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1. **Culture hypothesis:**
- Cultural homogeneity = precondition of welfare solidarity

2. **Institutional hypothesis:**
- Institutions matter
- Temporal order matters
  - may be difficult to build a welfare state
  - far less difficult to maintain a welfare state
- Welfare state may even mobilize solidarity
- Type of welfare state matters
  - residual welfare state targeted to the poor = vulnerable
  - institutional welfare state covering social risks and providing services for the entire population = much less vulnerable

Taylor-Gooby: No direct causal link between ethnic/racial diversity and social spending.
Politics is the intervening (mediating) variable
(and Politics is crystallized as welfare institutions)
Denmark as test case - Why?

- (easy data access...)
- can be legitimized as a “worst case”:
  - Unsuccessful labour market integration
  - Political mobilisation of anti-immigration sentiments
  - Attitudes to immigration at least as important for political identities and party choice as economic left-right position (2001 and 2005)

→ If solidarity deteriorates anywhere, it should deteriorate in Denmark
**Worst case:**


Percentages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>“tax protest party”</th>
<th>“anti-immigration party”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Danısh People's</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress Party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New right, total</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percentages mentioning immigration among most important problems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date/Description</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1971-1984 (election surveys)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb.1986</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep.1986</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug.1987</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep.1987 (election)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1988 (election)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1989</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1989</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1990 (election)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 1994 (election)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1998 (election)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb.2000 (‘mid-term survey’)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb.2001</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 2001 (pre-election survey)</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 2001 (election)</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 2003 (‘mid-term survey’)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 2005 (pre-election survey)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question:** Now I would like to ask which problems you think are the most important that the politicians should handle? (slightly different wording in 1986-88)

**Sources:** Tøgeby (1997:67), Tonsgaard (1989), Election surveys, and surveys conducted by Goul Andersen in cooperation with Ugebrevet Mandag Morgen. Election surveys refer to the month of the election even though many of the interviews were recorded 1-3 months later.
Does multiculturalism lead to erosion of solidarity?

overview of plausible arguments:

- Culture argument: Multiculturalism negative impact on solidarity

- Culture/institutions argument:
  Differences in work ethics - undermine system with weak economic incentives?

- Rational self interest argument: Competition over jobs?

- Rational self interest argument: Competition over welfare?

- Demobilisation argument: Indirect effect via demobilisation of labour movement and mobilisation of anti-immigration parties?
  (“collateral damage”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree mostly with A</th>
<th>Agree mostly with B</th>
<th>Indifferent/ Don't know</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>PDI (in favour of welfare state)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A: Social reforms have gone too far</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B: Social reforms maintained</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A: Prefer tax relief</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*) Wordings:

1. "First a question about government spending on social programs.
   A says: ‘Social reforms have gone too far. More than now, people should manage without social security and contributions from society’
   B says: ‘The social reforms that have been carried through in this country, should be maintained at least at the present level’.
   - Do you agree mostly with A or with B?"

2. "If it becomes possible in the long run to lower taxation, what would you prefer: ...
   A: Tax relief or B: Improved public services?"


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005: The state spends</th>
<th>balance of opinion: spends too little minus too much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>too little</td>
<td>appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old age pension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unempl.benefits (level)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc assistance (level)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid to developing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>refugees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wording: “Now, I’ll ask about your view on public expenditures for various purposes. I should like to know whether you think, government spends 1) too much, 2) appropriate, or 3) too little money on these tasks.”

Source: Election surveys (1985-2005); 2003: Mid-term survey, conducted in cooperation with Mandag Morgen

