A Meta Analysis of County, Gender, and Year Specific Effects of Active Labour Market Programmes

Agne Lauzadyte

Department of Economics, University of Aarhus

E-Mail: alauzadyte@econ.dk

and

Michael Rosholm

Department of Economics, Aarhus School of Business

E-Mail: ROM@asb.dk

1. Introduction

Unemployment was high in Denmark during the 1980s and 90s, reaching a record level of 12.3% in 1994. Consequently, there was a perceived need for new actions and policies in the combat of unemployment, and a law Active Labour Market Policies (ALMPs) was enacted in 1994. The instated policy marked a dramatic regime change in the intensity of active labour market policies. After the reform, unemployment has decreased significantly – in 1998 the unemployment rate was 6.6% and in 2002 it was 5.2%.

TABLE 1. UNEMPLOYMENT IN DANISH COUNTIES

(EXCL. BORNHOLM) IN 1990 - 2004, %

	1990	**1992**	**1994**	**1996**	**1998**	**2000**	**2002**	**2004**
Country	*9,7*	*11,3*	*12,3*	*8,9*	*6,6*	*5,4*	*5,2*	*6,4*
Copenhagen and Frederiksberg	12,3	14,9	16	12,8	8,8	5,7	5,8	6,9
Copenhagen county	6,9	9,2	10,6	7,9	5,6	4,2	4,1	5,3
Frederiksborg county	6,6	8,4	9,7	6,9	4,8	3,7	3,7	4,5
Roskilde county	7	8,8	9,7	7,2	4,9	3,8	3,8	4,6
Western Zelland county	10,9	12	13	9,3	6,8	5,6	5,2	6,7
Storstrøms county	11,5	12,8	14,3	10,6	8,3	6,6	6,2	6,6
Funen county	11,1	12,7	14,1	8,9	6,7	6,5	6	7,3
Southern Jutland county	9,6	10,6	10,8	7,2	5,4	5,2	5,3	6,4
Ribe county	9	9,9	9,9	7	5,2	4,6	4,5	5,2
Vejle county	9,2	10,7	11,3	7,6	6	4,8	4,9	6,1
Ringkøbing county	7,7	8,4	8,8	6,4	4,8	4,1	4,1	5,3
Århus county	10,5	12	12,8	9,3	7,2	6,2	6	7,1
Viborg county	8,6	9,5	9,6	7,2	5,1	4,6	4,3	4,9
Northern Jutland county	12,9	14,5	15,1	10,7	8,1	7,2	6,8	8,7

Source: www.statistikbanken.dk

However, the unemployment rates and their evolution over time differ between Danish counties, see Table 1. It has fallen by astonishing 64% in the

Municipalities of Copenhagen and Frederiksberg, while in Southern Jutland the decline was more modest, slightly above 50%. In two of the traditionally most problematic counties, Northern Jutland and Storstrøm, the unemployment rate fell from a level around 14-15% and by 55% and 57%, respectively. The Table shows that while the unemployment rates show some variation, the relative changes from business cycle trough to peak is of the same order of magnitude in all municipalities.

The goal of the new labour market policies was to upgrade the skills of long-term unemployed to bring them back into employment. The ALMPs are seen as an important part of the Danish 'Flexicurity' model, see e.g. Andersen & Svarer (2006), which consists of flexible hiring and firing rules on the Danish labour market, a fairly generous unemployment insurance system, and a fairly strict set of rules and regulations regarding availability for work. The aim of ALMPs in Denmark is twofold; first, it is designed to upgrade the skills of the unemployed workers to improve their chaces of finding employment, and second, they serve as availability tests, and to some extent as 'threats' (for more on threat effects, see Black et al., 2003, and Rosholm & Svarer, 2004).

As a consequence of this dual purpose, there has been some debate over the impacts of the programs in terms of their most important purpose, the upgrading of skills; indeed, most analyses that have been conducted have shown that ALMPs in general have quite disappointing effects, see e.g. Rosholm & Svarer (2004) and Munch & Skipper (2004). Most analyses on Danish data seem to agree, however, that subsided employment in the private sector shortens

unemployment duration, see Bolvig et al. (2003) and Graversen (2004).

The law on ALMPs implied the same rules regarding eligibility and participation in programs to be applicable in all regions of the country, but it may still be the case that the impacts of these policies at the individual level differs between municipalities for a number of reasons; first, the composition of the unemployed workers may differ between regions, and second, the labour markets may differ, and some labour markets may be more receptive of ALMPs than others. Third, it may be the case that the composition of instruments used, or the type and/or quality of courses offered to unemployed workers, may differ between counties.

In this paper we study regional and annual variations in ALMP impacts, and try to relate these differences to differences in composition, labour markets, and the characteristics of unemployment and program use. We first estimate timing-of-events duration models, following local tradition in the program evaluation literature (see Rosholm and Svarer, 2004). First, the duration model comprises a dynamic approach to the evaluation of ALMPs, and second, the timing of events model of Abbring & van den Berg (2003), allows for selection on observed as well as unobserved variables under relatively mild assumptions.

The effects of ALMPs are separated into two effects - a locking-in effect and a post-program effect. During the program participation period, job search intensity may be lowered since there is less time to search for a job, and because the individual might want to complete an ongoing skill-enhancing activity. Therefore, a decline in the job finding rate is expected during this period, and

this is called the locking-in effect. The post-program effect covers the period after participation in a program. If an individual's employability has been increased by program participation, an increase in the job finding rate is expected. The combination of these two effects consequently determines the net effect of ALMPs on unemployment duration, which is also calculated. The net impact on the expected duration of unemployment is calculated for each of four different programs; private sector employment subsidies, public sector temporary jobs, education and training programs, and other programs. The impact of each program is estimated separately by counties, and for separate years withing each county.

Subsequently, these estimated impacts, by gender, program, year, and county, are related to a number of explanatory variables describing the local labour market composition, the composition of programs, and the structure of local unemployment. This is done by the use of meta analysis, which is a technique for analyzing and summarizing the results of different studies, each of which is focused on the same question. The idea to use meta-analysis to measure the effectiveness of European ALMPs was first implemented by Kluve and Schmidt (2002), who summarized a total of 53 European active labour market programs. Further it was developed by Kluve (2006), when he summarized effects of European ALMPs from all European evaluation studies available to that date (95 different evaluation studies).

In Kluve (2006), the implementation of the analysis first considers a binomial outcome, i.e. whether the evaluation of a program finds a positive treatment

effect or not. The framework of probit regression is used, where education programs are taken as the base category, i.e. the effects of the ALMPs are judged relative to these programs. Kluve (2006) finds, that education programs in European countries tend to produce a modest positive impact on the post-program employment rates. He also reports out that private sector incentive programs and Services and Sanctions show a much better performance - they are 40-50 % more likely to give a positive impact than the traditional education programs. He concludes with the policy advice, that education programs should be continued and private sector incentive schemes should be fostered.

The structure of the paper is the following: the next section describes the elements of Danish Active Labour Market Policies. The econometric model is explained in section 3, while section 4 presents the data and section 5 - meta analysis technique. Estimation results are discussed in section 6, section 7 presents the meta analysis findings, and section 8 concludes.

2. Danish Active Labour Market Policies

The Danish unemployment system is split in two parts, depending on whether the concerned unemployed individual is eligible for unemployment insurance (UI) benefits or not. Approximately 20% of the labour force are not eligible for UI benefits, and they may instead receive unemployment assistance, which is administrated by the municipalities, and where the rules and regulations concerning active policies differ slightly from those that apply to UI recipients. As this paper is mainly concerned with UI recipients, in the following we will present only the policies that apply to individuals receving UI benefits.

The "rights and obligations" principle is the key principle of the current Danish labour market policy. The principle is based on the right of individual to the compensation for the loss of income, but also on the obligation to take action to get back into employment. The society has the obligation to help the individual to improve his situation on the one hand, but on the other hand the society has the right to make requirements of the individual concerned.

The length of the period during which an unemployed individual can receive UI benefits has been reduced significantly since the 1994 reform. Before the reform in 1994, participation in programs led to renewed eligibility for UI benefits. In 1994, this renewal of eligibility rule was abandoned, such that only ordinary employment during a period of time would lead to renewed eligibility. In 1994, the maximum UI benefit duration was 7 years, including a 4 year 'passive' period and subsequently a 3 year 'active' period. This duration has gradually be reduced from 1994 to 1999 such that currently the maximum UI benefit period is 4 years. After 4 years of UI benefit receipt, an individual should have at least 26 weeks of full time employment in order to renew benefit eligibility.

The passive period lasts 1 year and the active period 3 years. During the active period the unemployed person is required to participate in active labour market programs for at least 75% of the time. Programs can also be offered during the passive period based on the regional labour market council's evaluation of the regional needs, or in order to test the availability for work of a certain individual or group of individuals. The unemployed individual has the obligations to accept all programs offered and to be available for both non-subsidized

and subsidized work. However, only a fairly low fraction of the unemployed participate in programs during the passive period.

Programs are categorized into 4 types by the National Labour Market Authority:

* Subsidized employment programs with private employers. The individual is employed in the private sector for a 6 - 9 months period, and the employer is paid the subsidy corresponding to roughly 50% of the minimum wage.

* Subsidized employment programs with public employers. These programs offer the individual temporary (6 - 12 months) jobs in public sector institutions.

* Education/training programs. These include all types (usually short-lasting) training programs, based on the background of the unemployed individual concerned.

* Other programs, which include all programs that cannot be classified within one of the categories above. A variety of programs is covered by this group, for example job search assistance, competence detection programs, individual specialized job training (in case the unemployed individual cannot take ordinary training programs), job rotation (when leave taken by employees is combined with a job training contract for unemployed workers), pool jobs (the jobs in the public sector of up to 3 years duration, having the goal to create more permanent jobs in the priority fields), etc.

3. Econometric model

The research is done using the timing-of-events model for identifying treatment effects in a duration model framework, developed by Abbring & van den Berg (2003).

The timing-of-events model simultaneously models the transition rate out of unemployment, and the transition rate into the ALMPs. The model is intended to correct for non-random selection into programs, with respect to observed as well as unobserved variables. Abbring & van den Berg (2003) show that with an assumption of 1) mixed proportional hazards and 2) a non-defective distribution of time until participation in ALMPs given observed explanatory variables, the parameters of interest - say, the effect of participation in ALMPs - are identified non-parametrically. The implication is that there is no need for an exclusion restriction, that is, a variable which appears in the selection equation, but which does not affect the outcome variable, in this case the hazard rate out of unemployment. The intuition is that random variation in the timing of the event of participation in ALMPs separates the treatment effect from the distribution of unobserved heterogeneity, which is assumed to be time-invariant.

Let us T_u be a random variable denoting the duration of an unemployment spell, and let T_p be another random variable denoting the time from entry into unemployment until participation in the first ALMP. When we have $T_p < T_u$, the individual participates in an ALMP during the unemployment spell. If $T_p \leq T_u$, then T_p is censored, and the individual did not participate in an ALMP before T_u.

Let $\mathbf{X}(t)$ be a vector of observed exogenous explanatory variables, and let V_u, and $V_p = (V_{p1}, V_{p2}, V_{p3}, V_{p4})$, denote the unobserved variables possibly affecting the exit rate out of unemployment and the entry rates into the four different types of ALMPs.

The hazard into ALMPs is the sum of four cause-specific hazard rates, one for each type of ALMP:

$$\theta_p(t_p|\mathbf{x}(t_p), v_p) = \sum_{i=1}^{4} \theta_{pi}(t_p|\mathbf{x}(t_p), v_{pi}). \qquad (1)$$

Each of these cause-specific hazards is assumed to be of the mixed proportional hazard type,

$$\theta_{pi}(t_p|\mathbf{x}(t_p), v_{pi}) = \lambda_{pi}(t_p) \exp\left(\mathbf{x}(t_p)\boldsymbol{\beta}_{pi} + v_{pi}\right). \qquad (2)$$

Now we define two time varying vectors of indicator variables, $\mathbf{d}_1(t)$ and $\mathbf{d}_2(t)$: $\mathbf{d}_1(t)$ is a 4×1 vector, where the $i\prime th$ element takes the value 1 if the individual participates in an ALMP of type i at time t and takes the value 0 otherwise. Note that at most one element of $\mathbf{d}_1(t)$ can take the value 1 at time t. Similarly, the $i\prime th$ element of $\mathbf{d}_2(t)$ (which is also 4×1) takes the value 1 if the individual has completed an ALMP of type i during the last 26 weeks (the implication is that we only allow ALMPs to affect the hazard rate out of unemployment up to 26 weeks after completion).

Assuming once again a mixed proportional hazard rate, the hazard rate out of unemployment in our model is specificed as

$$\theta_u(t_u|\mathbf{x}(t_u), \mathbf{d}_1(t_u), \mathbf{d}_2(t_u), v_u) =$$

$$\lambda_u(t_u) \exp\left[\mathbf{x}(t_u)\boldsymbol{\beta}_u + \mathbf{d}_1(t_u)\delta_1 + \mathbf{d}_2(t_u)\delta_2 + v_u\right]. \tag{3}$$

The parameter δ_1 here measures the locking-in effect, while δ_2 - the post-program effect. In the estimations performed below, we will allow for separate effects of programs that start in different years, but for expositional convenience, this interaction - between participation and completion indicators on the one side, and year dummies on the other - has been ignored.

The timing-of-events model takes into account potential endogeneity of $\mathbf{d}_1(t)$ and $\mathbf{d}_2(t)$ by allowing for correlation between the two unobserved components, V_u and V_p. That is, this methods allows for selection on unobservables as well as observed explanatory variables.

We define C_u as an indicator variable that takes the value 1 when the unemployment spells are completed and 0 for right censored unemployment spells, and so the contribution to the likelihood function of an individual with J unemployment spells, given observed and unobserved characteristics, is:

$$\mathcal{L}(v_u, v_p) = \prod_{j=1}^{J} \theta_p(t_{pj}|\mathbf{x}(t_{pj}), v_p)^{1\{t_{pj}<t_{uj}\}} \times$$
$$\theta_u(t_{uj}|\mathbf{x}(t_{uj}), d_1(t_{uj}), \mathbf{d}_2(t_{uj}), v_u)^{C_u} \tag{4}$$
$$\times \exp\left[-\int_0^{t_{pj}} \theta_p(s|\mathbf{x}(s), v_p)ds - \int_0^{t_{uj}} \theta_u(t|\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{d}_1(t), \mathbf{d}_2(t), v_u)dt\right],$$

and the likelihood function then can be expressed as:

$$\mathcal{L} = \iint \mathcal{L}(v_u, v_p)dG(v_u, v_p), \tag{5}$$

where $G(\cdot,\cdot)$ is a bivariate distribution function for (v_u, v_p).

The expected duration of an unemployment spell may be calculated as

$$E[T_u|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}_1, \mathbf{d}_2, \mathbf{v}_u] = \int_0^\infty S(t|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}_1, \mathbf{d}_2, \mathbf{v}_u)dt$$

where the time-variation in the explanatory variables has been ignored for analytical convenience.

3.1 Identification

Identification in the timing-if-events model is based on two assumptions, as mentioned above: a 'distributional' assumption, requiring the hazard rates to be specified as mixed proportional hazards, and a 'no anticipation' assumption, which implies that the individual is allowed to know the distribution of time until program participation and the distribution of program types, but not the exact moment at which he will participate.

3.2 Parametrization

We assume all baseline hazard rates to be piecewise constant (that is $\lambda_j(t) = \exp(\alpha_{jm})$, $m = 1, ..., M_j$, where M_j is the number of intervals for baseline hazard j). The following cut-off points for the intervals are used for all hazard rates (the unemployment duration and time until program participation are both measured in weeks): 4, 13, 26, 39, 52, 65, 78, 91, 104, 156.

With such a parametrixation, it is straightforward to show that the expected

duration of an unemployment spell is equal to

$$E[T_u|\mathbf{x},\mathbf{d}_1,\mathbf{d}_2,\mathbf{v}_u] = \sum_{m=1}^{M_u} \frac{1}{h_i^m(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{d}_1,\mathbf{d}_2,\mathbf{v}_u)} \cdot \mathbf{P}\left(\tau_{m-1} < T_u \leq \tau_m|\mathbf{x},\mathbf{d}_1,\mathbf{d}_2,\mathbf{v}_u\right)$$

where the τ_m denote the cut-off for the intervals, and h_i^m the value of the hazard rate in interval m, and $\mathbf{P}\left(\tau_{m-1} < T_u \leq \tau_m|\mathbf{x},\mathbf{d}_1,\mathbf{d}_2,\mathbf{v}_u\right)$ the probability that an individual leaves unemployment in the m'th interval.

For the mixture distribution, we apply a discrete distribution with two points of support for each of the marginal distributions of the unobserved variables. Let (v_u^1, v_u^2) and (v_{pi}^1, v_{pi}^2), $i = 1,2,3,4$, be the mass-points of V_u and V_{pi}, respectively. The associated probabilities are then:

$$P_1 = Pr(V_u = v_u^1, V_{p1} = v_{p1}^1, V_{p2} = v_{p2}^1, V_{p3} = v_{p3}^1, V_{p4} = v_{p4}^1),$$

$$P_2 = Pr(V_u = v_u^2, V_{p1} = v_{p1}^1, V_{p2} = v_{p2}^1, V_{p3} = v_{p3}^1, V_{p4} = v_{p4}^1),$$

$$P_3 = Pr(V_u = v_u^1, V_{p1} = v_{p1}^2, V_{p2} = v_{p2}^2, V_{p3} = v_{p3}^2, V_{p4} = v_{p4}^2),$$

$$P_4 = Pr(V_u = v_u^2, V_{p1} = v_{p1}^2, V_{p2} = v_{p2}^2, V_{p3} = v_{p3}^2, V_{p4} = v_{p4}^2),$$

with $0 \leq P_i \leq 1$ for $i = 1, ..., 4$, and $\sum_{i=1}^{4} P_i = 1$. Note that the unobserved heteregeneity terms are restricted to be perfectly correlated in the four cause-specific hazard rates into programs. This is also called a factor-loading specification. It restricts the correlation between V_{pi} and V_{pj} to be either 1 or -1 if $i \neq j$. The correlation between V_u and V_p is unrestricted, which is important, since this is the correlation which is intended to correct for selection on unobservables. We normalize the distribution of the unobservables by setting $v_j^1 = 0$ for all hazard rates. This is done instead of normalising e.g. the mean

of the mixture distribution to one.

4. Data

There has been made 28 data sets - 14 for men and 14 for women in different Danish counties (excl. Bornholm) - for the research. The data was extracted from an event history data set developed by the Danish National Labour Market Authority. The event histories are based on the administrative registers, which record and govern the payments of public income transfers, as well as the register in which the employment agencies record the unemployed's participation in ALMPs. Using these event hictories, constructed by the NLMA itself, the employment agencies determine the risk that an individual becomes long-term unemployed (Hammer et al., 2004), so in this respect not only the underlying information but also the event histries themselves are considered to be a very reliable data source.

The data used in this paper covers the period from January 1, 1999 to December 31, 2004. The records are done on a weekly basis and include all time periods when the unemployed has received a public income transfer. Since this data is used for administrative purposes, it is frequently updates and therefore not merged with other registers containing information on such variables as education and work experience.

In this paper we concentrate on the unemployment spells of workers who are eligible for UI benefits since the information available for UI recipients are of a much higher quality than for social assistance recipients. An unemployment spell means the period, in which the individual is either openly unemployed or

participates in an ALMP. If there can be found four consecutive weeks out of open unemployment, when a person does not receive any other public income transfer, then he is treated as having found a job. If the individual has more than four weeks out of unemployment receiving other transfers, the unemployment spell will be characterised as right censored.

Periods out of unemployment shorter than four weeks usually include paternity leave (two weeks), holiday periods (typically up to three weeks), or short periods of sickness benefit payments and are treated as a part of the unemployment spell.

The samples consist of 25% of observations in data sets, drawn randomly.

The age of the individuals in the sample is limited between 25 and 59 (both included). Another - much stricter - umeployment policy is applicable to the individuals younger than 25 years while for those over 59 the special rules (in this case - much milder) are valid as well, so both of these age groups are excluded from our research.

The temporary unemployment is eliminated by excluding from our samples all unemployment spells lasting less than four weeks (note: about 40% of the unemployment spells belong to temporary unemployment, more than 90% of them lasting less than four weeks), since the ALMPs are not used in the case of a short term unemployment.

Description of the sample is given in Table A.1. in the Appendix.

4.1. Explanatory variables

A number of explanatory variables is used for the research. The three

age groups - *AGE30-39*, *AGE40-49* and *AGE50-59* - represent the age of the unemployed. There is a set of indicators showing the UI fund membership: *UI FUND CONSTRUCTION, UI FUND MANUFACTURING, UI FUND TECHNICIANS, UI FUND TRADE, UI FUND CLERICAL, UI FUND ACADEMICS, OTHER UI FUND*, and *UI FUND SELF-EMPLOYED*. Some of UI funds exist based on the industry, while others are based on the educational achvievements of the members. For example, *UI FUND MANUFACTURING* mainly insures unskilled workers of the manufacturing industry, and *UI FUND ACADEMICS* covers UI funds, which insure academically educated workers. Thus, the UI membership to some extent represent educational attainment, and to some extent - past occupation.

An indicator of the marital status and two indicators representing the country of origin have been included (the reference category is native Danes). The indicator that the individual lives alone is *SINGLE*. *IMMIGRANT FROM DC* covers the first and second generation immigrants from developed countries, while *IMMIGRANT FROM LDC* - immigrants from less developed countries.

