



Denmark

## Assessment of the 2008-2010 National Reform Programmes for Growth and Jobs from a social inclusion perspective: The extent of synergies between growth and jobs and social inclusion policies

Jørgen Anker, Jacob Andreas Holch and  
Jonas Lindén  
Rambøll Management A/S

*Disclaimer: This report reflects the views of its author(s) and these are not necessarily those of either the European Commission or the Member States.*

October 2008



On behalf of the  
**European Commission**  
DG Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities





## Content

Summary .....	4
<b>A. Overall assessment of the 2005-2008 National Reform Programmes during the past year from a social inclusion perspective .....</b>	<b>5</b>
A.1 Strengthening of <i>feeding in</i> and <i>feeding out</i> since the 2007 implementation report.....	5
A.2 Good example of <i>feeding in</i> and <i>feeding out</i> supported by impact assessments .....	5
<b>B. Assessment of the 2008-2010 NRP from the perspective of social inclusion.....</b>	<b>5</b>
B.1 Overall assessment.....	5
B.1.1 Attention to strengthening the social dimension and awareness of feeding in and feeding out in the NRP .....	5
B.1.2 Impact of the slowdown of the economy, higher oil and commodity prices, and ongoing turbulence on financial markets on people at risk of poverty and social exclusion.....	6
B.1.3 Strengthening of links between the National Reform Programme and the Social Protection and Social Inclusion Process .....	6
B.2 Feeding out.....	6
B.2.1 Employment and feeding out .....	6
B.2.2 Economic growth, financial sustainability and feeding out .....	8
B.3 Feeding in.....	8
B.4 Governance.....	11
B.4.1 Monitoring and assessment .....	11
B.4.2 Involvement of stakeholders .....	11
B.4.3 Coordination .....	12
<b>C. Update on key indicators.....</b>	<b>12</b>

## Summary

This report is an assessment of the Danish 2008 National Reform Program (hereafter referred to as the NRP) from a social inclusion perspective. The report consists of an assessment of the degree to which *feeding in* and *feeding out* take place in the outline of the policy framework presented in the NRP. Also, the report attempts to establish whether or not awareness of social inclusion has changed since the 2007 NRP. In addition to this, the report presents a set of key social indicators related to Social Inclusion and Social Protection.

Overall the NRP can be said to demonstrate a relatively high level of awareness of *feeding in* and *feeding out*, since these concepts are explicitly demonstrated in the report. As the following chapters will show, *feeding in* is particularly present in the chapter on “Denmark as knowledge and innovation society” (education), whereas *feeding out* is primarily manifest in the report’s chapter on employment and labour market policy. However, a systematic approach to *feeding in* and *feeding out* can not be said to be consistent throughout the NRP report. Although, initiatives aimed at increasing employment, for example through vocational training programs, potentially feed out into social cohesion, this effect is at no point stated as a policy objective. Rather, the focus, in terms of objectives and desired effects, lies on increased job supply and economic growth. Hence, evidence of explicit feeding out has not become more frequent in the 2008 NRP when compared to the 2007 NRP.

Generally, employment must be considered one of the most, if not *the* most, important instruments of promoting social inclusion through the concept of *feeding out* in Denmark. Given that employment is one of the most secure ways of avoiding poverty, many of the initiatives seeking to stimulate employment and to support disadvantaged groups will potentially feed out to increased social cohesion. However, the linkage between employment and social inclusion is never explicitly outspoken in the NRP which, from this assessment’s perspective, must be considered a weakness of the NRP. Having put forward this criticism, it may be said that, in Denmark, the mutual interplay between employment and social policies has been acknowledged for a long time.

Turning to the issue of *feeding in*, our assessment shows that the consideration of growth and employment enhancing effects of social policy is perceptible in some areas, for example education policy, whereas it is lacking in others, for example anti-discrimination as well as child and family poverty. *Feeding in* does also, in some places, occur explicitly. The policy approach to gender equality constitutes an example of implicit *feeding in* since there are no explicit considerations of the impact of this area on growth and labour supply. Yet, gender equality is framed in the broader policy approach aimed at the challenge of ensuring labour supply showing that the area is integrated into employment policy and, hence, constitute an example of *feeding in*.

