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).
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ABBREVIATIONS

BBZ (Besluit Bijstandsverlening Zelfstandigen)
(Supplementary) social assistance for self-employed Act

IOAW (Wet Inkomensvoorziening Oudere en gedeeltelijk Arbeidsongeschikte werkloze Werknemers)
Act on income provisions for older and partially disabled unemployed employees

IOAZ (Wet Inkomensvoorziening Oudere en gedeeltelijk Arbeidsongeschikte gewezen Zelfstandigen)
Act on income provisions for older and partially disabled formerly self-employed

WAJONG (Wet Arbeidsongeschiktheidsvoorziening Jonggehandicapten)
Disability insurance Act for young handicapped

WAO (Wet op de Arbeidsongeschiktheidsverzekering)
Disability insurance Act

WAZ - (Wet Arbeidsongeschiktheidsvoorziening Zelfstandigen)
Disability insurance Act for self-employed

WIA (Wet Werk en Inkomens naar Arbeidsvermogen)
Work and Income according to employability Act

WIJ (Wet Investeren in Jongeren)
Investment in youth Act

WW (WerkloosheidsWet)
Unemployment Act

WWB (Wet Werk en Bijstand)
Work and social Assistance Act

DEFINITIONS

ALLOCHTHONES
Persons of which at least one of the parents is born abroad. First generation allochthones are born in a foreign country: second generation allochthones are born in the Netherlands.

AUTOCHTHONES
Persons whose parents are both born in the Netherlands, regardless of the country of birth of the persons themselves.

ECONOMICALLY ACTIVE (beroepsbevolking)
All persons aged 15-64 who are either working or looking for a job for more than 12 hours per week. Those who work for more than 12 hours per week are counted as part of the employed economically active; those who work less than 12 hours per week are counted as part of the unemployed economically active.

EMPLOYED ECONOMICALLY ACTIVE (werkzameberoepsbevolking)
All persons aged 15-64 who are (self-)employed for at least 12 hours per week.
LEGAL MINIMUM SUBSISTENCE LEVEL (*Wettelijk Sociaal Minimum*, or WSM)
The standard norm for the minimum household income varies for different types of households. It is comparable to the set amount for social assistance benefits.

MINIMUM HOUSEHOLDS (*minimahuishouden*)
Households with an income up to 110% of the legal minimum subsistence level (WSM) that has been set for their kind of household composition and age. Many municipal provisions target households with an income up to 110% of the WSM.

NET PARTICIPATION (*nettoparticipatie*)
Employed economically active in percentage of the total population aged 15-64.

PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT AGENCY (*UitvoeringsWerknemersVerzekering*, or UWV)
Public Employment Agencies are responsible for nationally regulated "employees insurances", such as unemployment and disability insurance.

UNEMPLOYED ECONOMICALLY ACTIVE (*werklozeberoepsbevolking*)
All persons who do not work or who work less than 12 hours per week, who are available to work for more than 12 hours per week within 2 weeks time and who are actively looking for a job of that sort.

UNEMPLOYED JOBSEEKER (*Niet-WerkendeWerkzoeker*, or NWW)
All those persons aged 15-64 who are registered as jobseekers with an UWV WERKbedrijf (Public Employment Agency)

UNEMPLOYMENT RATE (*werkloosheidspercentage*)
Unemployed economically active in percentage of the total number of economically active.

WORK AND INCOME SERVICE (*Dienst Werk en Inkomen*, or DWI)
Municipal service responsible for the implementation of various social assistance schemes, including WWB, WIJ, and provisions for minimum income households.
INTRODUCTION

Nijmegen is a middle-sized city (164,265 habitants in 2011) in the East of the Netherlands, near the border of Germany. Here, the urbanisation is less than in the West of the country, and Nijmegen is, along with its neighbour city Arnhem, considered to be the most important city for the economic region. The municipality proudly advertises to be the oldest city of the Netherlands - archaeological findings suggest it is 2,000 years old. Once, the Romans settled in the area because of the Waal river, which springs from the Rhine, and the many hills. During the Second World War, Nijmegen became severely damaged because of an accidental allied attack with bombers on the centre of the city in February 1944. As a result of this assault 800 people died, which makes it one of the biggest bombings in the Netherlands. After the war, the city managed to rebuild what was destroyed. There was a major shortage of houses and many new neighbourhoods arose quickly in the 1950s and 1960s - vicinities, consisting of cheap buildings, which are now thought of to be the problem areas.

The character of an university city became clear during the 1970s, when the leftist activist movement, among them many students, raised their voice and had some (violent) confrontations with the local government. In this period, also local politics gained a strong left orientation which was the reason that Nijmegen received the nickname “Havana at the Waal”. The past decennia, always a coalition with left parties led the municipal government. In 2010, a coalition was formed between the green party (GroenLinks), social democrats (Labour Party) and this time liberal democrats (Democraten ‘66) (instead of the socialist party, SP, who were part of the coalition for eight years).

1. TRANSFORMATIONS IN THE LABOUR MARKET

1.1. Socio-economic trends

The labour population of Nijmegen is growing. After a long period of stability between the end of the 1980s and mid 1990s, the net labour population has increased from 60,000 to 80,000 people. Especially the proportion of working people has grown spectacularly: in 2008, there were working 60 percent more people than twenty years earlier. This expansion is greater than the national average. The average proportion of employed economically people employed was 66.1 percent in 2008 and fell back to 63.5 percent in 2010, while it was 61.2 percent in 2000 (Table 1 and Table 2). Still, this is very low compared to the Dutch average. This is caused by the relatively low participation of young people, which is mainly a result of the many students living in the city. The increase of economically active people among elderly is striking: an increase from 34.4 to 57 percent for men and women aged 55-65 years. For all men on average, the participation rate was 69.7 and increased to 73.9 percent in 2008, but decreased to 68.5 in 2010, whereas for women this drop was less big, and their labour participation changed from 53 percent in 2000 to 59 percent in 2010. Of all working men, circa two third is employed full time, whereas 80 percent of all women is working part time - typical for the Dutch labour market (see country report). The net participation is especially high for higher educated women: 75.1 percent in 2010 versus 36.3 percent among low educated women. The difference between men with a low and high education is less great: 46.3 percent among the former and 86.5 among the latter. It looks like economic turndowns especially affect the labour participation of low educated men: in 2009, low educated men were working 10 percent more than in 2010.

In 2010, there were circa 100,000 jobs which thus surpluses the volume of the labour population of the city, but this not high when compared with other similar sized cities. Because of its academic hospital, the health care sector employs many people in Nijmegen.
### Table 1 - Net labour population Nijmegen (absolute numbers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>3,160</td>
<td>6,030</td>
<td>5,970</td>
<td>5,910</td>
<td>5,090</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>4,220</td>
<td>2,170</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>69,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>3,150</td>
<td>5,770</td>
<td>6,090</td>
<td>5,940</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>4,780</td>
<td>4,330</td>
<td>2,410</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>70,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>3,130</td>
<td>5,670</td>
<td>6,050</td>
<td>5,890</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>4,830</td>
<td>4,320</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>71,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>3,170</td>
<td>5,690</td>
<td>5,990</td>
<td>5,830</td>
<td>5,300</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>2,920</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>72,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>3,180</td>
<td>5,660</td>
<td>5,880</td>
<td>5,730</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>4,920</td>
<td>4,460</td>
<td>3,080</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>73,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>3,390</td>
<td>5,580</td>
<td>5,780</td>
<td>5,750</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>4,950</td>
<td>4,530</td>
<td>3,250</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>75,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>3,640</td>
<td>5,680</td>
<td>5,550</td>
<td>5,840</td>
<td>5,540</td>
<td>4,920</td>
<td>4,510</td>
<td>3,280</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>76,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>3,750</td>
<td>5,710</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>5,750</td>
<td>5,540</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>4,510</td>
<td>3,280</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>77,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>5,700</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>5,650</td>
<td>5,540</td>
<td>4,870</td>
<td>4,510</td>
<td>3,320</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>78,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>3,810</td>
<td>5,660</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>5,650</td>
<td>5,540</td>
<td>4,850</td>
<td>4,510</td>
<td>3,320</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>79,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>3,810</td>
<td>5,660</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>5,650</td>
<td>5,540</td>
<td>4,850</td>
<td>4,510</td>
<td>3,320</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>79,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bureau Economic Research, Province Gelderland.

### Table 2 - Net labour participation and unemployment rates Nijmegen (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total net labour participation</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>60.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>60.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>60.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Netherlands
(29.9 percent of all jobs in 2010) (Table 3). Also, due to the presence of the city’s university, the educational sector is bigger than average (12.4 percent in 2010). Most jobs are also created in these sectors and they are one of the few sectors which are expected to grow despite the economic crisis. According to estimations, the share of medical jobs in the region of Nijmegen will increase with twelve percent in 2015. One of the reasons for this prognosis is that this sector is very much affected by the ageing of its employees—many will retire in the next decennium. The same accounts for the educational sector. The financial and business sector is relatively small in Nijmegen—40 percent of all jobs are in this segment when one would expect 50 percent in a comparable city. Among the biggest 20 organisations in Nijmegen only two of them are industrial companies, but nevertheless the amount of jobs in the industrial sector is relatively high, though the growth of this sector is falling behind in contrast with other cities and it is losing job opportunities every year. In 2000, the share of jobs in this sector was 15.4 percent (over 14,000 jobs) while in 2010 the share went down to 10.3 percent (10,170 jobs). The biggest company in Nijmegen is the university hospital with almost 10,000 employees.