There is an access to the past labour market history information. We have the data about the fraction of the time spent on public income transfers for each of the past five years, we know as well how many spells receiving public income transfers the person has experienced within the past five years. But only the information from the two last years, *TRANSFER DEGREE LAST YEAR*, *TRANSFER DEGREE TWO YEARS AGO*, *# TRANSFER SPELLS LAST YEAR*, and *# TRANSFER SPELLS LAST 2 YEARS* was significantly

different from zero in preliminary explorations, and therefore only information from these past two years before the unemployment spell is used .

Finally, we also have access to the information of sickness periods. The data from the last two years has been used in our research, for the same reason as given above.

5. Meta Analysis Framework

To summarise the effects of ALMPs in Danish counties the framework of meta-analysis – a technique for analyzing and summarizing the results of different studies, each of which is focused on the same question – is used. The meta analysis techniques have been developed and applied widely in the area of medical and natural sciences. Application of these techniques in Economics has been developed by Phillips (1994), Card and Kruger (1995), Ashenfelter and others (1999), van der Sluis and others (2004), van der Sluis and others (2005), Kluve and Schmidt (2002) and Kluve (2006). In van der Sluis and others (2005) meta-analysis of the impact of education in developing economies has been carried out using ordinary least squares and ordered probit. The meta-analysis here is defined as 'a quantitative tool that is applied to synthetize previous research findings that share common aspects that can be addresses statistically'.

The idea to use meta-analysis to measure the effectiveness of European ALMPs was first implemented by Kluve and Schmidt (2002), who summarized a total of 53 European active labour market programs. It was further developed by Kluve (2006), when he summarized effects of European ALMPs from all European evaluation studies available to that date (95 different evaluation

studies). The basic idea of meta-analysis there was to construct and analyse a data set in which each observation represented a particular program evaluation. The motivation for such an analysis was its ability to identify systematic differences across different types of ALMPs, while controlling for other factors, like economic conditions, during the period of the evaluation.

Various different programs and evaluation methods are used in order to estimate the effects of European ALMPs. Thus, talking about the problems of implementing meta-analyses, the differences among the evaluation studies tend to be an important issue. Firstly, there is a variation among the ALMPs in different countries - the programs differ in their design and in their focus on different target groups. Secondly, the institutional and economic environment differ among the countries and thirdly, there are disparities in the evaluation design and estimation techniques.

In our research these problems are not present, since the effectiveness of ALMPs in Danish counties is measured using the same methodology - the timing-of-events model for identifying treatment effects in a duration model framework, described in Section 3. The types of ALMPs do not differ among the counties either.

We have two goals of meta-analysis.

Firstly, we need to answer, which of the Danish ALMPs have shown the best performance in the counties of Denmark and in the whole country. In order to be able to get the answers, we need to summarize the annual results of the timing-of events models estimated separately for men and women in each of the

14 counties in Denmark.

We calculate the weighted averages of the net effects of the programs for men and for women in the country and at county levels. We have 28 samples (for men and for women in 14 counties). However, weighting the effects of the programs by sample sizes, as it is common in statistical analyses, is not an optimal approach in our case, since the estimated effects are based on those who participate in programs in different counties in different years. We therefore take the numbers of individuals activated in each of the ALMPs in a given calendar year as the optimal weights for our analysis.

Thus, we have: $\overline{ES}_{program} = \frac{\sum_{i,t} ES_{program,i,t} * N_{i,t}}{\sum_{i,t} N_{i,t}}$,

where $\overline{ES}_{program}$ is the average effect of a program (locking-in effect, post-program effect or net-effect);

$ES_{program,i,t}$ is the effect of a program in county i in calendar year t;

$N_{i,t}$ is the number of unemployed individuals in county i activated in the program in calendar year t;

$\sum_{i,t} N_{i,t}$ is the total number of the individuals activated in the program.

To find the country-level effect of the program we calculate a weighted average of 84 observations (from 14 counties and 6 calendar years of research). In the same way we find the average county-level effects as weighted averages of 6 annual observations.

The summarized results of Danish ALMPs' performance are presented and discussed in Section 6.

The second goal of our meta-analysis is to obtain a quantitative assessment of the factors (i.e. economic conditions, composition of the work force and the labour market, intensity of program use), which are perceived to be associated with the effect of ALMPs.

We construct two data sets - one for men and another for women - each of them having 84 observations (14 counties * 6 calendar years). The dependent variable of interest is given by the net effect of the program evaluated. The net effect is defined as the impact on the expected duration of unemployment for a standard person, and here we use the same standard person in each region. Participation is assumed to take place from week 52 in the unemployment spell. The net effect of each program is related to a set of county-level variables in a linear regression model. "Activation, %" is defined as the fraction of the unemployed individuals activated in the particular type of ALMPs (individuals activated in all 4 ALMPs types = 100%).

'Low-skilled' is the fraction of persons employed as 'lønmodtagere grundniveau' in the county in the given year. The fraction of the low-skilled workers is steadily decreasing It went down from 41.8% in 1999 to 34.9% in 2004 for men and from 44.8% to 40.4% for women. The biggest reduction in the fraction is noticeable in 2004. The county level figures varied as well: from the average of 32.5% (in Copenhagen and Frederiksberg region) to 43.7% (in Viborg county) for men and from 38.4% (in Copenhagen and Frederiksberg) to 46.4% (in Storstrøms county) for women.

'Manufacturing, %', 'Private sector, %' and 'Self-employed, %' show the

fractions of individuals employed in manufacturing, in private sector, and the self-employed individuals. In the manufacturing sector work about 21% men while for women this figure comes up to about 11.5%. The lowest fraction of manufacturing tends to be in the area of capital and around the capital (Copenhagen and Frederiksberg region, Copenhagen and Frederiksborg counties) while the biggest - in the Central Jutland (Ringkøbing, Viborg and Vejle counties). 75.3% of men work in the private sector while for women this figure comes up only to 45.5%. The highest percentages of the employed women work in social institutions (21.2%), health and education sectors (9.4% in each). Among men the most popular are the metal industry (9.6%) and construction (10.4%). These figures differ among the counties from 63.7% employed men in the private sector in Copenhagen and Frederiksberg region to 82.5% in Ringkøbing county, and from 37.3% (Storstrøm) to 51.6% (Copenhagen county) for women. 10.5% of the working force of men and 3.9% of women are self-employed. The biggest share of self-employed men is in Viborg (14.4%); of self-employed women - Storstrøm county (4.7%).

'Unemployment, %' is regional unemployment rate, '>50 years old, %' - the fraction of those older that 50 years among the 30-59 years aged unemployed individuals, that equals to about 32 - 33% for both men and women.

'Duration, weeks' is the expected unemployment duration (without activation), measured in weeks. In the standard notation of program evaluaton, this variable is $E[T_0]$, the outcome in the absence of program participation, where $E[T_1]$ is the outcome in the presence of program participation. The coefficient

to this variable will be informative about the trade-off between equity and efficiency in active labour market policy; if those with large unemployment duration are also those whose unemployment duration is reduced the most, then there is no trade-off, while in the opposite case, there is a controversy between the goals of equity and efficiency. Unemployment duration is 1.5 - 2 times longer for women than for men and differs from 8.5 weeks (men) and 17.6 weeks (women) in Viborg to 22.5 weeks (men) and 34.6 weeks (women) in Copenhagen and Frederiksberg region.

County level statistical information about unemployment is available in Tables A.8.1. - A.8.2. in the Appendix. Appendix Tables A.9.1. - A.9.8. present the fractions of low-skilled in the working population of men and women, the percentages of men and women occupied in manufacturing, the fractions of men and women in the private sector as well as the fractions of those self-employed, Tables A.10.1. - A.10.2. - the age structure (by %) of the 30-59 years aged unemployed individuals.

The analysis is conducted using a linear regression framework. To control for any permanent features of different years that may influence the net effect of the ALMPs we include year dummies. We use 1999 as the omitted year in the base category, i.e. the annual effects are judged relative to 1999.

Section 7 presents and discusses results of the meta analysis.

6. Estimation Results

This section covers the results of the research and tries to answer which of the ALMPs have shown the best performance for the employability of the

unemployed men and women and for their unemployment duration in different counties of Denmark and in the whole country. The timing-of events model is estimated separately for men and women, and for each of the 14 counties in Denmark (because of few observations, we have not estimated the model for the county of Bornholm). In addition, the models are specified with an interaction between year and program participation and completion indicators, such that the effects of programs are estimated separately by calendar year.

The results are presented in the Tables 2-6. Table 2 shows the average program effects in the country while county-level effects are presented in Tables 3-6. The best results among the four types of the ALMPs, achieved by the private job training, are marked in bold in Table 2, while in Tables 3-6 we marked in bold the three most favourable (or least harmful) results produced by the programs in Danish counties.

The effects have been averaged using methodoly explained in Section 5. 'Locking-in effect' and 'Post-program effect' in the tables show the coefficients estimated, that is, the exponential function of the reported parameter gives the multiplicative impact on the hazard rates. The 'Net effect' shows the effect of the programs on expected unemployment duration. The net effect is calculated for a 'standard person' with close to average characteristics for each of the samples used. Participation is assumed to take place after 52 weeks of unemployment, and last for 26 weeks (private and public job training), 16 weeks (education) and 8 weeks (other ALMPs).

The year and county specific effects are showed in the Appendix.Tables A.2.1

- A.6.8. Tables A.2.1. - A.2.16. here present the locking-in effects of the programs, Tables A.3.1. - A.3.16. - the post-program effects. The annual county-level results of unemployment durations (with and without program participation) are showed in Tables A.4.1. - A.4.9, while Tables A.5.1. - A.5.8 and Tables A.6.1. - A.6.8 cover the net-effects of the ALMPs and the percentage changes in unemployment duration, resulted by participation in the programs. The standard errors of the unemployment durations and net-effects of the programs will be presented in a later paper version.

TABLE 2. AVERAGE EFFECTS OF ALMPs IN DENMARK IN 1999 - 2004

	Locking-in effect, %	Post-program effect, %	Net effect (weeks)
Private job training			
Men	**-17,5**	**60,0**	**-0,21**
Women	**-12,2**	**57,6**	**-0,85**
Public job training			
Men	-58,7	-8,4	1,22
Women	-55,6	0,5	1,99
Education			
Men	-59,8	-6,6	2,01
Women	-68,4	-5,1	1,93
Other ALMPs			
Men	-25,8	-17,0	0,45
Women	-40,8	-11,2	1,00

From Table 2, where the columns for the locking-in and post program effects show the percentage change in the hazard rate, we observe that only one group of ALMPs - private sector employment programs - reduced unemployment duration, by 0.85 weeks for women and by 0.21 weeks for men. The small locking-in effect of theis program was followed by a significant positive post program effect, when the hazard rate out of unemployment was increased by

60% for men and by 57.6% for women. For education and for other ALMPs we find both locking-in and post-program effects to be negative, which leads to the positive net program effects (the programs increased unemployment duration). The post-program effect of public job training for women found to be slightly positive (0.5%), however this does not compensate the dramatic locking-in effect. The worst performance was shown by education programs, which increased unemployment duration of both men and women by about 2 weeks.

The county-level effects of private sector employment subsidy programs are presented in Table 3. The table shows that the estimated average post-program effect is positive for both men and women in all counties, and in most counties the post program effect exceeds the locking-in effect, and expected unemployment duration is reduced (except Viborg county for men, and Frederiksborg, Western Zealand and Ribe counties for women).

For both men and women, we find the best performance of private sector employment programs in Roskilde and Northern Jutland. It is worth mentioning that the program effects also look very favourable in the Copenhagen and Frederiksberg municipalities for women (1.87 weeks decrease in unemployment duration) and in Frederiksborg county for men (0.40 weeks decrease).

Overall, for private sector employment programs, we would thus conclude that there is a tendency that these programs perform better in the area around the capital, the counties with the lowest unemployment rate, and in Northern Jutland, where the unemployment rate is one of the highest in the country.

TABLE 3. EFFECTS OF PRIVATE JOB TRAINING PROGRAMS IN DANISH COUNTIES (EXCL. BORNHOLM) IN 1999 - 2004

	Locking-in effect		**Post-program effect**		**Net effect**	
	Men	**Women**	**Men**	**Women**	**Men**	**Women**
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	-25,87	**-17,83**	50,31	**91,13**	-0,05	**-1,87**
Copenhagen county	-18,93	-9,03	40,31	42,50	-0,19	-0,92
Frederiksborg county	**-1,13**	-36,50	**46,06**	37,00	**-0,40**	0,32
Roskilde county	**6,92**	**12,07**	**54,06**	**56,13**	**-0,81**	**-1,51**
Western Zelland county	-0,90	-34,70	26,84	7,81	-0,19	1,05
Storstrøms county	-23,33	-31,16	64,56	56,50	-0,13	-0,35
Funen county	-19,28	-15,21	61,18	79,39	-0,11	-0,64
Southern Jutland county	-0,44	-15,02	28,78	58,40	-0,35	-0,74
Ribe county	-35,78	-33,62	68,64	10,65	-0,02	0,86
Vejle county	3,10	0,92	68,42	64,26	-0,20	-1,12
Ringkøbing county	-11,81	18,35	55,28	38,06	-0,13	-1,19
Århus county	-18,91	-5,46	82,09	70,60	-0,30	-1,16
Viborg county	-40,03	-18,10	44,76	40,41	0,12	-0,15
Northern Jutland county	**-24,05**	**-2,19**	**93,62**	**83,08**	**-0,34**	**-1,67**

TABLE 4. EFFECTS OF PUBLIC JOB TRAINING PROGRAMS IN DANISH COUNTIES (EXCL. BORNHOLM) IN 1999 - 2004

	Locking-in effect		**Post-program effect**		**Net effect**	
	Men	**Women**	**Men**	**Women**	**Men**	**Women**
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	-61,11	-57,46	1,77	19,34	2,00	2,28
Copenhagen county	-57,96	-54,84	-12,49	-11,21	1,86	2,42
Frederiksborg county	-61,28	-54,19	-12,21	0,36	1,29	1,89
Roskilde county	-71,79	-50,20	-15,60	-16,41	1,85	2,26
Western Zelland county	-66,71	-60,77	-2,52	-2,86	1,37	2,46
Storstrøms county	-58,28	-55,37	-29,41	-2,19	1,26	1,89
Funen county	-70,82	-76,52	-17,79	2,27	0,84	2,24
Southern Jutland county	-54,16	-59,11	-5,96	-28,50	0,90	2,48
Ribe county	**-50,67**	-60,96	**-13,53**	-5,80	**0,55**	2,40
Vejle county	-53,62	-53,06	-0,42	-3,01	1,04	1,75
Ringkøbing county	-62,35	**-54,59**	-30,74	**11,52**	0,67	**1,65**
Århus county	**-48,59**	**-28,15**	**3,45**	**14,92**	**0,77**	**1,37**
Viborg county	**-62,82**	**-57,36**	**-11,01**	**6,43**	**0,58**	**1,37**
Northern Jutland county	-47,57	-52,01	-1,16	3,02	0,89	1,90

TABLE 5. EFFECTS OF EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN DANISH

COUNTIES (EXCL. BORNHOLM) IN 1999 - 2004

	Locking-in effect		**Post-program effect**		**Net effect**	
	Men	**Women**	**Men**	**Women**	**Men**	**Women**
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	-58,11	-66,95	-6,61	-5,11	2,70	2,70
Copenhagen county	-53,08	-66,08	-6,88	-8,28	2,43	2,43
Frederiksborg county	-52,80	-68,91	-11,83	-8,07	1,82	1,83
Roskilde county	-47,22	-65,04	3,89	-3,58	2,01	1,99
Western Zelland county	-45,67	-64,04	-6,44	-8,98	1,92	1,92
Storstrøms county	**-61,77**	**-69,52**	**3,68**	**-8,32**	**1,54**	**1,54**
Funen county	**-57,77**	**-65,02**	**7,00**	**-1,49**	**1,49**	**1,49**
Southern Jutland county	-58,70	-72,45	-7,85	-7,09	1,85	1,87
Ribe county	-56,52	-72,17	-0,27	-3,68	2,01	2,03
Vejle county	-67,75	-67,71	-2,02	-7,52	1,93	1,93
Ringkøbing county	-70,10	-70,72	-14,31	-14,12	1,83	1,86
Århus county	-65,41	-68,90	-11,77	-6,55	1,78	1,79
Viborg county	**-65,85**	**-69,55**	**-4,56**	**-3,12**	**1,31**	**1,32**
Northern Jutland county	-64,77	-71,32	-45,34	-3,32	1,73	1,74

TABLE 6. EFFECTS OF OTHER ALMPs IN DANISH COUNTIES

(EXCL. BORNHOLM) IN 1999 - 2004

	Locking-in effect		**Post-program effect**		**Net effect**	
	Men	**Women**	**Men**	**Women**	**Men**	**Women**
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	-18,98	-44,72	-16,55	-18,68	0,60	1,70
Copenhagen county	-27,49	-38,27	-17,65	-9,85	0,61	1,37
Frederiksborg county	-53,54	**-48,48**	-13,15	**5,72**	0,54	**0,41**
Roskilde county	-35,59	**-9,48**	-31,82	**13,75**	0,87	**-0,16**
Western Zelland county	-23,20	-25,00	-10,95	-6,19	0,30	0,43
Storstrøms county	-23,60	-31,05	-21,46	-20,16	0,39	0,87
Funen county	-38,84	-41,84	-17,20	-10,61	0,25	0,60
Southern Jutland county	-9,10	**-10,65**	-17,30	**-7,50**	0,24	**0,18**
Ribe county	**-28,85**	-63,18	**-13,44**	-2,01	**0,15**	0,83
Vejle county	-34,24	-34,49	-9,62	-8,21	0,30	0,58
Ringkøbing county	-26,21	-53,86	-22,39	-10,94	0,19	0,98
Århus county	**-7,58**	-32,54	**-17,06**	-5,93	**0,23**	0,55
Viborg county	**-32,81**	-50,31	**-21,61**	-14,50	**0,22**	0,73
Northern Jutland county	-37,03	-57,03	-15,27	-16,23	0,35	1,25

The estimated effects of the other 3 groups of ALMPs (see Tables 4-6) are not nearly as positive, in fact only few programs have a significantly positive post-program effect and they nearly all have large locking-in effects and increased unemployment durations in all except one case, especially public sector employment programs and education programs.

The application of the public sector employment programs to men (Table 4) results in negative post-program effect in most of the counties (with the exception of very slightly positive effects in Copenhagen and Frederiksberg municipalities and Aarhus county). For women, however, the estimates of post-program effects are slightly or moderately positive in half of the counties with the best result - 19.3% - found in Copenhagen and Frederiksberg. In spite of the positive post-program effect Copenhagen and Frederiksberg region experienced the most harmful consequences in the increasing of unemployment duration - by 2 weeks for men and 2.28 weeks for women. The unemployment duration increased significantly in Copenhagen and Roskilde counties.

The best results are found to be in Aarhus, where the employment probabilities for women and men increased by 15% and 3.5% respectively at the end of program participation. But even these moderate positive effects were not nearly large enough to compensate for the locking-in effect and to reduce unemployment duration.

The education programs (Table 5) on average gave the worst impacts for both men and women. In light of the fact that this is the most frequently used type of program, this is of course terribly disappointing. With the exception of Funen,

where the post-program hazard rate out of unemployment for men increased by 7%, within the whole country the post-program education effect was negative for women and negative or only very slightly positive (not larger than 4%) for men. However, the probability of leaving unemployment *during* the education period was reduced by 46-70% for men while for women it decreased by even more - 64-72%. The biggest increases in unemployment duration - 2.7 and 2.4 weeks (both men and women) have been found in Copenhagen and Frederiksberg as well as in Copenhagen county, the lowest - 1.3 weeks - in Viborg.

'Other active labour market programs' (Table 6) are found to be ineffective. The locking-in effects here are milder than in the cases of public job training and education programs. But on the other hand these (other) programs do not produce positive post-program effects either. Moreover, there are only two counties - Frederiksborg and Roskilde - that are experiencing a slightly positive post-program effect to the hazard out of unemployment of women, while for men in all the counties these effects are negative. Only for women in Roskilde county a slight - 0.16 weeks - decrease in unemployment duration is observed while in the other counties duration is increased for both men and women (with the highest increase in Copenhagen and Frederiksberg region and Copenhagen county as well as in Nothern Jutland for women and in Roskilde for men).

Based on the results above we conclude that only in one of the four groups of Danish active labour market programs - private job training – is the post-program effect large enough to counteract the locking-in effect in many of the counties and thus to reduce expected unemployment duration, while the partici-

pants in the other three types of programs experience increasing unemployment duration. The public job training programs produced in some cases a mild or moderate positive effect in the post program period, but a large locking-in effect during the program period, and so unemployment duration increased. The 'Other ALMPs' group also showed negative effects (except for women in Roskilde), while the poorest performance by far was achieved by education programs with dramatic locking-in effects, negative or slightly positive post-program effects, and increases in unemployment duration.

There is a tendency that private sector employment programs perform better in the area around the capital. It is important to stress that these programs were very favourable in Northern Jutland, where the unemployment rate is one of the highest in the country. The effects of the other 3 groups of ALMPs, however, show different regional patterns. In terms of geography, public sector training, education and other ALMP programs worked badly in the area of the capital and around the capital. The least-harmful results of these programs experienced mid-Jutland - Aarhus and Viborg - counties, however even there unemployment duration increased.