- No decline in support for Social Assistance, even though immigrants constitute a rapidly increasing proportion.
- Decline in support for Public Pensions, even though these are received almost exclusively by Danes.
- Policy-dependent attitudes to spending for immigrants
Attitudes towards the scope of government, 2000. Percentages and average index values on a scale 1-4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent should it be the responsibility of government to ...</th>
<th>Definitely</th>
<th>Probably</th>
<th>Probably not</th>
<th>Definitely not</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>Index 2000 (1-4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide health care for the sick</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a decent standard of living for the old</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide child care for everybody who need it</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a decent standard of living for the unemployed</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide decent housing for those who can’t afford it</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate immigrants</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide good leisure facilities for children and young people</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide leave arrangements for families with small children</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide leisure facilities for pensioners</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a job for everyone who wants one</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce income differences between the rich and the poor</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Immigration salient problem</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>don’t know</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Balance of opinion: Disagree minus agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998 yes</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effect</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001 yes</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effect</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 yes</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effect</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 yes</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effect</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Silent revolution: Mobilization of support for immigrants

Implication of culture hypothesis:
Most generous welfare states should be most reluctant to grant equal rights to immigrants,
or requirements about cultural conformity should be higher:
The more people pay, the more they should expect recipients to be like themselves.

**Attitudes towards equal treatment and assimilation requirements. 2002.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Should immigrants be treated equally</th>
<th>better for a country if almost everyone share customs &amp; traditions</th>
<th>Important (0-10) that immigrants are committed to way of life in society</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>7.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>6.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>6.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>8.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>7.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandinavia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>7.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>7.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>7.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>7.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all countries</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>7.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: European Social Survey (2002)
Alternative Hypothesis:
Does difference in work ethic undermine welfare arrangements with weak incentives to work?

Very little evidence. Small N.

Work orientations, by mother tongue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Danish or language spoken in EU</th>
<th>Others (N=62)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Want a job</td>
<td>81 %</td>
<td>85 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looked actively for a job</td>
<td>71 %</td>
<td>73 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to move for a job</td>
<td>25 %</td>
<td>37 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to job in another industry</td>
<td>20 %</td>
<td>36 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alternative Hypothesis: The costs of immigration

- Competition over jobs?

Competition on the labour market / competition over welfare. Average values on scale from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>average wages brought down by immigrants</th>
<th>immigration harm econ. prospects of the poor</th>
<th>unemployed immigrants should be sent home</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Scandinavia</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean all countries</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: European Social Survey (ESS), 2002.
Competition over welfare?

• until 2005 election no indications whatsoever
• In 2005 overrepresentation of Danish People’s Party among disability pensioners (som 25 per cent) and unemployed (> 15 per cent)

Apart from over-representation of disability pensioners: social profile equivalent to Social Democrats, reflecting educational composition.

But general concern among the Danish people about costs of immigration
Alternative hypothesis:
Erosion of welfare due to
Demobilisation of the labour movement

Proportion voting socialist and on parties to the right, by occupation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Socialist parties</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Liberals, Conservatives, New Right</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manual workers</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White collars</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All voters</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Similar figures in 2005

Balances of opinion: Left attitude minus right attitude. Percentage points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Maintain social reforms at least as now</th>
<th>Increase economic equality</th>
<th>Immigration a threat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>manual workers</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>white collar</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>difference</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Election surveys (N about 2000).

- No changes in opinion structure
- But changes in saliency
Proportion of workers among the supporters of various party groups.

Deviations from sample means. Percentage points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>Progress Party/DPP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other bourg. part.</td>
<td>-26</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social demcr. part.</td>
<td>+27</td>
<td>+26</td>
<td>+15</td>
<td>+19</td>
<td>+16</td>
<td>+16</td>
<td>+13</td>
<td>+9</td>
<td>+8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Wing</td>
<td>+26</td>
<td>+17</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note. Entries are deviations between the proportion of manual workers among the supporters of various party groups and in the entire sample ("normal").
Postindustrial marginalisation?
What characterizes the voters of Danish People’s Party?

