

Social Urban Development Monitoring 2010

Updated for the period 2008 - 2009

**Senate Department for Urban Development
Unit I A**

Authors:

res urbana
Dr. Hartmut Häussermann
Dr. Axel Werwatz
Daniel Förste, Dipl. Soc. Sci.
Patrick Hausmann, Dipl. Admin.

December 2010

Contents

0	Social Urban Development Monitoring Berlin - Summary	2
1	Basisfor Social Urban Development Monitoring 2010.....	3
1.1	Grounds and objective	3
1.2	Indicators and method	3
1.3	Method: Calculation of the index in categories	6
2	Development trends in the city as a whole.....	7
2.1	Status indicators	7
2.2	Dynamics indicators	9
3	Observation of the urban area	10
4	Polarisation trends at the planning area level.....	11
4.1	Monitoring using the development index.....	11
4.2	Observation using the status/dynamics index	13
5	Summary of results and recommendations	15
5.1	Summary of results	15
5.2	Development of the Action Areas ^{plus}	16
5.3	Recommendations	16
6	Appendix.....	19

0 Social Urban Development Monitoring Berlin - Summary

Berlin's Social Urban Development Monitoring was set up in 1998 as an urban monitoring and early-warning system with a management function.

It is an essential foundation for shaping urban regeneration programmes in Berlin. It is taken into account in the selection of areas for building investment programmes (for example, redevelopment and restoration), and it is especially effective in the selection and removal of areas within the programme with particular social integration needs (The Social City - "Action Areas plus").

The monitoring programme is continuously updated, initially in two-year phases up to 2004, and annually since 2006. The city sociologist Dr. Häussermann provided scientific support to the Senate Department for Urban Development in drawing up and updating the programme.

During the thirteen years of practical work using Social Urban Development Monitoring its methodology has been the subject of continuous development:

- shorter time periods (annually),
- concentration on a few key indicators (17 initially, at present 12),
- the use of narrowly focused data (no estimating processes),
- presentation of developments in progress (time series updated annually),
- transparent evaluation processes (from cluster analysis to indexing).

The most significant new development is the new focus on optimised geographical referencing. In August 2006 the Senate decided in agreement with the districts to re-focus the existing Geographical Reference System on Living Environment Areas (Lebensweltlich orientierte Räume, or LORs). In this way it has been possible since 2007 to carry out continuous monitoring of quarters and neighbourhoods ("Planning Areas" with an average of 7,500 inhabitants) instead of the previously used Traffic Zones (with an average of 10,000 inhabitants). This allows Social Urban Development Monitoring to be implemented more precisely, that is with a "socio-spatial orientation".

Social Urban Development Monitoring is based upon 12 indicators, of which six describe social status and six illustrate social dynamics. A status index is derived from the status indicators and a dynamics index from the social dynamics indicators.

The principal outcome of Social Urban Development Monitoring is summarised in the development index, the status index and the dynamics index (in a ratio of 3: 2). Here the planning areas are divided into four groups (20% high, 60% medium, 10% low and 10% very low).

The development index is of particular significance in making decisions regarding the creation of new Quarter Management Areas (or their removal from the scheme). However, monitoring cannot be applied schematically, that is, it does not replace causal research in the field. Intervention in the quarters only takes place if negative trends can be observed over several years.

The development index was also an essential basis for the selection of the five "Action Areas plus" (AR+) in 2010. The AR+ are larger urban areas where cross-departmental and cross-functional work needs to be intensified and where support programmes should be coordinated.

As mentioned above, the results of Social Urban Development Monitoring are taken into account in determining urban redevelopment or urban restoration areas and in distributing funds for voluntary activity and for individual specialist programmes.

Social Urban Development Monitoring also influences budgeting for specific products relating to the Social Infrastructure. Here the development index has become an essential parameter in the allocation of funds to the districts.

The essential outcomes of Social Urban Development Monitoring in 2010 are:

- A positive development in the labour market has been achieved in almost all problem neighbourhoods across Berlin between 2008 and 2009 (these areas have not been decoupled).
- Overall, a relatively stable socio-spatial structure can be observed.
- The "Action Areas plus" have been confirmed. Areas with a very low development index are concentrated in Wedding/Moabit, Neukölln-Nord, Kreuzberg-Nordost, Marzahn-Nord/Hellersdorf-Nord and Spandau-Mitte.

