the whole labour force													
3 labour force manufacture (D-f) in per cent of the whole labour force													
4 labour force sale, tourism, traffic (G-I) in per cent of the whole labour force													
5 labour force other services (J-P) in per cent of the whole labour force													
6 long- term unemployed (12 month and more) in per cent of all unemployed, annual average													
7 long- term unemployed (12 month and more) in per cent of all unemployed, figures for December													

Source: own figure.

Figure 2 - Most relevant indicators for Münster and Berlin in the field of demography

Indicator	Regional level	Indicators Demographic Change and Family											
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Source
population1	Germany	82259540	82440309	82536680	82531671	82500849	82437995	82314906	82217837	82002356	81802257	.	f
population1	Münster	265609	267197	268945	269579	270038	270868	272106	272951	273875	275543	.	f
population1	Berlin	3382169	3388434	3392425	3388477	3387828	3395189	3404037	3416255	3431675	3442675	.	f
population1	Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg	267919	270572	268839	.	c
population under 18 %2	Germany	18,8	18,7	18,5	18,2	18,0	17,7	17,3	17,0	16,7	16,5	.	f
population under 18 %2	Münster	17,0	17,0	16,9	16,7	16,6	16,4	16,2	16,0	15,9	15,8	.	f
population under 18 %2	Berlin	16,6	16,2	15,9	15,6	15,3	15,0	14,7	14,5	14,3	14,4	.	f
population under 18 %2	Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg	14,6	14,3	14,4	.	c
population 65 and older %2	Germany	16,6	17,1	17,5	18,0	18,6	19,3	19,8	20,1	20,4	20,7	.	f
population 65 and older %2	Münster	15,7	15,9	16,2	16,5	16,9	17,3	17,6	17,7	17,8	17,9	.	f
population 65 and older %2	Berlin	14,6	15,0	15,5	16,0	16,6	17,2	17,9	18,4	18,8	19,1	.	f
population 65 and older %2	Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg	10,2	10,2	10,1	.	c
population women %2	Germany	51,2	51,1	51,1	51,1	51,1	51,1	51,0	51,0	51,0	51,0	.	f
population women %2	Münster	53,2	53,2	53,2	53,2	53,2	53,2	53,1	53,2	53,2	53,1	.	f
population women %2	Berlin	51,4	51,4	51,3	51,3	51,2	51,1	51,1	51,1	51,0	51,0	.	f
population women %2	Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg	48,9	48,9	48,9	.	c
population men %2	Germany	48,8	48,9	48,9	48,9	48,9	48,9	49,0	49,0	49,0	49,0	.	f
population men %2	Münster	46,8	46,8	46,8	46,8	46,8	46,8	46,9	46,8	46,8	46,9	.	f
population men %2	Berlin	48,6	48,6	48,7	48,7	48,8	48,9	48,9	48,9	49,0	49,0	.	f
population men %2	Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg	51,1	51,1	51,1	.	c
families %3	Germany	26,3	25,9	25,8	25,6	25,4	25,6	25,0	24,9	24,4	24,1	.	f
families %3	Münster	17,9	17,7	17,6	17,5	.	17,4 d
families %3	Berlin	23,9	23,6	22,9	22,1	21,9	.	.	c
families %3	Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg	c
lone parent families %4	Germany	17,0	17,4	17,8	18,2	18,6	19,2	20,1	20,0	20,7	20,8	.	f
lone parent families %4	Münster	21,9	22,2	22,3	22,2	.	d
lone parent families %4	Berlin	45,6	33,2	34,6	34,7	35,8	35,8	.	c
lone parent families %4	Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg	39,1	.	c
birth rates	Germany	9,3	8,9	8,7	8,6	8,6	8,3	8,2	8,3	8,3	8,1	.	8,3 d
birth rates	Münster	10,5	9,8	9,3	9,7	9,3	9,0	9,2	9,2	9,4	9,2	.	df
birth rates	Berlin	8,8	8,4	8,5	8,5	8,7	8,5	8,7	9,1	9,3	9,3	.	f
birth rates	Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg	11,5	11,9	11,6	11,9	.	c
coverage rate childcare under 3s	Germany	14,4	17,9	22,4	.	f
coverage rate childcare under 3s	Münster	14,7	17,8	20,4	.	f
coverage rate childcare under 3s	Berlin	38,9	39,0	40,4	.	f
coverage rate childcare under 3s	Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg	42,9	.	c
coverage rate childcare 3 to under 6 Germany	90,7	92,7	93,4	.	f
coverage rate childcare 3 to under 6 Münster	92,1	95,8	96,2	.	f
coverage rate childcare 3 to under 6 Berlin	91,0	92,7	92,0	.	f
coverage rate childcare 3 to under 6 Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg	97,2	.	c
a eurostat													
b Bundesagentur für Arbeit													
c Statistik Berlin Brandenburg													
d Amt für Stadtentwicklung, Stadtplanung, Verkehrsplanung Münster													
e lt.nrw													
f desstat													
1 population at 31th of December													
2 population group's share of whole population in per cent													
3 families (households with children) in per cent of all households													
4 lone parent families in per cent of all families													
5 labour force other services (L-P) in per cent of the whole labour force													
6 children in childcare in per cent of all children of the same age group													
7 long- term unemployed (12 month and more) in per cent of all unemployed, figures for December													

Source: own figure.

Figure 3 - Most relevant indicators for Münster and Berlin in the field of immigration

Indicator	Regional level	Indicators Immigration										Source	
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009		2010
foreigners %1	Germany	8,8	8,9	8,9	8,9	8,8	8,8	8,8	8,8	8,8	8,8	8,7	f
foreigners %1	Münster	7,7	7,8	7,9	7,8	7,6	7,3	7,2	7,0	6,8	6,7	6,7	f
foreigners %1	Berlin	12,8	13,0	13,1	13,2	13,4	13,7	13,9	14,0	14,0	13,7	13,7	f
foreigners %1	Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg	22,6	22,4	22,3	21,0	21,0	c
migrants % 2	Germany	18,3	18,4	18,7	19,0	19,2	19,2	f
migrants % 2	Münster	20,9	d
migrants % 2	Berlin	22,8	22,8	23,6	23,9	24,3	24,3	c
migrants % 2	Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg	30,3	32,2	36,1	35,9	35,9	c
unemployment rate3 foreigners	Germany	16,6	15,7	b
unemployment rate3 foreigners	Münster	15,8	14,3	b
unemployment rate3 foreigners	Berlin	26,6	25,5	b
unemployment rate3 foreigners	Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg *	26,8	25,3	b
immigration trend foreiners4	Germany	86455	188272	152769	102696	55217	95717	74693	99003	10685	27506	27506	f
immigration trend foreiners4	Münster	999	110	1028	295	-105	-123	353	101	-177	191	883	d
immigration trend foreiners4	Berlin	8094	12925	11370	7672	5698	-5943	-5943	f
immigration trend foreiners4	Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg	1495	869,0	1527,0	-3044,0	-3044,0	c
main nationalities foreiners5	Germany	Turkey (24,8%), Italy (7,7%), Poland (6,0%), Serbia (5,4%), Greek (4,2%)										f	
main nationalities foreiners5	Münster	Turkey (9,5%), Portugal (7,9%), Poland (6,3%), Serbia (5,7%), Kosovo (4,5%)										d	
main nationalities foreiners5	Berlin	Turkey (23,5%), Poland (9,2%), Serbia (4,4%), Italy (3,3%), Russian Federation (3,3%)										c	
main nationalities foreiners5	Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg	.											
main nationalities migrants6	Germany	Turkey (15,9%), Poland (8,3%), Russian Federation (6,8%), Italy (4,9%), Kazakhstan (4,2%)										f	
main nationalities migrants6	Münster	Poland (13%), Russian Federation (9,7%), Turkey (6,9%), Kazakhstan (5,9%), Serbia (4,4%)										d	
main nationalities migrants6	Berlin	.											
main nationalities migrants6	Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg	.											
b Bundesagentur für Arbeit	1 foreigners (no german citizenship) in per cent of whole population, figures for December												
c Statistik Berlin Brandenburg	2 migrants (foreigners and persons with own or inherited migration experiences) in per cent of whole population, figures for December												
d Amt für Stadtentwicklung Münster	3 unemployed in per cent of economically active foreigners, figures for December												
f destatis	4 net migration												
* figures for Berlin-Mitte	5 five main nationalities foreigners in per cent of all foreigners, figures for 2009												
	6 five main nationalities migrants in per cent of all migrants, figures for 2009												

Source: own figure.

Figure 4 - Most relevant indicators for Münster and Berlin in the field of housing

Indicators Housing												
Indicator	Regional level	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010 Source
home ownership rate %1	Germany	.	.	40,9	42,6	41,6	43	f,h (2009)
home ownership rate %1	Münster
home ownership rate %1	Berlin	.	.	11,0	12,7	14,1	14,1	f
home ownership rate %1	Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg
change rate residential property %2	Germany	.	-0,9	-0,3	0,0	0,9	0,5	0,9	4,7	3,8	2,6	f
change rate residential property %3	Münster	.	.	.	-11,0	-5,1	-2,9	3,2	1,8	3,8	-4,8	1,2 g
change rate residential property %3	Berlin	.	.	.	0,8	39,5	-26,7	0,0	-0,9	-5,0	1,8	-5,7 g
change rate residential property %3	Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg
average price townhouse (new) in 1000 €	Germany	192,5	g
average price townhouse (new) in 1000 €	Münster	220,0	g
average price townhouse (new) in 1000 €	Berlin	180,0	g
average price townhouse (new) in 1000 €	Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg
change rate rent %4	Germany	1,2	1,2	1,4	1,2	1,0	0,9	1,0	1,2	1,2	0,9	1,0 f
change rate rent %4	Münster
change rate rent %4	Berlin
change rate rent %4	Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg
average net cold rent in € per sq. m.	Germany	6,5	i
average net cold rent in € per sq. m.	Münster	8,5	i
average net cold rent in € per sq. m.	Berlin	5,8	i
average net cold rent in € per sq. m.	Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg
f destatis	1 share of owner occupied property											
g LBS research	2 annual change rate of residential property (new) compared to previous year											
h Euroconstruct/ifo	3 annual change rate of residential property (new and old) compared to previous year											
i BBSR	4 annual change rate of rent compared to previous year											

Source: own figure.