Table 3 - Amount of jobs per sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of contract</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>jobs total [%]</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jobs agriculture/fishery [%]</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jobs industry/mining [%]</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jobs public utilities [%]</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jobs construction [%]</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jobs wholesale [%]</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jobs retail/automotive industry [%]</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jobs logistics [%]</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jobs food/catering industry [%]</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jobs finance [%]</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jobs business services [%]</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jobs public administration [%]</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jobs education [%]</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jobs health care [%]</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jobs other services [%]</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bureau Economic Research, Province Gelderland

There is no information available on the estimated grey labour market in Nijmegen. In other parts of the South and East of The Netherlands, there are signs that in the agricultural sector, grey paid employees from Eastern Europe are hired for work. Since Nijmegen’s agricultural sector is only small, this is not prominent on the agenda. However, in Nijmegen drugs related criminality does seem to occur more often, which could be an indication that the illegal drugs dealing scene has become more extensive than ten years ago. In general, the share of informal economy in the Netherlands is very low compared to other European countries. Estimations on NUTS 2 level for the year 2004 show that the shadow economy in the province is probably close to the average of the Netherlands, i.e. just below 10 percent (Tafenau et al. 2010).

Table 4 - Jobs by type of contract

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of contract</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>permanent contract</td>
<td>92,645</td>
<td>94,575</td>
<td>96,520</td>
<td>96,300</td>
<td>95,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contract with temporary job agency</td>
<td>3,890</td>
<td>3,810</td>
<td>4,035</td>
<td>3,560</td>
<td>3,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96,535</td>
<td>98,385</td>
<td>100,555</td>
<td>99,860</td>
<td>98,925</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Provincial Employment Survey, Province Gelderland

1http://www2.nijmegen.nl/content/1046714/extra_agenten_nodig_voor_aanpak_wietcriminaliteit
Unfortunately, no figures about temporary employment are available. Looking at the amount of people registered at temporary work agencies, it seems this has decreased the last few years (Table 4). In 2008, more than 4,000 people were registered but in 2010 this declined with circa 800, probably as an effect of the crisis - which again shows the precarious position of people working in temporary jobs. Unemployment rates in the city were particularly high during the 1980s, facing difficult economic times and shifting from an industrial to a knowledge-based city. In 1987, almost twenty percent of the labour population was out of a job (two times higher than the Dutch average). Since then, unemployment has been decreasing, moving towards the average of Dutch middle sized cities. While unemployment rates were low in the beginning of the last decennium, they increased to relatively high rates between 2004 and 2006, and after a temporary decline they are (Table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10,497</td>
<td>9,172</td>
<td>9,185</td>
<td>9,553</td>
<td>10,492</td>
<td>10,578</td>
<td>9,983</td>
<td>9,279</td>
<td>8,087</td>
<td>7,345</td>
<td>8,672</td>
<td>8,416</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>5,282</td>
<td>4,719</td>
<td>4,695</td>
<td>4,759</td>
<td>5,096</td>
<td>5,203</td>
<td>4,979</td>
<td>4,869</td>
<td>4,274</td>
<td>3,828</td>
<td>4,162</td>
<td>3,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>5,215</td>
<td>4,453</td>
<td>4,490</td>
<td>4,794</td>
<td>5,396</td>
<td>5,375</td>
<td>5,004</td>
<td>4,410</td>
<td>3,813</td>
<td>3,517</td>
<td>4,510</td>
<td>4,475</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-24 year</td>
<td>, , ,</td>
<td>1,112</td>
<td>1,141</td>
<td>1,075</td>
<td>1,075</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>823</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-49 year</td>
<td>, , ,</td>
<td>6,345</td>
<td>6,988</td>
<td>7,061</td>
<td>6,620</td>
<td>6,092</td>
<td>4,928</td>
<td>5,258</td>
<td>5,086</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-64 year</td>
<td>, , ,</td>
<td>2,096</td>
<td>2,363</td>
<td>2,442</td>
<td>2,484</td>
<td>2,466</td>
<td>2,640</td>
<td>2,393</td>
<td>2,452</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>, , ,</td>
<td>5,422</td>
<td>6,133</td>
<td>6,211</td>
<td>5,835</td>
<td>5,358</td>
<td>4,511</td>
<td>3,888</td>
<td>4,593</td>
<td>4,505</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surinam</td>
<td>, , ,</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antilles/Aruba</td>
<td>, , ,</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>243</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>, , ,</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>654</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>, , ,</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>454</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western countries</td>
<td>, , ,</td>
<td>1,295</td>
<td>1,463</td>
<td>1,446</td>
<td>1,332</td>
<td>1,286</td>
<td>1,087</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>1,195</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non-western Countries</td>
<td>, , ,</td>
<td>1,225</td>
<td>1,238</td>
<td>1,226</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>1,142</td>
<td>1,115</td>
<td>1,133</td>
<td>1,136</td>
<td>1,295</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surinam</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antilles/Aruba</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western countries</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non-western Countries</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>educational level</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISCED 1 or less</td>
<td>2,626</td>
<td>2,315</td>
<td>2,363</td>
<td>2,418</td>
<td>2,567</td>
<td>2,606</td>
<td>2,594</td>
<td>2,230</td>
<td>2,640</td>
<td>2,406</td>
<td>2,536</td>
<td>2,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISCED 2</td>
<td>3,467</td>
<td>3,070</td>
<td>3,178</td>
<td>2,780</td>
<td>2,905</td>
<td>2,755</td>
<td>2,383</td>
<td>2,245</td>
<td>2,042</td>
<td>1,850</td>
<td>2,274</td>
<td>1,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISCED 3</td>
<td>1,903</td>
<td>1,699</td>
<td>1,706</td>
<td>2,280</td>
<td>2,591</td>
<td>2,707</td>
<td>2,440</td>
<td>2,327</td>
<td>1,896</td>
<td>1,803</td>
<td>2,351</td>
<td>2,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISCED 5</td>
<td>2,501</td>
<td>2,088</td>
<td>1,938</td>
<td>2,075</td>
<td>2,429</td>
<td>2,510</td>
<td>2,173</td>
<td>1,958</td>
<td>1,503</td>
<td>1,281</td>
<td>1,503</td>
<td>1,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Client registration Public Employment Agency (UWV) / Provincial Employment Survey, Province Gelderland

In 2004 it increased to 9 percent and after a temporary decline, the economic crisis caused again an increase to an unemployment rate of 6.4 percent overall in 2010. Furthermore,
following an economic downturn in 2003, the amount of self-employed increased rapidly. Particularly in health care, more women started their own business. More in general, as elsewhere, lowly educated people have difficulties finding a job. More than 60 per cent of all unemployed jobseekers in Nijmegen is lowly educated, while the respective demographic figure is 18 per cent (Table 5). Unemployment rates do not differ much between men and women (6.4 percent for women in 2011, 6.5 percent for men), although in 2009, 6.5 percent of all women in Nijmegen were unemployed, and only 4.7 percent of men. Unemployment is especially high among people with an ethnic background (Table 5, see paragraph 3.1).

Looking at the duration of unemployment, there has been an increase especially in short-term unemployment, while long-term unemployment has decreased (Table 6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6 - Duration of unemployment; unemployed jobseekers (NWW)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-36 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 months or more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Municipality Nijmegen

Economic crisis

The economic crisis has clearly affected the economy of Nijmegen. Although the economy is still relatively stable, mainly because of the large non-profit sector, it caused not only an increase in unemployment and social assistance receivers, also more people end up in debts, less houses are sold and less jobs are created, especially in the market sector, such as industry, wholesale and business services. The last few years, the city has witnessed a decrease in especially the lower professional jobs, which makes it less easy for low educated people to find suitable jobs. Furthermore, because it is very difficult for young people to buy houses, it could be well that people are living longer in the same dwelling, even if it might be too small.

In the region of Nijmegen (which comprises the municipality of Nijmegen and several other smaller municipalities, and includes a labour population of circa 130,000 people), the economic crisis caused a 60 percent increase in the unemployed jobseekers among 15-27s between May 2008 and May 2009 (from 977 to 1,583) and this increase actually was solely responsible for the entire increase in employment during that time (Arbeidsmarktregio Gelderland-Zuid/Nijmegen 2009). There are more young jobseekers in Nijmegen compared to the national average: 14 percent of all the jobseekers are aged between 15-27 years in Nijmegen in 2009, while the national average was 12 percent. Of the 1,583 not working jobseekers in 2009, 44 percent were women. Most young jobseekers are looking for a job in the following sectors: mechanics and production, trade and administration, and catering and housekeeping. The increase in unemployment affected men particularly - while for women the increase was 32 percent, the proportion of men almost doubled. Furthermore, it hit higher educated youngster more than lower educated, although there are still not many higher educated young people in search of a job.
Table 7 - Average gross income of persons by gender and ethnic background (x1,000 Euro)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total persons</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic background: Dutch</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic background: western country</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic background: non-western country</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Netherlands

**Income**

The average gross income in Nijmegen is somewhat lower compared to the Dutch average: 27,900 Euro per person per year in 2009 (students excluded) (Table 7). The income for men was 31,800 Euro in 2005 and this has increased to 36,500 Euro. For women, this was 19,000 Euro and 22,500 Euro respectively. Thus, although for both genders the income has increased the income gap between men and women has increased. In 2007, 11.6 percent of all households was making a living out of 105 percent of the legal minimum subsistence level (WSM) and 22.6 percent received 130 percent of the WSM (Table 8). Especially single households have more chance to be in these categories, but also single parents are overrepresented - almost twenty percent of the people with 105 percent of the WSM are single parents. Of course there are differences between neighbourhoods. Especially in the city parts Zuid, Oud-West, Nieuw-west, Dukenberg and Lindenholt the average income is much lower than in other city parts (see Figure 1 for all the city parts).

Table 8 - Legal minimum subsistence level (% of all households)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>households with income 105% of WSM</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>households with income 110% of WSM</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>households with income 120% of WSM</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>households with income 130% WSM</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**type of household**

- households with income 105% of WSM: single households | 7.1 |
- households with income 105% of WSM: couple without children | 1.2 |
- households with income 105% of WSM: couple with children | 0.8 |
- households with income 105% of WSM: single parent | 2.2 |
- households with income 105% of WSM: other | 0.3 |

**ethnic background**

- households with income 105% of WSM: Dutch | 7.4 |
- households with income 105% of WSM: Western countries | 1.7 |
- households with income 105% of WSM: non-Western countries | 2.5 |

Source: Statistics Netherlands

**Young unemployed**

In January 2011, there were 2,204 lower educated (max. ISCED 3) unemployed jobseekers below the age of 35 in Nijmegen (Table 9). This was slightly lower than in January 2010, but much higher than the 1,663 in 2008. From the beginning of 2011 until October, the
amount of young jobseekers have been fairly stable. In reality, the number may be higher, because this comprises only registered unemployed jobseekers.