7. Meta Analysis Findings

In the previous sections, we have discussed the performance of Danish ALMPs in different counties of Denmark. We found that the different ALMPs had different influences on unemployed men and women. The decrease in unemployment duration resulted by activation in private job training programs was higher for women, public job training and other ALMPs behaved better for men while

education had the similar impact on the unemployment duration for men and women. We also found that the programs behaved very differently in the different counties: The most effective programs - private job training - changed unemployment duration from 1.87 weeks decrease (for women in Copenhagen and Frederiksberg region) to 0.86 weeks increase (for women in Ribe). Public sector employment programs increased unemployment duration by 0.55 - 2.48 weeks, education programs - by 1.31 - 2.7 weeks while the impact of other ALMPs varied from -1.16 to 1.7 weeks.

An interesting finding is that in general participation in ALMPs affected women more than men. This should be taken into consideration since unemployment duration for women in Danish counties is considerably longer than for men.

One important aspect is the intensity of program use (which is defined as the fraction of the unemployed individuals activated in the particular type of ALMPs; individuals activated in all four ALMPs types equal to 100%). Tables A.7.1 – A.7.4 in the Appendix present the intensity of different types of ALMPs among the unemployed men and women in Danish counties and in the whole country in 1999 – 2004. The tables tell us that the education programs, which have shown the poorest performance in the employability of men and women, tend to be the program which is used most for both men and women. More than half of men and women within the country who participate in a program participate in education programs, while private job training programs were used the least. On the other hand, the use of private job training increased

from 5.8% in 1999 to 9.5% in 2004 for men, and from 3.2% to 5.5% for women.

There are annual variations in the intensity of program use. Particular interest here has to be paid to the year 2002, when the popularity of private job training programs within the country rose from 7.7% to 19.7% for men and from 4.4% to 9.7% for women. The use of other ALMPs went down - from 23% to 11% and 20.2% to 10.6% respectively. The fraction of activation in public job training increased while education/training declined, thought not so significantly. In 2003, however, these figures went in the opposite direction, towards 2001 level. The intensity of program use thus differs between years within the county level. However, most of the counties experienced quite similar annual fluctuations.

The goal of this chapter is to investigate how the behaviour of the ALMPs in Denmark depends on the regional unemployment level and duration, the composition of the work force (skills), the structure of labour market (sectoral composition), the age of the unemployed, and finally, on the intensity of the use of the programs. We employ here a meta analysis, described in Section 5, to the results presented in the last chapter. A number of explanatory factors (see Section 5) are considered. Tables 7-8 present results of the analysis for men (excluding and including year dummies), and tables 9-10 presents the same results for women. Significant estimates here are marked in bold.

TABLE 7. EFFECTIVENESS OF DANISH ALMPs FOR MEN

	Private job training		Public job training		Education		Other ALMPs	
	Effect	t-ratio	Effect	t-ratio	Effect	t-ratio	Effect	t-ratio
Activation, %	-0,012	-0,95	0,005	0,43	**-0,005**	**-2,29**	0,002	0,59
Low-skilled, %	-0,002	-0,10	0,030	1,54	0,004	0,52	-0,023	-1,61
Manufacturing, %	-0,007	-0,17	-0,047	-1,55	0,005	0,39	0,007	0,33
Private sector, %	-0,014	-0,43	0,017	0,66	0,017	1,59	-0,001	-0,04
Self-employed, %	0,032	0,40	0,016	0,24	-0,030	-1,08	0,017	0,37
Unemployment, %	-0,005	-0,08	-0,043	-0,79	0,038	1,81	0,013	0,37
>50 years old, %	-0,027	-0,81	-0,005	-0,18	**-0,038**	**-3,55**	0,010	0,51
Duration, weeks	-0,038	-0,88	**0,084**	**2,43**	**0,067**	**4,54**	0,032	1,27

TABLE 8. EFFECTIVENESS OF DANISH ALMPs FOR MEN

(WITH YEAR DUMMIES)

	Private job training		Public job training		Education		Other ALMPs	
	Effect	t-ratio	Effect	t-ratio	Effect	t-ratio	Effect	t-ratio
Activation, %	**0,045**	**2,17**	-0,005	-0,29	**-0,006**	**-2,56**	-0,001	-0,19
Low-skilled, %	-0,029	-0,74	0,049	1,42	-0,012	-0,86	0,012	0,48
Manufacturing, %	-0,043	-1,00	-0,057	-1,63	0,017	1,21	-0,015	-0,57
Private sector, %	0,012	0,38	0,015	0,57	0,011	1,04	-0,004	-0,22
Self-employed, %	0,092	1,22	0,022	0,32	-0,038	-1,47	0,015	0,32
Unemployment, %	0,022	0,29	-0,051	-0,75	0,033	1,28	-0,064	-1,34
>50 years old, %	-0,053	-1,61	-0,002	-0,06	**-0,032**	**-3,06**	-0,005	-0,24
Duration, weeks	-0,048	-1,20	**0,085**	**2,43**	**0,064**	**4,69**	0,030	1,18
Year dummies:								
2000	0,080	0,38	-0,284	-1,65	**-0,152**	**-2,25**	-0,042	-0,34
2001	**-0,451**	**-2,00**	-0,014	-0,07	**-0,246**	**-3,06**	0,044	0,31
2002	**-1,159**	**-3,09**	0,109	0,41	**-0,195**	**-2,04**	0,010	0,07
2003	**-0,689**	**-2,29**	0,046	0,18	-0,073	-0,72	**0,305**	**1,88**
2004	-0,365	-1,00	0,054	0,17	-0,252	-1,87	0,376	1,66

TABLE 9. EFFECTIVENESS OF DANISH ALMPs FOR WOMEN

	Private job training		Public job training		Education		Other ALMPs	
	Effect	t-ratio	Effect	t-ratio	Effect	t-ratio	Effect	t-ratio
Activation, %	**-0,172**	**-2,75**	-0,006	-0,47	0,002	0,39	**0,017**	**2,37**
Low-skilled, %	**-0,165**	**-2,14**	**0,091**	**2,04**	-0,012	-0,52	0,013	0,32
Manufacturing, %	0,185	1,84	-0,019	-0,33	0,029	1,01	-0,020	-0,40
Private sector, %	-0,052	-0,81	-0,007	-0,17	-0,006	-0,33	0,026	0,72
Self-employed, %	**1,328**	**2,57**	-0,099	-0,32	**-0,477**	**-3,02**	0,203	0,70
Unemployment, %	-0,056	-0,46	-0,081	-1,10	0,004	0,12	**0,187**	**2,75**
>50 years old, %	-0,019	-0,23	-0,021	-0,41	0,012	0,49	-0,064	-1,41
Duration, weeks	0,046	0,78	**0,077**	**2,13**	**0,057**	**3,20**	0,031	0,95

TABLE 10. EFFECTIVENESS OF DANISH ALMPs FOR WOMEN

(WITH YEAR DUMMIES)

	Private job training		Public job training		Education		Other ALMPs	
	Effect	t-ratio	Effect	t-ratio	Effect	t-ratio	Effect	t-ratio
Activation, %	-0,001	-0.013	0,012	0,60	-0,003	-0,63	**0,015**	**2,09**
Low-skilled, %	0,034	0.258	0,068	0,87	0,006	0,16	2,088	0,38
Manufacturing, %	-0,028	-0.213	-0,025	-0,35	0,007	0,23	-0,044	-0,73
Private sector, %	0,019	0.268	0,007	0,16	0,006	0,31	0,040	1,13
Self-employed, %	**1,992**	**3,43**	-0,079	-0,23	**-0,344**	**-2,22**	0,486	1,64
Unemployment, %	-0,277	-1,82	-0,082	-0,93	-0,034	-0,84	0,106	1,36
>50 years old, %	-0,161	-1,46	0,006	0,09	0,011	0,36	-0,085	-1,49
Duration, weeks	0,026	0.445	**0,071**	**2,00**	**0,053**	**3,51**	0,026	0,91
Year dummies:								
2000	-0,366	-0,73	**-0,700**	**-2,56**	**-0,365**	**-3,11**	-0,155	-0,68
2001	-0,144	-0,27	**-0,723**	**-2,31**	**-0,607**	**-4,23**	**-0,704**	**-2,71**
2002	-0,981	-1,13	-0,865	-1,87	**-0,507**	**-2,83**	**-0,623**	**-2,24**
2003	0,405	0,56	-0,724	-1,61	-0,175	-0,86	0,272	0,79
2004	1,030	1,20	-0,605	-1,14	-0,079	-0,31	-0,008	-0,02

One of the most important findings of the analysis, common for men and women, is the existence of highly significant relationships between the expected unemployment duration and the effects of public job training and education programs. When expected unemployment duration increases by 1 week, participation in public job training programs prolongs the unemployment duration by 0.085 weeks for men and 0.077 weeks for women. For education these figures are 0.065 and 0.055 weeks, respectively. It is disappointing that the programs, which already showed the worst impact, tend to be the most harmful in the counties (and years) with long unemployment durations. This relation is estimated for given levels of the regional unemployment rate, so the interpretation is that regions with low turnover rates in the labour market (an immobile labour market) show worse impacts of program participation. This result must be investigated further and pursued in several directions, one of which is the optimal program entry time.

For men, the fraction of those older that 50 years show a statistically significant correlations with the effectiveness of education programs. Since education programs are mainly offered to young workers, this could imply that they are more effective when there is less competition for the skills they provide.

The relationship between intensity of program use (activation, %) and program effectiveness also needs to be explored further. On the one hand, we would expect an increasing use of a program to render it less effective, since increasing the intensity of program use is assumed to lead to diminishing marginal returns. On the other hand, it may be the case that there is an effectiveness gain in the

learning sense; as programs are used more, the administrators learn how to improve their effectiveness; kind of a 'returns to scale' argument. In the results, there seem to be indication of both, but we are considering to include both the relative distribution of programs (as we have now) as well as the absolute number of persons in different programs, in order to capture both effects. The learning story would then - presumably - be captured by the latter variable.

Private sector employment programs tend to behave worse (for women) in counties where the fraction of self-employed workers is larger, but education programs showed the opposite tendency. The implication may be that in regions with many small firms (many self-employed individuals), there is a larger need for upgrading the skills of the work force, (presumably due to many start-ups, which require skilled workers to achieve high productivity levels). At the same time, job-openings are less likely to occur in small firms, since for a given turnover rate, more persons will be leaving large firms, rendering private job training programs less effective in such regions.

In the model without year dummies, the increase in activation of women in private job training found to be related with the decrease in their unemployment duration. These programs also performed better when the fraction of the low-skilled was bigger while public job training showed here the opposite. When including dummies, these effects are no longer significant. Thus, the significant coefficients tend to be caused by the annual differences in activations and in the fraction of low-skilled that happen to be correlated with the net effect of the programs, rather than by cross-county variation. The fractions of the individuals

employed in manufacturing and in the private sector did not show any significant relations with the net effects of the ALMPs neither for men nor for women.

There are significant annual effects on the efficiency of ALMPs, and here attention has to be paid to the year 2002. As it was mentioned above the intensity of program use differed in 2002, and the use of private job training increased quite strongly. Nevertheless, counter intuitively, we found that private job training programs were extremely effective in the year 2002. This also needs to be investigated further.

Based on the findings above we can conclude, that the effectiveness of Danish ALMPs to men does not seem to depend neither on the composition of the work force (skills) nor on the labour market (sectoral composition). For women, the sectoral composition does not influence the effect of the ALMPs, but skill composition plays a significant role. The unemployment level does not seem to be an important factor.

The most important finding is that public job training and education programs tend to behave worse when unemployment duration increases. This is terribly dissapointing since not only unemployment rate, but also its duration is an important measure of welfare (see Borooah, 2002). This suggest that these programs should be used more actively in regions with higher levels of labour turnover (labour markets characterised by high mobility).

8. Conclusions

In this study we have used the timing-of-events model - developed by Abbring & van den Berg (2003) for identifying treatment effects non-parametrically in a duration model framework - to estimate the impact of ALMPs on the escape rate from unemployment for men and women in all 14 Danish counties. We have used fairly new Danish data from administrative registers to estimate the parameters of the econometric model. The effects of ALMPs have been decomposed in two separate effects - a locking-in effect and a post-program effect, and the model has been estimated separately for each county, and for men and women.

Calculations of net impacts on the expected duration of unemployment reveal that only private sector employment subsidies reduce unemployment duration. As program impacts are estimated separately by region and year, we subsequently conduct a meta analysis, relating the net impacts of each program to a number of variables describing the local labour market, the composition of the work force, and the characteristics of unemployment and program use. We found a tendency for programs to be least effective for those who need them the most; those with longer unemployment durations. This important result has a number of policy implications, as the implied trade-off between equity and efficiency in the construction of ALMPs would tend to favour other policies than these two, which, unfortunately are the programs which are used most intensively.

References

Abbring, J. & G. van den Berg (2003). "The Non-Parametric Identification of Treatment Effects in Duration Models", Econometrica, 71, 1491-1517.

Andersen, T. M. & M. Svarer (2006), "Flexicurity - den danske arbetsmarknadsmodellen", Ekonomisk Debatt, Vol. 34, 17-29.

Ashenfelter, O., C. Harmon & H. Oosterbeek (1999), "A Review of Estimates of the Schooling/Earnings Relationship, with Tests for Publication Bias", Labour Economics, 6(4):453-70.

Black, D., J. A. Smith, M. C. Berger & B. J. Noel (2003), "Is the Threat of Reemployment Services More Effective than the Services Themselves?", American Economic Review, Vol. 93, 1313-1327.

Bolvig, I., P. Jensen and M. Rosholm (2003), "The Employment Effects of Active Social Policy", IZA Discussion Paper No. 736, Institute for the Study of Labor, Bonn.

Borooah, V. K. (2002), "A Duration-Sensitive Measure of the Unemployment Rate: Theory and Application", ICER Working Paper No 19-2002.

Card, D. and A.B. Krueger (1995), "Time-Series Minimum-Wage Studies: A Meta-analysis", The American Economic Review, Vol. 85(2):238-243.

Graversen, B. K. (2003), "The Impact of Active Labour Market Programmes on Welfare Dependence in Denmark", The Danish National Institute of Social Research, Aarhus, mimeo.

Hammer, B., M. Rosholm & M. Svarer (2004): “A Danish Profiling System”, Unpublished Manuscript, University of Aarhus.

Kluve, J. and C.M. Schmidt (2002), "Can training and employment subsidies combat European unemployment?", Economic Policy 35, 409-448.

Kluve, J. (2003) "The Effectiveness of European Active Labor Market Policy", IZA Discussion Paper No. 2018, Institute for the Study of Labor, Bonn.

Munch, J. R. & L. Skipper (2004), "The Consequences of Active Labour Market Programme Participation in Denmark", Unpublished Working Paper.

Phillips, J.M. (1994), "Farmer Education and Farm Efficiency", Economic Development and Change 43(1):149-165.

Rosholm, M. & M. Svarer (2004): “Estimating the Threat Effect of Active Labour Market Programmes”, Working Paper No. 2004-06, University of Aarhus.

Van der Sluis, J., C. M. van Praag & W. Vijverberg (2004), "Education and Entrepreneurship in Industrialized Countries: A Meta-analysis", Tinbergen Institute Working Paper No. TI 03-046/3.

Van der Sluis, J., C. M. van Praag & W. Vijverberg (2005), "Entrepreneurship selection and performance: A meta-analysis of the impact of education in less developed countries", World Bank Economic Review, 19 , (2), 225-261.

APPENDIX

TABLE A.1. DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLE (OBSERVATIONS)

	Men	**Women**
Copenhagen and Frederiksberg	72363	86303
Copenhagen county	45451	66191
Frederiksborg county	23998	38646
Roskilde county	16713	28928
Western Zelland county	28297	44260
Storstrøms county	29526	42913
Funen county	61298	82768
Southern Jutland county	25424	42637
Ribe county	23698	36695
Vejle county	35227	59830
Ringkøbing county	27082	51998
Århus county	79193	116823
Viborg county	26098	40951
Northern Jutland county	71980	102534

TABLE A.2.1. LOCKING-IN EFFECTS OF PRIVATE JOB TRAINING TO MEN

(1999-2001)

	1999			2000			2001		
	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	-0,382	0,569	-31,7	-0,565	0,382	-43,2	-0,152	0,279	-14,1
Copenhagen county	-0,331	0,820	-28,2	-0,029	0,545	-2,9	-0,258	0,345	-22,7
Frederiksborg county	-	-	-	-0,811	0,764	-55,6	0,189	0,353	20,8
Roskilde county	0,260	1,350	29,7	-0,458	0,905	-36,8	0,027	0,493	2,7
Western Zelland county	0,445	0,679	56,0	-0,237	0,502	-21,1	0,220	0,392	24,7
Storstrøms county	-0,659	0,881	-48,3	-0,336	0,377	-28,5	-0,399	0,339	-32,9
Funen county	-0,640	0,972	-47,3	-0,620	0,295	-46,2	-0,094	0,211	-9,0
Southern Jutland county	-0,860	0,796	-57,7	-0,354	0,368	-29,8	-0,287	0,296	-24,9
Ribe county	0,224	6,537	25,0	-0,622	0,605	-46,3	-0,362	0,790	-30,4
Vejle county	-0,555	0,645	-42,6	0,023	0,435	2,3	-0,123	0,338	-11,6
Ringkøbing county	-0,299	0,764	-25,8	-0,259	0,456	-22,8	0,139	0,522	15,0
Århus county	-0,880	0,319	-58,5	-0,242	0,224	-21,5	-0,357	0,204	-30,0
Viborg county	-0,461	0,547	-36,9	-1,052	0,709	-65,1	-0,885	0,533	-58,7
Northern Jutland county	-0,408	0,519	-33,5	-0,279	0,421	-24,3	-0,401	0,240	-33,0

TABLE A.2.2. LOCKING-IN EFFECTS OF PRIVATE JOB TRAINING TO MEN

(2002-2004)

	2002			2003			2004		
	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	0,041	0,211	4,2	-0,281	0,228	-24,5	-0,477	0,159	-37,9
Copenhagen county	0,213	0,304	23,7	-0,001	0,260	-0,1	-0,496	0,214	-39,1
Frederiksborg county	0,339	0,591	40,4	-0,071	0,365	-6,8	-0,188	0,256	-17,2
Roskilde county	0,382	0,478	46,5	0,145	0,436	15,7	-0,547	0,282	-42,2
Western Zelland county	-0,194	0,367	-17,6	0,300	0,237	35,0	-0,148	0,292	-13,7
Storstrøms county	-0,084	0,275	-8,1	-0,371	0,350	-31,0	-0,303	0,241	-26,1
Funen county	-0,184	0,230	-16,8	-0,161	0,195	-14,9	-0,255	0,150	-22,5
Southern Jutland county	0,859	0,302	136,0	-0,078	0,365	-7,5	-0,074	0,349	-7,2
Ribe county	-0,373	0,486	-31,1	-0,369	0,399	-30,8	-0,670	0,399	-48,8
Vejle county	0,109	0,283	11,5	0,186	0,304	20,4	-0,031	0,233	-3,0
Ringkøbing county	-0,169	0,380	-15,5	0,180	0,343	19,8	-0,454	0,293	-36,5
Århus county	0,000	0,202	0,0	-0,317	0,192	-27,2	-0,210	0,120	-18,9
Viborg county	-0,316	0,354	-27,1	-0,219	0,314	-19,6	-0,540	0,302	-41,7
Northern Jutland county	-0,338	0,223	-28,7	-0,099	0,211	-9,4	-0,232	0,139	-20,7

TABLE A.2.3. LOCKING-IN EFFECTS OF PRIVATE JOB TRAINING TO WOMEN (1999-2001)

	1999			2000			2001		
	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	-0,727	1,080	-51,7	0,040	0,662	4,1	-0,296	0,410	-25,6
Copenhagen county	-0,460	1,259	-36,9	-0,022	0,398	-2,1	-0,252	0,619	-22,3
Frederiksborg county	0,268	1,360	30,8	-0,664	0,711	-48,5	-0,793	0,654	-54,7
Roskilde county	0,351	23,228	42,1	-0,280	1,102	-24,4	0,093	0,655	9,7
Western Zelland county	0,493	0,952	63,7	-0,495	0,687	-39,0	-0,256	0,583	-22,5
Storstrøms county	-0,480	0,645	-38,1	0,726	0,447	106,7	-0,407	0,625	-33,4
Funen county	-0,752	0,663	-52,9	-0,708	0,686	-50,7	-0,318	0,390	-27,2
Southern Jutland county	0,217	0,638	24,2	-0,114	0,417	-10,8	-0,109	0,315	-10,4
Ribe county	-0,896	1,277	-59,2	-0,762	0,729	-53,3	-0,287	0,457	-25,0
Vejle county	-0,555	0,501	-42,6	0,023	0,325	2,3	-0,123	0,233	-11,6
Ringkøbing county	-0,287	0,507	-24,9	0,089	0,296	9,3	0,385	0,289	46,9
Århus county	-0,805	0,428	-55,3	-0,231	0,266	-20,6	-0,307	0,231	-26,4
Viborg county	-1,500	1,113	-77,7	-0,078	0,406	-7,5	-0,155	0,435	-14,4
Northern Jutland county	-0,415	0,429	-34,0	-0,466	0,374	-37,2	0,116	0,225	12,3

TABLE A.2.4. LOCKING-IN EFFECTS OF PRIVATE JOB TRAINING TO WOMEN (2002-2004)