2. CITY REPORT FRIEDRICHSHAIN-KREUZBERG: ONE DISTRICT, TWO HISTORIES AND MANY KIEZE

2.1. Introduction

Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg, Berlin's smallest (20.2 km²) but most densely populated (13,389 inhabitants/km²) district mirrors many facets of the city in a nutshell. Foremost, in terms of space, Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg may be considered as the heart chamber of Germany's capital. Separated by the Spree River, Friedrichshain represents the Eastern part and Kreuzberg the Western part of the district. The former independent constituencies were merged through an administrative reform in 2001. Since then - similar to West and East Berlin at the whole - two very different localities collided and are gradually adapted to each other. At the first glance, with respect to WILCO's research interest, Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg share merely a high number of relatively poor people. In 2010, around 60,000 out of the district's ~270,000 inhabitants (~22%) were dependent on elements of social assistance payments ("Hartz IV"). The medium income amounts to 1,300€ per person/month. With on average 36.9 years, Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg's population is comparatively young.

Headed by a Green mayor, supported by a strong leftwing majority in the district parliament, the local government is responsible for a rather heterogeneous citizenry. To a large extent, the former East-West demarcation line still has an impact. This becomes especially apparent with regard to the spatial distribution of immigrants: In Kreuzberg, an area that since the end of the 1960s has become the embodiment of multiculturalism in Germany, nowadays 34% of the inhabitants have a non-German (mostly Turkish) offspring. In contrast, ethnical mixing in Friedrichshain is low. There, around 8% of the inhabitants are immigrants. From a political point of view, it is worthy to note that most of the immigrants in the district are not EU citizens and therefore lack suffrage in local elections.

Most strikingly, the percentage of single mothers in Friedrichshain is much higher than in the Western part of the district, where with regard to informal support networks of various subcultures and immigrants, strong communities often function as a safety net for families under stress. Another key part of the population, characterizing the whole district, are the so called "young creatives" (Häußermann *et al.* 2009: 21-4) - a label that includes students, artists and entrepreneurs which reshaped the local economy tremendously within the last decade. Owing to its central location, Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg has become a hot spot for tourism, culture, nightlife and fashion stores. Respective start-up companies showed robustness in the financial crisis and are still flourishing; however, jobs that have been created in this sector are often part-time, precarious and poorly paid.

While writing this report, the most urgent problem in the district concerns the provision of affordable dwellings for low-income earners. The rising of rents turns out to be an explosive force that challenges the social cohesion of Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg's citizenry. In the medium term, the previous capacity of the local *Kieze* (see introductory note for the German city reports above) as integrating and protective zones for all inhabitants across social classes is in serious danger.

2.2. Transformation in the labour market

Traditionally, Berlin's labour market performance is below the national average. The city's exceptional position in the aftermath of World War II and the specific problems accompanied with the reunification of East and West Berlin in 1990 complicated the regional economic conditions and worsened the vitality of Berlin's labour market sustainably. For the purpose of this report, the historic impact of key factors should only

be mentioned in a fast time-lapse (for more details see Häußermann and Kapphann 2009). After 1945, West Berlin has been deindustrialized and, due to its sudden peripheral position, lost its national relevance for key service branches such as banks or insurance companies. The local economy in East Berlin, being at that time a "dominant metropolis of the GDR" (ibid.: 38), was marked by decomodification, whereas jobs had been concentrated in the public sector. In 1990, the socio-economic situation of the reunited city was deeply shaped by the long-term effects of these structural features. Furthermore, the transformation process brought new challenges to the fore: Foremost, the omission of West Germany's subsidies that stabilized West Berlin economically and, of course, the reintegration of East Berlin into the market economy. As in Germany at the whole, the "miracle of reunification" did not unfold in Berlin in a swift economic boom. Instead, the readjustment took place gradually, influenced by global economic developments and national policies.

Unemployment and precarious work in Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg

In Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg, all these features that shaped Berlin tremendously within the last 66 years, can be viewed under a magnifying glass. The district still represents a miniature view of Berlin's challenges and problems. In the following, main aspects of the development of the local labour market and economy within the last decade will be presented.

In September 2010, the unemployment rate in Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg amounted to 11.8% (12.9%/September 2009) on average. Compared to the annual average in Germany (~7.7%/2010), the district lags behind; however, the *Land* Berlin is the appropriate yardstick against unemployment in Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg has to be compared. Against this backdrop, the district prevails with 1.5% less unemployed than Berlin as a whole (~13.3%/2010). With regard to personal features, Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg's 20,398 unemployed (July 2011) split into 12,091 men and 8,307 women. Furthermore, 13,950 unemployed are Germans while 6,398 are foreigners without a German citizenship. The number of long-term unemployed, being jobless than one year and longer, amounts to 6,704.

Beyond these initial stats, employment prospects are less promising for Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg. According to the local jobcentre (employment agency), 60,000 (~22%) of the inhabitants could be labelled as "clients" with permanent contact to and support from the agency. The high number results from the fact that the social assistance ("Hartz IV")-system supports long-term unemployed together with their families. Thus, the social microstructure is deeply characterized by a milieu that is temporarily excluded from full-time employment patterns (or rather has never been a part of it). At least for Kreuzberg, this is not a new phenomenon. Due to its peripheral position at the borderline between East and West, its affordable housing space and its special mixture of inhabitants of German dropouts, alternative subcultures and (mostly Turkish) "guest workers", the area has been steadily considered as a "problem district" since the 1970s. On the other hand, the situation in Friedrichshain leads back to the political and economic upheaval after 1989. At this time, the whole local economy broke down and, since then, has been recovered slowly through an evolutionary renewal process.

Consequently, instead of being a monolithic bloc, the district's precarious inhabitants are highly segmented and unequal in terms of their needs and capabilities to build on. For instance, 33.2% of the clients of the jobcentre in Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg are immigrants (most of them from Kreuzberg), many of them without an educational attainment that is valid in Germany. Similarly, 2,140 out of 60,000 clients (mostly from Friedrichshain) are using childcare facilities while e.g. participating in a job-training programme. Youngsters, aged 15 to 24, are another group to take care of: In August 2010, 7,545 youngsters were

clients of the jobcentre; 2,284 of them are jobless. Among these clients 14.6% have no school-leaving qualifications, which in most cases (77.5%) is synonymous with unemployment.

In face of the clients' heterogeneity, the jobcentre's manager, Stephan Felisiak, being asked for a common denominator of the clients, emphasized merely their remarkable distance from education and training as a typically feature. "These people are embedded in communities that lack role models for decent work", states Felisiak.

How to deal with such persistently unfavourable conditions? Besides the common toolbox of activation measures and workfare policies (trainings, "one-euro-jobs" etc.) the local jobcentre relies on networking in order to generate mutual trust and in order to sensitize for jobseeker's multiple problems networks with other service providers. Therefore, the improvement, cultivation and use of overlapping networks are preconditions to establish close contacts with, both, the employers' side and also the heterogeneous group of the unemployed. Though, social capital is distributed unevenly in the locality: While Kreuzberg has a high density of projects to reintegrate the unemployed, networks are less developed in Friedrichshain.

On the one hand, there are networks with public institutions (e.g. the local child and youth welfare office) and Third Sector Organizations (TSOs) in the realm of social services that should help to have more than simply an employment-centred integration approach. An outstanding example, is e.g. the project "district mothers" (supported by the jobcentre), where bilingual immigrant women building bridges between their peers and local authorities, in order to ease a better understanding of clients' needs and complex living conditions (see below). On the other hand, there are also networks with employers such as the Chamber of Industry and Commerce, the Chamber of Crafts and business associations. For instance, in the past the jobcentre initiated a network in order to pool tourism-related working opportunities: with three millions overnight stays per year tourism is a booming sector in Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg. Both elements of local networks are not common features of jobcentres in Germany.

Socio-economic trends

As stated above, Berlin's unique heritage forces the city to seek its economic fortune in newly founded companies and the expansion of personal services. In this respect, Germany's capital succeeded in making a virtue out of necessity. Berlin is the frontrunner with regard to the number of commercial businesses among the German *Länder* (FEA 2011) and counts strongly on the further boom of the service sector.

Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg may be described as the epicentre of this economic development. Nowhere else in Berlin, start-ups, small companies and various service providers expanded to a similar extent. Not surprisingly, 60.1% of all employed are working in the service sector. Though, since 2006, a period where the service sector has been stable for Berlin overall, it decreased by almost 4% in Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg. The sector of commerce, gastronomy and transportation has a share of 29% (2010). Both sectors, service and commerce, are slightly bigger (on average 1-2%) in Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg than in Berlin overall. Manufacturing makes up for the smallest economic sector with 10.2% of all employees in the district. The total number of employees has increased by 11.1% in the last years: from 123,100 in 2006 to 136,800 in 2009. During the same period the amount of employees in Berlin increased only by 6.7%. On the other hand, the unemployment rate decreased, both in Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg and Berlin from 2005 to 2009. Although the decrease has been bigger in Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg (25.3% to 16.6%) than in Berlin (19% to 14.1%). However, even if Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg spearheaded Berlin in terms of economic dynamism, the sheer facts say little about the actual situation

on the labour market. By going local, it becomes obvious that a booming local economy does not necessarily mean a flourishing of decent jobs and prosperity.

Once more, differences between Friedrichshain and Kreuzberg are outstanding. Most strikingly, the huge Turkish community in Kreuzberg has its own full-fledged local economy, containing the whole spectrum of groceries, retailers, restaurants and service providers such as hairdressing salons or travel agencies. This well-established economy coexists largely besides its traditional German counterpart. From a perspective that is sensitive to social inclusion, the given parallel economy raises additional questions such as how to gain and train youngsters, namely second and third generation migrants, for jobs dedicated to the whole society (e.g. as public servants)? Especially, in Kreuzberg networks of public administrations (e.g. the jobcentre) and associations of Turkish entrepreneurs become critical, for instance, when it comes to issues such as integrated German language teaching for employees. In comparison, Friedrichshain's small share of non-German inhabitants gives the local economy a slightly different flavour. There, creative start-ups, ranging from internet businesses and design labels to social projects (e.g. the foundation of a kindergarten), have been transformative forces so far.

The tourism sector is an engine for jobs in both parts of the district. Berlin-wide 232,300 people live from the yearly turnover of 8.99 billion € (2009) made in the tourism sector. With three million overnight stays per year (a sixth of Berlin's 18,872 million overnight stays in 2009) Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg collects a huge hunk of the money. Therefore, tourism plays a key role for the local economy. According to data from the Berlin tourism office (2009), tourism-related jobs were not affected by the recent financial crisis due to an unbroken rush of visitors. Though, tourism-related working opportunities in Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg are quite special. Instead of state-recognized skilled occupations, such as hotelier, chef of cuisine or museum guide, the boom in tourism produces precarious and temporary jobs in youth hostels, low-budget hotels, 24-hour-shops, bars, bistros and clubs. According to the local jobcentre (2011), this trend has hardly positive effects on the overall economic development of the district. Furthermore, respective job vacancies, providing in very few cases salaries to make a decent living, go along with additional problems. For instance, service staff employees with children, working at late evenings and during the night, are in need of tailored childcare facilities.