Since we have only limited knowledge of how the NRP has been compiled and coordinated at ministerial level, it has been rather difficult to assess the aspects related to governance. It is however the general impression from reading the NRP that coordination between different ministries to ensure a greater interaction between concerns for growth and employment and social inclusion have not adequately been implemented.

## **A. Overall assessment of the 2005-2008 National Reform Programmes during the past year from a social inclusion perspective**

### **A.1 Strengthening of *feeding in* and *feeding out* since the 2007 implementation report**

Similar to the 2007 implementation report, the 2008 NRP does, at an overarching level, include explicit as well as implicit references to *feeding in* and *feeding out*. As in last year's implementation report, there is a strong focus on meeting the challenge of increasing labour supply. Although, initiatives aimed at increasing employment, for example through vocational training programs, potentially feed out into social cohesion, this effect is at no point stated as a policy objective. Rather, the focus, in terms of objectives and desired effects, lies on increased job supply and economic growth. Hence, evidence of explicit *feeding out* has not become more frequent in the 2008 NRP when compared to the 2007 NRP. Given that ensuring a high level of employment has been a point to watch for Denmark in both the 2007 NRP and the 2008 NRP, there is a broad scope of policies focusing on this issue meaning that social policy and education policy has been framed as contributors to increased employment as well as economic growth. It is, however, difficult to assess whether or not the 2008 NRP demonstrates an increased awareness of consideration to *feeding in* when compared to the 2007 NRP. In terms of increased presence of evidence and impact assessments, we have not been able to see an increase since last year's report. We are however aware that several of the large policy programs are being systematically monitored and evaluated, but there is no reference to any results of these evaluations in the 2008 NRP.

### **A.2 Good example of *feeding in* and *feeding out* supported by impact assessments**

We have not been able to identify any evidence of *feeding in* and *feeding out* and can, therefore, not present any initiatives whose success is supported by impact assessments.

## **B. Assessment of the 2008-2010 NRP from the perspective of social inclusion**

### **B.1 Overall assessment**

#### *B.1.1 Attention to strengthening the social dimension and awareness of *feeding in* and *feeding out* in the NRP*

Overall the NRP can be said to demonstrate a relatively high level of awareness of *feeding in* and *feeding out*, as these concepts are explicitly demonstrated in the report. As the following chapters will show, *feeding in* is particularly present in the chapter on "Denmark as knowledge and innovation society" (education), whereas *feeding out* is primarily seen in the report's chapter on employment and labour market policy. However, a systematic approach to *feeding in* and *feeding out* can still not be said to be consistent throughout the NRP report. In continuation, the NRP lacks attention to the social dimension, as the report does not address this aspect in almost any

of the policy areas, except in relation to the employment effort for special target groups. Implicitly some policies will include this aspect, as e.g. education is proven to reduce the risk of poverty. In regards to the 2008 recommendations and points to watch for Denmark the report does show an awareness of *feeding in* and *feeding out* in relation to these. This is however not the case for the second point to watch on energy interconnection. In the case of the two other points to watch, the *feeding in* and/or *feeding out* aspects are not explicit, but more so a result of the use of the concept in the chapters of the NRP where they are addressed. In conclusion, the NRP does not sufficiently manage to show how social inclusion can be mainstreamed to different policy areas, wherefore this aspect of the NRP could be strengthened significantly.

### *B.1.2 Impact of the slowdown of the economy, higher oil and commodity prices, and ongoing turbulence on financial markets on people at risk of poverty and social exclusion\**

The NRP does address the slowdown of the economy and ongoing turbulence on financial markets as a concern, but the impact on people at risk of poverty and social exclusion is however not dealt with. Higher oil and commodity prices (as a consequence of international market developments) are not addressed in the report. An aspect that could have been included in the report is how it is possible to safeguard the jobs of socially disadvantaged people in a potential recession with increased unemployment (cf. NRP 2008 Preface), as several marginalised groups have seen increased employment rates in light of the booming economy in recent years.

### *B.1.3 Strengthening of links between the National Reform Programme and the Social Protection and Social Inclusion Process*

There is little evidence of a strengthening of the links between the NRP and the NSRSPSI since last year. There are no explicit cross-references, or references in the text, linking the two documents. There exist thematic overlaps between the two documents, for example many of the initiatives related to employment recur in both reports. It is, however, difficult to assess whether or not these linkages are the result of a coordinated approach or, merely, arbitrary links that will naturally occur as both reports refer to fundamental Government policies and central challenges.