	2002			2003			2004		
	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	-0,468	0,344	-37,4	0,380	0,259	46,2	-0,369	0,208	-30,8
Copenhagen county	0,493	0,368	63,8	-0,197	0,293	-17,9	-0,235	0,327	-20,9
Frederiksborg county	-0,353	0,744	-29,8	-0,353	0,723	-29,8	-0,462	0,433	-37,0
Roskilde county	0,837	0,569	131,0	-0,024	0,633	-2,3	-0,754	0,447	-52,9
Western Zelland county	-0,373	0,346	-31,1	-0,379	0,509	-31,6	-0,899	0,416	-59,3
Storstrøms county	-0,467	0,489	-37,3	-0,472	0,388	-37,6	-0,630	0,341	-46,8
Funen county	0,055	0,285	5,7	-0,200	0,361	-18,1	-0,122	0,201	-11,5
Southern Jutland county	0,007	0,337	0,7	-0,740	0,926	-52,3	-0,135	0,350	-12,6
Ribe county	-0,310	0,557	-26,6	-0,145	0,426	-13,5	-0,654	0,389	-48,0
Vejle county	0,109	0,261	11,5	0,186	0,262	20,4	-0,031	0,229	-3,0
Ringkøbing county	0,415	0,350	51,4	-0,060	0,386	-5,8	0,041	0,380	4,2
Århus county	0,216	0,205	24,1	0,037	0,197	3,8	-0,143	0,158	-13,3
Viborg county	0,039	0,361	4,0	-0,095	0,442	-9,1	-0,400	0,362	-32,9
Northern Jutland county	0,290	0,248	33,7	-0,262	0,300	-23,0	-0,035	0,192	-3,5

TABLE A.2.5. LOCKING-IN EFFECTS OF PUBLIC JOB TRAINING TO MEN

(1999-2001)

	1999			2000			2001		
	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	-0,906	0,274	-59,6	-1,029	0,242	-64,3	-0,939	0,219	-60,9
Copenhagen county	-1,116	0,276	-67,2	-0,945	0,350	-61,1	-1,276	0,285	-72,1
Frederiksborg county	-1,948	0,717	-85,7	-1,091	0,520	-66,4	-1,476	0,548	-77,1
Roskilde county	-0,884	1,840	-58,7	-1,740	0,799	-82,4	-1,080	0,539	-66,0
Western Zelland county	-1,747	0,566	-82,6	-1,219	0,554	-70,5	-0,888	0,412	-58,9
Storstrøms county	-1,201	0,412	-69,9	-0,836	0,355	-56,6	-0,966	0,257	-61,9
Funen county	-2,242	1,079	-89,4	-1,411	0,383	-75,6	-1,629	0,346	-80,4
Southern Jutland county	-1,904	0,776	-85,1	-1,389	0,456	-75,1	-0,643	0,383	-47,4
Ribe county	-1,190	0,654	-69,6	-1,375	0,701	-74,7	-0,409	0,562	-33,6
Vejle county	-1,150	1,004	-68,3	-0,710	0,693	-50,8	-1,034	0,625	-64,4
Ringkøbing county	-1,073	1,138	-65,8	-0,751	0,743	-52,8	-0,992	0,255	-62,9
Århus county	-1,220	0,405	-70,5	-0,815	0,268	-55,7	-1,007	0,245	-63,5
Viborg county	-	-	-	-0,963	0,438	-61,8	-1,543	0,495	-78,6
Northern Jutland county	-1,077	0,610	-65,9	-1,086	0,376	-66,3	-0,823	0,234	-56,1

TABLE A.2.6. LOCKING-IN EFFECTS OF PUBLIC JOB TRAINING TO MEN

(2002-2004)

	2002			2003			2004		
	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	-1,026	0,170	-64,1	-0,898	0,150	-59,3	-0,903	0,160	-59,5
Copenhagen county	-0,767	0,215	-53,6	-0,776	0,241	-54,0	-0,705	0,198	-50,6
Frederiksborg county	-0,966	0,389	-61,9	-0,354	0,252	-29,8	-0,911	0,434	-59,8
Roskilde county	-0,953	0,535	-61,4	-1,822	0,835	-83,8	-1,007	0,414	-63,5
Western Zelland county	-0,749	0,377	-52,7	-1,568	0,592	-79,2	-0,958	0,317	-61,6
Storstrøms county	-0,642	0,266	-47,4	-1,172	0,339	-69,0	-0,747	0,221	-52,6
Funen county	-1,175	0,297	-69,1	-1,255	0,261	-71,5	-0,732	0,201	-51,9
Southern Jutland county	-0,507	0,384	-39,7	-0,667	0,349	-48,7	-0,819	0,364	-55,9
Ribe county	-0,710	0,469	-50,8	-0,820	0,480	-56,0	-0,430	0,367	-34,9
Vejle county	-0,371	0,445	-31,0	-1,034	0,520	-64,5	-0,697	0,393	-50,2
Ringkøbing county	-1,454	1,007	-76,6	-0,543	0,455	-41,9	-1,028	0,527	-64,2
Århus county	-0,559	0,204	-42,8	-0,674	0,198	-49,0	-0,427	0,181	-34,8
Viborg county	-0,604	0,573	-45,4	-1,155	0,735	-68,5	-1,037	0,444	-64,6
Northern Jutland county	-0,590	0,220	-44,6	-0,851	0,251	-57,3	-0,172	0,206	-15,8

TABLE A.2.7. LOCKING-IN EFFECTS OF PUBLIC JOB TRAINING TO WOMEN (1999-2001)

	1999			2000			2001		
	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	-1,881	0,480	-84,8	-0,936	0,247	-60,8	-0,718	0,203	-51,2
Copenhagen county	-1,239	0,356	-71,0	-1,520	0,280	-78,1	-0,574	0,197	-43,7
Frederiksborg county	-1,886	0,441	-84,8	-0,846	0,396	-57,1	-1,269	0,395	-71,9
Roskilde county	-1,241	0,527	-71,1	-0,584	0,346	-44,2	-0,901	0,338	-59,4
Western Zelland county	-1,518	0,416	-78,1	-0,908	0,269	-59,7	-1,241	0,300	-71,1
Storstrøms county	-0,998	0,276	-63,1	-0,555	0,283	-42,6	-0,764	0,230	-53,4
Funen county	-1,427	0,329	-76,0	-1,677	0,306	-81,3	-0,742	0,180	-52,4
Southern Jutland county	-1,538	0,548	-78,5	-1,115	0,401	-67,2	-1,263	0,313	-71,7
Ribe county	-1,882	0,478	-84,8	-1,361	0,360	-74,4	-0,837	0,243	-56,7
Vejle county	-1,150	0,427	-68,3	-0,710	0,297	-50,8	-1,034	0,325	-64,4
Ringkøbing county	-1,428	0,384	-76,0	-0,925	0,284	-60,4	-0,585	0,237	-44,3
Århus county	-1,240	0,330	-71,1	-0,923	0,260	-60,3	-0,623	0,193	-46,4
Viborg county	-1,855	0,528	-84,4	-1,418	0,424	-75,8	-0,714	0,236	-51,0
Northern Jutland county	-1,682	0,384	-81,4	-1,250	0,245	-71,4	-0,873	0,199	-58,2

TABLE A.2.8. LOCKING-IN EFFECTS OF PUBLIC JOB TRAINING TO WOMEN (2002-2004)

	2002			2003			2004		
	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	-1,119	0,195	-67,3	-0,612	0,161	-45,8	-0,685	0,147	-49,6
Copenhagen county	-0,699	0,186	-50,3	-0,816	0,206	-55,8	-0,645	0,171	-47,5
Frederiksborg county	-0,719	0,278	-51,3	-0,242	0,277	-21,5	-0,685	0,321	-49,6
Roskilde county	-0,535	0,322	-41,5	-0,932	0,374	-60,6	-0,481	0,254	-38,2
Western Zelland county	-0,858	0,254	-57,6	-0,736	0,308	-52,1	-0,781	0,246	-54,2
Storstrøms county	-0,893	0,234	-59,1	-0,634	0,212	-46,9	-0,914	0,196	-59,9
Funen county	-1,769	0,240	-83,0	-1,769	0,244	-83,0	-1,105	0,172	-66,9
Southern Jutland county	-0,635	0,238	-47,0	-0,823	0,252	-56,1	-0,792	0,228	-54,7
Ribe county	-0,753	0,273	-52,9	-0,553	0,293	-42,5	-1,109	0,311	-67,0
Vejle county	-0,371	0,247	-31,0	-1,034	0,291	-64,5	-0,697	0,231	-50,2
Ringkøbing county	-0,571	0,237	-43,5	-1,198	0,321	-69,8	-0,549	0,249	-42,3
Århus county	0,323	0,184	38,1	-0,636	0,147	-47,1	-0,495	0,131	-39,0
Viborg county	-0,761	0,277	-53,3	-0,438	0,275	-35,5	-0,774	0,256	-53,9
Northern Jutland county	-0,725	0,192	-51,6	-0,508	0,175	-39,8	-0,434	0,153	-35,2

TABLE A.2.9. LOCKING-IN EFFECTS OF EDUCATION TO MEN (1999-2001)

	1999			2000			2001		
	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	-0,780	0,124	-54,1	-0,856	0,113	-57,5	-0,856	0,087	-57,5
Copenhagen county	-1,005	0,190	-63,4	-0,873	0,154	-58,2	-0,703	0,124	-50,5
Frederiksborg county	-1,313	0,260	-73,1	-0,782	0,180	-54,2	-0,771	0,168	-53,8
Roskilde county	-0,982	0,377	-62,6	-0,714	0,258	-51,0	-0,563	0,223	-43,0
Western Zelland county	-0,592	0,239	-44,7	-0,710	0,203	-50,9	-0,387	0,146	-32,1
Storstrøms county	-1,635	0,334	-80,5	-0,840	0,211	-56,8	-1,042	0,232	-64,7
Funen county	-1,194	0,195	-69,7	-0,757	0,137	-53,1	-1,009	0,126	-63,6
Southern Jutland county	-0,949	0,340	-61,3	-1,521	0,268	-78,1	-0,762	0,170	-53,3
Ribe county	-0,866	0,418	-57,9	-0,963	0,324	-61,8	-1,249	0,230	-71,3
Vejle county	-1,390	0,282	-75,1	-1,102	0,187	-66,8	-1,017	0,171	-63,8
Ringkøbing county	-1,268	0,267	-71,9	-1,454	0,287	-76,6	-1,265	0,265	-71,8
Århus county	-1,226	0,148	-70,7	-1,169	0,115	-68,9	-1,112	0,094	-67,1
Viborg county	-1,609	0,373	-80,0	-1,145	0,454	-68,2	-1,548	0,301	-78,7
Northern Jutland county	-1,273	0,174	-72,0	-1,273	0,154	-72,0	-0,791	0,116	-54,7

TABLE A.2.10. LOCKING-IN EFFECTS OF EDUCATION TO MEN (2002-2004)

	2002			2003			2004		
	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	-0,881	0,096	-58,6	-0,940	0,112	-60,9	-0,859	0,101	-57,6
Copenhagen county	-0,743	0,135	-52,4	-0,677	0,136	-49,2	-0,747	0,138	-52,6
Frederiksborg county	-1,299	0,235	-72,7	-0,146	0,202	-13,6	-0,324	0,175	-27,7
Roskilde county	-0,563	0,213	-43,0	-0,469	0,192	-37,4	-0,807	0,225	-55,4
Western Zelland county	-0,488	0,139	-38,6	-0,628	0,173	-46,6	-0,791	0,235	-54,7
Storstrøms county	-0,934	0,220	-60,7	-0,768	0,319	-53,6	-0,745	0,215	-52,5
Funen county	-0,975	0,103	-62,3	-0,697	0,106	-50,2	-0,757	0,108	-53,1
Southern Jutland county	-0,811	0,218	-55,6	-0,896	0,254	-59,2	-0,572	0,214	-43,6
Ribe county	-0,523	0,182	-40,7	-0,859	0,251	-57,6	-0,555	0,174	-42,6
Vejle county	-1,057	0,191	-65,3	-1,359	0,226	-74,3	-0,971	0,232	-62,1
Ringkøbing county	-1,021	0,238	-64,0	-1,248	0,261	-71,3	-1,006	0,191	-63,4
Århus county	-1,107	0,129	-66,9	-0,862	0,109	-57,8	-1,001	0,114	-63,3
Viborg county	-0,703	0,196	-50,5	-0,887	0,286	-58,8	-0,810	0,222	-55,5
Northern Jutland county	-1,438	0,125	-76,3	-1,015	0,129	-63,8	-0,855	0,126	-57,5

TABLE A.2.11. LOCKING-IN EFFECTS OF EDUCATION TO WOMEN

(1999-2001)

	1999			2000			2001		
	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	-1,177	0,133	-69,2	-1,067	0,113	-65,6	-1,032	0,104	-64,4
Copenhagen county	-1,053	0,149	-65,1	-1,257	0,141	-71,6	-0,970	0,113	-62,1
Frederiksborg county	-1,388	0,176	-75,0	-1,252	0,150	-71,4	-1,252	0,155	-71,4
Roskilde county	-1,599	0,261	-79,8	-1,161	0,211	-68,7	-0,825	0,221	-56,2
Western Zelland county	-1,369	0,219	-74,6	-1,160	0,180	-68,7	-0,795	0,134	-54,8
Storstrøms county	-1,507	0,233	-77,8	-1,155	0,164	-68,5	-0,848	0,160	-57,2
Funen county	-1,577	0,170	-79,3	-1,192	0,128	-69,6	-1,071	0,100	-65,7
Southern Jutland county	-1,434	0,198	-76,2	-1,370	0,188	-74,6	-1,178	0,143	-69,2
Ribe county	-1,733	0,338	-82,3	-1,091	0,229	-66,4	-1,156	0,176	-68,5
Vejle county	-1,390	0,169	-75,1	-1,102	0,153	-66,8	-1,017	0,135	-63,8
Ringkøbing county	-1,472	0,175	-77,1	-1,146	0,148	-68,2	-1,197	0,149	-69,8
Århus county	-1,261	0,125	-71,7	-1,228	0,102	-70,7	-1,286	0,088	-72,4
Viborg county	-1,821	0,281	-83,8	-1,164	0,233	-68,8	-0,843	0,174	-57,0
Northern Jutland county	-1,472	0,136	-77,1	-0,919	0,106	-60,1	-1,181	0,103	-69,3

TABLE A.2.12. LOCKING-IN EFFECTS OF EDUCATION TO WOMEN

(2002-2004)

	2002			2003			2004		
	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	-1,145	0,108	-68,2	-1,094	0,107	-66,5	-1,137	0,111	-67,9
Copenhagen county	-0,952	0,107	-61,4	-0,992	0,133	-62,9	-1,224	0,145	-70,6
Frederiksborg county	-1,207	0,195	-70,1	-0,947	0,213	-61,2	-0,976	0,232	-62,3
Roskilde county	-1,067	0,220	-65,6	-0,907	0,184	-59,6	-1,036	0,217	-64,5
Western Zelland county	-0,897	0,130	-59,2	-1,006	0,188	-63,4	-1,068	0,245	-65,6
Storstrøms county	-1,091	0,163	-66,4	-0,939	0,224	-60,9	-1,592	0,241	-79,7
Funen county	-1,097	0,092	-66,6	-0,923	0,102	-60,3	-0,834	0,109	-56,6
Southern Jutland county	-1,234	0,164	-70,9	-1,372	0,222	-74,6	-1,257	0,210	-71,5
Ribe county	-1,129	0,158	-67,7	-1,058	0,214	-65,3	-1,583	0,300	-79,5
Vejle county	-1,057	0,150	-65,3	-1,359	0,210	-74,3	-0,971	0,181	-62,1
Ringkøbing county	-0,926	0,149	-60,4	-1,109	0,185	-67,0	-1,494	0,191	-77,6
Århus county	-1,093	0,096	-66,5	-1,026	0,105	-64,1	-1,137	0,108	-67,9
Viborg county	-1,014	0,159	-63,7	-1,154	0,216	-68,5	-1,342	0,221	-73,9
Northern Jutland county	-1,289	0,093	-72,4	-1,195	0,107	-69,7	-1,402	0,148	-75,4

TABLE A.2.13. LOCKING-IN EFFECTS OF OTHER ALMPSs TO MEN

(1999-2001)

	1999			2000			2001		
	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	-0,718	0,269	-51,2	-0,506	0,289	-39,7	-0,273	0,152	-23,9
Copenhagen county	-0,388	0,277	-32,2	-0,389	0,392	-32,2	-0,581	0,213	-44,0
Frederiksborg county	-0,219	0,596	-19,7	-1,471	0,636	-77,0	-0,859	0,352	-57,6
Roskilde county	-0,503	0,567	-39,5	-0,145	0,973	-13,5	-0,068	0,293	-6,6
Western Zelland county	0,031	0,453	3,1	0,469	0,486	59,9	-0,589	0,333	-44,5
Storstrøms county	-1,015	0,537	-63,8	-0,232	0,279	-20,7	-0,108	0,297	-10,2
Funen county	0,362	0,692	43,6	0,207	0,389	23,0	-0,368	0,192	-30,8
Southern Jutland county	-1,053	1,138	-65,1	0,476	0,517	61,0	-0,502	0,431	-39,4
Ribe county	-0,697	0,539	-50,2	-0,302	0,525	-26,1	0,335	0,437	39,8
Vejle county	-1,038	0,329	-64,6	-0,312	0,302	-26,8	-0,240	0,208	-21,3
Ringkøbing county	-1,227	0,603	-70,7	-0,503	0,595	-39,5	-0,266	0,255	-23,3
Århus county	-0,258	0,274	-22,7	0,089	0,219	9,3	-0,256	0,188	-22,6
Viborg county	-0,280	0,393	-24,4	-0,444	0,441	-35,8	-0,004	0,240	-0,4
Northern Jutland county	0,135	0,402	14,4	0,072	0,554	7,5	-0,799	0,502	-55,0

TABLE A.2.14. LOCKING-IN EFFECTS OF OTHER ALMPSs TO MEN

(2002-2004)

	2002			2003			2004		
	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	-0,093	0,066	-8,9	-0,111	0,066	-10,5	-0,320	0,173	-27,4
Copenhagen county	-0,221	0,149	-19,8	-0,287	0,135	-24,9	-0,287	0,178	-24,9
Frederiksborg county	-0,970	0,348	-62,1	-0,206	0,536	-18,6	-0,717	0,342	-51,2
Roskilde county	-0,168	0,286	-15,4	-0,715	0,799	-51,1	-0,768	0,595	-53,6
Western Zelland county	-0,504	0,304	-39,6	-0,110	0,240	-10,4	-0,162	0,169	-15,0
Storstrøms county	-0,297	0,229	-25,7	-0,286	0,191	-24,9	-0,110	0,143	-10,4
Funen county	-0,256	0,179	-22,6	-0,754	0,563	-52,9	-0,671	0,316	-48,9
Southern Jutland county	-0,349	0,330	-29,5	0,586	0,447	79,7	-0,026	0,289	-2,6
Ribe county	0,333	0,397	39,5	0,000	0,000	0,0	-0,949	0,565	-61,3
Vejle county	-0,066	0,169	-6,4	-0,656	0,243	-48,1	-0,534	0,180	-41,4
Ringkøbing county	-0,479	0,243	-38,1	-0,566	0,341	-43,2	0,098	0,290	10,3
Århus county	0,022	0,145	2,2	-0,360	0,267	-30,2	0,075	0,171	7,8
Viborg county	-0,382	0,322	-31,7	0,008	0,530	0,8	-0,902	0,556	-59,4
Northern Jutland county	-0,826	0,425	-56,2	-0,707	0,417	-50,7	-0,174	0,177	-16,0

TABLE A.2.15. LOCKING-IN EFFECTS OF OTHER ALMPSs TO WOMEN

(1999-2001)

	1999			2000			2001		
	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	-0,825	0,321	-56,2	-0,792	0,366	-54,7	-0,341	0,192	-28,9
Copenhagen county	-0,896	0,384	-59,2	-0,444	0,454	-35,9	-0,145	0,200	-13,5
Frederiksborg county	-0,304	0,500	-26,2	-0,304	0,357	-26,2	-0,174	0,245	-16,0
Roskilde county	-0,796	0,455	-54,9	-0,262	0,901	-23,0	0,380	0,297	46,2
Western Zelland county	0,017	0,467	1,7	-1,440	0,700	-76,3	0,047	0,252	4,8
Storstrøms county	-0,444	0,348	-35,8	-0,314	0,284	-27,0	0,190	0,292	21,0
Funen county	-1,435	1,007	-76,2	-0,200	0,389	-18,1	-1,323	0,298	-73,4
Southern Jutland county	-0,324	0,745	-27,7	-0,833	0,500	-56,5	-0,225	0,264	-20,1
Ribe county	-0,745	0,410	-52,5	-1,228	0,480	-70,7	-1,237	0,592	-71,0
Vejle county	-1,038	0,281	-64,6	-0,312	0,254	-26,8	-0,240	0,150	-21,3
Ringkøbing county	-1,011	0,288	-63,6	-1,354	0,469	-74,2	-0,840	0,234	-56,8
Århus county	-0,664	0,293	-48,5	-0,369	0,240	-30,8	-0,424	0,197	-34,6
Viborg county	-1,435	0,435	-76,2	-0,934	0,540	-60,7	-0,227	0,266	-20,3
Northern Jutland county	-0,800	0,575	-55,0	-1,110	0,417	-67,1	-1,276	0,479	-72,1

TABLE A.2.16. LOCKING-IN EFFECTS OF OTHER ALMPSs TO WOMEN

(2002-2004)

