Archives of Business Research – Vol. 13, No. 06
Publication Date: June 10, 2025
DOI:10.14738/abr.1306.18930.
Lee, J. (2025). Comparative Analysis of Social Security Systems in High HDI Nations: Extractable Features for U.S. Reform. *Archives of Business Research, 13*(06). 44-62.

SERVICES FOR SCIENCE AND EDUCATION

Comparative Analysis of Social Security Systems in High HDI Nations: Extractable Features for U.S. Reform

[*]**Josephine Lee**

ABSTRACT

This research examines social security systems across nations ranking highest on the Human Development Index, analyzing structural elements, funding mechanisms, and benefit designs that contribute to their effectiveness and sustainability. Through comparative institutional analysis of Norway, Switzerland, Iceland, Hong Kong, Denmark, and Sweden, this study identifies transferable features that could potentially address the United States' impending social security crisis, where trust fund reserves are projected for depletion by 2034, potentially triggering benefit reductions of approximately 23%. The analysis reveals that successful systems consistently incorporate multi-pillar frameworks distributing responsibility across public, occupational, and private domains; implement diversified funding structures extending beyond traditional payroll contributions; establish flexible retirement provisions facilitating personalized work-retirement transitions; and deploy automatic adjustment mechanisms that enhance sustainability without continuous political intervention. Despite the presence of these common features, contextual factors including distinctive labor market structures, cultural attitudes toward taxation and redistribution, and demographic profiles, significantly constrain direct policy transfer. Nevertheless, the research identifies adaptation pathways, including strengthening mandatory occupational coverage, implementing flexible retirement mechanisms, diversifying revenue sources, and establishing automatic stabilizers, that could feasibly address critical vulnerabilities in the U.S. system while acknowledging institutional and political constraints. The study concludes that effective reform requires systemic rather than parametric adjustments, emphasizing the importance of incremental implementation sequencing, strategically framed policy narratives, and careful consideration of distributional impacts across diverse population segments.

INTRODUCTION

Social security systems constitute fundamental institutional mechanisms that mitigate lifecycle risks and promote economic stability across diverse population segments. Currently, the US's social security crisis demands immediate attention. Social Security Administration (2023)

[*] **Author Biography:**
Josephine Lee is a junior at Bergen County Academies in Hackensack, New Jersey. She has a strong affinity for the U.S. government and is particularly interested in how a country's cultural landscape influences the efficacy of policy implementation. Her academic interests revolve around comparative political systems and the intersection of governance with sociocultural factors. She is currently researching how food practices across countries reflect broader beliefs about consumerism and sustainability. Josephine is especially intrigued by how cultural norms and values shape political engagement and citizens' responsiveness to policy initiatives. Her long-term research goals include exploring the relationship between social beliefs and policy outcomes, particularly in democratic societies. Currently, she is examining how media tone—optimism versus pessimism—may affect youth participation in civic processes, including voting, protesting, and engagement with public institutions.

projections indicate trust fund reserve depletion by 2034, potentially triggering benefit reductions of approximately 17% for all beneficiaries absent meaningful structural adjustment (Goldstein et al.). The magnitude of this impending fiscal shortfall represents perhaps the most significant challenge to America's social protection framework since its establishment in 1935 (Social Security Administration). These developments occur against a backdrop of increasing longevity, declining fertility rates, and evolving employment patterns that collectively strain traditional social protection frameworks designed for industrial-era economic structures and demographic profiles.

The present study emerges directly in response to this escalating crisis, employing comparative institutional analysis to examine social security systems in nations consistently ranking highest on the Human Development Index (HDI), with specific attention to Norway, Switzerland, Ireland, Germany, and Denmark. Through systematic comparison of institutional architectures, funding mechanisms, and benefit structures, this research aims to identify transferable elements that might inform evidence-based policy development addressing the increasingly precarious position of U.S. social security financing.

This investigation is guided by three central research questions specifically formulated to address the American social security crisis: (1) What distinctive features characterize social security systems in high-HDI nations that have successfully avoided comparable funding shortfalls? (2) To what extent are these features contingent upon specific national contexts that differ from American institutional environments? (3) Which elements might be effectively transferred to resolve the critical deficiencies in the U.S. social security framework before trust fund depletion triggers automatic benefit reductions? By addressing these questions through structured comparative analysis, this study advances discourse regarding welfare state reform while maintaining careful attention to the contextual factors that shape both policy effectiveness and transferability.

