

## **Danish democratic forums**

### **A preliminary report.**

*This report offers a rough and descriptive analysis of the Danish deliberative forums.*

#### **Overview**

The two deliberative forums – Day 1 and Day 2 from now on - took place on two Saturdays, respectively the 3<sup>rd</sup> and the 24<sup>th</sup> of October 2015 from 9 am to 5 pm. They were held in Copenhagen in the facilities of the Danish research institute TNS Gallup. Employees from TNS Gallup organized and ran both of the deliberative forums – including introducing the participants to the project on day 1 and moderating the plenary sessions as well as the focus-group conversations. All conversations were recorded on video and transcribed and translated from Danish to English by members of the TNS Gallup crew.

On both of these days the AAU-research team were present. The role of the research team was mostly that of the passive observer, “being the fly on the wall”. However, the Gallup employees occasionally turned to the AAU research team for clarifications when needed.

Day 1 consisted of a plenary introduction to the project and a plenary discussion leading to the five major topics to be discussed in the three breakout groups on day 1. Following from this each of the five themes were discussed for approximately 25 minutes in the three groups. After the breakout group sessions participants gathered once again for an afternoon plenary session where spokespersons for the three groups presented results from their discussions and evaluated the first day.

Day 2 began with a short plenary presentation of the program of the day and a Q-and-A-session with Prof. Christian Albrect Larsen from the AAU research team. Following from this was five breakout group discussions where participants agreed upon their specific policy proposals (three for each theme). From the middle of the afternoon and onwards, participants gathered for 2.5 hours and all breakout groups presented their concrete proposals and voted for or against each of them.

#### **Data handling and initial coding process**

The translated English transcripts were imported to NVivo 11 and split into 34 transcripts – one for each of the four plenary sessions (two morning and two afternoon sessions) and one for each of the themes (10 in total) discussed in the three breakout groups during the two days. Student assistant Phillip Halberg Nielsen person-coded the transcripts and postdoc Mathias Herup Nielsen did a first round of content coding as he coded the main themes of the material. The results presented in this report provide a rough summary of the content of the discussions of the two days. The report is a result of viewings of the video footage and of re-reading transcripts, notes and power-point-slides from the two days.

## Plenary sessions

### Day 1 – Morning session.

#### How were the five themes of day 1 found?

The morning session on Day 1 aimed at understanding what participants think of when they reflect upon 'the welfare state' and 'challenges of the welfare state'. Just before the plenary session, participants answered the survey questions and were given yellow, white and green nametags – corresponding to the colors of their respective breakout groups. They gathered in a large conference room and were seated in horseshoe formation as Lars Bo Andersen, head of section from TNS Gallup, briefly introduced the overall idea of the project. Participants were very much encouraged to engage themselves in the discussions and Lars Bo described some overall rules for the conversations throughout the two days ("it's alright to disagree, but you must respect other people's opinions"/"you need to say your first name whenever you speak"). At this point, participants were told to turn to the person sitting next to them and to talk for five minutes about what the welfare state is basically about - and what sort of challenges it is currently facing.

Subsequently participants presented the contents of their discussions to the rest of the participants and the themes to be discussed during the breakout group session of Day 1 were defined directly following from this.

The vast majority of descriptions of the welfare state were *either* of the welfare state as **a moral project**, where those who are strong and able take care of those who are unable to take care of themselves *or* of the welfare state as **a universal community** where all citizens – through tax payments – contribute and receive a return (e.g welfare services). Those who described the welfare state as a moral project used phrases such as the following:

- *"It's so beautiful, it almost brings tears to your eyes. It is there for you if you fail, or if something happens in your life" (P 82)*
- *"We talked a lot about the basics of the origin of the welfare state and the way in which it was created. Our obligation to take care of the weakest" (P 55)*

Those who depicted the welfare state as a community where everyone gives and takes used sentences such as these:

- *"We talked a lot about the welfare state as a community where everyone contributes. It's not just about who gets something and who the weak ones are or how much they should get, but about a community" (P 65)*
- *"The welfare state, that was the right flank, but they're also starting to call it the welfare society. That's what it is referred to as in the current debate. I like the word society better than state. What is essential in order for us to be able to have a welfare society today is what neoliberals have referred to as 'the price of civilisation'. What's that then? It's tax payment. So the actual tax payment and the very basis for us having a welfare society and being able to take care of everyone, and everyone having a place in society, that's where tax payment is absolutely, absolutely essential" (P 68)*