1 Basis for Social Urban Development Monitoring 2010

Social Urban Development Monitoring 2010 covers the period 31 Dec. 2008 to 31 Dec. 2009.

1.1 Grounds and objective

Social Urban Development Monitoring supplies detailed information on changes in the socio-structural and socio-spatial development of sections of the city of Berlin. This was begun in Berlin some 12 years ago. *Social Urban Development Monitoring* has been carried out on an annual basis since 2007 to increase the value of the information and make it possible to react more promptly to any changes.

Social Urban Development Monitoring is the basis for determining areas under the Federal and States Programme "The Social City" in accordance with Section 171e of the Building Code. This makes it possible on the one hand to react to problematic changes by bringing new areas within the programme, and on the other hand, allows any improvement in the social situation in a city area to be recognised which may lead to areas being withdrawn in accordance with Section 171e of the Building Code.

Social Urban Development Monitoring is not only used to determine areas suitable for urban regeneration. It also contributes to the development of new tools in social urban development. One result of the research carried out in *Social Urban Development Monitoring* in 2008 was a recommendation for the designation of five areas in which the most problematic areas of the city were to be concentrated on and prioritised for assistance in an integrated way over several years. The Senate established the five Action Areas^{plus} on this basis. In the Action Areas^{plus} it is intended for the processes of the "Social City" and other urban regeneration programmes (urban redevelopment, restoration, active centres, protection of urban heritage) to be brought together more intensively than before and new partnerships encouraged. Social Urban Development Monitoring 2010 re-engages with these new arenas in the Action Areas^{plus} which are significant for the development of the whole city and it thus includes (updated) separate monitoring of these five areas. The results of the monitoring reports in past years also contributed to the decision by the Senate to develop a whole-city, cross-divisional "Framework Strategy for the Social Urban Development of Berlin".

In addition to this, the results of *Social Urban Development Monitoring* feed into the calculation of the "Balance Allocation" in the allocation of funds for the social infrastructure to the districts.

Social Urban Development Monitoring offers the public the opportunity to view the results of the analysis in detail on the website of the Senate Department for Urban Development and to download the reports:

http://www.stadtentwicklung.berlin.de/planen/basisdaten_stadtentwicklung/monitoring/

1.2 Indicators and method

The basic set of indicators for *Social Urban Development Monitoring* was developed in 1998 and first modified in 2002. Amendment of the Social Codes (SGB) II, III and XII on 01 Jan. 2005 required a complete reworking of social assistance and unemployment statistics because the

associated set of people to be reached through the transfer (welfare) system had changed. The resulting amendments to the indicators for unemployment and the receipt of transfer payments were implemented in *Social Urban Development Monitoring in 2007*. Since 2007 there has been a differentiation in data selection between indicators which describe the social situation in a quarter ("status") and indicators which characterise the changes in the population of the area in the previous year ("dynamics"). Status indicators include data on unemployment and receipt of transfer payments as well as the migration background and dynamics indicators include data on mobility (movements) and changes in individual status indicators.

The revision of *Social Urban Development Monitoring 2007* also led to a re-thinking of the statistical process by which the results of the analysis are compiled. The new method of calculating the index by categories that replaced the previous cluster analysis made it possible to establish time series in order to observe development over longer periods. This allowed the relative changes in the position and ranking of individual areas to be presented in comparison with the city as a whole. This dynamic observation is based on weighted indicators and their consequent grouping together or classification into one developmental typology. Bringing together their classification based on the indices and the observation of absolute changes in the areas mean it is possible not only to see which areas show high problem densities but also what are the problematic circumstances that lie behind them.

A decisive factor in the selection of the indicators was that the data should be available on the one hand on a yearly basis and on the other in the smallest possible level of detail covering the "Living Environment Areas" (LORs), i.e. the planning areas. This excludes the use of schooling data that is only available for school catchment areas as well as data from electoral statistics which is obtained for voting districts and constituencies.

The methodology and selection of indicators are retained for *Social Urban Development Monitoring 2010*. The method of calculation by categories for the status, dynamics and development index has demonstrated its value and has been recognised.² Since 2007 two groups of data have been used for *Social Urban Development Monitoring*:

- data on unemployment and receipt of transfer payments,
- data on immigrations and the demographic situation.

These are brought together in two groups of indicators:

- six indicators describe the social situation of the population in a quarter ("status"),
- six indicators describe the change in the population numbers and the social situation in a quarter ("dynamics").