The significance of this research derives from the increasing urgency of social security reform within the United States, where political gridlock has repeatedly thwarted adjustment attempts despite growing actuarial imbalances. Rather than pursuing incremental adjustments to existing parameters, effective reform requires more of a fundamental recalibration of institutional structures to align with demographic and economic environments in the status quo. The comparative framework employed in this study facilitates identification of systemic patterns across diverse welfare regimes while acknowledging the distinctive historical trajectories and institutional path dependencies that shape reform possibilities within the American political economy.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study employs a comparative institutional analysis methodology to examine social security systems across six nations that rank highest on the Human Development Index (HDI). The Human Development Index serves as a theoretically appropriate evaluative framework due to its comprehensive measurement of precisely those dimensions that social security systems aim to address. Life expectancy is directly impacted by income security in old age, healthcare access, and poverty prevention; educational attainment is indirectly supported through intergenerational transfers and family stability; and per capita income is directly impacted through income security and maintenance of consumption capacity.

This alignment between HDI components and social security objectives provides a coherent theoretical foundation for cross-national comparison. The methodology acknowledges inherent limitations of the HDI, particularly its inability to capture inequality within nations and the potential for high-ranking countries to achieve their status through means other than robust social security systems.

The comparative analysis focuses on four key dimensions: (1) institutional architecture, including administrative structures and governance mechanisms; (2) funding mechanisms, encompassing contribution structures, revenue sources, and fiscal sustainability provisions; (3) benefit architectures, including eligibility criteria, calculation methodologies, and adequacy measures; and (4) implementation effectiveness, examining both process indicators and outcome measures. This approach allows for a thorough evaluation of each system's performance while highlighting features that might work well in the United States.

Data Collection

The analysis draws upon multiple data sources to ensure comprehensive assessment and triangulation of findings. Primary data sources include:

1. Official government publications and statistical databases (2018-2023), including ministerial reports, regulatory documentation, and national statistical compilations from respective departments of labor, social affairs, and pensions
2. International organization databases and comparative analyses, including OECD social expenditure databases, European Commission pension adequacy reports, and International Labour Organization social protection statistics
3. Academic literature examining institutional structures, reform trajectories, and performance assessments published in peer-reviewed journals
4. Expert assessments from international organizations including policy briefs and technical analyses from the IMF, World Bank, and regional development institutions
5. Quantitative indicators measuring coverage, adequacy, and sustainability dimensions from standardized cross-national datasets

For each case, data collection prioritized documentation of institutional structures, financing mechanisms, eligibility criteria, benefit calculation methodologies, and performance outcomes. Where possible, longitudinal data were collected to identify system trajectories and reform patterns over time. Data collection protocols emphasized obtaining comparable metrics across cases while preserving distinctive national features critical to understanding system functioning.

Analytical Framework

Data analysis followed a structured comparative framework examining the four key dimensions identified above. The institutional architecture analysis focused on administrative structures, governance mechanisms, and coordination arrangements across system components. The funding mechanism analysis examined contribution structures, tax integration, fiscal sustainability provisions, and automatic adjustment mechanisms. The benefit architecture analysis investigated eligibility criteria, calculation methodologies, adequacy measures, and targeting mechanisms. The implementation effectiveness analysis assessed both process indicators (such as administrative efficiency and client accessibility) and outcome measures (including poverty reduction, income replacement, and labor market effects).

Additionally, contextual analysis examined demographic, economic, political, and cultural factors that potentially impact system performance and transferability. This contextual assessment included demographic dependency ratios, labor market structures, political economy constraints, and cultural values regarding state responsibility and solidarity. The analytical framework specifically incorporates assessment of how contextual factors interact with institutional design to produce observed outcomes, enabling more nuanced understanding of potential policy transfer constraints.

Assessment of Transferability

For each identified system feature, transferability assessment employed a structured framework examining (1) institutional requirements, including administrative capacities and governance structures; (2) political economy constraints, including interest group configurations and reform windows; (3) fiscal preconditions, including revenue generation capacities and budgetary frameworks; and (4) cultural compatibility, including public expectations and solidarity preferences. This assessment framework enables systematic identification of both transferable features and potential implementation constraints within the U.S. context.