- Negative attitudes to immigrants
- Authoritarian values in general
- Low social trust
- Low educational levels
- Less inclined to see globalisation as advantage

BUT NOT
- Negative economic experience
- Economic insecurity in the future
- Low overall life satisfaction
- Or any other sign of marginalisation
- Negative attitudes to welfare
  (centrist or even left of centre)

Same for people with negative attitudes to immigrants
Not marginalisation but low education (in particular high school “gymnasium”)

18
Logic of Party Competition

New stable conflict structure in Denmark:

(1) Value Conflict: Libertarian left vs. Authoritarian right
(2) Distributional Conflict: Traditional Left-Right

Party strategies: change policy positions on welfare
Deliberately exploited by Danish People’s Party
- AND by the governing Liberal Party
to compete for working class voters alienated by Soc.Dem.’s
stand on immigration

Liberal Party turned rightwards on the Libertarian-Authoritarian
dimension. Closer to Danish People’s Party

But there was a price to be paid:
- Liberal Party turned significantly to the left on welfare
- Danish People’s Party image as “true” Social Democrats,
  protecting old-age pensioners, disability pensioners etc.
  → Little collateral damage on welfare
The New political conflict structure

Libertarian Left
(values)

Left Wing

Soc Dem

Rad Lib

traditional left
(distribution)

workers

traditional right
(distribution)

Lib

DPP

Authoritarian Right
(values)
Attitudes to welfare expenditures in Denmark 2005, by party choice. 
Percentage Difference Index: Proportions wanting to spend more minus proportions wanting to spend less. Percentage Points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>party</th>
<th>old-age pensions</th>
<th>health care</th>
<th>home help</th>
<th>early retirement allowance</th>
<th>index (average)</th>
<th>immigrants and refugees</th>
<th>(N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Left wing</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Dem.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre Parties</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>-34</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lib. + Cons.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-58</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Pre-election survey conducted by the author in cooperation with Ugebrevet Mandag Morgen, jan.2005

(this extreme picture emerges when we focus on “classical” welfare issues)
Alternative to erosion of welfare for all:
Change in Social Citizenship for foreigners
de facto - or de jure

2002: “Immigration Package “

– married partners allowed to be reunited only if both are more than 24 years
– and if they jointly have stronger affiliation with Denmark than with another country
– Social assistance replaced by much lower “start help” for the first 7 years
  reduction by 15-60 per cent, depending on family type
  from 7919 DKK → 5103 for single person
  from 11400 DKK → 8200 for family with two children
– incentive to seek a job
– incentive to stay away!!
### Effect on population prognosis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>year (prognosis)</th>
<th>whole population</th>
<th>0-19 y</th>
<th>20-64 y</th>
<th>65 y +</th>
<th>old age dep.ratio 65y+ as % of 20-64 y</th>
<th>total dep.ratio 0-19 y and 65y+ as % of 20-64 y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003 actual figure</td>
<td>5,383,507</td>
<td>1,299,812</td>
<td>3,285,344</td>
<td>798,351</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>63.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040 (2001 prognosis)</td>
<td>6,213,033</td>
<td>1,536,012</td>
<td>3,317,950</td>
<td>1,359,071</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>87.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050 (2003 prognosis)</td>
<td>5,261,187</td>
<td>1,163,485</td>
<td>2,838,407</td>
<td>1,259,295</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>85.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(change in net immigration; no change in fertility or mortality assumptions)
Changes in labour market policy de facto affecting immigrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unemployment Policy</th>
<th>Immigration/integration Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2002: “More People to Work”</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- lower social assistance after 6 months for families where both spouses receive Social Assistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- lower ceiling to social assistance for families with high expenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- social assistance replaced by spouse supplement if spouse is not considered available for the labour market</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2002: Immigration package</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **2005 “A new chance for all” - integration agreement** (formally applies to both Danes and foreigners!)
- minimum requirement of 300 hours of work in two years (2006-07: 150 hours in one year) for a family where both spouses receive SA. Otherwise regarded as a homemaker not eligible for SA. |
| 5 matching groups; full requirements for matching group 1-4 |
| gr. 1: good match |
| gr. 3: partial match: some relevant qualifications |
| gr. 4: low match: only very limited job functions possible |
| gr. 5: no match: no job functions possible (no requirements of job) |
Other policy changes:

e.g. Liberal Party’s idea of “letting the money follow the child”
De facto dropped:

→ Would be exploited mainly by immigrants
Differentiation of social rights = project of policy makers

- Strong popular pressure for limiting the number of immigrants
- Other attitudes relatively tolerant (by comparative standards)
- Some legitimacy for differentiation of social rights, but no pressure for this