² The Cities of Hamburg and Munich have to some extent introduced Social Urban Development Monitoring on the Berlin model.

Table 1: Social Urban Development Monitoring indicators 2010

Status	Dynamics
1. Unemployed (German Social Code SGB II and III) in % of 15-65-year-olds	1. Immigration volumes in % of inhabitants
2. Unemployed under 25 (SGB II and III) in % of 15-25-year-olds	2. Balance of migration in % of inhabitants
3. Unemployed with a reference period of over a year (long-term unemployed) (SGB II and III) in % of 15-65-year-olds	3. Balance of migration of children under 6 years in % of inhabitants under 6
4. Non-unemployed recipients of basic welfare benefits in % of inhabitants (those not registered unemployed receiving basic welfare benefits in accordance with SGB II and fit for work, recipients of basic welfare benefits in accordance with SGB II and not fit for work, and recipients of benefit under SGB XII)	4. Change in proportion of German recipients of basic welfare benefits in accordance with SGB II, III and XII compared with the previous year in % points (change in the total of status 1 and 4 without status 5, Germans only)
5. Recipients of basic welfare benefits and not fit for work in % of inhabitants under 15 years (recipients of basic welfare benefits in accordance with SGB II and not fit for work)	5. Change in the proportion of non-German recipients of basic welfare benefits in accordance with SGB II, III and XII compared with the previous year in % points (change in the total of status 1 and 4 without status 5, non-Germans only)
6. Children and young people under 18 years with a migration background in % of inhabitants under 18	6. Change in the proportion of recipients of basic welfare benefits in accordance with SGB II under 15 years not fit for work compared with the previous year in % points (change in status 5)

The first three status indicators (status 1 - 3) are based on unemployment data. The two indicators status 4 and 5 are derived from the data available at that time for persons drawing transfer payments. In this case a distinction is made between the characteristics "not unemployed" (status 4) and "not fit for work" (status 5). In this case "not unemployed" are persons who are indeed engaged in work but are unable to secure their basic personal needs through their income (commonly called "Top-up recipients" ["Aufstocker"]). Indicator status 5 measures the extent of transfer payments among children under 15 years of age.³

The demographic component is taken into account as previously in indicator status 6 - in which case the characteristic "proportion of children and young people under 18 years of age with a

³ It is not possible to differentiate at a great level of detail among age groups in the group "recipients of basic welfare benefits not fit for work". By far the greatest proportion is accounted for by the under-15 age group - 95.9% in Berlin as at 31 Dec. 2009.

migration background among residents under 18" ⁴is applied. This indicator is intended to show where there are specific challenges in the area of school and vocational education.⁵

The first three dynamics indicators (dynamics 1 - 3) illustrate the movement behaviour of the population in the areas and allow conclusions to be drawn regarding stability and indirectly also about the quality of life in the areas. The indicators dynamics 4 and 5 show the proportion of those drawing transfer payments differentiated according to Germans and non-Germans which corresponds in each case to the change in the total of status 1 and status 4⁶ compared to the previous year. The indicator dynamic 6 shows the change in the proportion of those drawing transfer payments under 15 years of age (indicator status 5; "child poverty").

The dynamics indicators are recorded in *Social Urban Development Monitoring* in order to show the directions of trends at an early stage (early warning or preventive function).

1.3 Method: Calculation of the index in categories

Since no individual indicator is able to illustrate completely the social situation or its progress in a quarter, the two partial "status" and "dynamics" indices are initially formed from the relevant individual indicators. The six "status" indicators and the six "dynamics" indicators are each summarised in a "status" and "dynamics" index. These figures result initially in a sequence for all 434 planning areas covered by the study.

From the total of 447 planning areas *Social Urban Development Monitoring 2010* does not take into account: eight planning areas with fewer than 200 inhabitants identified as "outliers" and excluded from further study. Indicator values are obtained in these areas which lie far outside the distribution of the other planning areas owing to special factors, and which would thus "distort" the overall result.