## **B.2 Feeding out**

### *B.2.1 Employment and feeding out*

In the Danish NRP a number of measures are identified within the aim of increasing access to employment and enhance employability to promote social inclusion. Generally speaking, employment must be considered one of the most, if not *the* most, important instruments of promoting social inclusion through the concept of *feeding out* in Denmark, cf. the 2008-2010 National Strategy Report for Social Protection and Social Inclusion.

---

\* Please look to the annex of this report regarding these issues.

### *Flexicurity*

The scope of this section is to assess how flexicurity can feed into social inclusion, as the core of the concept is to create a flexible labour market that meets the demands of the employers, while at the same time securing the labour force from falling into poverty and exclusion. Flexicurity remains to play a vital role in the Danish labour market policy. The Danish flexicurity model is characterised by 1) a high level of numerical flexibility with a low level of employment protection, 2) a relatively generous tax financed social security system in case of unemployment, and 3) active labour market policies which aim at upgrading the skills of unemployed people that are unable to return directly to a new job<sup>1</sup>. The NRP points out that Denmark in relation to the European joint indicators for monitoring and measuring of the development of the flexicurity elements show high values for the input and process indicators compared to other EU countries. The measures implemented to promote greater flexibility in recent years, in particular measures from the collective agreements from 2007 (the private labour market) and 2008 (the public labour market) as for an example “plus-time” and flexible work hours, are not in themselves balanced out by measures to ensure security. In this light it would be relevant to look into if any groups are at particular risk of not meeting these new measures of increased work hours and flexibility. However, at the same time a number of other measures to ensure security in the labour market and prevent social exclusion were introduced as for example funds for skills development and retention of senior employees. As a whole, these different measures show that there to a wide degree is a balance between measures to promote greater flexibility and measures to ensure security and avoid the risk of falling into poverty and social exclusion in the Danish labour market. On another note, the results from the collective agreements show that reconciliation of work and family life has been a priority in the collective negotiations as well as a Government Commission has looked into the matter; the NRP report, however, does not summarize the outcomes of these recent initiatives.

### *Job creation / older workers*

The NRP shows that employment rates for seniors have improved in a period over the last ten years. Measures to promote this development consists of a wage subsidy scheme with employment in private companies for persons who are over 55 years old along with a scheme that enables older people that lost the right to unemployment benefits to get a municipal senior job. Immigrants and their descendants also constitute a vulnerable group to whom special attention needs to be given in terms of job creation, although these groups experienced a remarkable increase in their employment rate from 2006 to 2007. The campaign “*A new Chance for Everyone*” is credited a great deal of this positive development in the NRP report and similar initiatives will be continued. However, as previously pointed out in our 2007 “*Trends, Developments, Feeding in, Feeding out*” report an important aspect of immigrants and their descendants integration into the labour market is missing, as discrimination is not addressed although discrimination is one of the most important determinants of social exclusion on the demand side<sup>2</sup>. The inclusion of people living with disabilities into the labour market has in line with the employment rates of older workers and ethnic minorities seen an increase in later years. This development has been supported by several initiatives, especially “*Disability and work – an employment strategy for disabled persons*”.

<sup>1</sup> Hansen, Lise Lotte (2007): From Flexicurity to FlexicArity? Gendered Perspectives on the Danish model. In, *Journal of Social Sciences* 3 (2): 88-93, 2007.

<sup>2</sup> Supp. doc., 2007 Joint Report, p.54.

*Example of 'feeding out' suitable for exchange of learning*

A good example of *feeding out* in relation to employment that could be the basis of exchange of learning is how the policy campaign "A new Chance for Everyone" had surprisingly great effect on employment rates for immigrants and their descendants, although the campaign was not exclusively aimed at ethnic minorities. By implying a special effort for social assistance and starting allowances recipients who have been unemployed for at least one year, the campaign succeeded in reaching many of the unemployed immigrants and descendants and thereby helped to promote social inclusion for these disadvantaged groups.