The transferability analysis specifically considered how identified features might interact with existing U.S. institutional structures, identifying potential complementarities and friction points. This approach avoids naive policy transplantation recommendations by acknowledging how institutional features operate within integrated systems rather than as isolated components. The analysis prioritized identification of features demonstrating both substantial effectiveness in origin contexts and significant potential for implementation within U.S. institutional constraints.

RESULTS

Switzerland

Switzerland ranks the highest of all countries on the Human Development Index, with a score of 0.967. The cornerstone of the Swiss approach to social security is its distinctive three-pillar pension structure, which distributes responsibility across public institutions, employers, and individuals (Schell). This structural arrangement reflects Switzerland's fundamental societal values emphasizing individual responsibility while maintaining moderate tax burdens (Carey et al.).

The first pillar consists of mandatory public insurance (AVS/AI/APG), supplemented by the second pillar of compulsory occupational pension plans (LPP), and culminating in a third pillar of voluntary individual provisions. The financing model demonstrates similar sophistication through diversified contribution structures. AVS/AI/APG contributions are divided equally between employers and employees, while self-employed individuals with annual incomes below CHF 58,800 benefit from a progressive sliding scale (Betsalel). Each pillar embodies distinct funding principles: the first pillar establishes intergenerational contracts through a pay-as-you-go system, the second pillar operates on a fully funded basis with capital market investments, and the third pillar incentivizes voluntary savings through tax advantages (Social Security Administration, “International Programs -U.S.-Swiss Social Security Agreement - Part 4”, Schell).

The health insurance component operates through non-income-dependent premiums averaging CHF 397 monthly per person in 2023, with notable regional variations reflecting Switzerland's decentralized healthcare markets (Buswell). The benefit structure provides universal coverage with earnings-related benefits, targeting approximately 60% pre-retirement income replacement through the combined first and second pillars (Tikkanen et al.). Special provisions include rehabilitation-focused disability insurance and robust maternity protections offering 80% income replacement combined with employment security guarantees.

Despite its comprehensive nature, the Swiss model faces challenges including regional disparities in decentralized social assistance programs (Eurostat) and documented non-uptake of entitled benefits stemming from information asymmetries and stigmatization, particularly among elderly populations (Lehmann et al.). Nevertheless, the system demonstrates remarkable effectiveness in balancing social protection with economic productivity, as evidenced by an 80.6% employment rate among the working-age population (Trading Economics).

Norway (0.966)

Norway's social security system exemplifies a comprehensive approach characterized by universal coverage principles and substantial public investment. The institutional framework operates through a predominantly centralized architecture, with the Norwegian Labour and Welfare Administration (NAV) serving as the primary administrative entity responsible for benefit delivery and system management (Tikkanen et al., “Norway”). This administrative consolidation, implemented through the 2006 NAV reform, represents a significant departure from the previously fragmented institutional landscape, wherein separate agencies managed unemployment benefits, pensions, and social assistance (Røysum). The organizational structure features hierarchical governance with policy formulation occurring at the ministerial level—primarily through the Ministry of Labour and Social Inclusion—while implementation occurs through regionally distributed NAV offices that maintain consistent service standards nationwide (BREIT et al.).

The funding structure incorporates a distinctive stabilization mechanism through the Government Pension Fund Global, commonly known as the Petroleum Fund. This sovereign wealth fund, established in 1990 to invest surplus revenues from petroleum activities, has accumulated assets exceeding $1.4 trillion as of 2023, providing substantial fiscal capacity for intergenerational risk distribution (Norges Bank Investment Management). The fund operates under strict governance protocols limiting annual withdrawals to 3% of its value, thereby insulating social expenditures from cyclical economic fluctuations and demographic pressures. Norway’s National Insurance Scheme is funded through a tripartite structure: contributions from employees (7.8%) and self-employed individuals (11.0%) above an income threshold, geographically tiered employer payroll taxes (0.0%–14.1%), and substantial state funding (Norwegian Ministry of Labour and Social Inclusion). The state fully finances targeted benefits such as disability supplements and family support, ensuring equity. This diversified model spreads fiscal risk, maintains sustainable contribution rates, and supports universal access while adapting to regional and income-based differences, strengthening both efficiency and social cohesion.