Instead of pointing to the heterogeneity of the district's inhabitants, interviewees put more emphasis on another division line that is responsible for people's chances on the labour market: education and practical skills. Concerning these criteria, the impact of people's origins diminished, even if migrants are still disadvantaged. However, the citizenry increasingly differentiates in terms of access to knowledge and education or rather people's capabilities. The cleavage between (young) professionals versus multiple deprived people affects also the field of housing and childcare (see below). Street scenes mirror these opposite lifestyles vividly: The so-called cosmopolitan *latte-macchiato-elite*, characterized by ostentatious activity and the typical insignia (e.g. smart phones), collide with a remarkable number of poor people (e.g. bottle collectors, increasing their small incomes through deposit refunds).

Public regulation

At the local level in Germany, the responsibility for labour market policies is shared between employment agencies (for short-term jobseekers), jobcentres (dealing with the long-term unemployed) and the municipalities. In Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg, - with regard to WILCO's target groups - the local jobcentre and the district council for health, social affairs and employment are in charge to service the unemployed. To a large extent, that task could be described as joint venture with a clear division of labour. The jobcentre is responsible for the payment, profiling and case managing of the unemployed as well as for

helping them to access additional services such as child minding or debt counselling (Evers *et al.* 2011). In addition, the jobcentre established permanent working groups concerning target groups and special needs that meet once a month. Hence, working groups are focused, for example, on clients with a migration background or single mothers. Furthermore, the jobcentre has tight contacts to other administrative boards of the district such as the child and youth welfare office, the housing department or the coordination unit for schools and business.

The district council for health, social affairs and employment runs also a coordination unit for employment promotion that facilitates contacts to TSOs and the local economy. Being in close cooperation with the jobcentre, the local authority co-organizes, for instance, a yearly youth conference including all stakeholders playing a part in the management of the transition phase between school and working life. In 2010, the youth conference, using the slogan "you are needed" (once more, youngsters were addressed as individual persons being important for the future of the district), mapped local job-entry and traineeship possibilities for young people aged 15 to 24. In the aftermath of the conference, the innovative project "jobexplorer" (see below) emerged, bringing together youngsters, school representatives and employers. However, despite these quite promising examples of sector-crossing cooperation, every stakeholder is continuously struggling to receive its own merits. For instance, interviewees of, both, jobcentre and the district council for employment highlighted *their* commitment concerning the success of the youth conference without sharing it.

An important role in the support and upscaling of job-related projects plays also the association of entrepreneurs in Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg. Founded in 1992, the association has 120 members, among them many medium-sized enterprises that are traditionally anchored in the district. According to its statutes the association aims at the improvement of the local economic structures, a task that includes also engagement in the mediation of jobs or rather the backing of (young) jobseekers. The association proved to be innovative. For instance, a recently launched project, called "senior mentors", developed a new job profile: facilitators, with much work experience, being in charge for the vocational training and accompany of young people in local companies. In addition, senior mentors ought to monitor the shortage of skilled workers within the company.

According to the manager of the local jobcentre in Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg, Stephan Felisiak, it is central for the governance of the local labour market to be itself a driver in the establishment of networks. Therefore, the jobcentre's advisory board consists of local employers and business associations, unions and members of the district council. As stated by the interviewees, "informal initiatives" by issue-centred coalitions among these stakeholders, e.g. to map job opportunities related to tourism or to report apprenticeship vacancies, are often more successful than routine regulation. However, such a supportive environment that lowers barriers and generates trust and reciprocity has been slowly developed over the time. In this respect, due to grown and well-groomed structures, conditions for cross-sectoral cooperation and networking are much better in Kreuzberg than in Friedrichshain.

Considering the welfare mix in the field of employment, Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg experienced in the last decade a redistribution of responsibilities and tasks. The so-called "Hartz-reforms" on the federal level from 2004 onwards have been a "game-changer" (Evers *et al.* 2011). Emanating from the respective laws, the anyhow fairly rigid Federal Employment Agency (FEA) received more steering competence, while the framework for local labour market policies narrowed. The local jobcentre has become a pivotal player. After receiving national attention in 2005, a time when up to 1,000 clients frequented Berlin's third largest jobcentre (SZ 10.05.2011), the agency has increased its successful placements in the subsequent years of economical upturn. As stated above, governance

through networks proved to be a key. The jobcentre succeeded to become embedded in the district's welfare system (for this purpose, the recruiting of staff from local council departments was helpful) and also generated new impulse by launching projects and programs for special target groups.

With regard to young workers (WILCO's target group one), several programmes exist that focus on different dimensions of unemployment and bring together different stakeholders. In the following, different approaches to combat youth unemployment will be introduced shortly.

- The coordination unit for schools and business has launched, together with the jobcentre and the association of local entrepreneurs, a program called "jobexplorer" that paves new ways in the job orientation for youngsters aged 13 to 17. A multiphase concept introduces pupils stepwise to the working world, starting already three years before they finish school. The innovative feature of the programme is its encouragement to mutual tests: Young people are invited to discover a certain job practically, while local companies have the opportunity to voice their specific demands on career starters.
- The jobcentre's funding guideline "job mediation with sustainable placement on the labour market" (German abbreviation: JOMP) aims at a similar direction: JOMP seeks to match young precarious workers with companies that may lack qualified employees in the mid-term due to the demographic change. Therefore, three consecutive processes - orientation, qualification and integration - are scheduled. If necessary, cooperation with local providers for social integrative assistance (e.g. drug counselling or the child and youth welfare office) will be facilitated. During the whole period, participants are individually coached in basic competences and practical life skills: ranging from "how to handle money", the coping with life crisis till the dealing with authorities.
- Jobcentres are entitled to use a part of their budget independently, e.g. through the promotion of measures beyond the standardized catalogue of activation instruments. In Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg, "Jobvision", a work-placed practical training for unemployed youngsters under 27, fits that category. Managed by the association "work and education", under-performing youth, partly without school-leaving degree, receive a double support: They get qualified for a job in local businesses and are taught on basic educational skills such as in math, German language and politics.
- Financed by the same fund, the program "qualification on the job" focuses also on hard-to-mediate youngsters in the district that often combine several deficits, such as learning disabilities, inappropriate German language skills or a background from socially disadvantaged families. By applying a five-phase-model - mediation of traditional work virtues and competences, internships, vocational training, career entry and a permanent work contract - within the time span of 15 months, concerned youngsters ought to be integrated in the working world in a gentle way.

In addition to these (relatively) established partnership programmes, carried out by the jobcentre, local companies and TSOs, a bunch of competing small-scale initiatives (e.g. job pilots and job entry advisors) complete the district's range of services for jobless youngsters.

2.3. Demographic changes and family

As stated initially, Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg is an exceptional young district. The daily street life is dominated by youngsters under the age of 30 and young parents with their children. Hence, one may assume the district currently experiences a reverse demographic change. Especially in comparison to the overall ageing in Germany, Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg appears to be a domicile of the youth. However, regardless to the ongoing baby boom, the district is still struggling to provide sufficient and appropriate childcare and family-oriented services to parents with children. Especially in Friedrichshain, where childcare facilities were mistakenly scaled back in the early 2000s, the provision of kindergarten places for children aged 3 to 6 remains a bottleneck factor.

Socio-economic trends

Since 2001 Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg's population has been grown steadily. In 2010 Berlin's statistical office counted 270,158 inhabitants, 4.5% more than in 2001 (251,769). Thus, the district adds up to the whole picture: In the last decade, Berlin's population has increased from 3,388,477 (2001) to 3,460,725 (2010). The local proportion of foreigners (people without a German passport) declines slowly, although, absolute numbers are almost unchanged: In 2010, 56,774 foreigners lived in Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg, making up for 21.02% of the overall population. In 2001, the share of foreigners was 22.33% (56,218), while in 2005 the share reached its peak with 22.68% (59,385). Currently, the district's proportion of foreigners is ~7% higher than in Berlin as a whole (13.9%, see below). Concerning the elderly, in 2010 the proportion of inhabitants over 65 years amounted to merely 10% in Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg (the percentage has been relatively stable over the last years). Berlin-wide the same cohort has been increased from 15% (2000) to 19% (2010).

In terms of birth rates, Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg is heading the rankings since 2009. Then, the district received for the first time the unofficial label "Berlin's district with the most children". In 2010, statistically 12.3 babies were born per 1,000 inhabitants, meaning an increase of 0.8 since 2006. In comparison, numbers for Berlin as a whole (9) and Germany (8.3) were much lower in 2010. Children up to 6 years represent 5.94% of the population. Children from 6 to 15 have a share of 6.48% of the population (numbers for 2009). While the rate for children up to 6 is slowly rising (5.66%/2006; 5.95%/2009), the rate for children from 6 to 15 diminished almost correspondingly (6.8%/2006; 6.49%/2009). Measured by family size, one-child-families made up for the majority (58%) in Berlin, followed by two-children-families (31.1%) and three-children-families (11%) (data from 2009). In Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg, a quarter of the population is married (65,300 [24.9 %] 2006; 68,300 [25.3 %] 2009). The number of marriages per 1,000 inhabitants increased from 2.6 in 2007 to 2.9 in 2009. The local ratio between marriage and divorce remains stable on 3:3.6. Of all couples, 32.8% (14,400 couples out of 43,900 couples) are living in partnerships without being married (data from 2009).

The share of one-person-households in Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg was 65% in 2009. In the previous years, from 2006 onwards, it was slightly higher, at 66-67%. The proportion of lone parent families, with respect to all families (households with children under 18), increased from 35.2% in 2006 to 39.8% in 2008. In both categories numbers for Berlin as a whole are lower; however, there, the percentage of lone parents keeps also significant (35.8% in 2009, thereof 87% women). The high number of lone parents leads simultaneously to a decreasing proportion of couples with children, again regarding all families with children under 18, from 64.8% in 2006 to 60.2% in 2008. The average number of persons per household fluctuates constantly between 1.5 and 1.6 (from 2006 to 2009).

In 2008, there were 7,500 single mothers in Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg. This number has an up and down trend from 7,400 in 2006 to 6,600 in 2007. In 2009, single mothers represent a share of 27.4% of all families and a share of 2.8% of all households with children under 18. However, in some neighbourhoods of Friedrichshain lone mothers make up the majority of households with children, whereas numbers in Kreuzberg are traditionally lower due to stronger family ties among immigrants. Though, according to interviewees, the proportion of immigrant women being divorced is increasing steadily. In Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg, the percentage of lone mothers being unemployed amounted to ~7% in 2010; the percentage for the *Land* Berlin was ~9% (FEA 2011). As for other beneficiaries, the most urgent problem for lone mothers in Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg, depending on "Hartz IV" payments, concerns affordable housing supply (see below).