In relation to this example, it should be pointed out that the NRP does not address all of the proposed aspects such as (in)adequate income from work and the contribution of SMEs to creating employment for those distant to the labour market.

*B.2.2 Economic growth, financial sustainability and feeding out*

The Danish 2008-2010 NRP does not explicitly or implicitly clarify how 'fiscal consolidation' or changes in fiscal policies have taken into account their impact on social inclusion. Furthermore, the chapter on the economic framework does not address how economic or fiscal policies can effect social inclusion or how feeding out in this matter can be established or take place, nor does it take into account the impact on social inclusion in relation to addressing territorial differences and regional gaps, the liberalisation of services or measures to increase internet access. In conclusion, the three chapters dealing with these issues do not include a social inclusion perspective on any of the suggested aspects.

A good example of how social inclusion can be taken into account in (broader) policies aiming to cut down administration costs and digitalising the public sector is how a number of municipalities aimed to help socially disadvantaged people in connection with the implementation of "NemKonto Easy Account" in 2005. "NemKonto Easy Account" entails that all citizens hold a bank account, where all payments from public institutions are transferred directly into. However, especially homeless people have experienced difficulties in obtaining bank accounts, wherefore this new policy could potentially cut them off from access to their social benefits (or other funds). A number of municipalities have solved this problem by making written contracts with local banks, ensuring that all citizens within the municipality have the right to hold a bank account with a debit card. These agreements between banks and public authorities have along with additional collaboration made it possible for even very socially disadvantaged people to be able to access their social benefits<sup>3</sup>.

### **B.3 Feeding in**

*Feeding in* is defined as "the contribution of social protection and social inclusion policies to economic growth and more jobs" (Guidelines p.4). This section will provide an assessment of the extent to which the IRNRP has fed in from, in particular, the Danish NSRSPSI 2008-2010 and, in a broader sense, from the EU Social Inclusion and Social Protection process. Similar to the 2007 Danish NRP, policies aimed at the inclusion of disadvantaged target groups which, at the same

<sup>3</sup> "Når kontantkassen lukker", NemKonto, 2005.  
[http://www.nemkonto.dk/wo/images/1021302\\_Naar%20kontantkassen%20lukker-vers2.pdf](http://www.nemkonto.dk/wo/images/1021302_Naar%20kontantkassen%20lukker-vers2.pdf)

time, contribute to growth and job objectives are mainly to be found in the section on employment and labour market policy.

Explicit feeding in can be said to exist in the case where social policies has economic growth and increased labour possibilities as a stated policy objective or in the case where such policies are framed in an economic growth context. Utilising this definition of the concept, a clear-cut example of explicit feeding in the overall approach to social policy can be found in the Danish NSRSPSI. Pointing to a large overrepresentation of fully unemployed persons in the low income group, it is stated that emphasis must be put to “keeping the attention focused on the employment target in social policy, including the principle that working must pay off. (P. 7)”. Similarly, a major challenge to sustained growth mentioned in the Danish NRP is to ensure “the continual high level of employment while meeting the challenge of curtailing capacity on the labour market (p. vii)”. In other words, employment policy and employment objectives constitute an area which provides an example of a clear linkage between the NRP and the NSRSPSI. However, although these examples provides evidence of a policy approach where feeding in from social policy into employment policy takes place, at least at the level of objectives, it is not unproblematic. As pointed out in the 2007 synthesis report on feeding in and feeding out, “the EU social agenda is not all about jobs and a social inclusion process has other objectives<sup>4</sup>”. A too narrow focus on the employment target may point to a lack of feeding in from the broader concept of social inclusion which forms the objective of Active Inclusion. At the same time the focus on employment is understandable since the ensuring of a sufficiently high level of employment is one of the 2008 challenges formulated for Denmark (p. vii).