The benefit structure implements a sophisticated architecture that combines universal coverage principles with earnings-related entitlements. The eligibility framework typically requires five years of insurance coverage for basic entitlement, with 40 years establishing the threshold for full benefits (European Commission). The universal pension system provides a guaranteed minimum pension independent of prior contributions, supplemented by earnings-related benefits calculated through a notional defined contribution approach. This dual structure ensures both basic income security and work incentives through close correspondence between lifetime earnings and benefit levels.

The Norwegian system incorporates sophisticated work incentive mechanisms, particularly following recent reforms in 2011, which allowed for flexible retirement between the ages of 62 and 75, enabling individuals to combine work and pension without reductions in benefits. This flexibility led to a significant increase in labor force participation among the 62–67 age group, with notable growth observed post-reform (Brinch et al.). The pension system's flexible retirement provisions enable continued employment with simultaneous pension receipt, creating positive participation incentives for older workers. This design has contributed to increased labor force participation rates among individuals aged 62-66, with average labor supply increasing from 30% to 46% among those aged 63 and 64, respectively (Hellevik and Herlofson, Hernæs et al.).

Iceland (0.959)

Iceland's social security system comprises three integrated pillars: a universal public pension, mandatory occupational pension funds, and voluntary individual savings, creating comprehensive coverage with financial sustainability (Government of Iceland, Gudmundsson). The regulatory framework requires occupational funds to maintain at least 800 participants for risk pooling efficiency and facilitates integration with broader welfare services through government-regulated provision (Pension Funds Online).

Iceland's second pillar operates through a sophisticated defined ambition (DA) or collective defined contribution (CDC) pension structure where all risks are borne by the members. This system functions through legally mandated contributions with a minimum rate of 15.5%, asymmetrically distributed between employers (11.5%) and employees (4%) (Rivermate). These contributions are comprehensive, covering not only retirement benefits but also disability insurance and death benefits for families. Unlike the United States with its FICA limit ($147,000 in 2022), Iceland applies this contribution requirement to the entire payroll without a taxable maximum, creating a more universal funding mechanism. This approach helps explain why Iceland's public pension expenditure represents only 3% of GDP, significantly below the OECD mean of 7.7% (OECD Statistics).

The structure of Iceland's second pillar facilitates substantial benefit accrual, averaging 1.8% of income per year. For instance, Icelanders with 40-year work histories can expect lifetime pensions equal to 72% of their CPI-indexed average annual pre-retirement income. Furthermore, the system offers flexible retirement timing, allowing monthly payouts to begin as early as age 62 (or 60 in some cases) or as late as age 70, with annual step-ups for deferral similar to the U.S. system. The pension funds themselves are integral to Iceland's financial ecosystem, significantly influencing both domestic investment and international diversification. By the end of 2023, these funds held assets totaling approximately ISK 7.71 trillion, representing an impressive 184% of GDP (Juntunen). This robust funding, combined with inflation-indexing and adjustments based on fund performance and longevity changes, creates a sustainable system that effectively balances security with adaptability to economic conditions.

The implementation effectiveness of Iceland's system demonstrates both notable achievements and significant limitations. While the system has received top rankings from Mercer and maintains one of the highest ratios of pension savings to GDP globally (approximately double the nation's GDP), it contends with structural challenges inherent to a small economy (Pechter). These include limited domestic investment opportunities, potential conflicts of interest in fund management, and the controversial means-testing mechanism that effectively eliminates first-pillar benefits for those with monthly second-pillar income exceeding ISK670,000 ($4,700).

Moreover, despite an impressively low official elderly poverty rate of 2.8% compared to the OECD average of 14.7%, scholars like Harpa Njalsdottir have identified significant socioeconomic disparities, noting that "seventy percent of the elderly in Iceland have incomes below subsistence standards," with particularly severe impacts on women who worked in low-wage sectors (Hansson). These disparities are further exacerbated by housing costs, which consume disproportionate portions of retirement income for those without substantial personal savings or property ownership (Pechter).