Lone mothers' occupational status and professional activities cover a wide range. On the one hand, there is Friedrichshain's in large parts well-educated female workforce, including public servants, teachers, physicians and highly skilled professionals; on the other hand, immigrant women in Kreuzberg are mostly dependent on job opportunities within their local economy or rather communities. Accordingly, being a lone mother means not inevitably to be in peril of precarious work. However, most of the actual jobs request very flexible childcare arrangements, e.g. very long opening hours of kindergartens or rather additional self-organized support networks. In this respect, the jobcentre's appointee for lone parents emphasizes the importance to expand appropriate childcare facilities instead of just focusing on job creation schemes for this target group. Once again, cooperation across authorities is necessary in order to meet childcare demands appropriately (Interview child and youth welfare office). Thus, plain stats - in 2010, childcare coverage rates in Berlin were above average with 94% (kindergarten) and 42% (crèches) - do not indicate whether women (and especially single mothers) succeed to conciliate working and caring.

Public regulation

In Germany welfare benefits and services for families are provided by, both, the federal and the local level (Evers *et al.* 2011). As a rule, benefits such as child and education allowances or parental leaves are paid by the Federal Ministry for Family affairs. Regarding these benefits, several changes occurred within the last years. Most importantly, family allowances, amounting to 67% of the average net income, changed in two ways: First, they were reduced to a period of one year; second, they are not any more flat-rate- but income-related with the main aim to encourage better-off women to consider, both, a working career and motherhood. Thus, labelling family allowances as a "wage replacement benefit" has been a paradigm shift in order to promote female employment. However, critics argue that the employability orientation of a former social benefit discriminates mothers (and some fathers) that either cannot live from 67% of their net income or have hardly chances returning to work after the leave. Furthermore, the reform of family benefits requires comprehensive childcare arrangements for children aged 0 to 6.

Childcare in Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg

In Germany, the provision of childcare is governed and paid for mainly on the local level. That means in Berlin, regulation and financing are located on the state level (*Land* Berlin) with minor competences on the district level. However, federal initiatives such as the extension of crèches and respective subsidies have also an impact. Overall, the *Land* Berlin has 140,000 kindergarten places at its disposal; however, despite the ongoing baby boom merely ~123,000 places have been allocated. The main reason why the quota is not fully used is a shortage of approximately 800 skilled nurseries. The quotas of places, distributed by the Senate to Berlin's twelve districts, do not mirror the actual demand. For instance, Reinickendorf, a district in the northwest of Berlin, has continually unused kindergarten

places while Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg urgently needs additional ones (see below). However, according to Senate statutes redistribution of places among districts is not allowed. Besides Hamburg, Berlin is the only German city where parents make their claims for a kindergarten place valid via vouchers, issued by the local child and youth welfare office. The voucher system is based on criteria such as the employment situation of parents (vocational training and integration courses are also considered), pedagogical and social needs for children (e.g. language training). Parents have to declare their monthly family income (as an indicator for childcare allowances) in order to apply for a voucher. The daily demand on childcare (half-day or full-day) has to be stated on the voucher. However, due to limited kindergarten places the voucher system does not provide parents with greater choice but works merely as an administrative tool in order to distribute existing resources.

Generally, in the last decade TSOs and private providers dominated on local childcare arrangements (Evers *et al.* 2011); a trend that is also mirrored in Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg. There, on the basis of numbers the provision of childcare seems sound and ensured at the first glance: The district pays a yearly amount of 84 million € into different arrangements of childcare services. Theoretically, parents are able to choose between 150 providers that run 245 kindergartens with more than 11,500 places. Practically, the demand on childcare exceeds the supply and limits the actual choice; therefore between 1,000 and 1,500 additional places should be created until 2015. Furthermore, the field of childcare includes eight "family centres", which are strategically located within Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg. Family centres, understood as facilities to pursue a more holistic approach of childcare including the families, offer also additional services on a small scale, such as informal meeting places or family cafés. Taken together, the district has a relatively grown childcare infrastructure at its disposal.

However, historic differences of East and West Germany regarding childcare are still observable in the district. For instance, in Friedrichshain (East Berlin) 51% of the children aged 0 to 3 attend a crèche, while just 30% of their contemporaries do so in Kreuzberg. Reasons for that are a better provision of crèches in Friedrichshain (due to its GDR tradition) and cultural reservations of immigrant parents in Kreuzberg to commit their children to public institutions so early. Remarkably, differences are fading when it comes to the care of children aged 3 to 6. While nearly all of these children in the district being cared in a kindergarten, 69% attend all-day care arrangements. This development is supported by childcare providers that often nudge parents to subscribe their children for full-time arrangements because of higher subsidies, targeted to providers, combined with those places. On the other hand, even parents that favour half-day services are increasingly forced to use all-day arrangements due to flexible working hours.

Despite these comparatively high attendance figures (on a national scale), Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg is struggling to fulfil the demand on childcare. Since 2000, a time where the local child and youth welfare office closed voluntary several kindergartens due to an assumed lack of demand in the future - a serious miscalculation - the still continuing upwards trend concerning birth rates has profoundly changed the need of childcare services. This trend has been coincided with Berlin's economic crisis forcing the Senate between 2002 and 2005 to transfer their stock of crèches and kindergartens to TSOs or rather to run them as "municipal enterprises" (with an own budget responsibility). In the meantime, the restructuring of the field has been almost accomplished - with the support of an ad-hoc taskforce called "baby boom" being located at the child and youth welfare office. However, providers are still overstrained by the actual demand and waiting lists for kindergarten places are the rule rather than the exception. A further problem is that available residential space to open-up new kindergartens in the district is both, rare and expensive.

The situation for single mothers occurs to be rather problematic in Friedrichshain. According to a local women's centre (*Frieda*), paying special attention to single mothers, current childcare arrangements do not allow a swift return to work after maternity leave. Long waiting lists for a place in kindergarten make the planning for a professional re-entry almost impossible. Additionally, due to the run of parents, local kindergartens have been tightening up practices of allocating places to parents. Hence, competing parents partly subscribe full CVs, entailing also information on their socio-economical status, to improve their baseline conditions. Apparently, such a procedure disadvantages single mothers with a small income. Concerned women ask for better information by the district council and the child and youth welfare office with regard to childcare entitlements (Frieda 2011).

The perceived needs of parents are taken up by several local initiatives and parent-driven networks that are part of the local welfare mix. Among others support is being offered by

- the already mentioned women's centre, *Frieda*, that combines practical offers, such as the teaching of relaxation methods for stressed mothers or learning methods for children, with juridical, pedagogical, psychosocial and professional advice. Moreover, networking of women is facilitated through a regular meeting of mothers.
- a family and neighbourhood education centre that promote themselves as a facilitator of communication and contacts between parents with children aged three months to 4 years. The basic "exchange dimension" is accompanied with regular courses for parents and children (e.g. with foci on interactive, playful and musical elements) and professional advice for early childhood and family building.
- so-called family-midwives that offer help to expectant and young mothers during their pregnancy and within the first year of maternity. In Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg, family midwives care especially about under-aged and single mothers or rather those that are suffering from problems with drugs and violence. The Berlin-wide project is carried out in cooperation with the local child and youth welfare offices and funded until mid-2014.
- Friedrichshain's local alliance for families, a national initiative by the ministry for family affairs that so far does not exist in Kreuzberg, aims at the strengthening of local support networks, more public commitment for family matters and the overall promotion of a family-friendly environment. Instead of providing own services, the alliance pools offers and resources for families and builds bridges between public, private and third-sector stakeholders. Furthermore, concrete pacts of cooperation and service integration, forged by the alliance, function as points of reference for parents seeking information.

2.4. Immigration

A popular but false assumption is that Berlin has the highest percentage of immigrants in Germany. This image can easily be disproved by numbers: The proportion of foreigners in Berlin amounts to ~13.9% and is, thus, significantly lower than in other major cities such as Munich (23.6%) or Frankfurt (21.1%). Also in terms of inhabitants with a "migration background", *Bundesländer* as Hamburg (25.8%), Baden-Württemberg (24.8%) or Hesse (23.4%) prevail Berlin (22.9%) (Schneekloth 2009: 56). Nevertheless, Berlin is deemed to be Germany's capital of multiculturalism; an unofficial title that is once a year celebrated at the so-called "carnival of cultures", an international street parade through Kreuzberg. What are the distinctive features of immigration in Berlin?

Socio-economic trends

Most strikingly, the distribution of immigrants is very uneven with regard to Berlin's twelve city districts or rather the East and the West part of the city. Hence, the territorial concentration of foreigners and immigrants, coming from 150 countries to Berlin, is high. On the whole, with a number of ~128,000, Turks make up for the biggest foreign group of people. In some neighbourhoods of the Western districts such as Wedding, Kreuzberg or Neukölln, the share of inhabitants with a non-German origin hits easily the 60-percent mark. Furthermore, different ethnicities are concentrated in certain areas: while in common parlance Kreuzberg is called "little Istanbul"; Neukölln (especially the north part around the *Hermannplatz*) is to be regarded as the home of Arab communities. On the other hand, districts of East Berlin such as Lichtenberg or Marzahn-Hellersdorf have a quite homogenous citizenry with a proportion of immigrants under 5%. Due to several attacks by right-wing extremists in the past, people with a foreign appearance regularly avoid to go to these areas.

Nevertheless, from the perspective of its multicultural citizenry, Berlin is seen as a "social mosaic" or a "patchwork rug", having its own flavour (Zürn *et al.* 2009: 297). In terms of integration and social inclusion, local communities and the above mentioned *Kieze* are critical - there the promising image of "permeable life worlds" (*ibid.*: 302) emanated from. Measured by regular contacts between Germans and immigrants and vice versa, the image holds also empirically true: 80% of the Germans and 97% of immigrants report to contact the supposedly "other side" (*ibid.*: 298).

Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg, connecting East and West Berlin, characterizes Berlin's distribution of immigrants on a small scale. Its overall share of foreigners makes up for 21.4%, 1.5% less than in Berlin as a whole. However, Kreuzberg, since the 1970s an immigration district, is nowadays home of the biggest Turkish community outside Turkey. Other ethnicities, such as Arabs or Africans, populate also the district but in much less numbers. Altogether, 40% of Kreuzberg's citizenry either are foreigners (without a German pass) or are Germans with a migration background. However, the dispersion of immigrants is also in Kreuzberg very uneven and depends on the respective neighbourhood. *Kieze* such as the *Mehringplatz*, *Werner-Düttmann-Siedlung* and *Zentrum Kreuzberg/Oranienstraße* have a share of inhabitants with a migration background between 70% and 80% while the percentage in fashionable and more expensive places to live, e.g. *Bergmannstraße*, are much lower. Despite these territorial concentrations, Kreuzberg's inhabitants are considered as fairly well socially mixed. Especially, immigrants with higher education and decent jobs that keep on staying in their *Kiez* contribute to Kreuzberg's social capital.