#### *Active inclusion*

First, it should be emphasised that at an overreaching level, the Danish Social Policy and Employment Policy framework is very much integrated in the same way as the active inclusion concept is designed. This may explain why the concept of active inclusion is not referred to specifically, even if the three pillars – links to labour market through vocational training and provision of job opportunities, adequate income support and access to social services – to a varying degree are treated separately. Policies aiming at providing job opportunities and vocational training are treated thoroughly (see section 4 of the NRP). Adequate income support is treated as an integral part of flexicurity (p. 31). Improvements of social services are mentioned within the context of “The quality reform” but there is no discussion of this subject in relation to groups with special needs (NRP p. 45). Hence, an integrated approach to these pillars aimed at creating synergies is not outlined in the NRP. To a certain extent, the concept of flexicurity, which is discussed in the NRP (p.31), does contain an integrated approach of the three pillars of active inclusion. However, it is our understanding that whereas flexicurity is designed to create an inclusive labour market, the concept of active inclusion is built upon a broader definition of inclusion and may, also, target a more specific and disadvantaged group. Programs for special target groups integrating several elements exist but are not described in the NRP.

#### *Education, training and lifelong learning*

The education policy framework targeting primary and secondary education has two major objectives. Firstly, policies must contribute to raising the level of the best pupils to the level of the best pupils in other countries and, also, raising the level of the weakest pupils. Secondly, the policy approach will aim to ensure that 95 percent of a youth cohort must complete a youth education programme by 2015 (p. 7). These policy objectives make up a part of an integral approach to “reap the full benefits of globalisation (p. 7)”. Hence, the overall framing of the policy area coheres to a feeding in approach.

<sup>4</sup> Begg Ian, Marlier Eric (2007): Synthesis report: Feeding in and Feeding out, p 4

Referring to the Danish Government's Globalisation Strategy which has life long learning as one of its objectives, it is stated that the vocational, supplementary training offered to adults must "contribute to increased competitiveness, high employment, and prosperity (P. 32)".

Hence, efforts and objectives within education policy are clearly feeding in into a wider growth strategy. The existence of feeding in is also mirrored at the level of funding which for many of the education initiatives is stemming from the globalisation fund (P. 8). There are, by contrast, no consideration in the NRP of how the same policies might contribute to social cohesion. According to research, education significantly lowers the risk of poverty<sup>5</sup> which means that the objective of ensuring a higher proportion of young individuals completing a youth education will most certainly pay off in increased social inclusion. This dimension of the issue of education is, by contrast, discussed in the NSRSPSI (p. 27).

#### *Gender equality*

The section on gender equality is placed in the section on employment policy and, consequently, makes part of the broader policy response to the challenge of increasing labour supply. Placing the topic of gender equality in this very section, may clearly be interpreted as an implicit example of feeding in. The section contains, however, no explicit example of how gender equality may contribute to enhanced growth. Rather the potential contribution of gender equality is more clearly outspoken in the NSRSPSI than in the NRP where it is mentioned that gender barriers may be a factor hampering increased labour supply (NSRSPSI, p.9). It could be mentioned, however, that seen from a comparative perspective there is a high labour market participation of women in Denmark.

The policy approach targeting gender equality is directly referring to the EU's Equal Opportunities Pact meaning that the Danish Government's work in this area is linked to, and feed in from, a wider EU gender equality program.

#### *Anti-discrimination*

Similar to the 2007 NRP, the issue of discrimination is really not treated in the 2008 NRP. The only instance where discrimination is referred to is in Annex 5 which describes the use of the EU structural funds allocated to Denmark. In this context, it is mentioned that Denmark participated in the transnational community initiative EQUAL aimed at combating discrimination and inequalities in the labour market (p. 67). Apart from this initiative, there are no policies or initiatives in the NRP with anti-discrimination as an explicit objective. As we mentioned last year, the lack of feeding in related to anti-discrimination in the NRP is unfortunate since Denmark is performing relatively poorly in the field of anti-discrimination policy when compared to other European countries. (see: [www.integrationindex.eu](http://www.integrationindex.eu)) By contrast, the NSRSPSI contains a more thorough discussion on discrimination and the rationale behind the fight against it: "Perceived or real discrimination may lead to exclusion and, as a barrier to societal participation, discourage integration. (p. 41)". Although discrimination is mentioned in the NSRSPSI, discrimination is framed as a threat towards cohesion and not so much as a structural barrier that may affect growth.