Hong Kong (0.956)

Hong Kong's social security system operates through a bifurcated governance structure where the Social Welfare Department administers non-contributory programs like the Comprehensive Social Security Assistance (CSSA) and the Social Security Allowance (SSA) Scheme, while the Mandatory Provident Fund Schemes Authority oversees the mandatory occupational pension component (Social Welfare Department). This administrative configuration enables direct governmental management of basic social protections while simultaneously incorporating market-based mechanisms for retirement income provision, exemplifying a distinctive hybrid approach that merges selective universalism with market-oriented interventions.

The financing structure implements differentiated funding strategies across various program components. Universal allowances (old-age and disability) operate as non-contributory schemes fully financed through general revenue, while the mandatory occupational pension system establishes a proportional contribution structure requiring both employees and employers to contribute 5% of monthly earnings (Leung). This multi-pillar approach distributes fiscal responsibility among governmental appropriations, employer-employee contributions, and employer liability requirements for specific contingencies, potentially enhancing system resilience against demographic and economic fluctuations.

Eligibility criteria and benefit structures demonstrate considerable variation, reflecting both universalistic and targeted approaches to benefit provision. The Old Age Living Allowance (OALA) combines categorical eligibility (minimum age 65 with residential requirements) with means testing (income thresholds of HK$10,700 for single individuals and HK$16,440 for married couples), while the non-means-tested Old Age Allowance remains available for those aged 70 and above (Social Welfare Department). Benefit calculation methodologies predominantly employ flat-rate structures for universal and social assistance programs, with the Comprehensive Social Security Assistance benefits demonstrating household composition sensitivity through differentiated payment rates, considering the combined income and assets of all family members living together.

Denmark (0.952)

Denmark's social security system exemplifies the Scandinavian universal welfare model, characterized by comprehensive protection mechanisms and progressive financing within a centralized framework (Petersen and Bjerre). While predominantly state-administered, the Danish system incorporates significant non-governmental elements, particularly in pension provision. The pension architecture demonstrates institutional hybridization through a three-tiered structure comprising the universal state pension (Folkepension), mandatory occupational pensions (Arbejdsmarkedspension), and voluntary private pension schemes (Danish Ministry of Employment). Denmark’s pension system exemplifies a collaborative model where the government and labor market stakeholders jointly shape pension provisions. Occupational pensions, for instance, are established through collective bargaining agreements, ensuring that both employers and employees contribute to and benefit from the system (Danish Industry, Jensen). This approach fosters a cohesive framework aligning public policies with labor market practices.

The funding structure relies predominantly on progressive taxation, with higher-income individuals contributing proportionally more. The average Danish citizen contributes an average of 45% percent of their income in taxes (IRIS FMP). This tax-based financing enables universal coverage independent of labor market status.

Eligibility for core benefits derives primarily from citizenship or legal residency rather than contribution history, reflecting the system's universalist orientation and emphasizing residency over contribution history. The state pension requires residence in Denmark for at least three years between age 15 and retirement age, with full benefits requiring 40 years of residence for those reaching retirement age before June 30, 2025 (Lifeindenmark.dk). The system combines universal provision with means-tested supplements to prevent poverty among vulnerable populations (Jensen).

Denmark's welfare state emphasizes labor market activation through the "flexicurity" model, combining the easier ability to hire and fire employees with comprehensive unemployment protection and active labor market policies (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark, The Danish Agency for Labour Market and Recruitment, International Monetary Fund). Within this model,

URL: http://doi.org/10.14738/abr.1306.18930

the country offers generous unemployment benefits through a system of voluntary unemployment insurance funds, known as A-kasse. Eligible individuals can receive benefits for up to two years, with compensation rates reaching up to 90% of previous earnings for low-income workers.

Sweden (0.952)

Sweden's pension system operates through a hybrid administrative model, with the Pension Agency (Pensionsmyndigheten) managing both contributory components and non-contributory elements (Nordic Co-operation, “The Swedish Pension System | Nordic Cooperation”). A distinctive feature is the bifurcation between the income pension system and general fiscal operations, as the income pension remains separate from the state budget, establishing fiscal transparency while potentially insulating pension operations from broader budgetary fluctuations (Conexus Financial).