On the contrary, Friedrichshain's proportion of immigrants amounts to merely 8% and consists mostly of Vietnamese, Russians and Africans from former communist satellite states (e.g. Mozambique, Tanzania). In this respect, the East-West division of the district largely endures. Only gradually, ten years after the merger of the district, Turkish families move to Friedrichshain and also slowly gain a foothold in the local economy there (Interview Commissioner for Integration). Whether that trend will change the socio-economic structure of the district in the long run is not predictable yet.

Concerning the issue of inclusion, one decisive limitation has to be stated at the beginning. Most of Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg's immigrants lack suffrage at any elections because they are non-EU-citizens. In the face of that collective rejection, an equal participation of immigrants in key political matters of the district is denied. Hence, Kreuzberg's immigrants, e.g. increasingly threatened by housing exclusions due to expanding rents, lacked impact to coerce parties to take their grievances into account before the state election in September 2011. It is worth noting that the vast majority of immigrants came

to Berlin on a voluntary basis (instead of being refugees and/or asylum seekers) due to its attractiveness as place to live. In this context, the refusal of political rights represents a major handicap, given the fact that immigrants often perceive themselves as a part of a "pioneer era" (Zürn *et al.* 2009: 303). Among immigrants that have become German citizens the political commitment is remarkable: In Kreuzberg, top candidates from all major parties, the Christian Democrats (CDU), the Social Democrats (SPD), the Greens and the Left Party (Socialists), have a Turkish origin.

How are immigrants included in the local labour market? As stated above, to a large extent Turks, without a higher education, are employed within their local economy, e.g. as sales assistants or service personnel. Inclusion of immigrants in working contexts, concerning the whole of society, namely public services (ranging from teachers and physicians till administration employee), remain comparatively low and still do not mirror their proportional share of the citizenry. Significant staff shortage exists especially with regard to the care of the immigrant elderly and mother-tongue therapists. In order to narrow this gap, a public campaign, called "Berlin needs you!" (*Berlin braucht dich!*), initiated by the Immigration Commissioner of the *Land* Berlin, aimed at an intercultural career orientation.

Recently, immigrant's inclusion in the housing market has decreased. Especially in Kreuzberg, where Turkish guest workers have been located in social housing complexes on a massive scale since the 1970s, long-term residents are threatened by increasing rental fees (see below). Dismissals of previous tenancies seem unavoidable. Taking the fact into account that immigrants are seldom homeowners they lack impact in the governance of the housing market. According to immigrant interviewees, the fear of losing one's dwelling and, hence, one's social embeddedness in the *Kiez*, is rapidly spreading around.

Apparently, the territorial concentration of immigrants in Kreuzberg represents a permanent challenge. Neighbourhoods, as the area around the *Kottbusser Tor*, where Turks make up for the majority, have been social hotspots for decades. The quarter *Moritzplatz*, between *Oranienstraße* and *Prinzessinnenstraße*, is another immigrant-populated "problem neighbourhood". Being statistically the poorest locality of the city (Social Urban Development Monitoring 2010), the area holds the record of children depending from Hartz-IV-payments. However, interviewees stated rather unanimously that segregation effects - in a sense of rather gated parallel societies - are almost non-existing. Nevertheless, a persistent problem is the concentration of immigrant's offspring in some kindergartens and schools (partly up to 100% of all children and pupils). In contrast to housing where differences (and also inequalities) among *Kieze* are still appreciated as enrichment, education turns out to be a more awkward issue. Here educated immigrant parents choose schools by the same criteria (foremost, homogeneity in terms of pupils' capabilities and social background) as their German counterparts.

Due to its extraordinary density on projects, initiatives and intercultural associations, Kreuzberg has prevented a far-reaching isolation of immigrant communities so far. Instead, the district still promotes its cultural diversity as a unique characteristic and resource of quality of life. Even when the image of being cosmopolitan and tolerant is gradually fading (due to the accumulation of indicated problems), living conditions in Kreuzberg are not (or only seldom) associated with failure of immigrant integration, youth violence and an overall social decline as it is partly the case in Neukölln or Wedding.

Public regulation

In terms of responsibilities, the provision of services and benefits for immigrants does not differ from normal procedures (Evers *et al.* 2011). Immigrants in Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg, exercising their legal claims for Hartz-IV payments, childcare or social housing, deal with the same authorities than Germans do. In general, access for foreigners to these services is regulated by valid residence and work permissions.

Nevertheless, there are additional administrative bodies dedicated exclusively to immigration matters. To start with, the senate administration for integration, employment and social affairs of the *Land* Berlin sets the framework for immigration policies. The Senate has recently passed a law for integration and participation, codifying, a.o., the tasks of the State Advisory Committee for Questions of Integration and Immigration and for the State Commissioner for Integration. The latter holds a Berlin-wide advice centre providing information on issues such as childcare and education allowances or unemployment benefits. On the district level, local equivalents of, both, Committee and Commissioner exist. In Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg, the Committee, including local stakeholders and immigrant communities, meets on a monthly basis in order to debate on issues such as trends on the local job market or financial support for a voluntary return for immigrants. The work of the local Commissioner for Integration and Immigration mainly aims at the establishment of alliances for tolerance and religious diversity or rather dialogue between different communities in the district. Here, Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg's green mayor Frank Schulz, participating in several intercultural forums, is a key figure (Interview Commissioner for Integration). The Commissioner for Integration and Immigration cares also for an appropriate provision of special services orientated towards immigrants such as language courses or mother-tongue advice. Once more, projects carried out by (local) TSO's in cooperation with authorities, being capable to bring people from certain neighbourhoods closer to demands of the working world and help them education matters, play an important role as it is shown by the following examples:

- The project "Kreuzberg trades - entrepreneurship in the quarter" attempts to stimulate the economic infrastructure in the district. By applying an agency-oriented concept, especially immigrant citizens get encouraged to make use of their professional options. Immigrants, being interested in founding a start-up company, receive advice (e.g. how to apply for public subsidies) and accompany by professional mentors from local enterprises. Furthermore, the project facilitates the generation of sectoral networks, e.g. with companies from the healthcare industry or tourism, and eases cooperation with local authorities and TSOs.
- Exemplary, the project "integrated language teaching in vocational training" (German abbreviation: SPAS), supported by the European Social Fund (ESF) and the Berlin Senate, strives for equal opportunities for immigrant youngsters on the job market. An interdisciplinary approach, developed by school teachers, experts of vocational training and linguists, helps to combine job-related educational objectives with methods to improve competences in speaking and writing German. Currently, 28 vocational schools in Berlin use SPAS-instruments.
- In Kreuzberg's *Werner-Düttmann-Siedlung*, a managed neighbourhood (see below), "neighbourhood pilots" provide various support for local immigrants. Perceiving immigrant inhabitants of the *Kiez* as assets and resources ("pilots") that offer fellow residents help indicates the innovative character of the project. Pilots understand themselves as easy-to-contact persons that pave ways to local authorities and social services for advice-seekers. "Help for self-help" is conducted in seven different languages and includes all potential issues, ranging

from unemployment, rent debts, children's education to family-related problems.

- The most public attention attracts the project "district mothers" (*Stadtteilmütter*), initiated and managed by the *Diakonisches Werk*. The resource-oriented and *kiez*-related project has further developed the above-mentioned idea of mediators and mentors (based on blueprints from the Netherlands and other German cities), helping immigrant families with educational and also family-related issues. Kreuzberg's district mothers, mostly immigrants that completed a special qualification phase ranging from topics such as health promotion, language support to child protection, support and advise families by regular home visits free of charge. As a "low-threshold service", district mothers are easily identifiable by a red scarf in order to get directly addressed on the street, the project attempts to establish informal support networks and trust. Furthermore, the project, receiving already several awards for successful integration work, may be also a springboard to the first labour market: district mothers could combine their voluntary work with a professional training in order to become an assistant for intercultural family care. However, this real job perspective makes it difficult for the *Diakonisches Werk* to provide continuity and requests a steady recruitment of new district mothers. Hence, non-bureaucratic support by the jobcentre and the responsible district council department are preconditions for future success of the project.

2.5. Housing

In Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg, two complexes of buildings symbolize impressively the wide variety in the field of housing: On the one hand, the spectacular, for East Germany's standards luxurious premises alongside the vast socialist boulevard *Karl-Marx-Allee /Frankfurter Allee*, crossing Friedrichshain from West to East. On the other hand, the monolithic new buildings called "New Centre of Kreuzberg", constructed by a private real estate company in the 1970s in order to upgrade the area around the *Kottbusser Tor* where Turkish communities make up for the majority of inhabitants. Beyond these optical hallmarks of architecture, by and large, housing arrangements in the district are characterized through large quarters of old buildings in Friedrichshain that have been preserved during the cold war and different approaches of social housing in Kreuzberg. In addition, Kreuzberg largely benefitted from the *Internationale Bauausstellung (IBA)* in 1987 that paid special attention to the peculiarities of the district.

The status quo ante of housing in the unequal parts of the district appears to be the key to understand today's situation. In Friedrichshain, the heritage of preserved but rather poorly equipped (most of the flats had a coal stove instead of heating systems) old buildings have been renovated stepwise from the mid-1990s onwards. Despite its "social gentleness" (e.g. rents increased slowly and needs for age-appropriate housing were taken into account), the renovation process accelerated a far-reaching replacement of Friedrichshain's inhabitants. Many of the GDR-socialized elderly migrated to bordering districts or suburban areas of Berlin, whereas young people (students, professionals etc.) entered Friedrichshain in high numbers. In addition, the lifestyles of the newcomers change the renting conditions: letting flats to students (e.g. from affluent families) that share an apartment becomes much more lucrative than to families or even "Hartz IV"-recipients.

Historically, Kreuzberg benefitted from large stocks of social housing and, especially, Berlin's exceptional position in the former GDR that guaranteed the city generous subsidies being used for maintaining a moderate level of rents. After Germany's reunification, the Berlin Senate prolonged these favourable but for the public households financially disastrous conditions by bearing the additional renting costs (tenants paid $-6.80\text{€}/\text{m}^2$, while the real costs amount up to $-18\text{€}/\text{m}^2$) out of the state budget. In 2003, almost

suddenly, the *Land* Berlin ceased its subsidies due to high debts. In the following years, social housing buildings became successively privatized. Hence, affordable housing stocks under public tutelage melted off. As a result, the Berlin Senate intervened in 2004 by expanding tenant's dismissal protection to seven years from the date of privatization. Nevertheless, a creeping process of social decomposition set in due to tenants' inability to pay higher rents (some housing associations did not increase rents because they fear to lose all their tenants at once). Furthermore, in Friedrichshain many flats are actually redesigned as holiday apartments; a profitable but locally harshly criticized trend.