The ranking obtained from the status/ dynamics index is used to categorise the planning areas in groups of 10 per cent each (deciles). For the status index the two deciles with the best status values (20% of all planning areas) are awarded the status "high", the two deciles with the lowest values are given the status "low" or "very low". The six deciles (60%) in between are categorised as status "medium". Evaluation and categorisation into groups are carried out in a similar way for the dynamics index. In this case only 3 groups are formed: the groups "positive" (upper 20%), "negative" (lowest 20%) and "stable" (the intermediate 60%). As an interim step each planning area can be pinpointed by overlaying the groups from the status and dynamics index in a 12-field matrix (status/dynamics index). This index expresses the current position of an area compared to

⁴ "Persons with a migration background" are as defined by the Berlin-Brandenburg Office for Statistics:

1. Non-Germans
2. Germans with a migration background
 - Germans born abroad or identified as naturalised citizens or with optional nationality (children born in Germany with non-German parents first received German nationality from 01 Jan. 2000 under the provisions specified in Section 4 para. 3 of the Nationality Law (StAG) (Option regulation));
 - Germans under 18 years without their own migration features born abroad or identified as naturalised on the side of at least one parent if the person is registered at the address of the parent(s).

⁵ In order to ensure comparability with previous years the data on non-Germans is carried forward in one time series and published on the Internet as supplementary data for the planning areas, the district regions and districts.

⁶ Data on nationality is not available for status 5.

the others and indicates at the same time the direction of the trend in the area over the monitoring period. Analysing the categorisation of the planning areas into 12 groups in the status/dynamics index is significant in assessing the extent of polarisation in parts of areas within Berlin. In the final step, the "development index for social urban development" is obtained for each planning area by adding together the status and dynamics index. Since greater weight is allocated to the status indicators, the development index is calculated as a total of status and dynamics indicators in a ratio of 3:2. In the development index the two deciles (20%) with the lowest values are categorised together as "high" (= very low problem density; group 1); the two with the highest values respectively as "low" (ninth decile = high problem density; group 3) or as "very low" (tenth decile = very high problem density; group 4). The six deciles between the two upper and the two lower deciles together form group 2 with a "medium development index" (60% of all planning areas).

2 Development trends in the city as a whole

Using the data from *Social Urban Development Monitoring* it is possible to follow developments in progress over time. The indices and indicator values for 2007, 2008, 2009 and, for some indicators, also data for 2006 can be accessed for this purpose. The comparisons carried out in the following refer to monitoring periods since the introduction of the new calculation method in *Social Urban Development Monitoring* at the level of Living Environment Areas (LORs):

Social Urban Development Monitoring 2008 - monitoring period 31 Dec. 2006 - 31 Dec. 2007,

Social Urban Development Monitoring 2009- monitoring period 31 Dec. 2007 - 31 Dec. 2008,

Social Urban Development Monitoring 2010- monitoring period 31 Dec. 2008 - 31 Dec. 2009.

Overall, Berlin has gained further additional **inhabitants. This represents a further continuation of a trend observable over the last four years of a slight growth in population.**

2.1 Status indicators

Unemployment increased again between 2008 and 2009 (+ 4.7%), after a fall between 2007 and 2008.

Youth unemployment also increased slightly in 2009 (+ 3.9%), after a fall in 2008 compared to 2007.

The indicator value for **long-term unemployment** remained high in Berlin in 2009 falling back slightly to the 2008 level.

The proportion of **non-unemployed recipients of basic welfare benefits as a % of inhabitants ("Top-up recipients")** remains stable with a slight fall (- 0.5%) for the overall period 2007 to 2009 for the city as a whole.

The proportion of **recipients of basic welfare benefits not fit for work as a % of inhabitants under 15 years of age ("child poverty")** largely remained stable in Berlin in the past year after falling back between 2007 and 2008.

The proportion of **children and young people with a migration background** under 18 years of age as a proportion of all children and young people under 18 years increased between 2008 (42.8%) and 2009 (43.1%). This proportion is thus growing slowly but continuously.

Table 2: Status indicators for Berlin

	Indicator values in %			Change 2008 - 2009 in % (not rounded up/down)
	2007	2008	2009	
Status 1: Proportion of unemployed	10.2	9.4	9.9	4.7
Status 2: Proportion of youth unemployed	6.2	5.8	6.0	3.9
Status 3: Proportion of long-term unemployed	4.0	3.4	3.4	-2.3
Status 4: "Top-up recipients"	13.8	13.8	13.8	-0.5
Status 5: "Child poverty"	38.6	37.4	37.4	0.1
Status 6: Children and young people under 18 with migration background	41.6	42.8	43.8	0.7

2.2 Dynamics indicators

The **volume of migration**, which represents the combined total of immigration and emigration, again increased slightly in 2009 compared to 2008 and now stands at 28.4%.

The **balance of migration** in Berlin shows a slight gain in 2009 as in the previous year (+ 0.3%).