- *"We talked more fundamentally about that the welfare state is the infrastructure that ensures that we, as a society, can be productive, so that if I have children there someone there to look after them so that I can work." (P 74)*

When describing the current challenges of the welfare state participants tended to agree that the welfare state as we know it is under a lot of pressure and that things can't just stay the way they are. One participant expressed it in the following manner:

- *"Things are going downhill today. Hospitals are increasingly under strain, there will be fewer educators; I think it's about to fall apart and I'm becoming more and more afraid every day that passes, because I feel as though it's collapsing. The nurses can't keep up, doctors can't keep up, and treatment suffers as a result. Our children cannot be looked after, our parents cannot be cared for properly, they wet themselves and are left like that all night, and so on. And it gets worse and worse". (P 72)*

Following from this, several participants expressed concern for the future. A somehow common concern here was that too many people are behaving egoistically and don't contribute (enough) to the welfare state – even though they are actually capable of doing so. This fundamental concern was expressed in several different ways as shown in the following statements:

- *"I believe that one of the challenges is to preserve our own responsibility for our own lives and for others. That it doesn't turn into a nanny state" (P 69)*
- *"Also to preserve a form of gratitude of the fact that we get something, for example that you will be looked after, so that we don't end up with this 'demand mentality' because that doesn't work" (P 65)*
- *"We must protect those who struggle. But people should try to be a little more cooperative, rather than just putting themselves first (...) There is a difference between feeling weak and being weak. When you distribute, you can distribute both to those who are weak and to those who feel weak. Those who feel weak should be lifted up, but they should not be given." (P 84)*
- *"In terms of challenges, I think that those who really need help should get it while those who cheat or claim social benefits, early retirement or what have you, fraudulently should not." (P 87)*
- *"My grandparents took a certain pride in being self-sufficient. There was this basic pride in being able to look after yourself, and that, I think, we could definitely build on. We shouldn't really think so much in terms of what we get out of it." (P 82)*
- *"I think that what will matter to the welfare state in the future is that everyone feels motivated to contribute based on their ability. It may well be that there should be some adjustments, and I actually think we're heading that way already. Looking forward to 2040, I can certainly imagine that the rules relating to how we contribute will change. For example, all those who can work must work. Right now we're in the process of restructuring some services so that it will pay more to work. The starting point for the welfare society should be that all those who can do, should do." (P 50)*
- *"It is about what goes on inside our own minds. It is within ourselves that we need to have this feeling that allows us to have a society, a welfare society. I don't think it's been mentioned, but the rules imposed from above. Individualism v. community. For several years we have acted as single entities, and states too have acted on a very individual basis. If you we are to strengthen the welfare society, then we must incorporate this idea into our minds that we are a community". (P 76)*

Based on these considerations of the challenges of the welfare state, the five main themes to be discussed on 'Day 1' were agreed upon by the researchers and the participants.

Theme 1:	<b>"Financing the welfare state"</b>
Theme 2:	<b>"Safety Net"</b>
Theme 3:	<b>"Priorities"</b>
Theme 4:	<b>"Responsibility and personal motivation"</b>
Theme 5:	<b>"Productivity"</b>

## **Day 1 – The afternoon session**

During the afternoon plenary session, the five themes of Day 1 were discussed one by one. For each theme a spokesperson from one of the groups briefly presented the results of the group discussion (2 to 5 minutes) before a brief plenary discussion of the theme. The following provides a very brief overview and some preliminary observations from these five main theme plenary presentations. Thus, it also gives an idea about the content of the breakout group discussions.

### **Theme 1: financing the welfare state**

- All groups focused on taxation in their reflections on the theme
- A "lack of transparency" in the current Danish tax system was a recurrent theme for all three groups. What is needed here, according to participants, is to "simplify matters", to make it "easier to understand what you have to pay" and to fight the "bureaucratic tyranny".
- Groups discussed flat/proportional tax rate versus progressive tax (mostly related to the question of transparency) but didn't agree on this matter. Flat tax proponents argued for transparency – progressive tax proponents argued that "the broadest shoulders should continue to bear the greatest burden".
- The only spontaneous clapping of this afternoon occurred as P 69 described the danger of thinking on welfare only in economy terms. It is "making our outlook very blinkered": "We haven't looked at the bigger picture. How do we spend our lives, and is increased purchasing power the only thing that generates increased welfare – question mark."