Particularly, tenants being dependent on social assistance payments are hardly able to stay in the district. Receiving a capped amount to cover their rents (e.g. a family of five obtains a maximum of 705€), "Hartz IV"-recipients are forced to leave their too expensive (officialise: *inappropriate*) flats within a time span of six months. The previous period of ten weeks proved to be impractical; hence, the Senate modified the respective law but failed to present solutions how to deal with the problem at the whole. At the moment, a continuing crowding out competition seems inevitably.

Socio-economic trends

It is worth noting that housing rents in Berlin are still relatively low in a national comparison. A ranking, carried out by an independent research institute (<http://www.fund-b.de/>, 10.09.2011), demonstrates that on average rents in Munich (10.12€/m²) are twice as high than in West Berlin (~5.50€/m²; rents in East-Berlin are even lower). Especially West Germans, moving to Berlin for employment, appreciate the affordable rents and, at the same time, contribute to their steadily increase. However, that means Germany's capital suffers from low wages and its high number of "Hartz IV"-recipients and not from high rents at the first place. Problems arise from a rent market "normalizing" in face of a labour market where decent jobs are scarce. Due to both factors, the current decline of affordable housing may change the so-far quite balanced social composition within Berlin's inner-city *Kieze* in the mid-term.

Especially, in Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg housing conditions have altered remarkably within the last decade. Foremost, the framework within housing policies and individual opportunities being shaped have been readjusted by

- Berlin's Senate decision to cease social housing subsidies in 2003: For Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg the withdrawal from active social housing policies, due to cost containment, mean a ticking time bomb. Almost suddenly, landlords were allowed to charge real cost rents from dwellers, while the district lost its influence with regard to the allocation of dwellings that belonged to social housing programmes. That radical change, concerning foremost Kreuzberg's immigrant quarters, has been absorbed so far by compensation payments covering up to 90% of rent increases for a maximum period of eight years - until 2011.
- the redevelopment of areas in Friedrichshain: three quarters (*Samariterviertel*, *Travelplatz-Ostkreuz* and *Warschauer Str.*), making up for ~24,000 inhabitants and ~15,000 flats, were part of a Berlin-wide urban renewal process between 1993 and 2011. However, merely ~3,850 flats were modernized with public subsidies and are at the district's disposal for social housing. Main aims of the redevelopment were the upgrading of dwellings and the stabilization of ailing *Gründerzeit* quarters. The success of the programme is ambiguous: On the one hand, living conditions improved enormously; hence, the respective areas of Friedrichshain are privileged neighbourhoods for middle class families nowadays. On the other hand, people with small incomes and the elderly left disproportionately Friedrichshain due to increasing rents.

Taken together, both developments have shaken the social balance in Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg. While the de facto end of social housing capacities reduced the district's opportunities to provide inner-city dwellings for the lower strata; the redevelopment programmes - being in general a huge success for the overall living in Friedrichshain and an engine for the districts' boom - lowered the social cohesion of the local *Kieze* sustainably.

This creeping process can be illustrated by many anecdotes. For instances, in the district's trendiest neighbourhoods disparities among rents to be paid by tenants become increasingly paradox. There, e.g. rents for one-room-apartments partly exceed those for three and four room apartments that have been rented ten years ago. Mini-apartments are often covered by newcomers and singles, e.g. young professionals, entering the district, able to pay disproportionately high rents (e.g. 700€ for 30m²). On the other hand, "Hartz IV"-recipients, receiving a maximum of 378€ from the jobcentre to cover their rental costs, are almost without chances to get up for a one-person-slot. Flats belonging to that category are currently not available in Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg. Furthermore, in order to get rid of often problematic dwellers (socially deprived or drug addicted persons) landlords often increased rents consciously. Not by coincidence, the cheapest dwellings in the district cost at least 400€ - an amount that automatically excludes the unemployed.

However, conflicts emerge also among young families searching for a four- or five-room-apartment and students capable to rent those flats for higher rents due to financial support by their parents. "Family-friendly landlords" (ASUM 2008: 25), providing big dwellings for large families exclusively and, hence, do without the possible maximum on rental income are rare. Another problem, concerning in particular Friedrichshain, is the purchase of apartments by wealthy Europeans (and also Germans), enjoying a second home in Berlins' scene district as a holiday resort or rather an investment that promises huge rental profits (e.g. by letting flats to tourists). Finally, the fluctuation rate among dwellers stagnates and contributes to a reinforcement of the status quo. Resources, being used to improve personal living conditions in the past gradually through numerous moves in the *Kiez*, are nowadays only sufficient to maintain its own position there.

Finally, uneven patterns of changes emerged in Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg's *Kieze*. Today, the district embraces neighbourhoods like *Zentrum Kreuzberg/Oranienstraße* where Turks make up for the majority and where the quality of dwellings hardly improved. From there, an area where processes of gentrification are nearly invisible (disregarding the rise of tourists conquering every corner of the district) emanated the label "little Istanbul". In other areas in Kreuzberg, e.g. *Wrangelkiez* or *Bergmannstraße*, different changes (urban redevelopment, exchange of inhabitants and attractiveness of tourists) intersect and contribute to a situation where native *Kiez* inhabitants have been pushed to the edge and may disappear soon due to rising rents. As reported, in parts of Friedrichshain, inhabitants have already changed almost entirely - a development that made the east part of the district more prosperous and homogenous but less able for compensating social inequalities by creating a convivial mixture of inhabitants (Zürn *et al.* 2009: 296-98).

Public regulation

As stated above, the Berlin Senate stopped its commitment to support social housing financially in 2003 in order to contain costs. Housing associations that clearly belonging to the third sector do not exist in Berlin due to tight intertwinings with the Senate. The districts do not have its own responsibilities with regard to the housing field. Instead, they administrate respective Senate policies and serve as a local seismograph of demand and supply.

According to official stats, the Senate has still about 200,000 dwellings at its disposal where, at least theoretically, the unemployed or people with low income can be accommodated under the condition that they apply for a certificate of eligibility for social housing (*Wohnberechtigungsschein*) in advance. In 2010, 14,000 certificates were issued; 42,000 less than in 2001. Though, the interpretation of these figures and the accompanied leeway for action has become politically controversial. The vast majority of the 200,000 flats are property of real estate funds and private housing cooperatives that are allowed to offer their dwellings on the free housing market as soon as they repaid the subsidies that they received until 2003. However, the Senate has already agreed to renounce its right to allocation - officially to avoid a ghettoization of the areas in question - within 120,000 of the respective dwellings. Currently, merely 80,000 flats, unevenly dispersed over all twelve districts of the city, are left for owners of social housing certificates. Thus, public regulation by the Senate in terms of social housing has been limited within the last decade and may be further constrained when the remaining rights to allocation will run out (Berliner Morgenpost 08.08.2011).

In summer 2011, in the run-up to the state elections, virtually all parties lacked a comprehensive strategy how to solve the shortage of appropriate dwellings for social housing. Especially in Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg, where large numbers of inhabitants are still benefitting from the Senate's right to allocation, fear to be forced relocating themselves in another district dominated public discussions. What we have sketched are structural problems that are hard to tackle by innovative solutions on the micro level, except, perhaps by the rise of tenants' advice services. Given that development, services by TSOs are in demand, supporting tenants that are not longer able to pay their rents or have already legal disputes with housing associations and landlords.

Neighbourhood Management

Beyond the provision of dwellings public regulation in the field of housing is also concerning community oriented interventions for social cohesion and urban renewal. In this respect, "housing" is understood more widely as the place where people work and live together. Since 1999 the federal programme "Socially Integrative City" attempts "to counteract the widening socio-spatial rifts in the cities" (<http://www.sozialestadt.de/en/programm/>; 31.08.2011). In Berlin the programme is labelled "Neighbourhood Management" (*Quartiersmanagement*) and includes 34 quarters, six of them in Kreuzberg (Friedrichshain's three managed neighbourhoods runned out), divided in three categories for intervention: high, medium and prevention. Additionally, Berlin-wide five "activity areas" (*Aktionsräume Plus*), one of them in the north of Kreuzberg, ought to bridge the scattered managed neighbourhoods and scale up their commitment. Between 1999 and 2009, Berlin's managed neighbourhoods had a budget of 184.6 million € at its disposal, provided by the EU (66 million €), the federal level (35.1 million €) and the *Land* Berlin (83.5 million €). However, the continuity of the programme is in peril due to a decision of the German government to half its share from 2011 onwards.

The positive impact of neighbourhood management - as an engine for urban revitalization - is after more than ten years of practice widely acknowledged. The focus of the programme towards coordinated sectoral policies within manageable areas (*Sozialräume*), combining different goals (e.g. activation of and cooperation among inhabitants, uplifting of living environments and community life services), has proved to be successful. For instance, the neighbourhood management *Zentrum Kreuzberg/Oranienstraße*, an area were 71.8% of the inhabitants have an immigrant background and about 40% of all youngsters have no school-leaving certificate, has been a local pulse generator and agenda setter in terms of education and training. The management office, located in the very heart of Kreuzberg's centre, functions as a network agency that facilitates access to services such as early childhood education, promotes exchange between stakeholders such as kindergarten,

schools and local authorities and supports various community-oriented initiatives and projects. By doing so, the neighbourhood management perceives the local *Kiez* and its inhabitants as a resource for common action instead as an area with excessive deficits.

Despite its overall positive development, the concept of neighbourhood management has met some criticism. We have listed three major points, because they stand as well for the general problem of the coexistence of the regular urban and social policy administration on the one hand, and the intermediary sphere of targeted projects, services and initiatives on the other hand. So far, the existing dualism in Berlin bears no sign of a clear cut mainstreaming of innovative projects and practices. An overarching, Berlin-wide strategy for urban development that fosters cooperation among the Senate, district councils, the jobcentre and local service providers and is based on regular funding does not exist (Eichstädt-Bohlig/Henneberger 2010). Thus, the governance of neighbourhood management shares some negative or critical features with other policy areas. In particular, the previous politics lack

- sustainability: currently, a vast number of projects have developed around neighbourhood management agencies that are constantly struggling for funding. Instead of scaling up their rather positive working results, project coordinators are occupied by bureaucratic and time-consuming application schemes in order to maintain the status quo;
- target orientation: owed to the fact that neighbourhood management was conceptualised as an add-on programme to regular policies of local welfare and urban renewal, precise goals, binding obligations, quality indicators and evaluation instruments do not exist. For instance, attempts of managed neighbourhoods to reduce high school dropout and illiteracy rates are not examined with regard to its actual success. The fuzziness of targets weakens also further the status of neighbourhood management in relation to regular policies;
- coherence: community orientation as an new approach to deal with a bundle of social problems in a locality remains selective, if regular measures by district councils merely coexist to the former. In order to avoid "parallel systems", the coordination and governance of local support networks have to be adapted. Synergy effects may created by issue-centred service networks (e.g. housing, education etc.) that, independent from their principal, are responsible for certain areas.