In the case of the numbers of **children under 6 years** moving away (an indicator of family departures) the proportion of those leaving Berlin is also slightly higher in 2009 than the proportion of those arriving, though the loss by migration has become slightly less.

In 2009 the **proportion of German recipients of basic welfare benefits** declined by only a very small amount compared to all residents with German nationality (- 0.1 percentage points). Even greater falls were observed here in 2008 but especially in 2007.

On the other hand the change in the proportion of non-German recipients of basic welfare benefits compared to all non-Germans shows an increase of 1.3% points in 2009 (after remaining flat in 2008). Dependency on transfer payments in this population group has also increased further.

The **proportion of recipients of state basic welfare benefits (under SGB II) not fit for work below 15 years if age** compared to all under 15 years of age ("**child poverty**") did not change in the city as a whole in 2009.

Table 3: Dynamics indicators for Berlin

		Indicator values		
		2007	2008	2009
Dynamics 1: Volume of migration		28.2	27.4	28.4
Dynamics 2: Balance of migration	in %	0.2	0.4	0.3
Dynamics 3: Balance of migration of children under 6		-0.7	-0.4	-0.1
Dynamics 4: Change in the proportion of German recipients of basic welfare benefits		-0.9	-0.5	-0.1
Dynamics 5: Change in the proportion of non-German recipients of basic welfare benefits	in % pt	-0.1	0.0	1.3
Dynamics 6: Change in the proportion of recipients of basic welfare benefits (under SGB II) not fit for work under 15 years of age ("child poverty")		0.0	-1.2	0.0

3 Observation of the urban area

1. The **western inner city** is characterised principally by high values in the indicators for drawing transfer payments (status 4 and 5). Here every fifth inhabitant of working age is drawing additional welfare benefits although they are actively employed. Among those under 25 years of age, 6.5% do not have either a job or a training or study placement (status 2). This area of the city shows the sharpest growth in changes in the values for social problem density, or the smallest decline.

What is striking is the number of children and young people in the western inner city who live in households drawing transfer payments. The proportion stands at over 50% as was also the case in the previous investigation, which means every second child in these areas is dependent on state support - and in some quarters this proportion is significantly higher. In addition - without there being any direct demonstrable link here or in *Social Urban Development Monitoring* - there are problems concerning the integration of immigrants. Among the children and young people 70% have a migration background, a value that is rising even further in specific planning areas. This leads above all to an accumulation of problems in schools and reduces the opportunities for social participation. For a large proportion of the children and young people growing up in the quarters specified could affect the entire course of their lives.

2. Generally the most favourable indicator values are observable in the **eastern inner city** and the majority of indicators show a favourable trend for further development.
3. The **western outer city** shows a more favourable situation in all values than on average for the city as a whole.
4. The problems of the **eastern outer city** are significantly distinct from those of the western inner city - although a similar level is also visible here.

All three unemployment indicators display high values in the eastern outer city and unemployment here reaches a level more or less similar to that in the western inner city. Youth unemployment is also high and is rising further, against the trend in the city as a whole. However, the proportion of residents who have to top-up their wages through transfer payments is lower than in the western inner city. While in the western part of the city a rising problem density goes hand in hand with a high proportion of families with a migration background, this is not the case in the eastern part. The problem density there is high - especially in the outer areas - but the proportions of residents with a migration background are significantly lower.

4 Polarisation trends at the planning area level

The question whether the polarisation found in *Social Urban Monitoring 2008* and *2009* has continued can be examined in various ways: with the movements in the crosstab table in the status and dynamics index groups as well as by observing the trend in individual indicators. The development index is also useful for this if you compare the mean values for the indicators for each development index group in the various years.

We can speak of continued polarisation within Berlin if the highest status planning areas have moved in a more positive direction and at the same time the lowest status planning areas have moved in more negative direction - that is if the uppermost and lowest ranking groups have become further distanced from the more average ranking groups in the city. The study thus concentrates on the trend at the poles in the scale of social development.

4.1 Monitoring using the development index

If you look at the development index group 4 with the lowest development index, there are consistently falling values between 2007 and 2009 in the data for unemployment, youth and long-term unemployment, relative stability in the "top-up recipients" - and only in the case of "child poverty" is the already very high value of 71.0% in 2007 increasing to 71.1% in 2008 and 71.3% in 2009. Improvements in the labour market are not bringing with them a lessening in the proportion of families drawing transfer benefits. Such a discrepancy is not observable in development index group 2 where almost no change is shown in the unemployment data, although the proportions in "child poverty" are falling (see also Table 4).