### **Theme 2: Safety Net**

- It was a common idea, found in all of the groups, that we must maintain a safety net for "those who are not able to contribute" (P 69). However, it is also noted, that some people just don't bother to work. Therefore, designing the safety net of the future, from the perspectives of the participants, is quite often a matter of motivating those who can contribute while still securing those who can't.
- Two of the three groups presented reflections on increased user payments on public services. *Either* related to self-inflicted risks/individual choices such as having a tattoo removed or not showing up for a Doctor appointment (it was hard for participants to agree upon where to draw the line between self-inflicted risks and not self-inflicted risks). *Or* as a possibility of buying a better welfare service than the basic offer.
- The safety net was discussed both in the narrow sense of a net catching the weak, the sick and the poor specifically; but also in the wider sense as "an insurance" (P 74) that must provide security for each and every one as we all grow old and risk having a breakdown due to work-related stress ("the plague of our time" P 62).

### **Theme 3: Priorities**

- All groups spoke of the importance of prioritizing education.
- All groups spoke of the importance of thinking not only on education as high schools and universities but also as vocational training and the importance of prioritizing manual labour (“Why should 60% of a certain year go to high school and university, when that probably isn't necessary?” P 80)
- Other areas that should be prioritized according to either one or two of the groups include elderly care, family policies (so that Danish women want to have children again), health, the natural resources of the country and a better management of the public sector.
- Areas that, according to at least one of the groups, should be given a lower priority include: National Service (“that it's sort of a waste of resources, taking a bunch of young people and sending them somewhere to run around” (P 62)); bureaucracy and administration (“Replacing all the Djøf civil servant mid layers that have spread into administration, replacing all the bureaucrats – not all of them, but there is a lot of excessive administration of teachers and healthcare workers – so that there is someone who can look after the small and the sick” (P 80); paying for self-inflicted risks.

### **Theme 4: Responsibility and Motivation**

- All three groups discussed the responsibility of the individual; including the moral question of how to promote responsible lives where people contribute if they are capable of it and avoiding a “consumerist demand-mentality” where the individual acts egoistically
- Within this overall frame of responsibility/solidarity versus selfishness/individualism the respective groups discussed different subtopics. Some had a focus on how to change the mentality of all of us (“We need to pull ourselves together!” P 53), while other had a focus on the mentality of specific target groups (e.g social assistance benefit recipients or immigrants). Thus, one group discussed whether or not the institutions of the welfare state (for instance childcare institutions) are overprotective and thus doesn't teach the citizens how to be self-responsible. Another group discussed the dilemmas of dealing with benefit fraud (especially related to people outside of the labour market): Should you control all clients, so you catch the one out of 10 who cheat the system – or is it bad idea to punish the 90 percent, who haven't done anything wrong?
- Solutions mentioned include: That parents take responsibility when raising their children; a new form of mandatory civic duty where young people learn about rights and duties and the importance of contributing to society (one participant proposed to call it “Citizen Fun” P 82); that welfare institutions exposed children more to the consequences of existence – rather than shielding them in safe classrooms.

### **Theme 5: Productivity**

- Presentations were primarily focused on how to increase the amount of people being active and productive on the labor market. Specifically, presentations touched upon demographical changes and how to deal with these
- Especially two issues seemed to be paramount for participants here: (1) How to keep people on the labour market for as many years as possible and (2) how to integrate new generations of young workers into the labour market
- Specific Danish politicians were recurrently used as bad examples (“they *should* be role models”) and denounced as hypocrites in the presentations of the different theme discussions (“Take for example our new Minister of Defense, who never wanted to be a politician again, incidentally, who went and said it should pay to work. But since he was voted out of the Folketing [Danish Parliament] he has received 52,000 a month. And he will continue to get that for 2 years” P 62). Such examples occurred across the different discussions of the two days.

## Day 2 – Afternoon session

On Day 2, all participants were asked to play the role as expert advisors for the Danish government and to come up with a line of policy proposals during the five breakout group discussions of the day. The five themes for Day 2 were *Inequality, Immigration, Gender, Intergenerational Issues and Labour Market*. Specifically, all groups were asked to agree on three concrete policy proposals for each the five themes discussed on day 2, giving a total of 45 proposals.