	2002			2003			2004		
	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	-0,229	0,130	-20,5	-0,776	0,145	-54,0	-0,666	0,204	-48,6
Copenhagen county	-0,227	0,173	-20,3	-0,722	0,167	-51,4	-0,460	0,215	-36,9
Frederiksborg county	-0,375	0,245	-31,3	-1,275	0,695	-72,1	-1,086	0,337	-66,2
Roskilde county	-0,143	0,341	-13,4	-1,112	1,167	-67,1	-0,009	0,574	-0,9
Western Zelland county	-0,219	0,309	-19,7	-0,232	0,276	-20,7	-0,355	0,179	-29,9
Storstrøms county	-0,860	0,287	-57,7	-0,184	0,185	-16,8	-0,611	0,203	-45,7
Funen county	-0,506	0,178	-39,7	0,153	0,456	16,6	-0,138	0,310	-12,9
Southern Jutland county	-0,923	0,341	-60,2	0,328	0,344	38,8	0,232	0,278	26,1
Ribe county	0,037	0,421	3,8	-0,102	0,628	-9,7	-1,368	0,744	-74,5
Vejle county	-0,066	0,148	-6,4	-0,656	0,194	-48,1	-0,534	0,164	-41,4
Ringkøbing county	-0,611	0,150	-45,7	-0,696	0,256	-50,1	-0,515	0,294	-40,3
Århus county	-0,440	0,166	-35,6	-0,222	0,261	-19,9	-0,287	0,084	-24,9
Viborg county	-1,066	0,382	-65,5	-0,389	0,549	-32,2	-0,432	0,395	-35,1
Northern Jutland county	-0,235	0,289	-20,9	-0,972	0,352	-62,2	-0,132	0,184	-12,3

TABLE A.3.1. POST-PROGRAM EFFECTS OF PRIVATE JOB TRAINING TO MEN (1999-2001)

	1999			2000			2001		
	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	0,327	0,257	38,7	0,284	0,247	32,8	0,433	0,222	54,1
Copenhagen county	0,336	0,343	40,0	0,325	0,260	38,4	-0,201	0,303	-18,2
Frederiksborg county	0,621	0,365	86,1	0,507	0,353	66,0	0,517	0,360	67,6
Roskilde county	0,678	0,428	96,9	-0,228	0,288	-20,4	0,757	0,315	113,1
Western Zelland county	0,014	0,435	1,4	0,188	0,355	20,7	0,704	0,324	102,1
Storstrøms county	0,084	0,331	8,8	0,615	0,199	84,9	0,703	0,231	102,0
Funen county	0,568	0,218	76,5	0,261	0,227	29,8	0,474	0,147	60,6
Southern Jutland county	0,321	0,366	37,9	0,125	0,337	13,3	0,321	0,182	37,8
Ribe county	1,435	1,459	320,1	0,585	0,340	79,5	0,907	0,360	147,6
Vejle county	0,234	0,387	26,3	0,391	0,193	47,8	0,609	0,268	83,9
Ringkøbing county	0,726	0,309	106,7	0,422	0,269	52,5	0,889	0,346	143,1
Århus county	0,838	0,170	131,2	0,376	0,176	45,7	0,658	0,158	93,1
Viborg county	0,228	0,297	25,6	-0,078	0,337	-7,5	0,416	0,394	51,6
Northern Jutland county	0,528	0,289	69,5	0,760	0,162	113,8	0,825	0,184	128,2

TABLE A.3.2. POST-PROGRAM EFFECTS OF PRIVATE JOB TRAINING TO MEN (2002-2004)

	2002			2003			2004		
	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	0,356	0,205	42,7	0,793	0,168	120,9	0,253	0,187	28,7
Copenhagen county	0,382	0,281	46,5	0,494	0,240	63,9	0,443	0,187	55,7
Frederiksborg county	0,411	0,302	50,8	-0,165	0,418	-15,2	0,578	0,237	78,2
Roskilde county	0,479	0,378	61,4	0,477	0,406	61,2	0,204	0,323	22,6
Western Zelland county	-0,131	0,403	-12,3	0,360	0,206	43,3	0,461	0,226	58,5
Storstrøms county	0,787	0,226	119,6	-0,050	0,270	-4,9	0,333	0,195	39,5
Funen county	0,507	0,184	66,1	0,507	0,143	66,1	0,458	0,104	58,1
Southern Jutland county	0,122	0,232	13,0	0,453	0,333	57,3	0,230	0,219	25,8
Ribe county	0,239	0,365	27,0	0,498	0,247	64,6	0,549	0,197	73,1
Vejle county	0,739	0,196	109,3	0,634	0,197	88,5	0,084	0,140	8,8
Ringkøbing county	0,137	0,310	14,7	0,488	0,284	62,9	0,554	0,186	74,0
Århus county	0,637	0,156	89,1	0,522	0,159	68,5	0,612	0,098	84,5
Viborg county	0,451	0,360	57,0	0,281	0,248	32,4	0,595	0,234	81,2
Northern Jutland county	0,827	0,148	128,7	0,459	0,161	58,3	0,437	0,116	54,9

TABLE A.3.3. POST-PROGRAM EFFECTS OF PRIVATE JOB TRAINING TO WOMEN (1999-2001)

	1999			2000			2001		
	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	0,799	0,396	122,3	0,239	0,361	27,0	0,439	0,343	55,1
Copenhagen county	0,028	0,367	2,8	0,143	0,295	15,3	0,074	0,435	7,7
Frederiksborg county	-0,425	0,579	-34,6	0,258	0,340	29,4	0,751	0,331	112,0
Roskilde county	0,288	0,607	33,3	0,343	0,850	40,9	0,273	0,575	31,4
Western Zelland county	0,101	0,490	10,6	0,143	0,250	15,3	-0,166	0,504	-15,3
Storstrøms county	0,458	0,269	58,1	-0,345	0,317	-29,2	0,633	0,299	88,2
Funen county	0,725	0,341	106,5	0,706	0,245	102,7	0,706	0,263	102,7
Southern Jutland county	0,005	0,315	0,5	0,414	0,242	51,3	0,323	0,255	38,1
Ribe county	0,673	0,389	95,9	0,145	0,670	15,6	-0,202	0,378	-18,3
Vejle county	0,234	0,255	26,3	0,391	0,286	47,8	0,609	0,212	83,9
Ringkøbing county	0,374	0,209	45,4	-0,027	0,228	-2,6	0,444	0,211	55,8
Århus county	0,521	0,188	68,4	0,772	0,161	116,5	0,564	0,163	75,8
Viborg county	-0,063	0,373	-6,1	0,433	0,360	54,2	0,032	0,284	3,2
Northern Jutland county	0,550	0,232	73,2	0,577	0,173	78,1	0,649	0,190	91,4

TABLE A.3.4. POST-PROGRAM EFFECTS OF PRIVATE JOB TRAINING TO WOMEN (2002-2004)

	2002			2003			2004		
	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	0,483	0,264	62,0	0,468	0,258	59,7	0,919	0,209	150,6
Copenhagen county	0,560	0,278	75,1	0,482	0,286	62,0	0,400	0,287	49,2
Frederiksborg county	0,224	0,407	25,1	0,122	0,478	13,0	0,483	0,351	62,0
Roskilde county	0,837	0,719	131,0	0,034	0,421	3,5	0,445	0,447	56,0
Western Zelland county	0,168	0,346	18,3	0,054	0,259	5,6	0,048	0,371	4,9
Storstrøms county	0,499	0,389	64,7	0,348	0,293	41,6	0,726	0,204	106,7
Funen county	0,538	0,196	71,3	0,522	0,182	68,5	0,572	0,149	77,2
Southern Jutland county	0,683	0,250	98,1	0,254	0,367	28,9	0,647	0,259	91,0
Ribe county	-0,046	0,325	-4,5	0,103	0,285	10,8	0,383	0,251	46,6
Vejle county	0,739	0,166	109,3	0,634	0,192	88,5	0,084	0,175	8,8
Ringkøbing county	0,270	0,208	31,0	0,329	0,379	39,0	0,452	0,210	57,2
Århus county	0,413	0,158	51,2	0,536	0,141	71,0	0,607	0,128	83,5
Viborg county	0,649	0,305	91,4	0,321	0,279	37,9	0,228	0,251	25,6
Northern Jutland county	0,797	0,183	121,9	0,668	0,173	95,0	0,317	0,167	37,4

TABLE A.3.5. POST-PROGRAM EFFECTS OF PUBLIC JOB TRAINING TO MEN (1999-2001)

	1999			2000			2001		
	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	-0,008	0,181	-0,8	0,086	0,178	9,0	0,116	0,199	12,3
Copenhagen county	-0,079	0,242	-7,6	-0,335	0,272	-28,5	-0,298	0,323	-25,8
Frederiksborg county	0,209	0,360	23,3	0,115	0,393	12,1	0,186	0,390	20,4
Roskilde county	-0,144	0,668	-13,4	0,578	0,603	78,2	0,116	0,337	12,3
Western Zelland county	0,035	0,348	3,6	-0,335	0,303	-28,4	0,018	0,357	1,8
Storstrøms county	-0,157	0,320	-14,5	-0,009	0,248	-0,9	0,152	0,249	16,4
Funen county	0,341	0,280	40,6	0,151	0,204	16,3	-0,240	0,233	-21,3
Southern Jutland county	-0,165	0,383	-15,2	0,557	0,356	74,5	0,257	0,374	29,3
Ribe county	-0,594	0,608	-44,8	0,463	0,561	58,8	-0,749	0,735	-52,7
Vejle county	0,008	0,398	0,8	0,391	0,508	47,8	0,153	0,866	16,5
Ringkøbing county	0,282	0,489	32,6	0,419	0,531	52,0	-0,323	0,663	-27,6
Århus county	-0,009	0,247	-0,9	-0,050	0,179	-4,9	0,172	0,158	18,8
Viborg county	-0,206	0,920	-18,6	-0,206	0,434	-18,6	-0,204	0,495	-18,5
Northern Jutland county	0,158	0,248	17,1	-0,122	0,256	-11,5	0,390	0,196	47,6

TABLE A.3.6. POST-PROGRAM EFFECTS OF PUBLIC JOB TRAINING TO MEN (2002-2004)

	2002			2003			2004		
	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	-0,035	0,161	-3,4	0,067	0,136	6,9	-0,048	0,160	-4,7
Copenhagen county	0,180	0,187	19,7	-0,114	0,214	-10,8	-0,256	0,175	-22,6
Frederiksborg county	-0,937	0,568	-60,8	0,252	0,252	28,6	0,066	0,321	6,8
Roskilde county	-1,213	0,891	-70,3	-0,064	0,482	-6,2	0,505	0,282	65,7
Western Zelland county	0,227	0,286	25,4	-0,174	0,256	-16,0	-0,049	0,254	-4,8
Storstrøms county	-0,366	0,242	-30,6	-0,659	0,331	-48,3	-0,593	0,215	-44,7
Funen county	-0,223	0,309	-20,0	-0,311	0,208	-26,7	-0,225	0,178	-20,1
Southern Jutland county	-0,574	0,400	-43,7	-0,102	0,295	-9,7	0,135	0,364	14,4
Ribe county	-0,151	0,352	-14,0	-0,117	0,299	-11,1	0,129	0,307	13,8
Vejle county	-0,040	0,454	-3,9	0,061	0,425	6,3	-0,265	0,381	-23,3
Ringkøbing county	-0,342	1,020	-29,0	-0,958	0,822	-61,6	-0,383	0,419	-31,8
Århus county	0,080	0,173	8,3	-0,130	0,164	-12,2	0,080	0,132	8,3
Viborg county	-0,184	0,404	-16,8	0,029	0,403	2,9	-0,004	0,416	-0,4
Northern Jutland county	-0,146	0,208	-13,6	0,052	0,212	5,4	-0,172	0,142	-15,8

TABLE A.3.7. POST-PROGRAM EFFECTS OF PUBLIC JOB TRAINING TO WOMEN (1999-2001)

	1999			2000			2001		
	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	-0,032	0,232	-3,1	0,265	0,160	30,3	0,114	0,192	12,1
Copenhagen county	-0,078	0,213	-7,5	-1,520	0,186	-78,1	-0,149	0,176	-13,8
Frederiksborg county	0,149	0,237	16,1	-0,099	0,212	-9,5	-0,297	0,246	-25,7
Roskilde county	0,008	0,258	0,8	0,112	0,218	11,9	0,052	0,270	5,3
Western Zelland county	0,528	0,234	69,5	0,026	0,215	2,6	0,153	0,192	16,5
Storstrøms county	0,111	0,221	11,7	0,053	0,156	5,4	0,230	0,186	25,8
Funen county	0,147	0,267	15,8	0,246	0,141	27,9	0,041	0,137	4,2
Southern Jutland county	0,060	0,293	6,2	0,044	0,198	4,5	-0,365	0,269	-30,6
Ribe county	0,142	0,227	15,2	-0,017	0,184	-1,7	0,136	0,184	14,5
Vejle county	0,008	0,274	0,8	0,391	0,157	47,8	0,153	0,185	16,5
Ringkøbing county	0,148	0,235	15,9	-0,245	0,215	-21,7	0,295	0,157	34,3
Århus county	-0,094	0,137	-8,9	0,219	0,127	24,4	0,311	0,130	36,5
Viborg county	0,088	0,253	9,2	-0,134	0,295	-12,6	0,055	0,154	5,7
Northern Jutland county	0,141	0,176	15,1	0,055	0,158	5,7	0,104	0,139	10,9

TABLE A.3.8. POST-PROGRAM EFFECTS OF PUBLIC JOB TRAINING TO WOMEN (2002-2004)

	2002			2003			2004		
	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	0,224	0,137	25,1	0,337	0,138	40,0	0,080	0,129	8,3
Copenhagen county	0,083	0,153	8,6	-0,188	0,198	-17,1	0,213	0,130	23,8
Frederiksborg county	0,190	0,267	21,0	0,058	0,241	6,0	-0,051	0,265	-5,0
Roskilde county	-0,168	0,222	-15,4	-0,330	0,282	-28,1	-0,405	0,252	-33,3
Western Zelland county	-0,062	0,179	-6,0	-0,176	0,246	-16,1	-0,223	0,217	-20,0
Storstrøms county	-0,186	0,181	-16,9	0,065	0,193	6,7	-0,163	0,180	-15,0
Funen county	-0,010	0,138	-1,0	-0,004	0,244	-0,4	-0,068	0,172	-6,6
Southern Jutland county	-0,262	0,217	-23,1	-0,823	0,165	-56,1	-0,051	0,154	-4,9
Ribe county	-0,119	0,242	-11,2	-0,062	0,231	-6,0	-0,237	0,235	-21,1
Vejle county	-0,040	0,200	-3,9	-0,040	0,180	-3,9	-0,265	0,176	-23,3
Ringkøbing county	-0,167	0,226	-15,3	0,323	0,168	38,1	0,206	0,159	22,8
Århus county	0,323	0,119	38,1	-0,168	0,122	-15,4	0,073	0,095	7,6
Viborg county	0,035	0,202	3,5	-0,031	0,210	-3,1	0,261	0,162	29,8
Northern Jutland county	-0,007	0,143	-0,7	-0,114	0,139	-10,8	0,117	0,114	12,4

TABLE A.3.9. POST-PROGRAM EFFECTS OF EDUCATION TO MEN

(1999-2001)

	1999			2000			2001		
	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	-0,138	0,081	-12,9	-0,078	0,072	-7,5	0,137	0,065	14,7
Copenhagen county	0,059	0,114	6,1	0,033	0,096	3,3	-0,046	0,089	-4,5
Frederiksborg county	0,133	0,149	14,2	-0,007	0,120	-0,7	0,180	0,124	19,7
Roskilde county	0,218	0,207	24,4	0,171	0,181	18,6	-0,419	0,247	-34,3
Western Zelland county	-0,053	0,146	-5,1	0,102	0,128	10,8	0,162	0,121	17,6
Storstrøms county	-0,062	0,152	-6,0	0,126	0,122	13,4	0,156	0,125	16,9
Funen county	-0,148	0,100	-13,8	0,051	0,089	5,3	0,079	0,081	8,2
Southern Jutland county	-0,005	0,192	-0,5	0,207	0,132	22,9	0,086	0,126	9,0
Ribe county	-0,148	0,208	-13,8	0,104	0,189	10,9	0,129	0,141	13,7
Vejle county	-0,047	0,142	-4,6	-0,132	0,116	-12,4	-0,092	0,118	-8,8
Ringkøbing county	-0,143	0,163	-13,3	0,103	0,152	10,9	0,068	0,138	7,0
Århus county	-0,060	0,094	-5,8	0,063	0,065	6,5	0,041	0,061	4,2
Viborg county	0,002	0,185	0,2	0,241	0,188	27,3	-1,548	0,177	-78,7
Northern Jutland county	0,034	0,102	3,4	0,006	0,087	0,6	0,231	0,081	26,0

TABLE A.3.10. POST-PROGRAM EFFECTS OF EDUCATION TO MEN

(2002-2004)

	2002			2003			2004		
	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	-0,076	0,070	-7,3	-0,153	0,068	-14,2	-0,120	0,056	-11,3
Copenhagen county	-0,092	0,092	-8,8	-0,320	0,087	-27,4	-0,175	0,073	-16,1
Frederiksborg county	0,065	0,140	6,8	-0,086	0,144	-8,2	-0,065	0,175	-6,3
Roskilde county	-0,039	0,139	-3,8	-0,152	0,126	-14,1	0,047	0,111	4,8
Western Zelland county	-0,132	0,115	-12,4	-0,009	0,126	-0,9	0,019	0,144	2,0
Storstrøms county	0,112	0,131	11,8	-0,085	0,164	-8,1	0,073	0,136	7,6
Funen county	-0,045	0,071	-4,4	-0,250	0,071	-22,1	-0,127	0,063	-11,9
Southern Jutland county	-0,047	0,130	-4,6	-0,267	0,145	-23,4	-0,044	0,109	-4,3
Ribe county	-0,011	0,132	-1,1	-0,212	0,126	-19,1	-0,071	0,119	-6,9
Vejle county	-0,237	0,120	-21,1	-0,350	0,130	-29,5	-0,066	0,101	-6,3
Ringkøbing county	-0,054	0,167	-5,3	-0,637	0,158	-47,1	-0,282	0,113	-24,6
Århus county	-0,060	0,067	-5,8	-0,096	0,068	-9,1	-0,168	0,062	-15,5
Viborg county	-0,703	0,139	-50,5	-0,887	0,150	-58,8	-0,116	0,114	-11,0
Northern Jutland county	0,032	0,073	3,3	-0,134	0,077	-12,5	-0,057	0,070	-5,6

TABLE A.3.11. POST-PROGRAM EFFECTS OF EDUCATION TO WOMEN

(1999-2001)

	1999			2000			2001		
	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	-0,005	0,073	-0,5	-0,059	0,070	-5,7	0,052	0,068	5,3
Copenhagen county	-0,235	0,097	-20,9	-0,008	0,087	-0,8	0,146	0,080	15,7
Frederiksborg county	-0,094	0,113	-9,0	0,057	0,101	5,8	-0,117	0,106	-11,0
Roskilde county	0,127	0,125	13,5	-0,015	0,124	-1,5	-0,162	0,147	-14,9
Western Zelland county	-0,025	0,105	-2,4	-0,013	0,088	-1,3	0,075	0,098	7,7
Storstrøms county	-0,120	0,115	-11,3	-0,012	0,102	-1,2	-0,026	0,110	-2,5
Funen county	-0,024	0,080	-2,4	-0,082	0,074	-7,9	0,120	0,070	12,7
Southern Jutland county	-0,076	0,110	-7,4	0,105	0,095	11,1	0,030	0,090	3,0
Ribe county	-0,236	0,171	-21,0	0,062	0,137	6,4	0,077	0,108	8,0
Vejle county	-0,047	0,091	-4,6	-0,132	0,082	-12,4	-0,092	0,093	-8,8
Ringkøbing county	0,053	0,090	5,4	-0,085	0,094	-8,1	0,001	0,096	0,1
Århus county	-0,108	0,071	-10,2	0,012	0,062	1,2	0,048	0,053	4,9
Viborg county	-0,063	0,127	-6,1	-0,083	0,122	-8,0	0,043	0,126	4,3
Northern Jutland county	0,034	0,074	3,5	0,069	0,069	7,1	0,111	0,068	11,8

TABLE A.3.12. POST-PROGRAM EFFECTS OF EDUCATION TO WOMEN

(2002-2004)

	2002			2003			2004		
	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	-0,002	0,077	-0,2	-0,147	0,074	-13,7	-0,220	0,061	-19,7
Copenhagen county	-0,077	0,084	-7,4	-0,166	0,080	-15,3	-0,177	0,077	-16,3
Frederiksborg county	0,049	0,115	5,1	-0,194	0,145	-17,6	0,040	0,115	4,1
Roskilde county	-0,307	0,134	-26,4	-0,037	0,113	-3,6	-0,073	0,110	-7,0
Western Zelland county	0,158	0,084	17,1	-0,169	0,116	-15,5	-0,315	0,163	-27,1
Storstrøms county	0,112	0,097	11,8	-0,015	0,118	-1,5	-0,022	0,138	-2,2
Funen county	0,039	0,069	3,9	-0,197	0,066	-17,9	-0,231	0,065	-20,6
Southern Jutland county	-0,007	0,098	-0,7	-0,159	0,126	-14,7	-0,111	0,101	-10,5
Ribe county	-0,007	0,106	-0,7	-0,186	0,128	-17,0	-0,216	0,137	-19,5
Vejle county	-0,237	0,099	-21,1	-0,350	0,106	-29,5	-0,066	0,097	-6,3
Ringkøbing county	0,004	0,112	0,4	-0,135	0,124	-12,7	-0,231	0,110	-20,7
Århus county	0,030	0,056	3,0	-0,105	0,065	-10,0	-0,096	0,056	-9,2
Viborg county	0,068	0,105	7,1	-0,026	0,117	-2,5	-0,143	0,105	-13,3
Northern Jutland county	0,088	0,059	9,2	0,038	0,067	3,8	-0,002	0,076	-0,2