Table 4: Group mean values in the development index (status) for Social Urban Development Monitoring 2008, 2009 and 2010{ut1}

Group mean values in the development index (status)									Changes in %						
Development index group	Year	PLR	Status 1	Status 2	Status 3	Status 4	Status 5	Status 6	2009 compared to 2008 or 2009 compared to 2007	Status 1	Status 2	Status 3	Status 4	Status 5	Status 6
			Unemployment	Youth unemployment	Long-term unemployment	"Top-up recipients"	"Child poverty"	Proportion of young people with migration background under 18 years of age		Unemployment	Youth unemployment	Long-term unemployment	"Top-up recipients"	"Child poverty"	Proportion of young people with migration background under 18 years of age
1	2007	87	4.1	2.0	1.4	3.5	8.0	21.4							
	2008	87	3.7	2.0	1.2	3.5	7.7	21.6	2009 / 2008	12.2	12.3	9.8	0.8	5.6	2.9
	2009	87	4.2	2.2	1.3	3.5	8.1	22.3	2009 / 2007	2.7	9.7	-9.0	-0.1	0.8	4.3
2	2007	260	9.5	5.5	3.7	11.5	33.3	34.3							
	2008	260	8.7	5.2	3.2	11.7	32.2	37.5	2009 / 2008	5.9	7.2	-1.2	-1.9	-1.4	0.8
	2009	260	9.2	5.6	3.1	11.5	31.8	37.8	2009 / 2007	-3.4	1.5	-16.2	-0.2	-4.6	10.3
3	2007	44	13.7	8.5	5.3	21.5	58.2	60.0							
	2008	44	13.3	8.1	4.9	21.6	57.8	56.9	2009 / 2008	3.4	4.2	-3.7	1.6	2.3	-4.6
	2009	44	13.8	8.5	4.8	22.0	59.2	54.3	2009 / 2007	0.9	0.0	-10.8	2.0	1.7	-9.5
4	2007	43	17.3	10.6	6.9	30.3	71.0	73.3							
	2008	43	15.3	9.4	5.8	30.7	71.1	74.2	2009 / 2008	0.7	-7.9	-6.6	-2.2	0.3	2.3
	2009	43	15.9	8.6	5.4	30.0	71.3	75.8	2009 / 2007	-8.3	-18.9	-21.2	-1.0	0.4	3.5
Berlin as a whole	2007		10.2	6.2	4.0	13.8	38.6	41.6							
	2008		9.4	5.8	3.4	13.8	37.4	42.8	2009 / 2008	4.7	3.9	-2.3	-0.5	0.1	0.7
	2009		9.9	6.0	3.4	13.8	37.4	43.1	2009 / 2007	-3.6	-2.6	-16.2	0.1	-3.1	3.6

4.2 Observation using the status/dynamics index

While the classifications in the development index for each year illustrate the relationship between planning areas to one another, the status/dynamics index makes it possible also to detect changes in the classification.

According to the status/dynamics index, 20 planning areas each show status index 4 (the highest problem density) and a negative dynamic (group 4-) both in 2008 and 2009. At the other pole in this structure (1+), there are three more in 2009 than in 2008 with 39 planning areas. The distribution in the narrow middle field (2+/-) is only slightly greater than in 2008 with 172 planning areas (an increase of 3). Overall, a similar distribution can be observed as was already the case in 2008 (see also Tables 5, 6 and 7).

It can be established by looking at the status/dynamics index that polarising tendencies continue to be seen. This trend has not been reversed, but also has not intensified fundamentally. At the "upper" end of the social ranking, a small group of planning areas is becoming further distinct from the other areas of the city and at the "bottom" end there is a contrary movement among a very small group: 13 (out of 33) planning areas already placed in group 1+ in *Social Urban Development Monitoring 2009* are also in this group in *Social Urban Development Monitoring 2010* and 6 planning areas (out of 20) that were already in group 4- in *Social Urban Development Monitoring 2009* are also located there in *Social Urban Development Monitoring 2010*. There is thus definitely movement in this very narrow classification, but it can also be seen, however, that in the case of many planning areas that have left their group category these changes are only very slight. **Overall, this is an encouraging result especially in group 4- because only a very small number of planning areas seem to be on a fixed downward trend.**