There are signs that especially people in temporary jobs will have more difficulties to stay in the labour market. These are particularly lowly educated and young people. For example, the biggest industrial company in the city has decided not to prolong two hundred short term contracts, which will mainly affect lowly educated people working in the factory. More in general, a loss of manual labour in the area of Nijmegen will make it more difficult for this group to find a job. Furthermore, since the economic crisis, the municipality already signals more citizens, including young people, ending up in debts.

**Table 9** - Target group: unemployed jobseekers (NWW) - lowly educated and age <35 by year and month

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2,324</td>
<td>2,348</td>
<td>2,354</td>
<td>2,234</td>
<td>2,246</td>
<td>2,129</td>
<td>1,942</td>
<td>1,851</td>
<td>1,817</td>
<td>1,768</td>
<td>2,118</td>
<td>2,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2,330</td>
<td>2,321</td>
<td>2,284</td>
<td>2,199</td>
<td>2,096</td>
<td>2,033</td>
<td>1,989</td>
<td>1,968</td>
<td>1,989</td>
<td>1,949</td>
<td>1,718</td>
<td>1,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1,663</td>
<td>1,690</td>
<td>1,693</td>
<td>1,717</td>
<td>1,692</td>
<td>1,668</td>
<td>1,655</td>
<td>1,613</td>
<td>1,654</td>
<td>1,674</td>
<td>1,628</td>
<td>1,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1,810</td>
<td>2,003</td>
<td>2,145</td>
<td>2,192</td>
<td>2,183</td>
<td>2,131</td>
<td>2,152</td>
<td>2,175</td>
<td>2,226</td>
<td>2,294</td>
<td>2,356</td>
<td>2,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2,529</td>
<td>2,378</td>
<td>2,407</td>
<td>2,263</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>2,165</td>
<td>2,088</td>
<td>2,077</td>
<td>2,114</td>
<td>2,089</td>
<td>2,137</td>
<td>2,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2,204</td>
<td>2,249</td>
<td>2,313</td>
<td>2,332</td>
<td>2,323</td>
<td>2,280</td>
<td>2,241</td>
<td>2,209</td>
<td>2,286</td>
<td>2,299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Client registration Public Employment Agency (UWV)

### 1.2. Public regulation

The Unemployment Act (*Werkloosheidswet*, or WW) in the Netherlands is implemented by Public Employment Agencies (*UitvoeringsinstituutWerknemersverzekeringen*, or UWV), which fall under the responsibility of the Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment. UWVs distribute unemployment benefits (which are paid by workers’ premiums) to those who involuntarily lost their jobs. In 2009, 3,267 people received a WW benefit. Women seem to get more often WW benefits than men, especially in 2009 (Table 10). Instead, the Work and Social Assistance Act (*Wet Werk en Bijstand*, or WWB) applies to those who receive little to no income from work, and is carried out by municipal Work and Income Services (*DienstWerk en Inkomen*, or DWI). All municipalities now have a budget for granting WWB benefits, which complement one’s income to 70 percent of the minimum wage (see country report for further details and recent policy changes). Nijmegen has traditionally a high proportion of social assistance receivers as a result of high unemployment figures in the foregoing decennia. Allochthones more often receive WWB benefits than autochthones (Table 11). Also men are more likely to end up living of social assistance. Great differences exist between lower and higher educated individuals: lowly educated persons receive more often WWB income than highly educated habitants.

---

2The term “allochtone” is used to refer to a person of whom one or both parents are born abroad, regardless of whether s/he has the Dutch nationality or not. Instead, the term “autochthone” is used to refer to a person of whom both parents are born in the Netherlands, regardless of his/her ethnic background.
Table 10 - Amount of people receiving Unemployment Benefits (WW)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>1,064</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>1,022</td>
<td>1,358</td>
<td>1,705</td>
<td>1,802</td>
<td>1,406</td>
<td>1,059</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>1,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>1,274</td>
<td>1,114</td>
<td>1,018</td>
<td>1,429</td>
<td>2,023</td>
<td>2,117</td>
<td>2,010</td>
<td>1,534</td>
<td>1,129</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>2,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,338</td>
<td>2,022</td>
<td>1,776</td>
<td>2,451</td>
<td>3,381</td>
<td>3,822</td>
<td>3,812</td>
<td>2,940</td>
<td>2,188</td>
<td>2,014</td>
<td>3,267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Municipality Nijmegen

Table 11 - Amount of people receiving social assistance (WWB from 2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>6,967</td>
<td>6,579</td>
<td>6,216</td>
<td>6,342</td>
<td>6,609</td>
<td>6,579</td>
<td>6,168</td>
<td>5,083</td>
<td>4,803</td>
<td>5,007</td>
<td>5,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>3,947</td>
<td>3,688</td>
<td>3,431</td>
<td>3,453</td>
<td>3,526</td>
<td>3,495</td>
<td>3,226</td>
<td>2,729</td>
<td>2,469</td>
<td>2,518</td>
<td>2,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surinam</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antilles/Aruba</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western countries</td>
<td>1,063</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non-western countries</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>men</td>
<td>3,899</td>
<td>3,755</td>
<td>3,519</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,613</td>
<td>3,610</td>
<td>3,450</td>
<td>2,926</td>
<td>2,692</td>
<td>2,710</td>
<td>2,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>women</td>
<td>3,068</td>
<td>2,824</td>
<td>2,697</td>
<td>2,842</td>
<td>2,996</td>
<td>2,969</td>
<td>2,718</td>
<td>2,157</td>
<td>2,111</td>
<td>2,297</td>
<td>2,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-24 year</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-49 year</td>
<td>4,360</td>
<td>4,060</td>
<td>3,698</td>
<td>3,749</td>
<td>3,852</td>
<td>3,807</td>
<td>3,561</td>
<td>3,008</td>
<td>2,776</td>
<td>2,925</td>
<td>3,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-64 year</td>
<td>1,884</td>
<td>1,746</td>
<td>1,835</td>
<td>1,838</td>
<td>1,881</td>
<td>1,918</td>
<td>1,880</td>
<td>1,830</td>
<td>1,775</td>
<td>1,787</td>
<td>1,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISCED 1 or less</td>
<td>1,131</td>
<td>1,347</td>
<td>1,449</td>
<td>1,444</td>
<td>1,610</td>
<td>1,596</td>
<td>1,532</td>
<td>1,429</td>
<td>1,384</td>
<td>1,511</td>
<td>1,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISCED 2</td>
<td>1,343</td>
<td>1,539</td>
<td>1,578</td>
<td>1,819</td>
<td>1,951</td>
<td>1,965</td>
<td>1,757</td>
<td>1,499</td>
<td>1,453</td>
<td>1,544</td>
<td>1,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISCED 3</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISCED 5</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>3,051</td>
<td>2,280</td>
<td>1,852</td>
<td>1,446</td>
<td>1,376</td>
<td>1,425</td>
<td>1,467</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>1,192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Municipality Nijmegen

In 2010, 2,570 young people who are mentally/physically enabled in Nijmegen received "WaJong" benefits. Looking at the figures for all the main disability benefits, there is a decreasing trend: in 2000, 8,880 people were receiving a disability benefit, while this was 7,135 in 2009 (Table 12). However, the WAZ has been cancelled in 2004 and the WAO has been replaced by the WIA (Work and Income according to employability Act), and no figures are available (yet) on the inflow in this new act. It is likely that the decrease is (partly) compensated by the increase of people who are eligible for the new regulation.

Young unemployed who do not have any disability may apply for an unemployment benefit (WW) depending on their history of employment. However, because most young jobseekers are not entitled to the WW, they have to visit the Youth Window (Jongerenloket), which is part of the (regional) Public Employment Agency and started in Nijmegen in 2008. This organisation provides information, advice and help for youngsters under 27 (this age
criterion refers to the Investment in Youth Act or WIJ). An evaluation of the Youth Window shows fairly good results. In 2010, there were 3,545 applicants in Nijmegen, primarily man (59 percent). Young people can apply individually, but they may also be sent by the DUO (Education Agency) as a school dropout. In Nijmegen, 75 percent of the visitors are offered a work-learn program, as is the intention of the WIJ Act. Around 40 percent leaves the Youth Window with work or an education. However, there are indications that young people who stay unemployed for a longer period, tend to look for opportunities on the black labour market, which may be the drug dealing scene.

Table 12 - Amount of people receiving WAO/WAZ/WAJONG benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>3,701</td>
<td>4,886</td>
<td>8,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>4,003</td>
<td>4,877</td>
<td>8,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>4,129</td>
<td>4,865</td>
<td>8,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>4,298</td>
<td>4,860</td>
<td>9,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>4,259</td>
<td>4,745</td>
<td>9,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3,864</td>
<td>4,628</td>
<td>8,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>3,567</td>
<td>4,372</td>
<td>7,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3,482</td>
<td>4,083</td>
<td>7,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3,448</td>
<td>3,944</td>
<td>7,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>3,402</td>
<td>3,863</td>
<td>7,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>3,448</td>
<td>3,733</td>
<td>7,181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Municipality Nijmegen

Nijmegen has spent more than 77 million Euro on income benefits for people eligible for the WWB or the WIJ (Table 13). This is less than the beginning of the WWB implementation, namely 86 million Euro, but more than the 69 million Euro in 2008. The amount spent on reintegration services went back to the level of 2004 after an increase until 2008 and was 33 million Euro in 2010. Concerning poverty policies, such as supplementary income provisions, debt assistance and special social assistance (ad hoc benefits for essential purchases), the municipality spent over 16 million Euro in 2004, which then declined to 13 million Euro in 2007 but increased again to 16 million Euro in 2009.