The financing structure employs sophisticated mechanisms integrating pay-as-you-go and funded approaches within a unified framework. The public pension is financed through an 18.5% contribution on pensionable income, with 16% directed to the notional defined contribution income pension and 2.5% to the individually directed premium pension (Palmer & Könberg). The income pension incorporates explicit sustainability mechanisms through a balance index that automatically recalculates accrued pension rights annually based on multiple factors, creating automatic adjustment capabilities.

Eligibility criteria vary across system components. The income and premium pensions employ contribution-based eligibility with flexible retirement available from age 62, while the guarantee pension requires three years of residence in Sweden between ages 16 and 64, with 40 years' residence required for a full benefit (Sjogren Lindquist and Wadensjo). The system incorporates multiple features addressing both poverty prevention and income maintenance objectives, including the housing supplement (bostadstillägg) and maintenance support for the elderly (äldreförsörjningsstöd), which establishes a subsistence-level income floor.

Sweden also utilizes automatic adjustment mechanisms (AAMs) that enhance long-term sustainability without requiring continuous political intervention (Elif Arbatli et al.). The most important AAM in the Swedish NDC system is the annuity divisor, which serves as a crucial translation mechanism converting individual notional account balances into monthly benefits based on cohort-specific life expectancies. This approach inherently responds to demographic shifts by automatically adjusting benefit levels as population longevity increases. The mortality information undergoes regular updates, which are subsequently reflected in the divisor and systematically communicated to system members, enabling them to make informed adjustments to their retirement planning decisions.

DISCUSSION

Comparative Analysis of Key Features

Cross-case analysis of social security systems in high-HDI nations reveals several recurring structural elements that contribute to their effectiveness despite diverse institutional architectures.

First, multi-pillar pension frameworks emerge as a fundamental characteristic across examined cases. Switzerland's three-pillar system distributes responsibility across public institutions, employers, and individuals in a systematic manner, reflecting societal values emphasizing individual responsibility while maintaining moderate tax burdens. Similarly, Iceland's social security system is comprised of three integrated pillars: a universal public pension, mandatory occupational pension funds, and voluntary individual savings, creating comprehensive coverage with financial sustainability. This multi-layered approach enables risk diversification while establishing complementary mechanisms for income security.

Second, diversified funding structures incorporating multiple revenue sources beyond traditional payroll contributions appear critical for long-term sustainability. Norway's funding structure incorporates a distinctive stabilization mechanism through the Government Pension Fund Global, which has accumulated assets exceeding $1.4 trillion as of 2023, providing substantial fiscal capacity for intergenerational risk distribution. The fund operates under strict governance protocols limiting annual withdrawals to 3% of its value, thereby insulating social expenditures from cyclical economic fluctuations and demographic pressures. Denmark's funding structure relies predominantly on progressive taxation, with higher-income individuals contributing proportionally more. The average Danish citizen contributes an average of 45% percent of their income in taxes. These approaches contrast with the U.S. system's heavy reliance on dedicated payroll taxes, which creates particular vulnerability to demographic shifts and labor market transformations.

Third, flexible retirement provisions facilitating gradual transitions from work to retirement represent an increasingly common feature across examined systems. Norway's system incorporates sophisticated work incentive mechanisms, particularly following recent reforms in 2011, which allowed for flexible retirement between the ages of 62 and 75, enabling individuals to combine work and pension without reductions in benefits. Iceland establishes a legal retirement age of 68 for the private sector (66 for public sector) with strong financial incentives for delayed retirement, resulting in an average effective retirement age of 69.7 years for men. Consequently, Iceland demonstrates one of the highest elderly labor force participation rates within the OECD, with 84% of individuals aged 55-64 being employed in 2018. These flexibility mechanisms promote extended working lives while accommodating diverse individual preferences and capacities.

Fourth, automatic adjustment mechanisms emerge as critical sustainability tools across several systems. Sweden utilizes automatic adjustment mechanisms (AAMs) that enhance long-term sustainability without requiring continuous political intervention. The most important AAM in the Swedish NDC system is the annuity divisor, which serves as a crucial translation mechanism converting individual notional account balances into monthly benefits based on cohort-specific life expectancies. This approach inherently responds to demographic shifts by automatically adjusting benefit levels as population longevity increases. These mechanisms reduce political risk while establishing predictable adaptation pathways for demographic and economic changes.