Table 5: Status/dynamics index 2010 (revised for the period 31 Dec. 2008 - 31 Dec. 2009) - classification of planning areas in 2009

2010		Dynamics			Total
		positive (+)	medium (±)	negative (-)	
Status	Decile	1.+2.	3.-8.	9.+10.	
high (1)	1.+2.	36	44	7	87
medium (2)	3.-8.	43	172	45	260
low (3)	9.	3	26	15	44
very low (4)	10.	5	18	20	43
<i>Total</i>		87	260	87	434
<i>Notes:</i>					
<i>Total 3+4</i>	<i>9.+10.</i>	8	44	35	87

Table 6: Status/dynamics index 2009 (revised for the period 31 Dec. 2007 - 31 Dec. 2008) - classification of planning areas in 2008

2009		Dynamics			Total
		positive (+)	medium (±)	negative (-)	
Status	Decile	1.+2.	3.-8.	9.+10.	
high (1)	1.+2.	33	49	5	87
medium (2)	3.-8.	48	169	43	260
low (3)	9.	4	21	19	44
very low (4)	10.	2	21	20	43
<i>Total</i>		87	260	87	434
<i>Notes:</i>					
<i>Total 3+4</i>	<i>9.+10.</i>	6	42	39	87

Table 7: Status/dynamics index 2008 (revised for the period 31 Dec. 2006 - 31 Dec. 2007) - classification of planning areas in 2007

2008		Dynamics			Total
		positive (+)	medium (±)	negative (-)	
Status	Decile	1.+2.	3.-8.	9.+10.	
high (1)	1.+2.	42	42	3	87
medium (2)	3.-8.	43	172	45	260
low (3)	9.	1	26	17	44
very low (4)	10.	1	20	22	43
<i>Total</i>		87	260	87	434
<i>Notes:</i>					
<i>Total 3+4</i>	<i>9.+10.</i>	2	46	39	87

5 Summary of results and recommendations

5.1 Summary of results

1. The socio-spatial structure of the city of Berlin displays a high level of stability. Unemployment in general and youth unemployment fell in the period 2007 to 2009 in the areas with the highest problem density, while in the areas with the lowest problem density (development index 1) it increased somewhat. **As far as the situation on the labour market is concerned, areas of the city thus did not move further away from one another, that is, there has been a slight equalisation here.**
2. Encouragingly, in the two-year period 2007 - 2009, the mean values in the status indicators for **areas with development index 4** in terms of unemployment, youth unemployment and long-term unemployment **fell most strongly** where they were the highest.

Nonetheless, the differences in levels continue to be immense:

- ▶ **Unemployment continues to be more than three times as high in the areas with development index 4 than in the areas with development index 1. Youth unemployment** in areas with development index 4 is four times, **long-term unemployment** five times and the **proportion of "top-up recipients"** eight times as high as in areas with development index 1.
 - ▶ The **proportions of children living in communities in need - described as "youth poverty" in the following - continue to vary enormously:** in areas with development index 1 "child poverty" stands at approx. 8%, but in areas with development index 4 it is 71%, and it has risen continuously since 2007. At the end of 2009 "child poverty" in areas with development index 4 were twice as high as the Berlin average and eight times as high as in areas with development index 1. As a result, children under 15 years of age experience extremely differing environments which determine the course of their lives.
3. The labour market situation in the **period 2007 to 2009** in areas with development index 4 the , but the proportion in **"child poverty" increased slightly, however**. That can mean that these two **developments** have become **decoupled**. Movement into an occupation seems to be more rarely linked to such a high level of income that drawing additional social transfer benefits becomes unnecessary for those in work themselves and/or for the remaining members of the family.
 4. In the case of the population with a migration background, a social differentiation appears increasingly to be forming which resembles that of the indigenous German inhabitants. **A high proportion of the population with a migration background is not necessarily associated with a very high social problem density:** In the western outer areas, where the proportion of the population with a migration background is by comparison almost as high as the city average, the values for indicators of social problems are almost always lower. And in the areas in the eastern outer city where the proportion of the population with a migration background is at a very low level, the values for social problems are moving more and more towards the city average. In the eastern outer city "child poverty" has been

low since 2007 but has reduced continuously, while the proportion of children and young people with a migration background under 18 years has increased slightly, but also continuously.

However, in areas in the western inner city in which the population with a migration background is concentrated there is a clear correlation between migrant status and problem density. The values for indicators for the receipt of state transfer benefits are the highest there.