Table 13 - Expenditure on social assistance (Euro)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>WWB/WIJ benefits</th>
<th>WWB reintegration services*</th>
<th>IOAW</th>
<th>IOAZ</th>
<th>Bbz</th>
<th>Poverty policies**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>86,540,639</td>
<td>32,954,383</td>
<td>1,773,028</td>
<td>483,835</td>
<td>4,592,485</td>
<td>16,315,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>86,739,166</td>
<td>30,336,360</td>
<td>1,387,234</td>
<td>478,507</td>
<td>2,607,226</td>
<td>15,588,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>80,894,951</td>
<td>34,628,893</td>
<td>855,056</td>
<td>335,403</td>
<td>1,996,551</td>
<td>14,817,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>72,764,835</td>
<td>42,445,166</td>
<td>844,717</td>
<td>310,188</td>
<td>2,976,330</td>
<td>12,832,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>68,920,566</td>
<td>44,372,712</td>
<td>1,156,791</td>
<td>352,921</td>
<td>2,915,204</td>
<td>15,239,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>72,492,563</td>
<td>38,338,567</td>
<td>1,573,010</td>
<td>273,218</td>
<td>3,180,373</td>
<td>16,287,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>77,229,766</td>
<td>33,375,721</td>
<td>1,573,010</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,365,391</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Including immigrant integration/language courses and adult education
** Including supplementary income provisions, debt assistance and special social assistance (bijzonderebijstand)
*** Provisional

Source: Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment

The Nijmegen municipality uses several reintegration methods. To be eligible, one should receive social assistance or receive assistance from the WIJ (for under 27s); live in Nijmegen; be registered at the regional employment office; and be prepared to accept work within one’s capacities and possibilities. Among the reintegration possibilities are career opportunity tests, trainings, schooling etcetera. The municipality can also decide to subsidise an employee which is temporarily less productive or is still in education (“bridge subsidy”); to provide a subsidy for a short-term “try-out” job, so that the employer can decide whether to employ or not; to provide a subsidy for a “participation” job, which is
meant for people who have more severe difficulties to find a job, and is about supplementary work in order to gain confidence, to get used to the work rhythm and to working with colleagues, etcetera. The municipality is also entitled to cover travelling or (child) care costs. Whether one receives one or the other service depends on the individual case leaves much freedom for the municipality. For many of the in-kind services the municipality has contracts with private or third sector organisations. From 2005 to 2009, the people using reintegration services increased gradually from 4,150 to 7,010, but in 2010 the number fell back to that of 2005. Currently, the municipality is reconsidering its reintegration policy in the light of the upcoming cutbacks. Already the funding of subsidised jobs is steadily reduced. Almost all jobs that are not subsidised according to the WSW (see country report) will be brought to an end within a few years. Just as in many other cities, the reduction is reasoned by the expensive character of these subsidised jobs: almost the half of the entire reintegration budget is spend on subsidised jobs (WSW jobs not included). The reduction covers the ending of 700 jobs out of a total of 900. Still, for people who are eligible for the WSW because of some physical or mental handicap, subsidised jobs will not disappear. They are mostly working at the (non-profit) work provision company “Breed”, which is once put up by several municipalities in the region. People work for "Breed" internally, for example delivering mail, but they can also be hired out to other companies (see country report). Circa 2,200 people are working for Breed - including employees in the region. This makes them one of the biggest companies in Nijmegen.

A relatively new method unique for Nijmegen is the existence of “work corporations” since the spring of 2011. These should be financially independent companies where social assistance receivers can get work experience while being guided and sometimes getting additional training or schooling. The work corporations can be located in any sector, but should focus on socially useful services. The ultimate goal is to find a regular job for the employers (the aim of the municipality is an outflow of 25 percent).

Furthermore, there is an ongoing project called “Youth back to work” (Jeugdaan de slag) which tries to combat youth unemployment in the region. This regional project is the effect of the Youth Unemployment Regional Action Plan (Regionaal Actieplan Jeugdwerkloosheid), which had to be developed by all regions in the Netherlands between 2009 and 2011. The project focuses on all people under 27, regardless of educational background. Already 1.68 million euro has been spent on several projects and another 800,000 euro, subsidised through the European Social Fund, has been awarded to new projects in the spring of 2011. One of these projects includes youth vouchers worth each 2,500 euro, which are granted to employers who hire young employees for at least half a year, and can be spend on training and education. Also temporary projects have been organised, such as building an artistic belvedere. Important organisational actors here are the Public Employment Agency, Regional Educational Centre and employers in the region. The third sector is virtually absent in the project. However, in several neighbourhoods in Nijmegen welfare organisations as well as housing corporations are working together with the municipality to get people back to work. One example is Hatertwerk, which focuses solely on jobseekers in the neighbourhood Hatert, whether they receive benefits or not. Here, people from the municipality, Public Employment Agency and a private welfare organisation work together to provide information, advice and reintegration services to the residents. Cooperation with welfare organisations also exists in prevention of money issues. Along with different non-profit organisations, presentations are given on and teaching materials are provided for schools in the city.
2. DEMOGRAPHIC CHANGES AND FAMILY

2.1. Socio-economic trends

The population of Nijmegen has increased from 152,286 in 2000 to 164,265 in 2011 (Table 14). This growth is somewhat higher than the Dutch average and this has several causes.

Table 14 - Population growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>year</th>
<th>amount of habitants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>152,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>153,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>154,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>156,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>157,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>158,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>159,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>160,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>161,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>161,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>163,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>164,265</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Municipal Administration / Statistics Netherlands

Firstly, the city has witnessed a 27 percent increase in 15-25s, mainly due to the growth of the student population (Table 15). Because of its university, the proportion of this age group is much higher than the average in the Netherlands. In Nijmegen, the group 20-24 years old represents 11.2 percent (in 2011), while the Dutch average is 6 percent. Also, this group consists for the major part of women, since there are more female students. Secondly, in Nijmegen the birth rates exceed the death rates every year with 400-500 births. Thirdly, between 2000 and 2006 more people settled in Nijmegen than they left the city, although the ratio has been circa zero the last few years.

Nowadays, 14.4 percent of the population is aged between 0 and 14 years, 16.8 percent between 15-24, 30.2 percent between 25-44, 25.2 percent between 45-64 and 13.4 percent is aged 65 or older.

The amount of 45-64s has increased with 19 per cent since 2000 which reflects the (inter)national trend of an ageing population. The academic character of the city is also reflected in the educational level of its habitants. It is expected that because of the building of new houses, the population will still increase the coming years.

The dependency rate\(^3\) of 2011 is 51.6 percent (green pressure 31.2\(^4\), grey pressure\(^5\) 20.4 percent). There are almost 44 thousand people aged below 20, over 108 thousand between 20-64 years old and over 22 thousand 65 and older. The dependency rate of Nijmegen is, just like that of Amsterdam, far below the Dutch average (64.1 percent), which is typical for city areas.

\(^3\)Dependency rate = number of 0-19 year olds + over 65 year olds per 100 20-64 year olds.
\(^4\) The ratio between the amount of people aged 0 to 20 years and the amount of people aged 20 to 65 years.
\(^5\) The ratio between the amount of people aged 65 years and older and the amount of people aged 20 to 65 years.
Table 15 - Population by gender and age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-14</td>
<td>23,815</td>
<td>24,162</td>
<td>24,348</td>
<td>24,457</td>
<td>24,439</td>
<td>24,286</td>
<td>24,178</td>
<td>24,056</td>
<td>23,833</td>
<td>23,622</td>
<td>23,652</td>
<td>23,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-49</td>
<td>61,984</td>
<td>62,301</td>
<td>62,443</td>
<td>62,324</td>
<td>62,133</td>
<td>61,599</td>
<td>61,951</td>
<td>61,351</td>
<td>60,634</td>
<td>59,753</td>
<td>59,857</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-64</td>
<td>23,840</td>
<td>24,423</td>
<td>24,943</td>
<td>25,739</td>
<td>26,323</td>
<td>26,746</td>
<td>27,981</td>
<td>28,700</td>
<td>29,148</td>
<td>29,636</td>
<td>30,069</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>20,280</td>
<td>20,339</td>
<td>20,402</td>
<td>20,370</td>
<td>20,464</td>
<td>20,657</td>
<td>20,917</td>
<td>21,080</td>
<td>21,394</td>
<td>21,717</td>
<td>22,138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Municipal Administration / Statistics Netherlands

Table 16 - Average children per mother, amount of living birth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average births per mother</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother married (%)</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother not married (%)</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age of mother at first birth</td>
<td>29.91</td>
<td>29.91</td>
<td>30.23</td>
<td>30.21</td>
<td>30.27</td>
<td>30.36</td>
<td>29.82</td>
<td>30.49</td>
<td>30.27</td>
<td>30.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Netherlands, Statistics Municipality Nijmegen

On average, women in Nijmegen give birth to 1.45 children (in 2009) (Table 16). This used to be 1.34 in 2000 but has increased steadily since then. This is very low when compared with the average of Dutch women (1.7) and this can (partly) be explained by the high amount of students in the city and the higher educational level of the habitants. Particularly women under 30 are having fewer children compared to the national average, while women above 30 in Nijmegen are having more children than on average. The age of mothers has not changed a lot the past ten years and is always around 30 years (Table 16). The proportion of teenage mothers is very low (there were only 9 single parents aged under 20 in 2010). The proportion of unmarried mothers has increased from 680 in 2000 to 989 in 2009.