TABLE A.3.13. POST-PROGRAM EFFECTS OF OTHER ALMPSs TO MEN

(1999-2001)

	1999			2000			2001		
	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	0,032	0,138	3,2	-0,240	0,157	-21,3	-0,169	0,104	-15,6
Copenhagen county	0,317	0,170	37,3	-0,100	0,199	-9,5	-0,223	0,139	-20,0
Frederiksborg county	-0,101	0,361	-9,6	0,255	0,240	29,1	-0,375	0,248	-31,3
Roskilde county	0,114	0,424	12,0	-0,783	0,458	-54,3	-0,154	0,265	-14,3
Western Zelland county	-0,127	0,238	-11,9	0,056	0,236	5,7	-0,311	0,209	-26,7
Storstrøms county	-0,306	0,261	-26,4	0,000	0,161	0,0	-0,152	0,188	-14,1
Funen county	0,247	0,599	28,0	-0,293	0,266	-25,4	0,021	0,140	2,1
Southern Jutland county	0,077	0,367	8,0	-0,320	0,361	-27,3	-0,217	0,285	-19,5
Ribe county	-0,594	0,294	-44,8	-0,243	0,462	-21,5	0,677	0,344	96,8
Vejle county	-0,103	0,277	-9,8	0,139	0,204	14,9	0,125	0,178	13,3
Ringkøbing county	-0,418	0,323	-34,1	-0,203	0,368	-18,3	0,002	0,219	0,2
Århus county	-0,203	0,190	-18,3	-0,099	0,121	-9,4	-0,130	0,124	-12,2
Viborg county	-0,685	0,257	-49,6	-0,179	0,221	-16,4	-0,139	0,213	-13,0
Northern Jutland county	-0,481	0,263	-38,2	-0,069	0,236	-6,6	0,082	0,246	8,5

TABLE A.3.14. POST-PROGRAM EFFECTS OF OTHER ALMPSs TO MEN

(2002-2004)

	2002			2003			2004		
	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	0,015	0,066	1,5	-0,338	0,052	-28,7	-0,142	0,076	-13,2
Copenhagen county	-0,085	0,097	-8,2	-0,290	0,065	-25,2	-0,219	0,096	-19,7
Frederiksborg county	-0,049	0,173	-4,8	-0,033	0,227	-3,2	-0,157	0,150	-14,5
Roskilde county	-0,216	0,207	-19,4	-0,269	0,349	-23,6	-0,740	0,295	-52,3
Western Zelland county	0,085	0,184	8,8	-0,285	0,177	-24,8	-0,144	0,114	-13,4
Storstrøms county	-0,198	0,140	-18,0	-0,401	0,096	-33,0	-0,394	0,096	-32,6
Funen county	-0,014	0,106	-1,4	-0,172	0,227	-15,8	-0,360	0,161	-30,2
Southern Jutland county	-0,327	0,275	-27,9	-0,110	0,299	-10,4	-0,156	0,194	-14,4
Ribe county	-0,188	0,342	-17,1	-0,398	0,563	-32,8	-0,403	0,565	-33,1
Vejle county	-0,110	0,144	-10,4	-0,389	0,104	-32,2	-0,195	0,094	-17,7
Ringkøbing county	0,135	0,126	14,5	-0,197	0,147	-17,9	-0,530	0,203	-41,1
Århus county	-0,130	0,094	-12,2	-0,360	0,118	-30,2	-0,263	0,086	-23,1
Viborg county	-0,004	0,166	-0,4	0,012	0,301	1,2	-0,229	0,259	-20,5
Northern Jutland county	0,040	0,163	4,1	-0,425	0,180	-34,6	-0,407	0,100	-33,4

TABLE A.3.15. POST-PROGRAM EFFECTS OF OTHER ALMPSs TO WOMEN

(1999-2001)

	1999			2000			2001		
	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	-0,021	0,150	-2,1	-0,174	0,152	-16,0	0,114	0,118	12,1
Copenhagen county	-0,149	0,179	-13,8	0,136	0,215	14,5	0,003	0,130	0,3
Frederiksborg county	0,169	0,268	18,4	-0,328	0,268	-28,0	0,358	0,164	43,0
Roskilde county	-0,267	0,223	-23,4	0,183	0,421	20,0	0,119	0,201	12,6
Western Zelland county	-0,632	0,341	-46,8	0,013	0,230	1,3	-0,037	0,168	-3,6
Storstrøms county	-0,793	0,278	-54,7	-0,301	0,159	-26,0	-0,026	0,180	-2,5
Funen county	0,098	0,414	10,3	-0,096	0,198	-9,1	-0,057	0,124	-5,6
Southern Jutland county	-0,735	0,486	-52,1	-0,128	0,284	-12,0	0,144	0,194	15,5
Ribe county	0,106	0,221	11,1	-0,258	0,249	-22,7	-0,042	0,323	-4,1
Vejle county	-0,103	0,179	-9,8	0,139	0,147	14,9	0,125	0,116	13,3
Ringkøbing county	-0,288	0,175	-25,0	-0,054	0,157	-5,2	0,199	0,118	22,1
Århus county	-0,040	0,133	-3,9	-0,048	0,117	-4,7	0,033	0,098	3,3
Viborg county	-0,159	0,168	-14,7	-0,240	0,169	-21,3	-0,036	0,146	-3,6
Northern Jutland county	-0,034	0,159	-3,4	-0,308	0,221	-26,5	-0,250	0,216	-22,1

TABLE A.3.16. POST-PROGRAM EFFECTS OF OTHER ALMPSs TO WOMEN

(2002-2004)

	2002			2003			2004		
	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %	Estimate	Std. Err.	Effect, %
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	-0,113	0,077	-10,7	-0,368	0,054	-30,8	-0,229	0,077	-20,5
Copenhagen county	-0,073	0,102	-7,1	-0,073	0,072	-7,1	-0,308	0,095	-26,5
Frederiksborg county	0,160	0,132	17,4	-0,183	0,212	-16,7	-0,011	0,337	-1,1
Roskilde county	0,327	0,167	38,7	0,199	0,247	22,1	0,243	0,260	27,5
Western Zelland county	-0,034	0,309	-3,4	-0,078	0,194	-7,5	0,166	0,090	18,1
Storstrøms county	0,004	0,137	0,4	-0,365	0,102	-30,6	-0,185	0,091	-16,9
Funen county	0,055	0,096	5,7	-0,282	0,217	-24,6	-0,146	0,137	-13,6
Southern Jutland county	0,377	0,139	45,7	-0,481	0,242	-38,2	-0,041	0,153	-4,0
Ribe county	0,214	0,265	23,8	-0,028	0,267	-2,8	0,049	0,193	5,0
Vejle county	-0,110	0,097	-10,4	-0,389	0,087	-32,2	-0,195	0,076	-17,7
Ringkøbing county	-0,055	0,108	-5,3	-0,055	0,126	-5,3	-0,374	0,152	-31,2
Århus county	0,090	0,079	9,4	-0,105	0,121	-10,0	-0,194	0,084	-17,7
Viborg county	-0,026	0,154	-2,6	-0,337	0,252	-28,6	-0,295	0,193	-25,5
Northern Jutland county	0,114	0,161	12,1	-0,043	0,149	-4,2	-0,276	0,102	-24,1

TABLE A.4.1. UNEMPLOYMENT DURATIONS (IN WEEKS) OF MEN

ACTIVATED IN PRIVATE JOB TRAINING PROGRAMS (1999-2004)

	1999	**2000**	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	22,84	23,29	22,13	21,81	21,61	23,19
Copenhagen county	20,25	19,68	21,05	19,04	19,32	20,29
Frederiksborg county	17,00	16,28	15,04	14,89	16,19	15,50
Roskilde county	16,82	19,53	17,09	16,86	17,33	18,96
Western Zelland county	14,21	15,27	14,12	15,47	14,27	14,89
Storstrøms county	14,48	13,61	13,57	13,19	14,31	13,87
Funen county	10,26	10,47	10,02	10,06	10,01	10,13
Southern Jutland county	14,11	13,91	13,59	12,03	13,18	13,45
Ribe county	8,93	9,87	9,50	9,99	9,81	9,92
Vejle county	12,58	12,45	12,25	12,57	12,12	12,07
Ringkøbing county	8,69	8,85	8,39	8,94	8,55	8,87
Århus county	13,76	13,77	13,59	13,23	13,70	13,49
Viborg county	8,67	9,10	8,75	8,48	8,52	8,51
Northern Jutland county	14,27	13,86	13,89	13,83	14,02	14,19

TABLE A.4.2. UNEMPLOYMENT DURATIONS (IN WEEKS) OF WOMEN

ACTIVATED IN PRIVATE JOB TRAINING PROGRAMS (1999-2004)

	1999	**2000**	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	33,69	33,66	34,25	34,62	31,21	32,17
Copenhagen county	33,56	31,55	32,69	27,77	30,93	31,40
Frederiksborg county	25,19	26,58	25,08	25,98	26,25	25,45
Roskilde county	20,20	19,25	20,56	19,17	21,57	23,74
Western Zelland county	23,46	26,82	26,87	26,44	26,74	27,95
Storstrøms county	22,43	20,11	21,78	22,29	22,72	21,86
Funen county	19,60	19,60	19,84	18,67	19,24	18,98
Southern Jutland county	23,66	23,76	23,99	22,65	25,61	23,12
Ribe county	25,52	27,05	26,74	26,48	25,65	26,13
Vejle county	22,23	20,49	20,32	19,42	19,47	21,29
Ringkøbing county	22,46	22,13	20,28	20,47	21,95	21,39
Århus county	24,22	22,34	23,04	21,97	22,33	22,59
Viborg county	19,91	17,11	17,90	16,49	17,33	18,06
Northern Jutland county	26,28	26,29	24,47	23,43	25,48	25,96

TABLE A.4.3. UNEMPLOYMENT DURATIONS (IN WEEKS) OF MEN

ACTIVATED IN PUBLIC JOB TRAINING PROGRAMS (1999-2004)

	1999	**2000**	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	24,52	24,49	24,29	24,76	24,34	24,60
Copenhagen county	22,25	22,51	22,85	21,27	21,87	22,01
Frederiksborg county	17,46	17,14	17,29	18,15	16,17	17,05
Roskilde county	20,02	19,13	19,75	21,40	20,66	18,85
Western Zelland county	16,80	16,84	16,22	15,86	16,93	16,36
Storstrøms county	15,16	14,73	14,66	14,87	15,57	15,14
Funen county	10,88	10,87	11,22	11,05	11,14	10,83
Southern Jutland county	15,38	14,02	14,03	14,82	14,53	14,35
Ribe county	10,97	10,25	10,55	10,46	10,50	10,10
Vejle county	13,02	13,06	14,48	13,72	13,00	13,63
Ringkøbing county	9,28	9,08	9,58	9,74	9,56	9,62
Århus county	15,08	14,81	14,72	14,42	14,75	14,28
Viborg county	9,21	8,93	9,33	8,95	9,08	9,06
Northern Jutland county	15,25	15,57	14,79	15,16	15,21	15,41

TABLE A.4.4. UNEMPLOYMENT DURATIONS (IN WEEKS) OF WOMEN

ACTIVATED IN PUBLIC JOB TRAINING PROGRAMS (1999-2004)

	1999	**2000**	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	39,49	36,80	36,88	37,35	35,68	36,91
Copenhagen county	35,78	34,45	34,49	34,04	35,28	33,39
Frederiksborg county	28,44	27,92	29,07	26,89	26,11	27,47
Roskilde county	24,81	24,09	24,48	24,18	25,39	24,64
Western Zelland county	27,17	28,02	28,18	28,16	28,18	28,38
Storstrøms county	24,23	23,63	23,56	24,78	23,75	24,77
Funen county	21,79	21,74	21,22	22,42	22,24	21,94
Southern Jutland county	27,23	26,80	27,99	26,70	26,76	26,53
Ribe county	28,41	28,40	27,21	27,71	27,14	28,62
Vejle county	23,75	22,09	23,23	22,45	23,46	23,60
Ringkøbing county	24,94	25,09	23,32	24,24	24,22	23,45
Århus county	26,51	24,98	24,50	24,69	25,69	24,69
Viborg county	19,85	19,97	18,86	18,96	18,55	18,56
Northern Jutland county	29,63	29,43	28,70	28,72	28,49	27,70

TABLE A.4.5. UNEMPLOYMENT DURATIONS (IN WEEKS) OF MEN

ACTIVATED IN EDUCATION PROGRAMS (1999-2004)

	1999	**2000**	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	23,99	23,94	23,43	23,96	24,19	24,03
Copenhagen county	21,18	21,14	21,15	21,29	21,65	21,46
Frederiksborg county	16,62	16,60	16,28	16,73	16,18	16,33
Roskilde county	18,92	18,82	19,65	19,16	19,16	19,13
Western Zelland county	15,68	15,57	15,25	15,68	15,65	15,73
Storstrøms county	14,73	14,22	14,27	14,28	14,43	14,24
Funen county	10,77	10,51	10,56	10,64	10,68	10,63
Southern Jutland county	14,23	14,10	14,01	14,22	14,54	14,09
Ribe county	10,36	10,21	10,26	10,14	10,40	10,19
Vejle county	13,55	13,19	13,07	13,23	13,72	13,38
Ringkøbing county	9,39	9,28	9,27	9,29	9,61	9,40
Århus county	14,66	14,48	14,48	14,61	14,54	14,69
Viborg county	9,02	8,79	9,02	8,82	9,01	8,90
Northern Jutland county	15,04	14,97	14,58	15,09	15,15	14,98

TABLE A.4.6. UNEMPLOYMENT DURATIONS (IN WEEKS) OF WOMEN

ACTIVATED IN EDUCATION PROGRAMS (1999-2004)

	1999	**2000**	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	37,08	37,16	36,67	37,04	37,53	37,84
Copenhagen county	34,86	34,27	33,32	34,17	34,55	34,86
Frederiksborg county	27,69	27,14	27,53	27,13	27,56	26,94
Roskilde county	24,12	24,21	24,35	24,84	24,11	24,25
Western Zelland county	27,76	27,55	26,88	26,74	27,83	28,28
Storstrøms county	24,40	23,88	23,65	23,49	23,71	24,18
Funen county	21,51	21,40	20,86	21,07	21,41	21,38
Southern Jutland county	26,51	25,94	26,02	26,18	26,69	26,48
Ribe county	28,19	26,92	26,94	27,16	27,56	28,06
Vejle county	23,24	23,23	23,06	23,43	23,92	22,95
Ringkøbing county	24,12	24,24	24,06	23,81	24,33	24,84
Århus county	25,67	25,34	25,30	25,18	25,43	25,56
Viborg county	19,29	19,01	18,54	18,62	18,90	19,23
Northern Jutland county	28,62	28,02	28,14	28,31	28,39	28,68

TABLE A.4.7. UNEMPLOYMENT DURATIONS (IN WEEKS) OF MEN

ACTIVATED IN OTHER ALMPs (1999-2004)

	1999	**2000**	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	23,01	23,52	23,17	22,58	23,36	23,15
Copenhagen county	19,69	20,66	21,03	20,51	20,96	20,64
Frederiksborg county	16,19	15,92	16,85	16,38	16,07	16,48
Roskilde county	18,43	19,55	18,64	18,82	19,24	19,92
Western Zelland county	15,48	14,62	15,76	15,19	15,48	15,34
Storstrøms county	14,50	13,89	14,01	14,15	14,36	14,26
Funen county	9,89	10,29	10,28	10,28	10,50	10,61
Southern Jutland county	13,81	13,65	14,07	14,15	13,34	13,80
Ribe county	10,17	10,12	9,22	9,84	10,53	10,37
Vejle county	12,86	12,50	12,52	12,92	13,11	12,92
Ringkøbing county	9,34	9,12	8,95	8,91	9,13	9,10
Århus county	14,16	13,86	13,99	13,93	14,38	14,04
Viborg county	8,88	8,71	8,56	8,60	8,49	8,83
Northern Jutland county	14,73	14,35	14,49	14,56	15,08	14,84

TABLE A.4.8. UNEMPLOYMENT DURATIONS (IN WEEKS) OF WOMEN

ACTIVATED IN OTHER ALMPs (1999-2004)

	1999	**2000**	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	35,72	36,31	35,56	35,42	36,99	36,40
Copenhagen county	33,47	31,93	32,12	32,52	34,08	33,62
Frederiksborg county	25,29	27,08	24,51	25,38	26,99	26,39
Roskilde county	23,67	21,57	21,58	21,56	22,93	22,15
Western Zelland county	27,18	26,69	25,71	26,03	26,18	25,52
Storstrøms county	24,41	23,38	22,43	22,98	23,39	23,33
Funen county	20,37	20,15	20,72	20,06	20,12	20,20
Southern Jutland county	26,41	25,50	24,24	23,91	25,05	24,22
Ribe county	25,77	27,08	26,48	24,73	25,62	26,25
Vejle county	22,41	21,28	21,26	21,71	22,87	22,34
Ringkøbing county	23,93	23,46	22,47	23,09	23,47	23,80
Århus county	24,30	23,92	23,94	23,78	25,02	24,41
Viborg county	18,66	18,65	17,86	18,27	18,51	18,47
Northern Jutland county	27,51	28,49	28,41	26,55	27,64	27,59

TABLE A.4.9. UNEMPLOYMENT DURATIONS (IN WEEKS) WITHOUT ACTIVATION

	Men	**Women**
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	22,5	34,6
Copenhagen county	20,1	31,9
Frederiksborg county	15,9	25,5
Roskilde county	18,3	22,3
Western Zelland county	15,1	25,7
Storstrøms county	13,8	22,3
Funen county	10,2	19,8
Southern Jutland county	13,6	24,4
Ribe county	9,9	25,4
Vejle county	12,5	21,4
Ringkøbing county	8,9	22,4
Århus county	13,8	23,6
Viborg county	8,5	17,6
Northern Jutland county	14,3	26,6

TABLE A.5.1. NET EFFECTS OF PRIVATE JOB TRAINING TO MEN

(1999-2004)

	1999	**2000**	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	0,317	0,765	-0,394	-0,709	-0,918	0,668
Copenhagen county	0,101	-0,466	0,907	-1,104	-0,831	0,147
Frederiksborg county	1,089	0,370	-0,871	-1,014	0,284	-0,403
Roskilde county	-1,502	1,208	-1,233	-1,464	-0,989	0,636
Western Zelland county	-0,843	0,224	-0,934	0,416	-0,786	-0,163
Storstrøms county	0,698	-0,173	-0,216	-0,594	0,521	0,089
Funen county	0,071	0,277	-0,174	-0,135	-0,177	-0,061
Southern Jutland county	0,523	0,326	0,002	-1,559	-0,406	-0,143
Ribe county	-0,923	0,018	-0,351	0,139	-0,047	0,069
Vejle county	0,064	-0,073	-0,268	0,045	-0,401	-0,453
Ringkøbing county	-0,185	-0,032	-0,492	0,057	-0,331	-0,010
Århus county	-0,033	-0,015	-0,201	-0,554	-0,087	-0,297
Viborg county	0,177	0,608	0,250	-0,012	0,020	0,012
Northern Jutland county	-0,036	-0,441	-0,417	-0,473	-0,288	-0,112

TABLE A.5.2. NET EFFECTS OF PRIVATE JOB TRAINING TO WOMEN

(1999-2004)

	1999	**2000**	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	-0,911	-0,941	-0,352	0,014	-3,395	-2,430
Copenhagen county	1,646	-0,357	0,776	-4,138	-0,982	-0,513
Frederiksborg county	-0,293	1,095	-0,397	0,497	0,769	-0,029
Roskilde county	-2,133	-3,086	-1,769	-3,158	-0,762	1,412
Western Zelland county	-2,202	1,154	1,208	0,772	1,079	2,280
Storstrøms county	0,080	-2,235	-0,564	-0,062	0,368	-0,486
Funen county	-0,149	-0,152	0,091	-1,083	-0,512	-0,772
Southern Jutland county	-0,767	-0,667	-0,431	-1,775	1,187	-1,303
Ribe county	0,099	1,627	1,326	1,060	0,237	0,710
Vejle county	0,875	-0,867	-1,038	-1,942	-1,888	-0,067
Ringkøbing county	0,078	-0,255	-2,106	-1,916	-0,431	-0,994
Århus county	0,604	-1,270	-0,570	-1,644	-1,289	-1,030
Viborg county	2,312	-0,491	0,306	-1,107	-0,266	0,465
Northern Jutland county	-0,371	-0,358	-2,175	-3,217	-1,165	-0,683

TABLE A.5.3. NET EFFECTS OF PUBLIC JOB TRAINING TO MEN

(1999-2004)