	Labour market policies	Childcare, education and training	Housing and neighbourhood management
Typical innovative projects	<p>← "District mothers" →</p> <p>← Preparing for work ("job explorer") →</p> <p>← Family support centres and early child minding ("family mid-wives") →</p> <p>← Tenant advocacy and consultancy →</p> <p>← Coordination of sectoral policies in selected neighbourhoods →</p>		
Constellations of actors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • projects & associations (temporary) financed and backed by established actors • the public administrations & policies by special support programs • representatives & organisations of the business sector • intermediary agencies • round tables 		
Main goals and instruments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • bridging gaps between established bureaucracies and groups/individuals/families • activating personal/private/community and civil/civic resources • towards socio-spatial approaches • personalizing support by services/transfers/consultancy • making services more "family-minded" • creating bundles of support from different sources & providers 		

Table 1 - Characteristics of innovations in local welfare systems: a preliminary mapping

REFERENCES

Literature:

- ASUM (2008) "Friedrichshain - ein Ort für Familien mit Kindern?" Wohn- und Lebenssituation von Haushalten mit Kindern in Friedrichshainer Sanierungsgebieten, online available via http://www.asum-berlin.de/studien-/Familienstudie_Endfassung.pdf.
- Berliner Morgenpost (08.08.2011) Wohnungsmarkt: Berlin verliert die Hälfte seiner Sozialwohnungen, online available via <http://www.morgenpost.de/berlin-aktuell/article1725545/Berlin-verliert-die-Haelfte-seiner-Sozialwohnungen.html>
- Eichstädt-Bohlig, F. & Henneberger, M. (2010) *Die SOZIALE STADT braucht eine ressortübergreifende Gesamtstrategie*, online available via http://www.eichstaedt-bohlig.gruene-berlin.de/cms/fileadmin/Dateien/Stadtentwicklung/Microsoft_Word_-_101025_Soziale_Stadt_Hintergrundpapier.pdf.
- Evers, A., Ewert, B., Meißner, M., Wolf, A. C. & Zimmer, A. (2011) "Local welfare systems as part of the German Welfare State: Housing, employment and child care", *WILCO Publication no. 08*, online available via http://www.wilcoproject.eu/public/-assets/img/uploads/WILCO_WP2_report_08_DE.pdf.
- Federal Employment Agency (FEA) (2011) *Arbeitsmarkt- und Integrationsprogramm des Jobcenters Berlin Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg für das Jahr 2011*, online available via <http://www.berlin.de/jobcenter/friedrichshain-kreuzberg/>.
- Frieda (2011) *Alleinerziehende in Berlin-Friedrichshain: Perspektiven und Anregungen*, FRIEDA-Frauenzentrum e.V., online available via <http://www.frieda-frauenzentrum.de/sidebar/medien/publikationen.html#c181>.
- Häußermann, H. & Kapphan, A. (2009) "Berlin: from divided to fragmented city", in Hamilton, F.E.I., Andrews, K. D. & Pichler-Milanović, N. (eds) *Transformation of Cities in Central and Eastern Europe. Towards Globalization*, Tokyo, New York, Paris: United Nations University Press, pp. 189-222.
- Häußermann, H., Gornig, M. & Kronauer, M. (2009) "Berlin: Wandel, Milieus und Lebenslagen. Thesen aus der Sozialforschung", in Gemeinnützige Hertie-Stiftung (ed.) *Hertie Berlin Studie*, Hamburg: Hoffmann und Campe, pp. 15-39.
- Social Urban Development Monitoring (2010) *Updated for the period 2008 - 2009 Senate Department for Urban Development* (short version), online available via http://www.stadtentwicklung.berlin.de/planen/basisdaten_stadtentwicklung/monitoring/de/2010/index.shtml#Bericht.
- Schneekloth, U. (2009) "Leben zwischen Hartz IV und Kreativwirtschaft: Soziale Lage in Berlin", in Gemeinnützige Hertie-Stiftung (ed.) *Hertie Berlin Studie*, Hamburg: Hoffmann und Campe, pp. 41-75.
- Süddeutsche Zeitung (SZ) (10.05.2011) *Jobcenter in Berlin: Ein Platz für kleine Erfolgserlebnisse*, online available via <http://www.sueddeutsche.de/karriere/-jobcenter-in-berlin-ein-platz-fuer-kleine-erfolgserlebnisse-1.1095261>.
- Zürn, M., Hurrelmann, K. & Häußermann, H. (2009) "Was sagt die erste Hertie-Berlin-Studie über die Stadt und ihre Bewohner?", in Gemeinnützige Hertie-Stiftung (ed.) *Hertie Berlin Studie*, Hamburg: Hoffmann und Campe, pp. 291-312.

Data sources for Berlin and Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg:

- Amt für Statistik Berlin Brandenburg (2009) *Bevölkerung im Land Berlin 2009*. Available via: http://www.statistik-berlin-brandenburg.de/Publikationen/Stat_Berichte/2010/SB_A1-3_j01-09_BE.pdf.
- Amt für Statistik Berlin Brandenburg (2008) *Bevölkerung im Land Berlin 2008*. Available via: http://www.statistik-berlin-brandenburg.de/Publikationen/Stat_Berichte/2009/SB_A1-3_j01-08_BE.pdf.
- Amt für Statistik Berlin Brandenburg (2007) *Bevölkerung im Land Berlin 2007*. Available via: http://www.statistik-berlin-brandenburg.de/Publikationen/Stat_Berichte/2008/SB_A1-3_j01-07_BE.pdf.
- Amt für Statistik Berlin Brandenburg (2006) *Bevölkerung im Land Berlin 2006*. Available via: http://www.statistik-berlin-brandenburg.de/Publikationen/Stat_Berichte/2007/Al3_j06-B.pdf.
- Amt für Statistik Berlin Brandenburg (2009) *Eheschließungen, Geborene und Gestorbene im Land Berlin 2009*. Available via: http://www.statistik-berlin-brandenburg.de/Publikationen/Stat_Berichte/2011/SB_A2-1_j01-09_BE.pdf.
- Amt für Statistik Berlin Brandenburg (2008) *Eheschließungen, Geborene und Gestorbene im Land Berlin 2008*. Available via: http://www.statistik-berlin-brandenburg.de/Publikationen/Stat_Berichte/2009/SB_A2-1_j01-08_BE.pdf.
- Amt für Statistik Berlin Brandenburg (2007) *Eheschließungen, Geborene und Gestorbene im Land Berlin 2007*. Available via: http://www.statistik-berlin-brandenburg.de/Publikationen/Stat_Berichte/2009/SB_A2-1_j01-07_BE.pdf.
- Amt für Statistik Berlin Brandenburg (2006) *Eheschließungen, Geborene und Gestorbene im Land Berlin 2006*. Available via: http://www.statistik-berlin-brandenburg.de/Publikationen/Stat_Berichte/2008/SB_A11-j-06_BE.pdf.
- Amt für Statistik Berlin Brandenburg (2011) *Einwohnerinnen und Einwohner im Land Berlin. Alter, Geschlecht, Familienstand, Migrationshintergrund, Staatsangehörigkeit, Kirchensteuermerkmal, Wohnlage, Bezirk Ortsteil LOR-Bezirksregion am 30. Juni 2011*. Available via: http://www.statistik-berlin-brandenburg.de/Publikationen/Stat_Berichte/2011/SB_A1-5_hj01-11_BE.pdf.
- Amt für Statistik Berlin Brandenburg (2009) *Ergebnisse des Mikrozensus im Land Berlin. Bevölkerung und Erwerbstätigkeit 2009*. Available via: http://www.statistik-berlin-brandenburg.de/Publikationen/Stat_Berichte/2011/SB_A1-10_A6-2_j01-09_BE.pdf.
- Amt für Statistik Berlin Brandenburg (2008) *Ergebnisse des Mikrozensus im Land Berlin. Bevölkerung und Erwerbstätigkeit 2008*. Available via: http://www.statistik-berlin-brandenburg.de/Publikationen/Stat_Berichte/2010/SB_A1-10_A1-11_A6-2_j01-08_BE.pdf.
- Amt für Statistik Berlin Brandenburg (2007) *Ergebnisse des Mikrozensus im Land Berlin. Bevölkerung und Erwerbstätigkeit 2007*. Available via: http://www.statistik-berlin-brandenburg.de/Publikationen/Stat_Berichte/2009/SB_A1-10_A1-11_A6-2_j01-07_BE.pdf.
- Amt für Statistik Berlin Brandenburg (2006) *Ergebnisse des Mikrozensus im Land Berlin. Bevölkerung und Erwerbstätigkeit 2006*. Available via: http://www.statistik-berlin-brandenburg.de/Publikationen/Stat_Berichte/2008/SB_L11_110_6_Mikrozensus_2006J00.pdf.
- Amt für Statistik Berlin Brandenburg (2010) *Ergebnisse des Mikrozensus im Land Berlin. Haushalte, Familien und Lebensformen 2010*. Available via: http://www.statistik-berlin-brandenburg.de/Publikationen/Stat_Berichte/2011/SB_A1-11_j01-10_BE.pdf.
- Amt für Statistik Berlin Brandenburg (2009) *Ergebnisse des Mikrozensus im Land Berlin. Haushalte, Familien und Lebensformen 2009*. Available via: http://www.statistik-berlin-brandenburg.de/Publikationen/Stat_Berichte/2010/SB_A1-11_j01-09_BE.pdf.