A great expansion of single person households has occurred in Nijmegen, from 38,553 in 2000 to 46,171 in 2010, which can also be assigned to the expansion of the student population, whereas more persons households, with as well without children, have increased only marginally (Table 17). Almost 50 percent of all more person households includes children. While the presence and the amount of children (one, two, or three or more) among non-married couples has increased, it has decreased among married couples. Divorcing in Nijmegen has not increased in the last decennium. The last few years it stayed more or less the same, which means around 300 marriages being dissolved each year. The amount of lone parent families has increased though, with almost twelve percent from 4,796 in 2000 to 5,355 in 2010. However, considering the increase in households, the proportion of single parenthood has not changed at all. Nowadays, of all households, 36.7
percent is a single household, 28 percent is a household of two married or cohabiting persons, 22.5 percent is a two parent family, 6.9 percent is a single parent household, 4.2 percent are student rooms or dorms and the remaining 1.7 percent are other forms of households. Of the 5,355 lone parent families, 3,442 families (64.3 percent) had one child, 1,474 (27.5 percent) two children and 439 (8.2 percent) three or more. It should be noted that single parenthood is much more common among immigrants than under autochthones - for instance, 14 percent of all Dutch-Antillean and Moroccan families are single parent families, while this is 6 percent for autochthonous families. 26.5 percent of all single parents in 2011 is aged below 40 (1,416 in absolute numbers) and in 2010 there were almost 1,000 single parents of which their youngest child was aged 5 at maximum. However, numbers on the educational background of single parents in Nijmegen are not available, thus it remains unclear what the exact population of target group number two is.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 17 - Household composition, absolute numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total private households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total private households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One person households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total more person households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More person households without children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More person households with children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More person household: 2 persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More person household: 3 persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More person household: 4 persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More person household: 5 or more persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total unmarried couples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried couples: no children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried couples: 1 child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried couples: 2 children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried couples: 3 or more children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total married couples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married couples: no children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married couples: 1 child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married couples: 2 children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married couples: 3 or more children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total single parent households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single parent households: 1 child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single parent households: 2 children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single parent households: 3 or more children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private households: other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>683</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Netherlands

It is difficult to assess what the occupational status and professional activities are of lowly educated single parents. What is known is that single parent households are overrepresented in the neighbourhoods where housing prices are low. Also, they more often receive WWB benefits, although the proportion has declined from 37.1 percent in
2000 to 21.5 percent in 2010 (Table 18). In 2008, almost 30 percent of all single parent households was living of the WSM. More than the half of all single parent households had to live with an income of 125 percent of this standard. Especially single parents with a non-western background are low on income. As noticed in the country report, full-time childcare services are expensive and sometimes even unavailable in the Netherlands what makes lone parents to work part-time, and thus make do with a lower income. Single parent families also often live in social housing - almost 70 percent lives in a dwelling owned by a housing association, whereas this is 25 percent for two parent families.

<p>| Table 18 - Single parents and social assistance |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total single parents</td>
<td>4,796</td>
<td>4,899</td>
<td>5,042</td>
<td>5,122</td>
<td>5,220</td>
<td>5,347</td>
<td>5,432</td>
<td>5,408</td>
<td>5,330</td>
<td>5,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of which receiving WWB/WIJ</td>
<td>1,780</td>
<td>1,730</td>
<td>1,620</td>
<td>1,660</td>
<td>1,670</td>
<td>1,620</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>1,240</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>1,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% receiving WWB/WIJ</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Municipality Nijmegen

2.2. Public regulation

Most family welfare benefits, such as paid leaves, child care benefits and child-related budgets are regulated through national law. Child care services regulated via a market-driven approach (see Amsterdam City Report and Country Report for details).

<p>| Table 19 - Child care facilities |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>amount of children aged 0-3 years</td>
<td>6,872</td>
<td>6,822</td>
<td>6,781</td>
<td>6,626</td>
<td>6,468</td>
<td>6,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amount of day care facilities</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amount of toddler playrooms</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amount of places*</td>
<td>1,552</td>
<td>1,581</td>
<td>1,631</td>
<td>1,708</td>
<td>1,957</td>
<td>2,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amount of children aged 0-3 years in child care</td>
<td>2,002</td>
<td>2,180</td>
<td>2,286</td>
<td>2,414</td>
<td>2,560</td>
<td>2,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% children in child care</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average hours per week day care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*One place refers to the child care of one child for 48 weeks, 5 days per week
Source: Statistics Municipality Nijmegen

<p>| Table 20 - Day care vs toddler playroom |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>amount of children aged 2-3 years</td>
<td>3,368</td>
<td>3,380</td>
<td>3,392</td>
<td>3,294</td>
<td>3,213</td>
<td>3,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% children using only toddler playroom</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% children using day care and toddler playroom</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% children using day care and/or toddler playroom</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>81.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Municipality Nijmegen

<p>| Table 21 - Child care costs |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average price per hour day care centers provided by KION</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>6.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: KION, personal correspondence
In total, there were 42 day care centres and 37 toddler playrooms in 2010. So, while the playrooms are diminishing, day care centres keep on expanding. In 2007, there were 9.5 child care facilities within a radius of 3 kilometres, which was the Dutch average. The average distance to child care facilities was 700 metres and this lower than the mean in the Netherlands (1.3 kilometres). In 2010, 43.3 percent of all children aged 0 to 3 years went to official child care. In 2004, this was only 29.1 percent (Table 19). Also, the capacity of child care facilities expanded rapidly in this period. On average, including child care during primary school, children in Nijmegen that had official day care were going there for 14.2 hours per week. That is one hour less than the Dutch average in 2010 (CBS 2011). If we look at children aged 2 to 3, the proportion going to child care is much higher: almost 80 percent went to a toddler playroom or day care in 2010 (Table 20). The percentage of toddlers only going to a playroom has decreased much, from almost 50 percent in 2004 to 34 percent in 2010 – since playrooms are only available for three half days at most, it is not attractive for working parents. In the tables, no figures on child minders are presented, but they play a marginally role in the child care provision. In 2010, only 8 percent of all child care hours for all children in Nijmegen were spent with child minders. The prices for day care centres of KION have increased the past few years, from 5.07 Euro per hour in 2007 to 6.44 Euro in 2011 (Table 21). However, the costs for child care are bounded to income - the height of the income determines the height of the (national) child care benefit (see Country Report). It is already known that the national government will cut the budget on childcare benefits. Because of the increasing prices, this will mean that practically for everyone, and especially for the low incomes, child care becomes way more expensive.

The role of third sector organisations (when leaving toddler playrooms out) is restricted to sharing information and giving advice. Unique for Nijmegen is the presence of twelve “Open neighbourhood schools” (Openwijkscholen), which combines a primary school with other welfare organisations. These schools are now being transformed steadily into so-called “broad schools” (Brede scholen), where children should be able to stay their entire childhood, by offering pre-school and between/after childcare. They work closely together with child care organisations, mainly KION, but also welfare organisations (often the big organisation called “Tandem”).

Considering the profile of child care provision in Nijmegen, it is specific in the sense that more than the half of all child care facilities are run by a foundation called KION. They not only provide day care centres but also toddler playrooms. The latter are all subsidised by the municipality. As can be read in the country report, toddler playrooms are originally voluntary organisations. Now, KION possesses all playrooms in Nijmegen, because the municipality had wished for one contracting partner. There is now discussion about the position of KION, because the municipality has plans to reform all the playrooms into regular day care, to assure more choice of freedom, more equity among child care providers (i.e. no different rules for toddler play rooms/day cares), and higher quality demands. This would mean that KION incorporates all 36 playrooms, and will posses 59 day care centres instead of 23. Other child care providers oppose this development, saying that this will give KION a monopoly position in the child care market of Nijmegen. These changes will not take place before the beginning of 2013. The regulation of subsidising pre-school education programs (VVE), that now are provided by playrooms (see country report), will probably also be changed. Instead of paying a playroom for offering a program, the municipality might be handing out subsidies per child. This will ensure that every child care provider can profit from the arrangement.

Furthermore, as in all Dutch municipalities, Nijmegen has two municipal “Centres for Youth and Family” (CentraJeugd en Gezin), who mainly function as an advice and information point for families with problems. These centres also collaborate closely with child care facilities.
organisations, health care organisations, immigrant organisations and educational institutions.

Just as elsewhere in The Netherlands, in Nijmegen the introduction of the Act Improvement of the Position of Lone Parents on the Labour Market (Wet VerbeteringArbeidsmarktpositieAlleenstaandeOuders) can exempt lone parents with children younger than 5 that receive social assistance benefits (WWB) from having to work (or look for a job) for a maximum of 6 years (regardless of the age of the child). Yet, this means an obligation for the applicant to follow an education or take part in other re-integration services. Next to the national arranged child care benefits and child allowances, the municipality of Nijmegen offers subsidy for parents or children with social medical problems. If a certain handicap calls for child care, parents can apply for this subsidy. The height of the subsidy depends on household income and the price rates of the child care facility and is bound to a maximum per hour compensation. Also, single parents with low income can apply for several low income policies. These are eligible for any household with children under 18 earning 120 percent of the social assistance benefit (WWB) at maximum. Families with more than one child are eligible for these poverty policies when they earn up to 130 percent of the WWB benefit. One is the Child Fund. Recently, three subsidy arrangements for schooling, sports and culture have been brought together in this fund. The implementation of the fund is in the hands of a foundation called “Learning Money” (StichtingLeergeld). This foundation looks at applications, visits families at home and decides for which activities or materials money is needed - for example a computer, sporting equipment or contributions for music club. How much money is given depends on the specific situation, but is bounded to a maximum - in total it could be a few hundred Euro. Furthermore, also single parents with low income may apply for a “prolonged subsidy” (Langdurigheidstoeslag). This is an extra, top-up sum benefit for people with low income. The regulation of this subsidy has been decentralised since 2009. Now, the municipality can decide how long the period of low income should be before one is eligible, as well as the height of the benefit. In Nijmegen, you should have had an income of maximal 105 percent of the social assistance benefit for at least three years. Furthermore, one may not be younger than 21 and older than 65 and a single parent’s capital may not exceed 11,110 Euro. It is particularly for people who do not and cannot follow education. In 2011 the height of the benefit has been set 395 euro per year for a single parent. Other examples of low income policies are to withdraw payment of municipal taxes, special social assistance (for essential, expensive purchases), the provision of a discount on health care insurance and favourable interest rates when low income households take a loan at the municipal bank. In 2008, 77 percent of all low income households eligible for extra benefits made use of them. This has increased to 80 percent in 2009. It is a goal of the municipality to reach as many low income households as possible. However, the low income policy of the municipality is under pressure, since the current cabinet only allows low income policies for 110 percent of the social assistance benefit. This means the municipality is spending too much on her policies and is forced to cut their expenditure.