	1999	**2000**	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	1,997	1,965	1,768	2,235	1,819	2,078
Copenhagen county	2,105	2,364	2,706	1,120	1,724	1,863
Frederiksborg county	1,555	1,231	1,379	2,245	0,258	1,145
Roskilde county	1,699	0,811	1,431	3,081	2,335	0,525
Western Zelland county	1,747	1,792	1,173	0,813	1,881	1,305
Storstrøms county	1,372	0,949	0,878	1,082	1,780	1,357
Funen county	0,690	0,681	1,029	0,862	0,949	0,643
Southern Jutland county	1,794	0,427	0,443	1,234	0,936	0,764
Ribe county	1,113	0,396	0,692	0,604	0,644	0,248
Vejle county	0,501	0,540	1,954	1,203	0,477	1,111
Ringkøbing county	0,398	0,198	0,699	0,863	0,684	0,740
Århus county	1,287	1,019	0,930	0,637	0,961	0,493
Viborg county	0,712	0,434	0,837	0,457	0,583	0,561
Northern Jutland county	0,948	1,261	0,485	0,859	0,904	1,101

TABLE A.5.4. NET EFFECTS OF PUBLIC JOB TRAINING TO WOMEN

(1999-2004)

	1999	**2000**	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	4,886	2,196	2,273	2,745	1,076	2,311
Copenhagen county	3,872	2,540	2,583	2,129	3,374	1,476
Frederiksborg county	2,959	2,434	3,590	1,404	0,627	1,992
Roskilde county	2,476	1,761	2,147	1,852	3,061	2,312
Western Zelland county	1,506	2,356	2,511	2,493	2,512	2,718
Storstrøms county	1,884	1,278	1,211	2,434	1,402	2,419
Funen county	2,041	1,983	1,468	2,662	2,486	2,189
Southern Jutland county	2,810	2,376	3,566	2,273	2,335	2,109
Ribe county	2,992	2,985	1,792	2,293	1,721	3,202
Vejle county	2,389	0,733	1,870	1,091	2,105	2,244
Ringkøbing county	2,557	2,707	0,937	1,861	1,840	1,070
Århus county	2,891	1,360	0,880	1,080	2,075	1,077
Viborg county	2,248	2,371	1,259	1,360	0,955	0,964
Northern Jutland county	2,983	2,788	2,051	2,076	1,842	1,052

TABLE A.5.5. NET EFFECTS OF EDUCATION TO MEN (1999-2004)

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	1,466	1,416	0,903	1,436	1,667	1,511
Copenhagen county	1,033	0,991	1,006	1,140	1,505	1,310
Frederiksborg county	0,711	0,688	0,374	0,824	0,277	0,425
Roskilde county	0,599	0,503	1,330	0,841	0,839	0,812
Western Zelland county	0,628	0,523	0,203	0,633	0,604	0,681
Storstrøms county	0,949	0,433	0,482	0,495	0,650	0,452
Funen county	0,581	0,315	0,371	0,451	0,489	0,436
Southern Jutland county	0,639	0,508	0,424	0,632	0,953	0,496
Ribe county	0,508	0,355	0,408	0,282	0,548	0,336
Vejle county	1,028	0,670	0,550	0,704	1,198	0,863
Ringkøbing county	0,509	0,398	0,388	0,407	0,729	0,520
Århus county	0,868	0,687	0,694	0,820	0,748	0,902
Viborg county	0,526	0,296	0,523	0,327	0,518	0,402
Northern Jutland county	0,734	0,666	0,277	0,787	0,840	0,676

TABLE A.5.6. NET EFFECTS OF EDUCATION TO WOMEN (1999-2004)

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	2,482	2,556	2,067	2,433	2,923	3,238
Copenhagen county	2,946	2,360	1,407	2,264	2,635	2,954
Frederiksborg county	2,208	1,662	2,047	1,647	2,075	1,462
Roskilde county	1,784	1,874	2,014	2,505	1,774	1,918
Western Zelland county	2,091	1,879	1,218	1,073	2,169	2,610
Storstrøms county	2,048	1,531	1,299	1,140	1,360	1,833
Funen county	1,760	1,651	1,110	1,317	1,654	1,629
Southern Jutland county	2,088	1,515	1,600	1,751	2,267	2,053
Ribe county	2,774	1,505	1,519	1,739	2,146	2,639
Vejle county	1,880	1,874	1,701	2,076	2,566	1,591
Ringkøbing county	1,733	1,854	1,678	1,427	1,943	2,458
Århus county	2,058	1,729	1,685	1,569	1,814	1,949
Viborg county	1,694	1,414	0,938	1,018	1,299	1,632
Northern Jutland county	1,972	1,377	1,497	1,664	1,749	2,038

TABLE A.5.7. NET EFFECTS OF OTHER ALMPSs TO MEN (1999-2004)

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	0,488	0,997	0,651	0,060	0,841	0,630
Copenhagen county	-0,459	0,513	0,885	0,362	0,814	0,494
Frederiksborg county	0,279	0,017	0,943	0,477	0,166	0,577
Roskilde county	0,111	1,225	0,318	0,496	0,914	1,600
Western Zelland county	0,427	-0,429	0,707	0,136	0,425	0,286
Storstrøms county	0,712	0,106	0,227	0,364	0,572	0,479
Funen county	-0,301	0,102	0,091	0,087	0,311	0,417
Southern Jutland county	0,222	0,065	0,484	0,557	-0,245	0,210
Ribe county	0,316	0,262	-0,631	-0,017	0,673	0,516
Vejle county	0,342	-0,018	-0,003	0,402	0,593	0,401
Ringkøbing county	0,459	0,236	0,069	0,031	0,246	0,219
Århus county	0,369	0,067	0,204	0,143	0,589	0,256
Viborg county	0,386	0,214	0,069	0,107	-0,009	0,331
Northern Jutland county	0,427	0,043	0,185	0,249	0,771	0,539

TABLE A.5.8. NET EFFECTS OF OTHER ALMPSs TO WOMEN (1999-2004)

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	1,120	1,710	0,962	0,815	2,385	1,793
Copenhagen county	1,564	0,025	0,205	0,608	2,166	1,708
Frederiksborg county	-0,193	1,603	-0,969	-0,101	1,506	0,913
Roskilde county	1,340	-0,766	-0,750	-0,776	0,600	-0,181
Western Zelland county	1,516	1,019	0,046	0,368	0,514	-0,146
Storstrøms county	2,060	1,031	0,081	0,627	1,044	0,985
Funen county	0,617	0,400	0,963	0,307	0,364	0,442
Southern Jutland county	1,984	1,073	-0,183	-0,514	0,622	-0,201
Ribe county	0,355	1,665	1,066	-0,689	0,201	0,832
Vejle county	1,056	-0,074	-0,095	0,348	1,513	0,987
Ringkøbing county	1,544	1,073	0,083	0,707	1,083	1,417
Århus county	0,689	0,302	0,321	0,164	1,406	0,793
Viborg county	1,061	1,049	0,258	0,677	0,915	0,875
Northern Jutland county	0,866	1,849	1,766	-0,093	0,997	0,947

TABLE A.6.1. EFFECTS (%) OF PRIVATE JOB TRAINING TO

UNEMPLOYMENT DURATION OF MEN (1999-2004)

	1999	**2000**	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	1,41	3,39	-1,75	-3,15	-4,07	2,97
Copenhagen county	0,50	-2,31	4,50	-5,48	-4,12	0,73
Frederiksborg county	6,84	2,33	-5,47	-6,38	1,78	-2,53
Roskilde county	-8,20	6,59	-6,73	-7,99	-5,40	3,47
Western Zelland county	-5,60	1,49	-6,20	2,77	-5,22	-1,09
Storstrøms county	5,07	-1,26	-1,57	-4,31	3,78	0,65
Funen county	0,69	2,71	-1,71	-1,33	-1,74	-0,60
Southern Jutland county	3,85	2,40	0,02	-11,48	-2,99	-1,05
Ribe county	-9,37	0,18	-3,56	1,41	-0,47	0,70
Vejle county	0,51	-0,58	-2,14	0,36	-3,20	-3,62
Ringkøbing county	-2,08	-0,36	-5,54	0,64	-3,72	-0,11
Århus county	-0,24	-0,11	-1,46	-4,02	-0,63	-2,15
Viborg county	2,08	7,16	2,94	-0,14	0,24	0,14
Northern Jutland county	-0,25	-3,08	-2,91	-3,31	-2,01	-0,78

TABLE A.6.2. EFFECTS (%) OF PRIVATE JOB TRAINING TO

UNEMPLOYMENT DURATION OF WOMEN (1999-2004)

	1999	**2000**	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	-2,63	-2,72	-1,02	0,04	-9,81	-7,02
Copenhagen county	5,16	-1,12	2,43	-12,97	-3,08	-1,61
Frederiksborg county	-1,15	4,30	-1,56	1,95	3,02	-0,11
Roskilde county	-9,55	-13,82	-7,92	-14,14	-3,41	6,32
Western Zelland county	-8,58	4,50	4,71	3,01	4,20	8,88
Storstrøms county	0,36	-10,00	-2,52	-0,28	1,65	-2,17
Funen county	-0,75	-0,77	0,46	-5,48	-2,59	-3,91
Southern Jutland county	-3,14	-2,73	-1,76	-7,27	4,86	-5,34
Ribe county	0,39	6,40	5,22	4,17	0,93	2,79
Vejle county	4,10	-4,06	-4,86	-9,09	-8,84	-0,31
Ringkøbing county	0,35	-1,14	-9,41	-8,56	-1,93	-4,44
Århus county	2,56	-5,38	-2,41	-6,96	-5,46	-4,36
Viborg county	13,14	-2,79	1,74	-6,29	-1,51	2,64
Northern Jutland county	-1,39	-1,34	-8,16	-12,07	-4,37	-2,56

TABLE A.6.3. EFFECTS (%) OF PUBLIC JOB TRAINING TO

UNEMPLOYMENT DURATION OF MEN (1999-2004)

	1999	**2000**	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	8,86	8,72	7,85	9,92	8,08	9,23
Copenhagen county	10,45	11,74	13,43	5,56	8,56	9,25
Frederiksborg county	9,77	7,74	8,67	14,12	1,62	7,20
Roskilde county	9,28	4,43	7,81	16,82	12,74	2,87
Western Zelland county	11,61	11,90	7,79	5,40	12,50	8,67
Storstrøms county	9,95	6,88	6,37	7,85	12,92	9,84
Funen county	6,77	6,68	10,10	8,46	9,31	6,31
Southern Jutland county	13,20	3,14	3,26	9,08	6,89	5,62
Ribe county	11,30	4,02	7,02	6,13	6,53	2,52
Vejle county	4,00	4,31	15,61	9,61	3,81	8,87
Ringkøbing county	4,49	2,23	7,88	9,72	7,71	8,33
Århus county	9,34	7,39	6,74	4,62	6,97	3,58
Viborg county	8,38	5,11	9,85	5,38	6,87	6,60
Northern Jutland county	6,62	8,82	3,39	6,01	6,32	7,70

TABLE A.6.4. EFFECTS (%) OF PUBLIC JOB TRAINING TO

UNEMPLOYMENT DURATION OF WOMEN (1999-2004)

	1999	**2000**	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	14,12	6,35	6,57	7,93	3,11	6,68
Copenhagen county	12,13	7,96	8,10	6,67	10,57	4,63
Frederiksborg county	11,61	9,55	14,09	5,51	2,46	7,82
Roskilde county	11,09	7,88	9,61	8,30	13,71	10,35
Western Zelland county	5,87	9,18	9,78	9,71	9,79	10,59
Storstrøms county	8,43	5,72	5,42	10,89	6,27	10,82
Funen county	10,33	10,04	7,43	13,47	12,58	11,08
Southern Jutland county	11,51	9,73	14,60	9,31	9,56	8,64
Ribe county	11,77	11,74	7,05	9,02	6,77	12,60
Vejle county	11,18	3,43	8,76	5,11	9,86	10,51
Ringkøbing county	11,42	12,09	4,18	8,31	8,22	4,78
Århus county	12,24	5,76	3,73	4,57	8,79	4,56
Viborg county	12,77	13,47	7,16	7,73	5,43	5,48
Northern Jutland county	11,19	10,46	7,70	7,79	6,91	3,95

TABLE A.6.5. EFFECTS (%) OF EDUCATION TO UNEMPLOYMENT

DURATION OF MEN (1999-2004)

	1999	**2000**	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	6,51	6,29	4,01	6,38	7,40	6,71
Copenhagen county	5,13	4,92	4,99	5,66	7,47	6,50
Frederiksborg county	4,47	4,33	2,35	5,18	1,74	2,67
Roskilde county	3,27	2,74	7,26	4,59	4,58	4,43
Western Zelland county	4,17	3,47	1,35	4,20	4,01	4,52
Storstrøms county	6,89	3,14	3,49	3,59	4,71	3,28
Funen county	5,70	3,09	3,64	4,43	4,80	4,27
Southern Jutland county	4,71	3,74	3,12	4,65	7,01	3,65
Ribe county	5,16	3,60	4,14	2,87	5,57	3,41
Vejle county	8,21	5,35	4,39	5,62	9,57	6,89
Ringkøbing county	5,73	4,48	4,37	4,58	8,21	5,85
Århus county	6,30	4,98	5,03	5,95	5,42	6,54
Viborg county	6,19	3,49	6,15	3,84	6,09	4,73
Northern Jutland county	5,13	4,66	1,93	5,50	5,87	4,72

TABLE A.6.6. EFFECTS (%) OF EDUCATION TO UNEMPLOYMENT

DURATION OF WOMEN (1999-2004)

	1999	**2000**	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	7,17	7,39	5,97	7,03	8,45	9,36
Copenhagen county	9,23	7,40	4,41	7,10	8,26	9,26
Frederiksborg county	8,67	6,52	8,03	6,46	8,14	5,74
Roskilde county	7,99	8,39	9,02	11,22	7,94	8,59
Western Zelland county	8,15	7,32	4,75	4,18	8,45	10,17
Storstrøms county	9,16	6,85	5,81	5,10	6,09	8,20
Funen county	8,91	8,36	5,62	6,67	8,37	8,25
Southern Jutland county	8,55	6,20	6,55	7,17	9,28	8,40
Ribe county	10,92	5,92	5,98	6,84	8,44	10,38
Vejle county	8,80	8,77	7,96	9,72	12,01	7,45
Ringkøbing county	7,74	8,28	7,50	6,38	8,68	10,98
Århus county	8,71	7,32	7,13	6,64	7,68	8,25
Viborg county	9,63	8,04	5,33	5,78	7,38	9,28
Northern Jutland county	7,40	5,17	5,62	6,25	6,56	7,65

TABLE A.6.7. EFFECTS (%) OF OTHER ALMPs TO UNEMPLOYMENT

DURATION OF MEN (1999-2004)

	1999	**2000**	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	2,17	4,43	2,89	0,26	3,73	2,80
Copenhagen county	-2,28	2,55	4,39	1,80	4,04	2,45
Frederiksborg county	1,76	0,11	5,93	3,00	1,05	3,62
Roskilde county	0,61	6,68	1,73	2,71	4,99	8,73
Western Zelland county	2,84	-2,85	4,70	0,91	2,82	1,90
Storstrøms county	5,17	0,77	1,65	2,64	4,15	3,48
Funen county	-2,95	1,00	0,89	0,85	3,05	4,09
Southern Jutland county	1,63	0,48	3,56	4,10	-1,80	1,54
Ribe county	3,20	2,66	-6,40	-0,17	6,83	5,23
Vejle county	2,73	-0,14	-0,02	3,21	4,73	3,20
Ringkøbing county	5,17	2,66	0,77	0,35	2,77	2,47
Århus county	2,68	0,49	1,48	1,04	4,27	1,86
Viborg county	4,54	2,51	0,81	1,26	-0,10	3,90
Northern Jutland county	2,98	0,30	1,29	1,74	5,39	3,76

TABLE A.6.8. EFFECTS (%) OF OTHER ALMPs TO UNEMPLOYMENT

DURATION OF WOMEN (1999-2004)

	1999	**2000**	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	3,24	4,94	2,78	2,35	6,89	5,18
Copenhagen county	4,90	0,08	0,64	1,91	6,79	5,35
Frederiksborg county	-0,76	6,29	-3,80	-0,39	5,91	3,58
Roskilde county	6,00	-3,43	-3,36	-3,47	2,69	-0,81
Western Zelland county	5,91	3,97	0,18	1,43	2,00	-0,57
Storstrøms county	9,22	4,61	0,36	2,81	4,67	4,41
Funen county	3,12	2,02	4,87	1,56	1,84	2,24
Southern Jutland county	8,12	4,40	-0,75	-2,10	2,55	-0,82
Ribe county	1,39	6,55	4,20	-2,71	0,79	3,27
Vejle county	4,95	-0,35	-0,45	1,63	7,08	4,62
Ringkøbing county	6,90	4,80	0,37	3,16	4,84	6,33
Århus county	2,92	1,28	1,36	0,70	5,95	3,36
Viborg county	6,03	5,96	1,46	3,85	5,20	4,97
Northern Jutland county	3,25	6,94	6,63	-0,35	3,74	3,55

TABLE A.7.1. UNEMPLOYED MEN AND WOMEN ACTIVATED IN PRIVATE SECTOR EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS IN 1999 – 2004, %

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Country level						
Men	*5,8*	*8,6*	*7,7*	*19,7*	*11,8*	*9,5*
Women	*3,2*	*4,6*	*4,4*	9,7	6,0	5,5
Copenhagen Frederiksberg						
Men	3,5	3,8	4,4	4,7	4,4	8
Women	1,9	2,2	2,6	2,9	3,2	5,5
Copenhagen county						
Men	3,3	4,4	5,1	4,9	4,4	9,4
Women	1,7	3,1	2,8	2,8	2,5	4,3
Frederiksborg county						
Men	5	7,8	7,9	17,8	12,3	10,1
Women	2,6	4,1	4,3	9,2	7,0	4,5
Roskilde county						
Men	6,4	7,9	8	20,8	11,6	8,2
Women	2,3	3,2	4,2	8,4	4,6	3,9
Western Zelland county						
Men	5,5	10,6	7,5	17,5	10,1	9,8
Women	3,4	5,6	3	9,5	5,6	4,6
Storstrøms county						
Men	5,7	10	10,2	23,2	14,5	11,4
Women	2,5	3,8	4,7	9,3	7,3	5,5
Funen county						
Men	2,9	8,7	9,1	24,5	11,0	10,4
Women	2,5	3,3	4,5	10,0	5,3	4,8
Southern Jutland county						
Men	12,5	16,8	14,9	23,2	15,8	16,1
Women	5,2	6,2	6,6	9,8	5,7	7,2
Ribe county						
Men	4,3	12,8	11	23,4	24,0	14,4
Women	2,7	4,9	5,2	11,8	9,9	7,1
Vejle county						
Men	8	11,6	9,9	24,6	18,8	11,7
Women	5	7,1	6,2	12,7	9,1	6,9
Ringkøbing county						
Men	8,2	11,6	9,6	26,8	15,5	11,5
Women	4,3	4,7	5,6	12,3	6,5	7,1
Århus county						
Men	8,5	9	6,8	23,2	13,0	8,6
Women	4	4,5	3,6	11,8	6,1	5,2
Viborg county						
Men	3,6	13,9	9,1	22,1	17,0	10,5
Women	2,7	7,4	5,1	10,9	8,2	7,6
Northern Jutland county						
Men	6,7	9,1	8,5	23,3	12,8	11,0
Women	3	5,9	5,4	10,6	6,1	6,5

Source: www.jobindsats.dk

TABLE A.7.2. UNEMPLOYED MEN AND WOMEN ACTIVATED IN PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS IN 1999 – 2004, %

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Country level						
Men	*11,6*	*11,5*	*12*	*21,5*	*17,5*	*13,9*
Women	*14,5*	*15,1*	*15,8*	*28,4*	*20,9*	*17,5*
Copenhagen Frederiksberg						
Men	13,1	11,1	10,2	13,5	12	12,8
Women	14,2	11,2	11	14,3	11,4	15,2
Copenhagen county						
Men	16,3	13,5	11,1	13,7	10,5	12,8
Women	15	13,8	13,5	15,9	12,8	17,3
Frederiksborg county						
Men	12,5	7,5	9,5	18,7	20,1	9,2
Women	12	10,9	12,5	25,2	25,9	12,7
Roskilde county						
Men	7,8	13,5	10,5	16,5	15,2	11,9
Women	12,9	23,5	18,8	28,5	20,7	20,5
Western Zelland county						
Men	12,1	15,9	16,2	18,1	17,5	16,4
Women	19,4	20,4	19	27,1	19,6	17,8
Storstrøms county						
Men	20,5	16,4	23,4	29,5	27,2	25,5
Women	21,9	17,8	22,7	34,1	24,4	25,5
Funen county						
Men	10,3	13,5	11,4	20,2	15,6	11,3
Women	15,8	18,1	15,8	24,6	18,8	15,0
Southern Jutland county						
Men	16,3	10,4	11,8	25,1	24,8	14,6
Women	17,3	14,7	16,7	39	31,9	17,8
Ribe county						
Men	10,2	15	13,4	24,9	18,7	14,7
Women	23,7	20,9	26	39	30,7	25,0
Vejle county						
Men	7	6,8	7,4	13	11,7	10,2
Women	10,5	10,8	12,1	23,6	18,0	17,2
Ringkøbing county						
Men	8,8	9,3	10	11,4	12,1	9,8
Women	12,4	14,4	17,9	26,4	20,6	16,3
Århus county						
Men	8,2	6,5	9	21,2	17,2	12,1
Women	10,7	10	10,5	30,6	22,4	14,6
Viborg county						
Men	8,6	19,8	15,6	22	16,2	13,9
Women	13,5	21,8	22	27,2	19,6	21,3
Northern Jutland county						
Men	10	14,3	18,4	27,8	17,9	17,0
Women	13,7	19	20,1	33,8	19,4	19,8