Recently, there has been a debate on whether highly educated immigrant women face larger difficulties in finding qualified jobs than women born in Denmark<sup>6</sup>. Data provided in the NRP on employment rate for highly qualified individuals of Danish origin as compared to highly qualified immigrants and descendants may support this assumption. In 2007, 89,1 percent of the highly

<sup>5</sup> The economic council (DØR) (2006): Danish Economy, Autumn 2006, p 181

<sup>6</sup> See: <http://www.dr.dk/Nyheder/Indland/2008/10/19/031224.htm?rss=true>

qualified individuals of Danish origin were employed whereas only 65,5 percent of the highly qualified immigrants held a job (p. 80). The employment rate gap between low qualified immigrants and individuals of Danish origin is approx. 12 percent (51,3% and 61%) (p. 80). The large employment rate gap between highly qualified individuals of Danish origin and immigrants may be a consequence of several factors, among which discrimination at various levels may be one. From a feeding in perspective, the employment rate gap between the two groups is problematic since it implies that there exist unutilised human resources.

#### *Child and family poverty*

The issue of poverty is at no instance referred to in the NRP. Difficulties faced by children and young persons are rather treated in the NRSSPSI.

#### *Social Economy*

The contribution of the social economy to job creation and growth is not discussed in the NRP. Although it is not mentioned in the NRP, voluntary organisations and NGOs receive funding within social policy programs (for example Joint Responsibility II) to support and help disadvantaged groups in, among other things, finding jobs. Also, local authorities are meant to support local voluntary organisations financially.

## **B.4 Governance**

The National experts have no exact knowledge on governments arrangements designed to strengthen the social dimension and the contribution of the NRP to greater social cohesion.

### *B.4.1 Monitoring and assessment*

Broadly speaking, there are few government initiatives which aim specifically at monitoring and assessing the impact of economic and employment policies on social inclusion and the impact of social inclusion policies on economic and employment growth. Many initiatives in the area of employment and social policies are monitored and evaluated separately, but they rarely include specific analyses of the interrelation between economic and employment policies and social inclusion.

### *B.4.2 Involvement of stakeholders*

Stakeholders in Denmark are normally given good opportunities to comment on new reforms that often are sent out to stakeholders for consideration. Annex 8 in the NRP refers to social partners of the labour market and refers to their contributions to the NRP. The partners included are:

- The social partners in the state sector
- Municipal and regional social partners
- The social partners in the private sector
- The Disabled People's Organisations
- The employment council
- The Working Environment Council.

The stakeholders involved are stakeholders, which normally form part of discussions concerning labour market development. However it is noteworthy that interest organizations of homeless people, drug users, The Council of Socially Marginalised People and representatives of ethnic

minorities apparently have not been asked to participate. In essence this indicates that groups experiencing poverty or social exclusion have not been included in the process.

#### B.4.3 Coordination

It has not been possible to obtain further information on coordination of joining up economic, employment and social policies.

## C. Update on key indicators

Below we have assembled a number of indicators covering various aspects of social inclusion and social protection. As we were a bit uncertain of the exact set of indicators being asked for we have gathered most of the indicators from the dataset "Overarching indicators - July 2008 Rev 1" available as excel file on the DG Empl site covering SP/SI: [http://ec.europa.eu/employment\\_social/spsi/common\\_indicators\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/spsi/common_indicators_en.htm) . (table 2,4,5,6,7,8 is taken from this dataset). However, as this dataset do not contain time series for all indicators we have also downloaded data for table 1 and 3 directly from eurostat.

### Indicators measuring poverty

#### 1. At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers by gender and age

	2003	2004	2005	2006
All	12 (b)	11	12	12
Male	:	:	11 (b)	12
Female	12 (b)	11	12	12
Less than 16 years	9 (b)	9	10	10
Between 16 and 24 years	27 (b)	27	29	28
Between 25 and 49 years	9 (b)	9	10	10
Between 50 and 64 years	:	:	13 (b)	14
65 years and over	21 (b)	17	18	17

Source: Eurostat

b = break in series

: = not available

As can be seen above, the at-risk-of-poverty rate seems to be relatively stable, or slightly increasing for some groups (see individuals who are less than 16 years), over the last years. Given the sole indicator above, it is rather difficult to assess the development of inequality over time. The economic council has assessed the share of people living in poverty to be relatively low and stable over the period of 1994 to 2006 (DØR, 2006). There are no differences between women and men. Breaking down the data into age groups, it is clear that individuals in the age group between 16 and 24 years face a larger at-risk-of-poverty rate than individuals in other age groups. As mentioned in the NRSSPSI, this is partly explained by the fact that this is an age group which has a high proportion of students (p. 7).