The way municipal expenditure on child care benefits is arranged changed after the implementation of the Act on Childcare in 2005. Before 2005, the municipality of Nijmegen spend circa 3 million Euro on subsidising child care for families (Table 22). In 2005, the Act on Childcare was put into practice. This meant that the role of municipalities became smaller. Now, the subsidies municipalise provide are only 1/6th part of the total benefit for child care when one or both parents are partly disabled or unemployed and are following a reintegration program (and the other parent is working or also following a reintegration program). In other cases, this part of the child care benefit is paid by the national tax administration. Hence, this change means that the expenditure on child care will be much less than before 2005.
Table 22 - Child care expenditure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005*</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subsidised child care (benefits)</td>
<td>3,295</td>
<td>3,463</td>
<td>2,986</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure child care</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1,363</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toddler playrooms (facilities, staff)</td>
<td>2,463</td>
<td>2,583</td>
<td>2,578</td>
<td>2,784</td>
<td>2,654</td>
<td>2,684</td>
<td>2,820</td>
<td>3,013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In 2005, the new act on child care was implemented. This meant a shift in the financial administration and makes it difficult to compare numbers before and after 2005.
** Provisional
Source: Financial Statements Municipality Nijmegen 2002-2009

The height of the subsidy for KION, in order to facilitate toddler playrooms, was 2.4 million in 2002 and slightly increased to 3 million Euro in 2009. The current contract with KION involves a payment of circa 3.7 million Euro for the period 2012-2014. The developing implementation of education programs for disadvantaged children partly explains this increase.

3. IMMIGRATION

3.1. Socio-economic trends

In 2011, there were 20,511 first generation allochthones in Nijmegen, which is 12.5 percent of all the habitants in Nijmegen and slightly over the half of all allochthones (i.e. including second generation) (Table 23). In 2002, this was 18,548, accounting for 12 percent of the total population. The majority of these allochthones are coming from non-western countries (57.4 percent). The total amount of people coming from foreign countries per year was 1,746 in 2000, then declining to circa 1,300 around 2003 and eventually increasing to 2,016 in 2009. The temporary decline between 2003 and 2006 was (partly) the effect of a strict immigration policy adopted by the coalition of that time.

Some immigrant groups have grown substantially in the past ten years. These are particularly “new” groups, i.e. not the “classic” immigrant groups that came to the Netherlands in the second half of the 20th century. For instance, in 2000, there were 88 first generation Afghans and in 2011 229. Also the amount of Iranian allochthones has grown from 510 to 585. The number of (former) Yugoslavs has increased with 14 percent from 970 to 1,104. The quantity of people coming from Africa (Morocco excluded) has even increased considerably with 46 percent from 632 to 920. Three of the “classic” ethnic groups have even decreased in absolute numbers, Surinamese with 11.2 percent, Antilleans with 12 percent and Indonesians (who came particularly between 1945 and 1965 and are an ageing group) even with 19.7 percent. The first generation Turkish population still increased with 8.3 percent, while Moroccans increased with 9 percent. If we look more detailed at immigration figures, it can be seen that immigration from Turkey, Surinam, the Dutch Antilles and Morocco is relatively low the past few years (Table 24). Especially the immigration of Moroccans has been declining - from 67 in 2000 to 8 in 2009. In 2009, only 6 Surinamese had entered the municipality of Nijmegen and 44 people coming from the Dutch Antilles or Aruba, while this was 167 in 2000. Numbers are naturally higher for all the other countries from the African continent together (205 new comers in 2009) and for Asia (299 in 2009). The last ten years, the amount of immigrants aged between 20 and 25 years has increased (761 in 2009) and is since several years the biggest age group coming into the municipality - for 25-30s the number is 366 and for 30-40s it is 345. A conceivable
explanation for this pattern could be the expansion of (mainly German) international students: the amount of first generation Germans aged between 20-25 has increased from 178 in 2000 to 662 in 2011. However, especially immigrants of Africa are also younger than on average and this is the fastest growing non-western ethnic group.

Table 23 - First generation allochthones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-14</td>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>25-49</td>
<td>50-64</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>total</td>
<td>0-14</td>
<td>15-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surinam</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antilles</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1,314</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aruba</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>1,743</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>2,673</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>1,015</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1,653</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>former Yugoslavia</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1,103</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Verde</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>former Dutch</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Indies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China/Hongkong</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>1,557</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other western</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1,527</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other non-western</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>1,468</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2,483</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,194</td>
<td>2,858</td>
<td>10,113</td>
<td>2,866</td>
<td>1,517</td>
<td>18,548</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>3,009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Municipality Nijmegen
If second generation allochthones are also included, almost 25 percent of all habitants (40,603 people) of Nijmegen are originally from another country (Table 25). In 1996, this was 22 percent. Especially the group with a non-western country of origin has increased (12 percent in 2011). The figures are then as follows: Germans account for 4 percent of all habitants (6,533 in absolute numbers) and more than 20 percent of them are studying at the university. Turks account for 3.2 percent of the habitants (5,288) and Moroccans 2.1 percent (3,440); then people from the (former) Dutch Antilles and Aruba 1.24 percent (2,045), from former Dutch East Indies (now Indonesia) 2.7 percent and from former Yugoslavia 1 percent (1,661) and at last from Surinam 0.9 percent (1,591). The amount of Yugoslavian immigrants is remarkable, because only the four biggest cities in The Netherlands (Amsterdam, Rotterdam, Utrecht, Den Haag) have more. Other groups are from various backgrounds and only marginally represented. In contrary to the trend in first generation allochthones, second generation Turks and Moroccans have increased very much, respectively with 21 and 29 percent since 2000.

Regarding the current demographics of the different ethnic minority groups, it is clear that most groups are much younger on average than autochthones. More than 30 percent of autochthone men and women are aged over 50s, while this is only 13 percent of Moroccan women and 16.1 percent for Moroccan men (second generation allochthones included). The same pattern is seen among the Turkish and Antillean minority. The demographics of people with a Surinamese background look the most equal as autochthones. Especially people of African, Moroccan and Afghan descent are very young compared to the average age of citizens in Nijmegen. Almost 50 percent of all African habitants of Nijmegen is 25 years or younger. African immigrants differ from other countries in the gender ratio: much more men (61 percent) come from African countries. The exception is Somalia, where first women and children have fled the country because of the acute emergency situation. The average age of Somali first generation immigrants in Nijmegen is 29 years and 64 percent is female (in 2010) (Table 26).
### Table 25 - Allochthones including second generation, by country of origin, age and gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Morocco 0-24</th>
<th>Surinam 0-24</th>
<th>Antilles/Aruba 0-24</th>
<th>Other non Western 0-24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1,490</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1,470</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1,410</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1,390</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1,370</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1,330</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1,310</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>880</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Municipality Nijmegen

People of Moroccan descent (first and second generation) are most often lowly educated: in 2007, 55 percent did not obtain a lower secondary vocational degree (ISCED 2) (Table 26). For people with a Turkish background, this was 45 percent. Residents in Nijmegen with Antillean or Surinamese roots were clearly higher educated (respectively 30 and 20 percent). The high percentages for Moroccans and Turks can partly be explained by the...
fact that the first generation of immigrants have had very low or even none education in their home country. Considering the religious background of immigrants, it is known that 55 percent of all non-western immigrants are an adherent of some faith.

Table 26 - Mean age by ethnic background first generation allochthones (2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Background</th>
<th>Mean age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surinam</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands Antilles</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aruba</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>former Yugoslavia</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Verde</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>former Dutch East Indies</td>
<td>73.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China/Hongkong</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other western</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other non-western</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etniciteitonbekend</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>40.8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Municipality Nijmegen

In total, there were 4,045 first generation non-western allochthones aged 25 to 40 years in 2011 - 20 percent of the entire first generation population - while this was 4,563 in 2000 and 4,748. So, despite the increase in immigration the last few years, the amount still has declined, which is because emigration also has increased in this period.

Table 27 - Educational level by country of origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of Origin</th>
<th>Morocco</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
<th>Antilles</th>
<th>Surinam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% lowly educated</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Municipality Nijmegen

Labour market

The labour participation of first and second generation allochthones has increased, but it remains lower compared to autochthones. In 2000, the net labour participation among this group was 53.5 percent and in 2011 this was 54.1 percent (Table 2). Especially the labour participation among female immigrants is low: 46.9 percent in 2011, while being 60 percent for male immigrants. Also, among people with a non-western background, the
amount of unemployed jobseekers is much higher than among autochthones. Between 2003 and 2011, there is no clear trend visible: it cannot be said that allochthones are becoming more or less unemployed. However, it looks like economic downturns affect these people more than autochthones. While 3.6 percent of people with Dutch roots are unemployed jobseekers, this is 9.5 percent for Surinamese, 11.9 percent for people coming from the Antilles or Aruba, 12.4 for Turks and 13.2 percent for Moroccans (Table 5). However, the highest chances of being unemployed are seen for African (although there are some country differences) and Afghan allochthones. Almost inevitably, this means that these groups also are more likely to receive benefits. While 2.2 percent of autochthones in Nijmegen is given a social assistance benefit (WWB), this is almost 9 percent among the Turkish minority and circa 10 percent for people with an Antillean or Moroccan background (Table 11). For the remaining non-western countries, including for instance Africa, Afghanistan, Iraq and Iran, the percentage is even 12 percent. Also figures about income show the disadvantaged position of many immigrants: the income for people with a non-western background in Nijmegen (including second generation allochthones) was 16,500 Euro per person per year in 2005 and has increased to 19,300 Euro in 2009 (Table 7). This increase is slightly higher for the former it was for the latter, although the gap between allochthones and autochthones was still 10,000 Euro in 2009.

Housing market and segregation

On average, almost 45 percent of all the inhabitants of Nijmegen own their dwelling. For allochthones, it is much harder to buy a house. More than 80 percent of first generation immigrants from Morocco, Iraq and Somalia are living in a rental dwelling. For Turkish, Antillean and Iranian allochthones this is circa 70 percent. 65 percent of all first generation non-western immigrants are housed in a building owned by a housing association. Thus, it is obvious that most allochthones have to rely on the rental sector instead of the home-buying sector. Moreover, even if they are house-owner, the value of their real estate is much less than the average native Dutch.