All participants gathered in the large conference in the middle of the afternoon. The policy proposals were briefly presented one by one and following each presentation participants voted either for or against the proposition – or refrained from voting.

The proposals and the number of votes for and again are summarized in the following table. Total amount of voters varies, as participants could choose to refrain from voting.

*Three brief, speculative observations regarding the voting process:*

- (a) It seems that the more abstract and less specific the policy proposals were, the better were their chances of receiving a lot of ‘yes’-votes. Slogan-type suggestions (“faster processing”/“equal pay for equal work”) generally received a lot of yes-votes.
- (b) It seems that a critical remark or question raised just before the voting process could potentially influence the voting process
- (c) Participants generally seemed to vote for proposals that tend to safeguard target groups such as “the unable”, “the weak” and “the sick”. Yet, participants also show quite a concern with separating those who are actually weak from those who only seem or pretend to be weak (especially visible in discussions on immigrants and unemployed) and it is hard for participants to find support for proposals, that will raise taxes.

Breakout group	Policy proposal	Yes	No	Policy number
<b>Inequality</b>				
Green	We need to safeguard the value of low incomes. The people in our society that earn the least must be safeguarded and maintained at a real value.	32	0	<b>1</b>
Green	There needs to be transparency in the tax system we have and that we should be able to understand it.	31	1	<b>2</b>
Green	(NB: Due to some disagreement the group created two versions of number 3) There should be balanced redistribution through the tax system, like today, with progressive taxation. So that the rich pay more tax.	27	4	<b>3a</b>
Green	The tax system should provide a greater degree of redistribution than we have today. So that it is more progressive and with possibly bigger deductions for vulnerable groups. So a greater degree of redistribution than today.	9	20	<b>3b</b>
Yellow	Regulating severance pay as a percentage of a persons salary (avoiding ‘golden handshakes’)	15	10	<b>4</b>

Yellow	Increased tax on non-wage income (owning a home, through speculation, through capital, through pension schemes which increase; anything that's income that's not directly related to the hourly wage for the work you do)	10	19	5
Yellow	Remuneration based on contribution and not automatically as a result of, for example, qualifications (why is a teaching assistant's contribution considered less valuable than that of a lawyer?)	8	19	6
White	Keep the current system and guarantee the same rights to welfare services and basic or core services such as health care and education	31	1	7
White	This proposal has two elements to it: (a) relating to the income of those on the bottom, we want to ensure that there is an absolute poverty line and that people don't fall below it.(b) is that we don't want to tax people who create value in society so that they become pushed out by the state.	22	2	8
White	People who receive a (free) education in Denmark are committed to spend a period of time working in Denmark.	14	13	9
<b>Immigration</b>				
Green	Immigration is an equal resource. We need opinion-influencers and politicians to make us understand that immigrants are a resource.	23	5	10
Green	We must have the same rules throughout the EU with regard to immigration specifically. In terms of what services and benefits they should get.	23	6	11
Green	Keep immigrant benefits on the same level as now (no further tightening), because we actually believe that will prevent it from becoming a further problem looking ahead to 2040	13	11	12
Yellow	Family reunification only if they can be self-sufficient and only available to immediate family.	22	2	13
Yellow	You need to demonstrate willingness to integrate. There must be a desire to learn the language and obey the laws. There should be some objective, contrastable criteria for when a person should be considered to have made an effort to be a part of our society.	19	2	14
Yellow	Qualified immigration: We must strategically attract people who contribute more than they take	26	0	15
White	All those who come to Denmark need to be processed more quickly than today to see whether we can use them or not	31	1	16
White	We need a fixed quota for how many refugees or immigrants we can have in this country. Can we cope with 3 million or can we only manage 300,000, or perhaps just 3,000? We suggest an upper limit in terms of how many society can absorb.	13	14	17