Source: www.jobindsats.dk

TABLE A.7.3. UNEMPLOYED MEN AND WOMEN ACTIVATED IN

EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN 1999 – 2004, %

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Country level							
Men	*63,8*	*63,9*	*57,3*	47,7	53,9	48,3	*53,8*
Women	*65,6*	*65,1*	*59,6*	51,3	58,8	54,7	*53,7*
Copenhagen Frederiksberg							
Men	65,3	68,4	57,1	43,9	37,3	56,1	54,4
Women	70	69,5	60,6	46,6	37,4	56,2	57,3
Copenhagen county							
Men	60,2	65,9	56,1	44,5	37,4	51,7	53,6
Women	71,1	68,2	59,5	48,6	39,1	52,9	57,3
Frederiksborg county							
Men	68,1	71,1	58,8	54,1	50,7	40,3	44,2
Women	74,8	71,8	60,2	55,2	52,9	48,2	43,8
Roskilde county							
Men	63,2	71,7	49,3	58,6	62,9	50,0	67,4
Women	65,1	66,7	51,3	59,3	67,5	52,4	68,3
Western Zelland county							
Men	56,8	59,8	55,7	22,7	44,7	55,1	34,6
Women	60,2	61,9	61,5	28,8	52,5	62,6	35,8
Storstrøms county							
Men	51,1	46,6	41,9	23	28,7	39,1	28,9
Women	58,6	56,4	56,5	32,8	42,3	50,9	31,5
Funen county							
Men	83,4	68,3	56,3	52,6	64,4	49,3	68,7
Women	77,1	69,5	59,2	62,5	68,9	55,3	70,1
Southern Jutland county							
Men	62,3	63,8	59,6	44	49,1	51,5	59,8
Women	69	70,8	64	45,2	52,8	58,4	61,6
Ribe county							
Men	54,8	54,4	64,4	48,1	51,9	56,1	56,9
Women	44,9	56,6	60,6	45,6	56,2	59,1	46,4
Vejle county							
Men	62,9	65	48,1	34,4	45,4	40,0	37
Women	60,4	65,1	49,4	38	51,3	46,2	32,9
Ringkøbing county							
Men	67,7	62,8	53,3	49,1	33,5	34,1	62,9
Women	62,3	62,7	52,8	45,3	40,9	40,0	58,2
Århus county							
Men	62,5	65	66,5	52,5	63,9	55,3	65,5
Women	65,6	68,1	68	53,7	65,9	60,4	64,3
Viborg county							
Men	54,4	36,6	45,1	46,6	59,2	44,6	66,8
Women	52,9	44,9	46,3	52,8	66,4	53,8	67,1
Northern Jutland county							
Men	70,1	66,9	61,3	40,2	62,0	64,0	51,8
Women	71,1	64,5	63,7	50,8	70,5	67,6	48,8

Source: www.jobindsats.dk

TABLE A.7.4. UNEMPLOYED MEN AND WOMEN ACTIVATED IN OTHER ALMPs IN 1999 – 2004, %

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Country level							
Men	*18,8*	*16,1*	*23*	11,1	16,9	28,3	*27,4*
Women	*16,7*	*15,1*	*20,2*	10,6	14,3	22,3	*27,4*
Copenhagen Frederiksberg							
Men	18	16,7	28,3	38	46,2	23	30,7
Women	13,9	17,1	25,8	36,2	48,1	23,1	28,2
Copenhagen county							
Men	20,1	16,2	27,8	36,9	47,8	26,1	31
Women	12,2	15	24,2	32,7	45,6	25,5	28,6
Frederiksborg county							
Men	14,5	13,6	23,9	9,5	17,0	40,4	41,8
Women	10,6	13,3	23,1	10,5	14,2	34,6	43,1
Roskilde county							
Men	22,5	6,8	32,2	4,1	10,3	29,9	11,2
Women	19,6	6,5	25,7	3,9	7,1	23,2	10,3
Western Zelland county							
Men	25,5	13,7	20,5	41,8	27,8	18,7	41,8
Women	16,9	12,1	16,5	34,6	22,3	15,0	42,6
Storstrøms county							
Men	22,7	27	24,5	24,3	29,6	24,1	44
Women	17,1	22	16,1	23,8	25,9	18,2	42,3
Funen county							
Men	3,4	9,6	23,2	2,7	9,1	29,0	11,7
Women	4,6	9,1	20,4	2,9	7,1	25,0	11,6
Southern Jutland county							
Men	8,8	9	13,7	7,8	10,3	17,9	19,2
Women	8,6	8,4	12,7	6	9,7	16,6	17,4
Ribe county							
Men	30,7	17,8	11,1	3,6	5,4	14,7	23,8
Women	28,8	17,6	8,2	3,5	3,2	8,8	30,8
Vejle county							
Men	22	16,6	34,6	28	24,1	38,1	46,9
Women	24,2	17,1	32,3	25,8	21,6	29,7	49,4
Ringkøbing county							
Men	15,3	16,4	27,1	12,7	38,9	44,6	18,2
Women	21	18,3	23,8	16,1	32,0	36,7	18,8
Århus county							
Men	20,8	19,6	17,7	3,1	6,0	24,0	14,3
Women	19,6	17,4	18	3,9	5,6	19,7	16,8
Viborg county							
Men	33,4	29,6	30,2	9,3	7,6	31,0	14
Women	31	25,9	26,7	9,1	5,8	17,4	14,2
Northern Jutland county							
Men	13,2	9,7	11,9	8,6	7,3	8,0	28,3
Women	12,2	10,6	10,8	4,8	4,0	6,1	29

Source: www.jobindsats.dk

TABLE A.8.1. UNEMPLOYMENT OF MEN AND WOMEN IN DANISH

COUNTIES (EXCL. BORNHOLM) IN 1999 - 2001, %

	1999		**2000**		**2001**	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Country	*4,9*	*6,5*	*4,6*	*6,2*	*4,5*	*5,9*
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	7,1	6,4	5,8	5,6	5,4	5,2
Copenhagen county	4,1	4,7	4,0	4,5	3,7	4,2
Frederiksborg county	3,4	4,6	3,2	4,2	3,1	4,0
Roskilde county	3,4	4,8	3,2	4,4	3,1	4,1
Western Zelland county	4,8	7,0	4,5	6,8	4,3	6,4
Storstrøms county	6,5	8,4	5,8	7,6	5,6	7,5
Funen county	6,0	7,8	5,7	7,5	5,5	7,0
Southern Jutland county	3,9	7,0	3,9	6,8	3,8	6,4
Ribe county	3,9	6,0	3,5	6,0	3,7	5,8
Vejle county	3,9	6,6	3,7	6,1	4,0	6,3
Ringkøbing county	2,7	5,9	2,7	5,8	2,8	5,6
Århus county	5,5	7,1	5,5	7,0	5,2	6,6
Viborg county	3,4	5,9	3,4	5,9	3,3	5,4
Northern Jutland county	6,1	8,4	6,1	8,4	6,0	8,4

TABLE A.8.2. UNEMPLOYMENT OF MEN AND WOMEN IN DANISH

COUNTIES (EXCL. BORNHOLM) IN 2002 - 2004, %

	2002		**2003**		**2004**	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Country	*4,7*	*5,8*	*5,7*	*6,6*	*5,8*	*7,0*
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	6,0	5,5	7,1	6,3	7,2	6,7
Copenhagen county	4,0	4,1	4,9	4,8	5,2	5,4
Frederiksborg county	3,5	3,9	4,6	4,6	4,4	4,7
Roskilde county	3,5	4,1	4,2	4,7	4,3	5,0
Western Zelland county	4,5	6,0	5,9	7,3	5,9	7,7
Storstrøms county	5,6	7,0	6,4	7,3	6,1	7,2
Funen county	5,5	6,6	6,9	7,7	6,8	8,0
Southern Jutland county	4,3	6,4	5,5	7,7	5,2	7,7
Ribe county	3,7	5,4	4,5	6,2	4,3	6,2
Vejle county	4,0	6,0	4,9	7,0	5,0	7,4
Ringkøbing county	3,0	5,5	3,8	6,3	4,0	6,8
Århus county	5,5	6,5	6,4	7,5	6,5	7,8
Viborg county	3,5	5,3	4,1	5,9	4,2	5,8
Northern Jutland county	5,8	8,1	7,1	8,9	7,8	9,7

TABLE A.9.1. FRACTIONS OF LOW-SKILLED WORKERS (1999 - 2001)

	1999		2000		2001	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Country	*41,8*	*44,8*	*41,5*	*45,2*	*38,6*	*43,0*
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	35,2	40,0	34,6	39,8	32,1	37,7
Copenhagen county	36,3	43,4	35,8	43,1	33,5	40,5
Frederiksborg county	35,8	42,7	35,8	42,9	32,5	40,3
Roskilde county	40,1	46,9	39,4	46,7	36,5	43,9
Western Zelland county	45,1	47,6	44,8	48,0	41,6	45,6
Storstrøms county	43,9	47,9	44,5	48,4	40,7	46,6
Funen county	44,2	45,5	44,1	45,9	41,1	43,4
Southern Jutland county	46,0	47,6	45,5	47,5	42,2	45,5
Ribe county	46,6	45,0	46,6	47,1	43,8	45,2
Vejle county	45,3	47,5	45,4	48,1	42,5	45,7
Ringkøbing county	46,1	47,7	46,1	48,1	43,2	45,9
Århus county	40,5	43,3	40,3	43,7	37,7	41,8
Viborg county	46,7	47,5	46,5	48,5	43,8	47,4
Northern Jutland county	45,4	45,7	45,0	46,8	41,8	44,3

Source: www.statistikbanken.dk

TABLE A.9.2. FRACTIONS OF LOW-SKILLED WORKERS (2002 - 2004)

	2002		2003		2004	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Country	*38,1*	*42,3*	*38,0*	*41,8*	*34,9*	*40,4*
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	31,2	37,4	31,3	37,1	29,2	35,7
Copenhagen county	33,0	40,1	32,8	39,7	29,8	38,1
Frederiksborg county	32,1	39,2	31,4	38,4	28,6	37,8
Roskilde county	35,8	43,3	35,6	42,9	32,3	41,1
Western Zelland county	41,2	45,3	40,5	44,3	37,1	42,9
Storstrøms county	40,0	45,7	39,6	45,0	36,6	43,3
Funen county	40,7	42,5	40,2	41,9	37,2	41,1
Southern Jutland county	41,7	44,7	41,7	44,4	38,5	42,5
Ribe county	43,1	44,5	43,2	44,2	34,6	42,6
Vejle county	42,3	44,9	42,2	44,1	37,9	42,4
Ringkøbing county	42,5	45,4	42,7	45,0	40,0	43,0
Århus county	37,0	40,5	37,0	41,2	33,8	39,9
Viborg county	43,4	46,1	43,4	43,2	39,7	42,3
Northern Jutland county	42,2	44,3	41,9	44,3	38,3	42,7

Source: www.statistikbanken.dk

TABLE A.9.3. FRACTIONS OF WORKERS IN MANUFACTURING (1999 - 2001)

	1999		2000		2001	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Country	*22,5*	*12,3*	*22,2*	*12,1*	*21,4*	*11,7*
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	10,7	6,9	10,5	6,7	9,8	6,3
Copenhagen county	14,7	9,0	14,2	8,7	13,3	8,2
Frederiksborg county	16,9	10,8	16,7	10,7	16,2	10,4
Roskilde county	17,3	10,0	17,1	9,8	16,4	9,5
Western Zelland county	21,3	11,9	21,4	11,9	21,0	11,6
Storstrøms county	20,6	11,4	20,4	11,2	19,9	10,7
Funen county	26,0	12,1	25,1	11,4	24,0	10,9
Southern Jutland county	29,5	16,1	30,3	16,7	29,3	15,8
Ribe county	28,8	16,9	28,9	16,7	28,4	15,9
Vejle county	30,2	18,1	30,0	17,9	29,3	17,2
Ringkøbing county	33,2	20,0	33,3	19,9	33,2	19,3
Århus county	23,6	11,4	23,1	11,1	22,3	10,9
Viborg county	31,6	18,1	31,6	18,3	31,2	18,3
Northern Jutland county	25,7	12,8	25,2	13,0	24,3	12,5

Source: www.statistikbanken.dk

TABLE A.9.4. FRACTIONS OF WORKERS IN MANUFACTURING (2002 - 2004)

	2002		2003		2004	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Country	*21,3*	*11,7*	*20,9*	*11,3*	*20,7*	*11,0*
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	9,5	6,2	9,0	6,0	8,6	5,7
Copenhagen county	13,1	8,1	12,6	7,9	12,1	7,7
Frederiksborg county	16,0	10,4	15,7	10,3	15,0	10,2
Roskilde county	16,1	9,5	15,7	9,2	15,5	9,0
Western Zelland county	20,7	11,4	20,2	11,1	20,3	11,1
Storstrøms county	20,3	10,9	19,5	10,6	19,5	10,2
Funen county	23,9	11,0	23,6	10,7	23,5	10,3
Southern Jutland county	29,5	16,3	29,5	15,9	28,4	14,4
Ribe county	28,1	15,8	28,0	15,5	28,5	15,4
Vejle county	29,2	17,0	29,0	16,3	29,0	16,0
Ringkøbing county	34,0	19,6	33,4	18,7	33,3	18,4
Århus county	22,3	10,8	21,5	10,2	21,2	9,9
Viborg county	31,7	18,4	31,5	18,1	31,0	18,0
Northern Jutland county	24,0	12,5	23,8	11,8	23,7	11,8

Source: www.statistikbanken.dk

TABLE A.9.5. FRACTIONS OF WORKERS IN PRIVATE SECTOR (1999 - 2001)

	1999		2000		2001	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Country	*74,4*	*45,1*	*74,6*	*45,4*	*74,8*	*45,8*
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	61,0	46,5	61,7	47,1	63,6	48,8
Copenhagen county	79,0	51,9	79,0	52,3	79,2	52,4
Frederiksborg county	71,3	41,9	71,3	42,1	73,8	43,4
Roskilde county	73,4	38,9	73,4	39,2	72,9	39,6
Western Zelland county	70,4	37,5	70,8	37,3	71,6	38,1
Storstrøms county	68,8	37,3	69,1	37,6	69,3	37,4
Funen county	75,5	42,6	75,9	43,0	75,3	42,8
Southern Jutland county	77,3	47,8	77,9	48,1	77,9	47,7
Ribe county	79,8	48,6	79,9	48,1	80,0	48,1
Vejle county	80,2	48,5	80,3	48,6	80,2	49,0
Ringkøbing county	81,1	50,2	81,5	50,6	82,3	50,8
Århus county	75,7	43,4	76,0	43,7	75,9	44,1
Viborg county	77,8	44,5	78,0	44,8	77,5	45,2
Northern Jutland county	74,9	41,7	74,6	42,0	74,3	41,9

Source: www.statistikbanken.dk

TABLE A.9.6. FRACTIONS OF WORKERS IN PRIVATE SECTOR (2002 - 2004)

	2002		2003		2004	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Country	*75,5*	*46,0*	*75,5*	*45,6*	*75,6*	*45,4*
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	64,1	49,2	64,6	49,4	64,3	49,0
Copenhagen county	77,4	51,7	77,3	51,6	77,1	50,8
Frederiksborg county	74,4	43,6	73,2	43,3	73,6	43,3
Roskilde county	74,2	40,1	74,3	39,9	74,8	40,4
Western Zelland county	72,9	38,0	73,2	38,1	73,3	38,2
Storstrøms county	71,0	37,6	70,3	37,0	71,3	37,3
Funen county	76,3	42,8	75,7	42,3	76,1	41,6
Southern Jutland county	79,3	47,7	79,1	47,5	79,3	47,1
Ribe county	82,0	48,6	81,6	48,3	81,5	48,1
Vejle county	81,3	49,1	81,3	48,4	81,9	48,4
Ringkøbing county	82,8	51,1	82,9	50,7	82,8	50,2
Århus county	77,3	44,4	77,4	43,7	77,2	43,4
Viborg county	78,3	45,0	78,0	45,0	77,2	45,1
Northern Jutland county	75,4	42,3	75,9	41,4	76,2	41,8

Source: www.statistikbanken.dk

TABLE A.9.7. FRACTIONS OF SELF-EMPLOYED WORKERS (1999 - 2001)

	1999		**2000**		**2001**	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Country	*10,9*	*4,0*	*10,8*	*4,0*	*10,7*	*4,0*
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	7,9	3,1	8,2	3,2	8,4	3,3
Copenhagen county	8,5	3,5	8,6	3,5	8,6	3,6
Frederiksborg county	10,4	4,5	10,4	4,5	10,4	4,5
Roskilde county	9,2	3,7	9,4	3,6	9,4	3,6
Western Zelland county	12,1	4,5	12,0	4,5	11,9	4,5
Storstrøms county	13,1	4,8	12,9	4,7	12,8	4,7
Funen county	11,2	4,2	11,2	4,1	11,0	4,1
Southern Jutland county	12,4	4,2	12,3	4,3	12,2	4,2
Ribe county	11,8	4,1	11,6	4,2	11,4	4,1
Vejle county	10,6	4,1	10,4	4,0	10,1	4,0
Ringkøbing county	13,8	4,2	13,4	4,2	13,1	4,1
Århus county	10,4	3,8	10,3	3,9	10,1	3,8
Viborg county	15,1	4,6	14,9	4,6	14,6	4,5
Northern Jutland county	11,9	4,2	11,8	4,2	11,6	4,1

Source: www.statistikbanken.dk

TABLE A.9.8. FRACTIONS OF SELF-EMPLOYED WORKERS (2002 - 2004)

	2002		**2003**		**2004**	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Country	*10,6*	*4,0*	*10,3*	*3,8*	*9,9*	*3,7*
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	8,7	3,5	7,3	3,2	7,3	3,1
Copenhagen county	8,6	3,7	8,2	3,5	8,1	3,5
Frederiksborg county	10,5	4,5	10,3	4,3	10,0	4,3
Roskilde county	9,4	3,7	9,2	3,5	9,0	3,5
Western Zelland county	11,7	4,5	11,4	4,2	11,0	4,1
Storstrøms county	12,7	4,8	12,8	4,6	12,1	4,3
Funen county	10,8	4,1	10,5	4,0	10,0	3,8
Southern Jutland county	12,1	4,1	12,1	4,1	11,5	4,0
Ribe county	11,0	4,1	10,9	3,9	13,6	3,8
Vejle county	9,9	3,9	9,7	3,7	9,3	3,5
Ringkøbing county	12,7	4,0	12,6	3,9	11,8	3,7
Århus county	9,9	3,8	9,6	3,6	9,2	3,5
Viborg county	14,2	4,4	14,1	4,3	13,4	4,1
Northern Jutland county	11,4	4,0	11,2	3,9	10,8	3,8

Source: www.statistikbanken.dk

TABLE A.10.1.FRACTIONS OF THOSE OVER 50 AMONG THE 30-59 - AGED

UNEMPLOYED MEN (1999 - 2004)

	1999	**2000**	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**
Country	31,7	32,9	35,0	34,8	34,2	33,9
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	24,0	24,5	24,8	24,7	24,4	24,1
Copenhagen county	33,0	33,3	33,4	33,4	33,2	32,8
Frederiksborg county	35,1	35,3	35,4	35,1	34,6	33,9
Roskilde county	35,8	35,9	35,8	35,2	34,4	33,4
Western Zelland county	32,0	32,8	33,3	33,5	33,5	33,4
Storstrøms county	34,0	34,9	35,6	36,0	36,2	36,2
Funen county	31,1	31,8	32,2	32,5	32,7	32,6
Southern Jutland county	31,8	32,2	32,7	33,0	33,1	33,2
Ribe county	30,3	31,1	31,8	31,9	32,2	32,5
Vejle county	31,3	31,6	31,9	31,9	31,9	31,7
Ringkøbing county	31,1	31,7	32,2	32,5	32,7	32,7
Århus county	30,1	30,9	31,5	31,7	31,9	31,9
Viborg county	29,9	30,8	31,5	32,0	32,4	32,8
Northern Jutland county	30,8	31,6	32,2	32,4	32,6	32,6

Source: www.statistikbanken.dk

TABLE A.10.2. FRACTIONS OF THOSE OVER 50 AMONG THE 30-59 - AGED

UNEMPLOYED WOMEN (1999 - 2004)

	1999	**2000**	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**
Country	30,2	30,6	32,8	32,9	32,3	31,3
Copenhagen Frederiksberg	25,2	25,8	26,1	26,0	25,7	25,3
Copenhagen county	31,2	31,7	32,0	31,8	31,7	31,3
Frederiksborg county	32,3	32,9	33,1	32,9	32,6	32,1
Roskilde county	32,5	33,1	33,4	33,0	32,7	32,0
Western Zelland county	28,7	29,6	30,4	31,0	31,3	31,3
Storstrøms county	30,6	31,8	32,6	33,2	33,8	33,9
Funen county	28,3	29,4	30,2	30,5	30,8	31,0
Southern Jutland county	28,1	29,0	29,8	30,3	30,9	31,3
Ribe county	26,9	27,8	28,6	29,1	29,6	30,1
Vejle county	28,5	29,3	29,8	30,0	30,2	30,1
Ringkøbing county	28,1	29,0	29,7	30,2	30,7	30,9
Århus county	27,4	28,5	29,3	29,7	30,1	30,3
Viborg county	27,2	28,1	29,0	29,4	30,0	30,6
Northern Jutland county	27,9	29,0	29,9	30,4	30,9	31,2

Source: www.statistikbanken.dk