Although it is debated, there are some areas in Nijmegen where the proportion of (first and second generation) immigrants is increasing, leading to more concentrated neighbourhoods. Between 2000 and 2006, the proportion of neighbourhoods with more than 15 percent first and second generation allochthones increased from 55 percent to 67 percent. Yet, there are no neighbourhoods where ethnic minorities have become the majority. Because less expensive houses are overrepresented in some neighbourhoods, and immigrants often have less income than autochthones, a specific pattern persists. Thus, it is seen that the proportion of allochthones (first and second generation) is higher in especially the west and south of Nijmegen. This includes the city parts Zuid, Oud-West, Nieuw-west, Dukenburgand Lindenholt(see Figure 1). Here the respective figures are 16, 17, 19 and 16 percent (Table 28). There are 9 neighbourhoods with those city parts where the percentage is higher than 21 (of a total of circa 44 neighbourhoods). People from the Turkish minority live especially in the city parts Oud-West and Zuid. A high proportion of Moroccans can be found in Dukenburgand Oud-West. Antillean/Aruban allochthones live mostly in Dukenburgand Lindenholt. Often, within the city parts, these ethnic groups are more or less spread over the area. Most problematic neighbourhoods are Hatert, Neerbosch-Oostand Lindenholt, which are characterised by a very high proportion of rental houses, lower household incomes, and more "low chance" children on school (for example children with language problems). In some neighbourhoods we see particularly high proportions of allochthonous youth, for example 40 percent in Neerbosch-Oost.
The neighbourhood with the highest percentage of allochthones is Meijhorst (31.6 percent). The main problems these neighbourhoods are dealing with are drugs dealing, youth nuisance and violent crimes. Although persistent problems do exist in several neighbourhoods in the city, it does not seem to increase during the last ten years. In almost every part of the city, residents think that there is less robbery, burglaries and theft in their neighbourhood. Also perceptions of insecurity has stayed more or less stable or even got slightly better. Reports of nuisance (whether it be neighbours or youth) have not really changed the past years too. Only a few problematic neighbourhoods have shown signs of increased youth problems (Meijhorst, Neerbosch-Oost). Moreover, the social climate has improved in many neighbourhoods, although in the areas with a high concentration of problematic social groups, community attachment is less strong than in other neighbourhoods. Most troubling however, is the stagnation of ethnic groups in income and educational performance, especially Moroccans and in less extent Turks.

Looking at numbers of discrimination reports, there seems to be not many tensions between native residents and people with an ethnic background. Still, the voting behaviour of residents in the concentrated neighbourhoods could point at dissatisfaction with the ethnic concentration. During the last municipal elections in and the national elections in 2010, many votes in these areas went to the extreme right party Partij Voor de Vrijheid (PVV), led by the populist Geert Wilders and known for its anti-Islam standpoints. Still, interethic conflicts are seldom reported in the local media. In 2007, in the neighbourhood Meijhorst, tensions among mainly youth of Moroccan descent resulted in several violent acts, such as the burning down a youth centre.
attend courses at the University, the Regional Educational Centre, but also at a few courses could also be offered by private companies or organisations. In Nijmegen, one can read in the Amsterdam City Report, all (non-EU) immigrants are required to complete and pass a so-called “integration course” (inburgeringscursus), which is stated in the Integration Act (Wet Inburgering, or WI) of 2007. Since 2007, integration/language courses could also be offered by private companies or organisations. In Nijmegen, one can attend courses at the University, the Regional Educational Centre, but also at a few.

Table 28 - Allochthones (including second generation) by city part

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nijmegen-Centrum</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nijmegen-Oost</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nijmegen-Oud-West</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nijmegen-Nieuw-West</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nijmegen-Midden</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nijmegen-Zuid</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dukenburg</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindenholt</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nijmegen-Noord</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Municipality Nijmegen

Table 29 - Dwellings by type, by country of origin (2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Low rise rent</th>
<th>Low rise buy</th>
<th>apartment rent</th>
<th>apartment buy</th>
<th>type unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surinam</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherland Antilles</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aruba</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>former Yugoslavia</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>former Dutch East Indies</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China/Hongkong</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great-Britain</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other western</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other non-western</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Municipality Nijmegen

Table 29 shows differences in type of dwelling by country of origin. Especially people of Moroccan and Turkish descent live in low rise rentals. However, Turks are more frequently home-owners of buy houses than Moroccans. Recent migrants groups, such as Iraqis, Iranians and Somali are more often found in apartment rentals. Western immigrants are more wealthy on average, which is reflected in the proportion of owner-occupied houses.

3.2. Public regulation

As can be read in the Amsterdam City Report, all (non-EU) immigrants are required to complete and pass a so-called “integration course” (inburgeringscursus), which is stated in the Integration Act (Wet Inburgering, or WI) of 2007. Since 2007, integration/language courses could also be offered by private companies or organisations. In Nijmegen, one can attend courses at the University, the Regional Educational Centre, but also at a few.
foundations and privately held companies. Several libraries have information points and offer some help with learning the Dutch language. It depends on the particular case of the immigrant whether the entire inburgeringscursus is paid by the municipality - sometimes, immigrants have to pay partly for the services.

Other than the compulsory inburgeringscursus, in the Netherlands, there are no welfare programs targeting allochthones in specific. However, in Nijmegen, between 2006 and 2008, there was particular attention for developing local policy for people with a Dutch-Antillean background as part of a national project. Since 2009, these experiences inspired the development of policy for people from the Moroccan minority. In collaboration with a platform of Moroccan self-organisations, the municipality has described and analysed the problems that persist within the Moroccan community. Now, Nijmegen participates in a national arrangement of twenty municipalities in order to create a specific policy on Moroccan minorities. One of the measures they would like to implement is an experiment to oblige Moroccan parents to participate in parent meetings on secondary school. They also would like to work with role models. Again, several other organisations are being involved in this project, including third sector organisations.

Third sector organisations offer help to allochthones. One locally well-known welfare organisation, Interlokaal, has four locations in different city parts and has many clients, especially migrants, who come for all sort of problems. For instance, people want help with filling in tax forms, or are having problems with payments. Also, they assist people with low income on how to benefit maximally from the arrangements available for them. The professionals at Interlokaal will help clients directly or, in the case of specific or serious problems, they will send them to other, specialised organisations, with which they closely collaborate - such as social work or the municipality. The municipality funds this foundation and several projects the foundation carries out. Also Tandem Welzijn, a large local welfare organisation provides different kinds of help in the form of International Women Groups, Neighbourhood Centres and all kinds of courses. Many times, also housing associations are involved, in the sense of funding or collaboration between professionals.

4. TRENDS IN THE HOUSING FIELD

4.1. Socio-economic trends

In 2000, there were circa 65,000 dwellings in Nijmegen (Table 30). Almost 62 percent of these dwellings were rentals. Five years later, the housing stock increased with more than 2,000 houses. The proportion of rentals decreased to 57.5 percent (almost 1,400 dwellings), as a result of neighbourhood restructuring. Obviously, the amount of privately owned houses increased, with almost 2,500 low rise buildings and 1,400 apartments. In 2011, Nijmegen counted over 70,000 dwellings. 34 percent consisted of privately owned low rise buildings, 25 percent of low rise rentals, 11 percent privately owned apartments and 31 percent rental apartments. 4,500 housing units have a communal kitchen and/or bathroom, and are usually occupied by students. Furthermore, the average value of real estate prices have increased, from 185.500 Euro in 2005 to 223,200 in 2010, but decreased in 2011 to 219,000 Euro (Table 31). This follows the national trend in housing prices. The stock of social rental houses in Nijmegen is relatively large - 42.9 percent of all rental houses. Only Amsterdam and Rotterdam have a higher proportion of social housing. The housing stock of social housing associations increased slightly between 2002 and 2006, from 29,268 to 30,483, but then decreased to 29,650 in 2011 (Table 32). In some neighbourhoods, the proportion of corporate buildings even exceeds 70 percent (Nije Veld, Hatert en Meijhorst). More than 90 percent of all social housing has a rental price under

---

6 Note that asylum seekers are considered a separate category. Special welfare policies (such as prioritised housing for instance) do apply to this particular group, see paragraph 4.2.
512 Euro. The renting prices have increased substantially the past ten years. In 2002, the average price for a house in possession of social housing associations was 328 Euro per month, while in 2011 the average rent is 431 Euro per month (Table 33). Of course a part of this increase is due to inflation corrections, but the main reasons for this trend are the demolition of old, cheap houses and the construction of newer, more luxurious apartments.