## 2. In-work at-risk-of poverty rate divided in fulltime and part-time job

	EU25	DK	DK <sup>(2)</sup>
fulltime	7s	4	4p
parttime	11s	6	8p

Source: SILC 2006, Income data 2005, <sup>(2)</sup> with imputed rent

## 3. In-work at-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers

2003	2004	2005	2006
5 (b)	5	5	4

Source: Eurostat

b = Break in series

The data on In-work at-risk-of poverty in Denmark show that, firstly, the problem of ensuring adequate income from work is lower than in EU25 and, secondly, that the risk has not been changing over the last years. Research carried out by the Economic Council has shown that in-work poverty is a relatively small problem in Denmark when compared to other countries and that few people who are employed live in poverty (DØR, 2006)

## 4. People living in jobless households: children (0-17 years) and prime-age adults (18-59 years), selected years (% of population in the relevant age group)

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Children	5,6	5,7	6	5,7	5
Total	7,6	8,6	8,5	7,7	6,9
Men	7,2	7,8	8,3	7,7	6,4
Women	8	9,3	8,8	7,8	7,3

Source: Eurostat, Labour Force Survey - Quarter 2 results

## Indicators measuring unemployment

### 5. Long-term unemployment rate by gender, selected years (% of the labour force 15+)

	1998	2000	2002	2004	2005	2006	2007
Total							
Denmark	1,3	0,9	0,9	1,2	1,1	0,8	0,6
Total EU25	4,4	3,9	3,9	4,1	3,9p	3,6p	3
Males	0,9	0,8	0,7	1,1	1,1	0,7	0,5
Females	1,7	1,1	1	1,3	1,2	0,9	0,7

Source: Eurostat, Labour Force Survey - Quarter 2 results

p=provisional

The data on long-term unemployment shows that there has been a trend downwards for the last 4 years. Moreover, the low long-term unemployment rate of Denmark when compared to EU25 reflects the challenge of ensuring a high labor supply in Denmark.

## Indicators measuring schooling

### 6. Early school-leavers (% of the total population aged 18-24 who have at most lower secondary education and not in further education or training)

	2004	2005	2006	2007
total	8,5	8,5	10,9	12.4b
female	6,7	7,5	9,1	8.9b
male	10,4	9,4	12,8	15.7b

Source: Eurostat, Labour Force Survey - Quarter 2 results

The high degree of variation of results over time is partly influenced by a low sample size  
b = break

The data above indicates that there has occurred a slight increase in the proportion of early school-leavers over the last four years. One explanation being put forward in the NRP is that extraordinary good employment opportunities may have motivated some students to leave school prematurely (p. 8).

### 7. Percentage of low-achieving (level 1 and lower) 15 years old in reading literacy

2000	2003	2006
17,9	16,5	16,0

Source: OECD, PISA survey

As can be seen in the table above, there has been a slight trend towards a smaller group of low-achieving pupils in literacy since the year of 2000.

## Health-related indicators

### 8. Disability free Life expectancy (+ Life expectancy at 0, 45, 65)

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Life expectancy at birth - males	74,5	74,7	74,8	75	75,4	76	76,1
Life expectancy at 45 - males	31,6	31,7	31,8	32	32,4	32,8	32,8
Life expectancy at 65 - males	15,2	15,2	15,4	15,6	15,9	16,1	16,2
Healthy Life Years at birth - males	62,9	62,2	62,8 (e)	63 (e)	68,3 (b,p)	68,4 (p)	:
Life expectancy at birth - females	79,2	79,3	79,4	79,8	80,2	80,5	80,7
Life expectancy at 45 - females	35,5	35,6	35,6	35,9	36,4	36,6	36,8
Life expectancy at 65 - females	18,3	18,3	18,2	18,5	19	19,1	19,2
Healthy Life Years at birth - females	61,9	60,4	61,0 (e)	60,9 (e)	68,8 (p)	68,2 (p)	:

Source: Eurostat – Demography

p = provisional

b = break in series

: = not available

As in most other European countries, the life expectancy at birth, as well as the healthy life years at birth, has been increasing over time for men and women.