- Amt für Statistik Berlin Brandenburg (2010) *Statistisches Jahrbuch 2010*. Berlin. Available via: http://www.statistik-berlin-brandenburg.de/PRODUKTE/jahrbuch/jb2010/BE_Jahrbuch_2010.pdf.
- Amt für Statistik Berlin Brandenburg (2009): *Statistisches Jahrbuch 2009*. Berlin. Available via: http://www.statistik-berlin-brandenburg.de/PRODUKTE/jahrbuch/jb2009/BE_Jahrbuch_2009.pdf.
- Amt für Statistik Berlin Brandenburg (2008) *Statistisches Jahrbuch 2008*. Berlin. Available via: http://www.statistik-berlin-brandenburg.de/PRODUKTE/jahrbuch/jb2008/BE_Jahrbuch_2008.pdf.
- Amt für Statistik Berlin Brandenburg (2007) *Statistisches Jahrbuch 2007*. Berlin. Available via: http://www.statistik-berlin-brandenburg.de/PRODUKTE/jahrbuch/jb2007/BE_Jahrbuch_2007.pdf.
- Amt für Statistik Berlin Brandenburg (2007) *Volkswirtschaftliche Gesamtrechnungen. Bruttoinlandsprodukt und Bruttowertschöpfung im Land Berlin nach Wirtschaftsbereichen 1991 bis 2010*. Available via: http://www.statistik-berlin-brandenburg.de/Publikationen/Stat_Berichte/2011/SB_P1-1_j01-10_BE.pdf.
- Berlin Tourismus Marketing GmbH (2009) *Wirtschaftsfaktor Tourismus Berlin*, online available via <http://press.visitberlin.de/de/artikel/wirtschaftsfaktor-tourismus-0>.
- Bundesagentur für Arbeit (2011) *Analyse des Arbeitsmarktes für Alleinerziehende in Deutschland 2010*. Nürnberg. Available via: <http://statistik.arbeitsagentur.de/Statischer-Content/Statistische-Analysen/Analytikereports/Zentrale-Analytikereports/Jaehrliche-Analytikereports/Generische-Publikationen/Analyse-Arbeitsmarkt-Alleinerziehende/Analyse-Arbeitsmarkt-Alleinerziehende-2010.pdf>.
- Bundesagentur für Arbeit (2011): *Analyse des Arbeitsmarktes für Ausländer Januar 2011*. Nürnberg. Available via: <http://statistik.arbeitsagentur.de/Statischer-Content/Statistische-Analysen/Analytikereports/Zentrale-Analytikereports/Monatliche-Analytikereports/Generische-Publikationen/Analyse-Arbeitsmarkt-Auslaender/Analyse-Arbeitsmarkt-Auslaender-201101.pdf>.
- Bundesagentur für Arbeit (2011) *Arbeitsmarkt 2010*. Nürnberg. Available via: <http://statistik.arbeitsagentur.de/Statischer-Content/Arbeitsmarktberichte/Jahresbericht-Arbeitsmarkt-Deutschland/Generische-Publikationen/Arbeitsmarkt-2010.pdf>.
- Bundesagentur für Arbeit (2011) *Arbeitsmarkt in Zahlen - Beschäftigungsstatistik. Sozialversicherungspflichtig beschäftigte Männer, Frauen, Deutsche und Ausländer - Zeitreihe -*. Nürnberg. Available via: <http://statistik.arbeitsagentur.de/Statischer-Content/Statistik-nach-Themen/Zeitreihen/Generische-Publikationen/Beschaeftigte-Zeitreihe.xls>.
- Bundesagentur für Arbeit (2011) *Der Arbeitsmarkt in Deutschland, Zeitarbeit in Deutschland - Aktuelle Entwicklungen*. Nürnberg. Available via: <http://statistik.arbeitsagentur.de/Statischer-Content/Arbeitsmarktberichte/Berichte-Broschueren/Arbeitsmarkt/Generische-Publikationen/Arbeitsmarkt-Deutschland-Zeitarbeit-Aktuelle-Entwicklung-2HJ2010.pdf>.
- Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge (2011) *Migrationsbericht 2009*. Nürnberg. Available via: http://www.bamf.de/SharedDocs/Anlagen/DE/Publikationen/Migrationsberichte/migrationsbericht-2009.pdf?__blob=publicationFile.
- Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge (2010) *Migrationsbericht 2008*. Nürnberg. Available via: http://www.bamf.de/SharedDocs/Anlagen/DE/Publikationen/Migrationsberichte/migrationsbericht-2008.pdf?__blob=publicationFile.
- Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge (2008) *Migrationsbericht 2007*. Nürnberg. Available via:

- http://www.bamf.de/SharedDocs/Anlagen/DE/Publikationen/Migrationsberichte/migrationsbericht-2007.pdf?__blob=publicationFile.
- Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge (2007) *Migrationsbericht 2006*. Nürnberg. Available via: http://www.bamf.de/SharedDocs/Anlagen/DE/Publikationen/Migrationsberichte/migrationsbericht-2006.pdf?__blob=publicationFile.
- Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge (2005) *Migrationsbericht 2005*. Nürnberg. Available via: http://www.bamf.de/SharedDocs/Anlagen/DE/Publikationen/Migrationsberichte/migrationsbericht-2005.pdf?__blob=publicationFile.
- Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge (2004) *Migrationsbericht 2004*. Nürnberg. Available via: http://www.bamf.de/SharedDocs/Anlagen/DE/Publikationen/Migrationsberichte/migrationsbericht-2004.pdf?__blob=publicationFile.
- Bundesinstitut für Bau-, Stadt- und Raumforschung (2011) *BBSR Fachbeiträge. Mieten und Preise: Immobilienpreis*. Berlin. Available via: http://www.bbsr.bund.de/cln_032/nn_816770/BBSR/DE/WohnenImmobilien/Immobilienmarktbeobachtung/Fachbeitraege/MietenPreise/Immobilienpreise/Immopreise.html.
- Bundesinstitut für Bau-, Stadt- und Raumforschung (2011) *BBSR Fachbeiträge. Mieten und Preise: Mieten*. Berlin. Available via: http://www.bbsr.bund.de/cln_032/nn_816770/BBSR/DE/WohnenImmobilien/Immobilienmarktbeobachtung/Fachbeitraege/MietenPreise/Mieten/Mieten.html.
- Bundesministerium für Familie, Frauen, Senioren und Jugend (2007) *Familienatlas 2007. Standortbestimmung. Potenzial. Handlungsfelder*. Berlin. Available via: http://www.prognos.com/fileadmin/pdf/Atlanten/Familienatlas_07/Familienatlas2007_Broschuere.pdf.
- Dechent, J. (2010) "Häuserpreise - Ergebnisse für 2009", in *Wirtschaft und Statistik* 10/2010, pp. 939-44.
- Destatis (2011) *Bevölkerung und Erwerbstätigkeit. Haushalte und Familien Ergebnisse des Mikrozensus 2010*. Wiesbaden. Available via: <http://www.destatis.de/jetspeed/portal/cms/Sites/destatis/Internet/DE/Content/Publikationen/Fachveroeffentlichungen/Bevoelkerung/HaushalteMikrozensus/HaushalteFamilien2010300107004,property=file.pdf>.
- Destatis (2010) *Bevölkerung und Erwerbstätigkeit. Bevölkerung mit Migrationshintergrund - Ergebnisse des Mikrozensus 2009*. Wiesbaden. Available via: <http://www.destatis.de/jetspeed/portal/cms/Sites/destatis/Internet/DE/Content/Publikationen/Fachveroeffentlichungen/Bevoelkerung/MigrationIntegration/Migrationshintergrund2010220097004,property=file.pdf>.
- Destatis (2008) *Bevölkerung und Erwerbstätigkeit. Haushalte und Familien Ergebnisse des Mikrozensus 2007*. Wiesbaden. Available via: <http://www.destatis.de/jetspeed/portal/cms/Sites/destatis/Internet/DE/Content/Publikationen/Fachveroeffentlichungen/Bevoelkerung/HaushalteMikrozensus/HaushalteFamilien2010300087004,property=file.pdf>.
- Destatis (no date) *GENESIS-Online Datenbank*. Wiesbaden. Available via: <https://www-genesis.destatis.de/genesis/online>.
- Destatis (no date) *Regionaldatenbank*. Wiesbaden. Available via: <https://www.regionalstatistik.de/genesis/online/logon>.

Experts interviews (with responsible persons from):

Jobcentre, Berlin Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg (23.06.2011)
Child and youth welfare office, Berlin Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg (23.06.2011)
Social housing department, Berlin Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg (24.06.2011)
Commissioner for Integration, Berlin Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg (24.06.2011)
Department of Public Administration, Berlin School of Economics and Law (Prof. Dr. Heinrich Bücker-Gärtner) (17.08.2011)
Council for health, social affairs and employment, Berlin Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg (17.08.2011)
Jobexplorer project, Berlin Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg (18.08.2011)
District mothers project. Berlin Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg (18.08.2011)
ASUM - Angewandte Sozialforschung und urbanes Management GmbH, Berlin-Friedrichshain (18.08.2011)
Neighbourhood management, *Zentrum Kreuzberg / Oranienstraße*, Berlin Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg (19.08.2011)
Neue Chance gGmbH (advice centre for people with housing problems), Berlin Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg (19.08.2011)
Sabine Bangert, speaker for employment, vocational training and social affairs (Green Party, Berlin Senate) (19.08.2011)

Further Internet resources:

Federal-Länder-Program "Socially Integrative City":
<http://www.sozialestadt.de/en/programm/> (31.08.2011)
F+B Forschung und Beratung für Wohnen, Immobilien und Umwelt: <http://www.f-und-b.de/> (10.09.2011)

THE AUTHORS

Benjamin Ewert studied Political Science at the Philipps-University Marburg and the Charles University Prague. Since 2007 he is a research assistant at the professorship for Comparative Health and Social Policy at the Justus-Liebig-University Giessen. Benjamin worked as an administrator within the European Network of Excellence "Civil Society and New Forms of Governance" (CINEFOGO).

Adalbert Evers is Professor for Comparative Health and Social Policy. He studied architecture and urban planning at the Technical University in Aachen, Germany and completed his doctoral thesis in Political Sciences in 1977 at the University of Bremen. He and his working group are renowned on an international level when it comes to issues of analyzing welfare mixes and different forms of governance with respect to social services.

THE WILCO PROJECT

Full title: Welfare innovations at the local level in favour of cohesion

Acronym: WILCO

Duration: 36 months (2010-2013)

Project's website: <http://www.wilcoproject.eu>

Project's objective and mission:

WILCO aims to examine, through cross-national comparative research, how local welfare systems affect social inequalities and how they favour social cohesion, with a special focus on the missing link between innovations at the local level and their successful transfer to and implementation in other settings. The results will be directly connected to the needs of practitioners, through strong interaction with stakeholders and urban policy recommendations. In doing so, we will connect issues of immediate practical relevance with state-of-the-art academic research on how approaches and instruments in local welfare function in practice.

Brief description:

The effort to strengthen social cohesion and lower social inequalities is among Europe's main policy challenges. Local welfare systems are at the forefront of the struggle to address this challenge - and they are far from winning. While the statistics show some positive signs, the overall picture still shows sharp and sometimes rising inequalities, a loss of social cohesion and failing policies of integration.

But, contrary to what is sometimes thought, a lack of bottom-up innovation is not the issue in itself. European cities are teeming with new ideas, initiated by citizens, professionals and policymakers. The problem is, rather, that innovations taking place in the city are not effectively disseminated because they are not sufficiently understood. Many innovations are not picked up, because their relevance is not recognised; others fail after they have been reproduced elsewhere, because they were not suitable to the different conditions, in another city, in another country.

In the framework of WILCO, innovation in cities is explored, not as a disconnected phenomenon, but as an element in a tradition of welfare that is part of particular socio-economic models and the result of specific national and local cultures. Contextualising innovations in local welfare will allow a more effective understanding of how they could work in other cities, for the benefit of other citizens.