5. Overall, a stark spatial concentration of planning areas with a "very low" or "low development index" is shown - as was already the case for 2007 and 2008. **Establishing the Action Areas^{plus} has thus been reconfirmed as the correct course of action.**

5.2 Development of the Action Areas^{plus}

1. Overall there are 34 planning areas which display a development index of 4 both in *Social Urban Development Monitoring 2009* and also in *Social Urban Development Monitoring 2010* and which fall within the parameters of the Action Areas^{plus}. The constant nature of the distribution of areas with development index 4 shows the correctness of establishing the Action Areas^{plus}. No similarly broad concentration has stood out until now in any other part of the city.
2. In the area of the Action Area^{plus} **Nord-Marzahn/ Nord-Hellersdorf**, a relative improvement was achieved for part of the areas which can be seen by its change in development index grouping. But the areas are still characterised by a high level and specific concentration in problem density.
3. Data for the Action Areas^{plus} show that the areas inside the defined parameters are developing in different ways. This is shown clearly in the Action Area^{plus} of **Neukölln-Nord**, where a decrease in unemployment and "child poverty" can be seen in some areas (08010301 - Reuterkiez and 08010116 - Wissmannstrasse). A similar development is suggested in Action Area^{plus} **Kreuzberg-Nordost**.

5.3 Recommendations

1. Certainly, the most urgent problem facing the social development of Berlin continues to be high unemployment - but also the large number of those in work who earn such a low income that they still have to draw social transfer benefits. This results in disadvantages in accessing educational opportunities and in the options for supporting children in the education system.
2. City policies can be of only limited effectiveness in overcoming labour market problems; they cannot remove the economic weakness of Berlin on their own. Nonetheless, the support measures initiated in the quarters can help to provide residents with a better job perspective. The "rise" of individual inner-city areas in the ranking order according to the development index might at least in part be a consequence of quarter management and

the packages of regeneration funding already put together. There is an express recommendation that the arrangements and allocation of resources for regeneration programmes be maintained. This includes in particular the programme "The Social City".

3. Of particularly great importance, and also the soonest to be affected by city policies, is the educational situation in quarters with high levels of "child poverty". The experience of failure and loss of motivation in the children thus affected must be prevented so that their life perspectives are not already destroyed in their early childhood. Endeavours to undertake particular efforts in respect of the educational situation and the development specialist integrated programmes should therefore be intensified in the strategies for the Action Areas ^{plus}. Networking educational arrangements into "educational associations and educational landscapes" is thus the right path to ensure connections are not restricted to the local environment but instead that bridges are also built to the rest of the city - and thus to the core of society.
4. The success of the *Reuterkiez Local Educational Association* and the *Rütli Campus* in the north of Neukölln shows that a committed educational policy which engages with local stakeholders can lead to visible success stories and an improvement in the social situation. By changing the educational situation, the image of schools also changes, thus making them attractive for families who have considered moving away on account of the schools.
5. In a few planning areas in Kreuzberg-Nordost and Neukölln-Nord there are signs of gentrification which should be monitored more closely. Possibly, if these trends stabilise, there can be a move away from supporting gentrification towards a more maintenance-focused strategy - also to prevent the concentration of poverty just being relocated elsewhere.
6. Since a geographical concentration of social problems appears to have taken root, even if there are indications of change in a few places and small-scale problematic trends are also becoming visible in the outer city areas outside the Action Areas ^{plus}, it is recommended that implementation of the **Social Space Orientation in city policy** be intensified. Social Space Orientation is the ideal tool in packaging together resources, which guarantees measures and initiatives are concentrated on the dominant thematic problems in specific areas.
7. Among the "losers", that is the areas that belonged previously to a higher development index group, there is a relatively uniform picture across the city as a whole. The majority of these areas is characterised in terms of the built environment by **large-scale housing estates**. A creeping socio-structural decline was already referred to in the previous *Social Urban Development Monitoring* in the areas specified. This is now shown very clearly in the groupings in the development index. It is recommended that models specific to these locations be developed further to ensure the sustained development of individual large-scale housing estates and their quarters. In addition to the socio-structural problems, the consequences of demographic change will especially affect these areas.

8. It is recommended that the residents of the estates be involved further not only in the planning but also in the implementation of structural and social measures. There is great potential for the development of functioning neighbourhoods through **civic engagement**.

6 Appendix

Map : Development index 2010 - with Action Areas^{plus} overlaid