White	We shouldn't have any passive dependency. We ought to look at people as resources when they come into the country and that we have an interest in making sure that they contribute.	28	1	<b>18</b>
<b>Gender</b>				
Green	Men and women should have the same rights when it comes to their children (fathers should have the same right as mothers)	32	0	<b>19</b>
Green	It should be easier for both sexes to go part-time or work flexible hours	24	8	<b>20</b>
Green	We believe that some of the gender inequalities will resolve itself due to the high level of education among women today, and that it will eventually rub off on the labour market where they will automatically get more top jobs (vote yes if you believe us)	23	3	<b>21</b>
Yellow	A shared parental fund (limiting labour market discrimination of young women)	29	1	<b>22</b>
Yellow	Counteracting gender stereotypes (e.g. that male educators aren't allowed to be alone with children)	29	0	<b>23</b>
Yellow	More information and less regulation: We shouldn't regulate using legislation or regulate in relation to gender roles. We need to focus more on information so that people can relate to the issues and make informed decisions on that basis.	29	1	<b>24</b>
White	Men's right to paternity leave. As an opportunity, not as a duty.	24	1	<b>25</b>
White	<i>(NB: White only has two gender proposals)</i> We're moving in the right direction but we're not there yet. We're in favour of equal pay for equal work.	32	0	<b>26</b>
White	Blank			<b>27</b>
<b>Generations</b>				
Green	Increased opportunity for self-care with the possibility of compensation	28	3	<b>28</b>
Green	We concluded that we should focus on people stepping back from the labour market based on need rather than age. And we're talking about the individual's needs, not the needs of society.	27	3	<b>29</b>
Green	We promote making it more attractive financially to have children at a younger age - but we're not sure how we'd do that.	17	8	<b>30</b>
Yellow	Improve the quality of life of older people, through grants for senior housing and better possibilities for volunteer work	31	1	<b>31</b>
Yellow	We wish to increase the focus on welfare technology. Examples of things that exist already include beds that help old people get up and something that helps them put their socks on. That means that we won't have to send a nurse out just to help someone put their socks on.	29	0	<b>32</b>



Yellow	If you don't want to work in Denmark after your education you will need to repay the state education support you've received. If you don't then you need to pay it back.	21	5	<b>33</b>
White	We need to preserve the basic old-age pension provision and means-test supplementary services. We would like for there to still be a fundamental pension provision but for supplementary services to be regulated based on income.	30	2	<b>34</b>
White	We retain a pension system where there's a basic amount and some additional services which are means-tested. However, this is a proposal to means-test the basic amount also.	15	14	<b>35</b>
White	We don't want to see any further cuts in the area of education in the future.	32	0	<b>36</b>
<b>Labor Market</b>				
Green	We believe that the Danish labour market model, also known as the Danish model, must be maintained, including the flexibility that allows for negotiation between the social partners.	31	0	<b>37</b>
Green	We believe that priority must be given to actively use our resources on education in order to create growth and jobs	25	2	<b>38</b>
Green	Workers from other countries should be paid the same as Danish workers, including the minimum wage, when they work in Denmark.	30	0	<b>39</b>
Yellow	Flexible working lives (Both parents might work part-time, 32 hours a week, while their children are aged 0-5 years old and then they work 39 hours a week for the next x number of years. So people would adapt their working hours to give themselves more free time in a certain period and vice-versa).	21	5	<b>40</b>
Yellow	Fewer resources on activation, job centres, activation programmes, work attitudes, etc.	16	8	<b>41</b>
Yellow	Maintain the Danish system but introduce a statutory minimum wage law for the social partners to build on. A bit like in Germany	22	7	<b>42</b>
White	NB: Proposal removed due to incorrect formulation			<b>43</b>
White	Social assistance should be maintained at the level of state education support for those under 30, same as it is today.	21	4	<b>44</b>
White	All kind of work is valuable. It's important to state that no job is better than another. That could for example be highlighted by holding a Danish Tradesmen's Championship.	28	0	<b>45a</b>
White	there should be a politically established minimum wage in areas where collective agreements do not stipulate a lowest wage. It's basically another way of saying the same thing (as proposal 42)	23	6	<b>45b</b>

## Breakout group sessions

Participants were in the same breakout groups on day 1 and day 2 – and each day included five group theme discussions. Each group was a mixture of participants with different backgrounds, e.g. different incomes, different ages (varied between 22 and 70 years), different political observations and labour market positions. However, the green group included three participants with an immigrant background (opposed to none in the two other groups); the white group included two unemployed participants (none in the two other groups); and the white group included four self-employed (as opposed to one and none in the two other groups). It should also be noted, that all participants live in the capital region of Denmark.