Table 30 - Amount of private dwellings by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low rise rent</td>
<td>19,055</td>
<td>18,873</td>
<td>18,894</td>
<td>18,731</td>
<td>18,083</td>
<td>17,780</td>
<td>17,697</td>
<td>17,677</td>
<td>17,276</td>
<td>17,423</td>
<td>17,105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low rise buy</td>
<td>19,304</td>
<td>20,081</td>
<td>20,360</td>
<td>20,907</td>
<td>21,347</td>
<td>21,755</td>
<td>22,085</td>
<td>22,999</td>
<td>23,047</td>
<td>23,417</td>
<td>23,899</td>
<td>24,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low rise unknown</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment rent</td>
<td>21,224</td>
<td>21,248</td>
<td>21,309</td>
<td>21,309</td>
<td>21,056</td>
<td>20,962</td>
<td>21,402</td>
<td>21,386</td>
<td>21,455</td>
<td>22,014</td>
<td>22,183</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment unknown</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type unknown</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65,435</td>
<td>66,152</td>
<td>66,652</td>
<td>66,876</td>
<td>67,532</td>
<td>68,190</td>
<td>69,816</td>
<td>69,866</td>
<td>70,195</td>
<td>71,729</td>
<td>71,904</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Municipality Nijmegen

Table 31 - Average real estate prices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>185,500</td>
<td>185,900</td>
<td>202,700</td>
<td>202,200</td>
<td>222,600</td>
<td>223,200</td>
<td>219,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Municipality Nijmegen

Table 32 - Housing stock social housing associations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwellings possessed by social housing associations</td>
<td>29,628</td>
<td>30,206</td>
<td>30,179</td>
<td>30,483</td>
<td>30,394</td>
<td>30,314</td>
<td>30,126</td>
<td>30,126</td>
<td>30,016</td>
<td>29,640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Municipality Nijmegen

Table 33 - Average renting prices of social renting houses (Euro per month)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>327.8</td>
<td>354.5</td>
<td>364.8</td>
<td>378.7</td>
<td>385.6</td>
<td>393.6</td>
<td>405.1</td>
<td>420.9</td>
<td>430.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Municipality Nijmegen

As in Amsterdam, in Nijmegen, the last ten years the demand for houses has always been higher than the provision. Building in the last few years has not been sufficient until so far, though the municipality plans on building an adequate number of dwellings in the next decennium. The housing market in Nijmegen has been labelled as “tense” (Gemeente Nijmegen 2009). For the period 2009-2020, there should be build 11,500 dwellings in order to meet the demand. There is especially a lack in student rooms and affordable housing for “starters” on the housing market. Because students are not able to move to desired neighbourhoods, they stay longer in their little apartments than necessary, making it difficult for new students to rent a room. The chances to succeed on the rental market have fallen back in the past ten years and are now the lowest ever. Families with children though, in the vast majority, manage to live in low rise buildings, not in apartment flats (88 percent in 2009). Also, to change from renting to buying is for many people difficult
because the housing prices are too high, especially for the lower and middle-income households.

How social houses are allocated, is written in the RegionaleHuisvestingsverordening. Social landlords are legally bounded to this regional regulation. If one would like to rent social housing in Nijmegen, he or she should register at Entree, an organisation which covers all social landlords in the region. After registration, it may take up to nine years to have a chance receiving a dwelling one applies for, although it differs per area and type of dwelling. The registration duration, also called “measuring time” (meettijd), is the most important variable in allocating a house. However, housing associations can make exceptions in circa 30 percent of their housing stock, for example excluding single person households or households with children. Since the EU ruling (see country report), the social landlords also need to assign at least 90 percent of all social housing to households with a maximum income of 33,614 Euro, finding affordable houses has become more difficult than ten years ago. The selling of social dwellings, the restructuring of neighbourhoods (which includes the demolishing of social dwellings) has only increased the pressure on the social housing market. Also, since 2002, the possibilities for people in the region to register for social housing in Nijmegen were expanded, which increased the demand. Additionally, there are fewer houses for rent in the lowest category. In 2009, of the 100 households with a WSM income only twelve could find a suitable dwelling which illustrates the difficulties for low income households on the social housing market.

On average, allochthones have to wait less than autochthones in order to receive a dwelling that is satisfactory - while the former wait on average seven years, it is five years more for the latter. This is partly because people with a non-western background often are looking for a big, affordable house, while they are registered for a shorter period on average. This means that they respond to houses in less popular neighbourhoods. Unfortunately, a side-effect of this is that these neighbourhoods do not overcome their concentration of migrants. It is even debated if housing associations are exacerbating segregation and that they do too little to spread low incomes and ethnic minorities over the city. However, the fact that social housing is concentrated in particular neighbourhoods is the main reason that remain or even become more segregated.

Another problem arising from the difficult access to social housing, is housing fraud - low income (immigrant) households who have no chances on the buying market and are not entitled to social housing, could end up in illegal practices in the private sector. Housing fraud refers to renting a dwelling that does not meet fire safety requirements, or sharing a house with too many other individuals. In big cities, such as Amsterdam, it is known that this is a problem, but investigation also pointed out Nijmegen as a “risk city” as it comes to housing fraud. This is mainly because the increase of labour migrants from East Europe is stressing the rental sector even more. Actual figures on overcrowding are difficult to assess. In the years between 2007 and 2010 the municipality of Nijmegen started ten juridical cases against overcrowding through illegal renting by foreigners. In seven of the ten cases it concerned Polish people. Only once the municipality indeed evicted the tenants. Regarding homelessness, reliable figures are also hard to find. One estimate is that circa 800 in the region of Nijmegen are residential homeless, while circa 150 to 200 people are factual homeless (Onderzoek en StatistiekGemeente Nijmegen 2010). Residential homelessness refers to people who are registered at social help organisations, while factual homelessness regards people who actually live on the streets and sporadically spend a night in a shelter. Organisations estimated that in reality there were 1100 people

7 Letter from the mayor to the council, available online: http://www2.nijmegen.nl/mmbase/attachments/974440/R2010091515_d19_Burgemeester_overbewoning_en_legale_kamerverhuur.pdf
without a dwelling of their own. According to specialists, the homeless population in Nijmegen is growing, in particular homeless Eastern-Europeans and homeless youth.

4.2. Public regulation

In the Netherlands, housing associations are responsible for the distribution of social housing. Housing allowances for renters and tax deductions for homeowners are regulated through the national tax offices (see country report for further details on the responsibilities of different actors in the provision of housing and recent policy changes). To be eligible for such a “housing allowance” (huurtoeslag), the rent that one pays per month must not exceed 652.52 Euro and one cannot have an income higher than 21,625 in case of single person households, or higher than 29,350 in case of cohabitation. For the elderly (older than 65), the maximum income for single person households is 20,325 Euro, and 27,750 Euro in case of cohabitation. The amount of housing allowance that is granted, though, has recently been reduced. Besides, in the private rental sector, the price of the rent is often higher than 652 Euro, whereby people are not entitled to receive such an allowance. In Nijmegen, 17,621 requests for housing allowances were granted, circa 200 grants more than in 2006 (Table 34). As said, the renting prices went up, but the average size of the allowances also increased: in 2006, households eligible for housing allowances received 1,614 Euro per year and in 2008 this was 1,708 Euro per year. For people who are in very problematic situations, a so-called “urgency status” exists. This is only for people who involuntarily have become in need of a house and cannot solve the problem because of financial issues and are not registered less long than nine years. The housing need must be so urgent that the current situation cannot persist more than four months. An application for urgency will then be judged by a commission.

Table 34 - Housing allowances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>total grants housing allowances until 2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total houses eligible for housing allowances</td>
<td>62,605</td>
<td>64,254</td>
<td>64,645</td>
<td>65,206</td>
<td>65,908</td>
<td>66,194</td>
<td>66,186</td>
<td>66,564</td>
<td>67,990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% grants of total housing stock</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average housing allowance (Euro per year)</td>
<td>1,373</td>
<td>1,420</td>
<td>1,445</td>
<td>1,501</td>
<td>1,560</td>
<td>1,571</td>
<td>1,642</td>
<td>1,621</td>
<td>1,690</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grants housing allowances from 2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average housing allowance (Euro per year)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,614</td>
<td>1,632</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In 2006, the law on housing allowances changed slightly

Source: Data Wonen, Ministry VROM

As in Amsterdam (see Amsterdam City Report), some housing associations are offering houses via the concept “Koopgarant” (or by another comparable concept) at a reduced price (up to 30 percent of its market value), and guarantee that they will buy it back if the home owner would like to sell it. Another housing association offers a subsidy on the mortgage if social housing renters would like to buy their house. They also put former social housing for sale and offer cost reductions for people buying their first house. Yet, even if the monthly installments are affordable for lower incomes, it remains very difficult to obtain a mortgage from the banks because of (too) strict requirements.
Housing associations arrange several things in order to deal with housing problems. For instance, *Talis* and *StandvastWonen* provide so-called neighbourhood managers. Also, the municipality has appointed their own neighbourhood managers in all the neighbourhoods of Nijmegen. Other assistance the municipality offers regarding housing problems is help with the repayment of debts and granting loans or subsidies for people who have moved but have little money to buy furniture and necessary electronic equipment. Then, there are several other organisations that help people dealing with (serious) housing problems. These are mainly foundations. Among them are *Driestroom*, *Dichterbij*, *Iriszorgand MEE*, all being organisations for people with mental or physical handicaps. They sometimes perform as intermediary actors between a tenant and a housing association - they can rent a dwelling for someone who needs help, while the tenant has to meet some demands from the organisation - for example, to assure no drugs will be used in the dwelling. Furthermore, there are seven "neighbourhood teams", consisting of the police force, Social Work Nijmegen (*NIM*), the “Call center special care” and housing associations. This project started in 2009 and is funded by the Province Gelderland and is meant for the more disadvantaged neighbourhoods in the city. If more parties of such a team signal problems with a household, this will result in a help plan or even in deploying a family coach. An evaluation in June 2011 gave ground for continuing the project. Furthermore, several tenant organisations exist throughout the city. Sometimes, these are supported by *Tandem Welzijn* or housing associations, but in other cases they are completely self-organised.

For refugees specific housing regulations apply. When they come to the Netherlands and apply for asylum and wait for the procedure, they will live in an asylum seeker centre (*AZC*). These are spread all over the country. From the moment they acquire a residence permit (*verblijfsvergunning*), they may apply for houses throughout the country by an internet database provided by the Central Agency for Reception of Asylum Seekers (COA). They can set preferences for the houses that are presented to them, but if they wait too long with making a choice, COA will make them one final offer which may not be refused.

In practice, refugees often do not receive their house of preference, especially because the big cities are the most popular to live in. The longer the duration of the stay in the asylum the more chance one will receive the house of preference. In some situations, one could be appointed a “placing criteria” which will heighten the chance of getting a dwelling, namely if one already has a job in some region, is following an education, having medical issues, or having family already living in the region. The dwellings on the database are made available by municipalities and are all owned by social housing associations. If a house is granted, the municipality will also lend money for decorating the house and buying necessary electronic equipment. Although this will assure someone has all the basic provisions, it also makes that he or she will start with a debt right away.

Since Nijmegen has an AZC in the city, this probably increases the amount of refugees willing to live in the city, once they get their residence permit.
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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.