The following pages provide a brief, quantified overview of the discussions in the three groups. Inspired by the reports from the UK and Germany research teams, we chose to focus on (a) the activity of all of the participants and (b) the number of differences to the main themes that were agreed upon. The numbers indicate the total amount of references to a participant or a specific theme on the two days.<sup>1</sup>

## The green group

### Participants in the green group:

- Seven women and five men
- The average age was 41 years
- Three students, four public-sector employees, three private sector employees, one self-employed and one retired
- Three had parents from without an EU country
- Eight voted for a left-wing coalition party at the latest national election, two votes for a right wing party and two didn't answer the question
- Three participants in the green group were only present on the first day

### Most active participants in the green group:

Coincidentally, the three most active participants from the green group all have exactly 127 references.

1. Participant 55 (127 references)  
male, 51, 1 child in household, teacher (vulnerable children), personal gross annual income (GAI from now on) 500.000-600.000 kr., Danish, Social Democrat
2. Participant 69 (127 references)  
male, 64, head of office, GAI 800.000-900.000 kr., Danish, centre-left-wing
3. Participant 85 (127 references)  
female, 25, student (cosmetician), GAI 0-99.999 kr., Danish, The Alternative (centre-leftwing party)
4. Participant 60 (75 references)  
male, 35, PhD Student (food studies), GAI 300.000-400.000 kr., Danish, Venstre (centre-rightwing party)

---

<sup>1</sup> Unfortunately, we have not yet found the time to provide a more thick and thorough qualitative evaluation of the many lively discussions in the focus groups throughout the two days. However, the final policy proposals do indicate some of the ideas discussed during the focus group discussions

5. Participant 75 (64 references)  
female, 33, social worker, 300.000-400.000 kr., Danish, Socialist People Party (centre-leftwing party)
6. Participant 84 (57 references)  
male, 70, disability pensioner, GAI 0-99.000 kr., Danish, Liberal Alliance (rightwing party)
7. Participant 87 (50 references)  
female, 23, student, GAI 100.000-200.000 kr., both parents born outside of the EU, did not vote
8. Participant 66 (43 references)  
female, 33, Social worker/case worker, GAI 200.000-300.000, Danish, Socialist People's Party (centre leftwing party). NB: Due to illness, she was only present on Day 1.
9. Participant 59 (37 references)  
female, 69, retired, doesn't want to give info on GAI, Danish, Social Democrat
10. Participant 52 (27 references)  
female, 34, 2 children in household (12 and 13 years), Laboratory technician, doesn't want to give info on GAI, both parents from Iraq, doesn't want to give info on political viewpoint
11. Participant 58 (7 references)  
female, 35, Support Manager, GAI 300.000-400.000 kr., Danish, the Radical Left (centre party). NB: She only participated on day 1
12. Participant 73 (0 references)  
male, 22,, self-employed shop owner, GAI 200.000-300.000 kr., mother from Lebanon father from Iraq, The Unity List/Enhedslisten (leftwing party) . NB: Was only present on day 1

#### **Total number of references to the main themes – green group**

	<b>Main theme</b>	<b>Total number of references</b>
1	Labour Market	310
2	Intergenerational issues	128
3	Welfare State Financing	120
4	Immigration	84
5	Taxation	84
6	Gender	81
7	Income inequality	74
8	Childcare and parenting	73
9	Funding or financing priority	73
10	Productivity	70
11	Social Safety Net	62
12	Unemployment	52
13	Education	38
14	Old-age pensions	28
15	Healthcare	16

## The yellow group

### Participants in the yellow group:

- Seven women and four men
- Average age was 49
- Two students, two unemployed, two public-sector employees, two private-sector employees, three retired
- None had parents from without the EU
- Four voted for left-wing coalition parties at latest election. Six voted for right-wing coalition parties. One didn't vote

### Most active participants

1. Participant 62 (134 references)  
male, 32, jurist (public sector), GAI 400.000-500.000 kr., Danish, Socialist People's Party (centre-leftwing)
2. Participant 57 (75 references)  
male, 30, accounts manager (private sector), GAI 400.000-500.000, Danish, Danish People's Party (rightwing party)
3. Participant 68 (55 references)  
male, 70, pensioner, GAI 100.000-200.000 kr., Danish, Socialist People's Party (centre-leftwing party)
4. Participant 83 (55 references)  
female, 56, secretary, won't provide GAI info, Danish, Liberal Alliance (rightwing party)
5. Participant 72 (48 references)  
female, 51, unemployed, GAI 100.000-200.000 kr., Danish, Danish People's Party (rightwing party)
6. Participant 50 (43 references)  
female, 68, pensioner, GAI 100.000-200.000 kr., Danish, The Alternative (centre-leftwing party)
7. Participant 79 (43 references)  
male, 65, children in household between 7 and 15 years, pensioner, GAI 200.000-300.000kr., Danish, Venstre (centre-rightwing party)
8. Participant 78 (33 references)  
female, 61, unemployed, won't provide GAI info, Danish, Danish People's Party (centre-rightwing party)
9. Participant 54 (24 references)  
female, 24, studies public administration at the University, GAI 0 - 99.000 kr., Danish, The Alternative (centre-leftwing party)
10. Participant 64 (20 references)  
female, 23, studies communication and media at a University, GAI 0 - 99.000 kr., Danish, doesn't remember who she voted for
11. Participant 70 (7 references)  
female, 59, nurse, GAI 300.00-400.000 kr., Danish, Liberal Alliance (rightwing party)

### Total number of references to main themes – Yellow breakout group

	Main theme	References
1	Labour Market	191
2	Intergenerational issues	96
3	Welfare State Financing	89
4	Immigration	69

5	Funding or Financing Priority	56
6	Income Inequality	49
7	Education	47
8	Gender	42
9	Unemployment	42
10	Taxation	41
11	Healthcare	39
12	Social Safety Net	38
13	Productivity	34
14	Childcare and Parenting	29
15	Old-age Pensions	21

## White breakout group

Participants in the white group

- Seven women and five men
- Average age was 47
- Four self-employed, two students, three private sector employees, one public sector employee and two retired

## Most active participants in the white group

1. Participant 67 (112 references)  
male, 56, retired IT-company CEO, pensioner, GAI 300.000-400.000 kr., Danish, Danish People's Party
2. Participant 65 (72 references)  
female, 23, studies philosophy, GAI 0 - 99.000 kr., Danish, The Unity List/Enhedslisten (leftwing party)
3. Participant 74 (71 references)  
male, 33, consultant, GAI 500.000-600.000 kr., Danish (with a Swedish father), did not vote
4. Participant 61 (55 references)  
female, 36, 1 child in household (3 months old), Group Lead Manager, 800.000-900.000 kr., Venstre (centre-rightwing party)
5. Participant 82 (48 references)  
female, 50, self-employed, GAI 600.000-700.000 kr., Danish, Venstre (centre-rightwing party)
6. Participant 76 (45 references)  
male, 64, self-employed environmental consultant, doesn't want to provide info on GAI, Danish, The Unity List/Enhedslisten (leftwing party)
7. Participant 80 (30 references)  
female, 63, early pensioner, GAI 200.000-300.000 kr., Danish, Venstre (centre-rightwing party)
8. Participant 56 (29 references)  
Female, 32, 1 child in household (1,5 years), Studies (Idræt), GAI 0 - 99.000 kr., Danish, The Socialist People's Party (centre left-wing)
9. Participant 71 (25 references)  
male, 62, Teacher (technical college), GAI 400.000-500.000 kr., Danish (German father), The Socialist People's Party
10. Participant 77 (17 references)  
female, 49, self-employed consultant (educating), GAI 400.000-500.000, Danish, The Alternative (centre leftwing party)

11. Participant 81 (11 references)  
male, 69, selfemployed consultant (communicating expert knowledge), GAI 600.000-700.000, Danish, Venstre (centre-rightwing)
12. Participant 53 (9 references)  
male, 27, PhD student (technical engineer – employed at the Technical University of Denmark), GAI 300.000-400.000, Danish, The Radical Left (Centre party)

#### **Top themes discussed in the white breakout group**

	<b>Main theme</b>	<b>Total number of references</b>
1	Labour Market	158
2	Intergenerational issues	97
3	Welfare State Financing	79
4	Immigration	69
5	Social safety net	52
6	Income inequality	51
7	Gender	47
8	Funding or financing	46
9	Taxation	37
10	Childcare and Parenting	35
11	Education	34
12	Unemployment	34
13	Old-age Pensions	30
14	Productivity	28
15	Healthcare	6