URL: http://doi.org/10.14738/abr.1306.18930

Contextual Factors Affecting Transferability

Despite these common features, analysis reveals significant contextual factors potentially limiting direct policy transfer to the U.S. context. First, labor market structures demonstrate substantial variation across examined cases. Denmark's welfare state emphasizes labor market activation through the "flexicurity" model, combining the easier ability to hire and fire employees with comprehensive unemployment protection and active labor market policies. This model reflects distinctive corporatist traditions with strong union participation in welfare state governance that differ markedly from the U.S. labor market context. The high employment rates observed in Switzerland, Iceland, and Denmark operate within institutional environments characterized by coordinated market economies with extensive collective bargaining coverage. These structural conditions differ substantially from the U.S. context.

Second, cultural factors, including societal attitudes toward taxation, income redistribution, and collective risk-sharing, shape both policy feasibility and implementation effectiveness. Switzerland's system reflects fundamental societal values, emphasizing individual responsibility while maintaining moderate tax burdens. Denmark's funding structure relies predominantly on progressive taxation, with higher-income individuals contributing proportionally more. The average Danish citizen contributes an average of 45% of their income in taxes. These taxation levels reflect distinctive social contracts that may not align with prevailing U.S. attitudes toward tax policy and state intervention.

Third, demographic structures vary considerably across examined cases, with European nations generally facing more advanced population aging but also benefiting from more developed institutional responses. Norway's flexible retirement provisions led to a significant increase in labor force participation among the 62–67 age group, with notable growth observed post-reform. Iceland establishes a legal retirement age of 68 for the private sector (66 for the public sector) with strong financial incentives for delayed retirement, resulting in an average effective retirement age of 69.7 years for men. These approaches reflect proactive policy responses to demographic challenges that may not correspond to the U.S. demographic trajectory or institutional readiness.

Implications for U.S. Social Security Reform

Despite these contextual constraints, the comparative analysis yields several implications for potential U.S. social security reform. First, multi-pillar development represents a promising direction, building on existing structures while strengthening coordination mechanisms and coverage requirements. Switzerland's three-pillar structure combines a mandatory public insurance tier (AVS/AI/APG), compulsory occupational pension plans (LPP), and voluntary individual provisions. Each pillar embodies distinct funding principles: the first pillar establishes intergenerational contracts through a pay-as-you-go system, the second pillar operates on a fully funded basis with capital market investments, and the third pillar incentivizes voluntary savings through tax advantages. This approach distributes responsibility across multiple stakeholders while establishing complementary income security mechanisms.

Second, funding diversification appears essential for long-term sustainability, potentially incorporating general revenue contributions to complement existing payroll tax mechanisms. Norway's National Insurance Scheme is funded through a tripartite structure: contributions from employees (7.8%) and self-employed individuals (11.0%) above an income threshold, geographically tiered employer payroll taxes (0.0%–14.1%), and substantial state funding. The state fully finances targeted benefits such as disability supplements and family support, ensuring equity. This diversified model spreads fiscal risk, maintains sustainable contribution rates, and supports universal access while adapting to regional and income-based differences, strengthening both efficiency and social cohesion. While the political feasibility of substantial tax increases remains questionable in the U.S. context, targeted revenue sources with dedicated purposes might generate broader political support than general allocation adjustments.

Third, flexible retirement provisions could enhance both system sustainability and individual welfare, replacing arbitrary retirement ages with actuarial adjustments and gradual transition options. Norway's system incorporates sophisticated work incentive mechanisms, particularly following recent reforms in 2011, which allowed for flexible retirement between the ages of 62 and 75, enabling individuals to combine work and pension without reductions in benefits. This flexibility led to a significant increase in labor force participation among the 62–67 age group, with notable growth observed post-reform. These approaches could potentially extend workforce participation among older populations in the United States while accommodating diverse individual preferences and capacities.

Fourth, automatic adjustment mechanisms offer promising tools for enhancing long-term sustainability without requiring continuous political intervention. Sweden's annuity divisor serves as a crucial translation mechanism converting individual notional account balances into monthly benefits based on cohort-specific life expectancies. This approach inherently responds to demographic shifts by automatically adjusting benefit levels as population longevity increases. The mortality information undergoes regular updates, which are subsequently reflected in the divisor and systematically communicated to system members, enabling them to make informed adjustments to their retirement planning decisions. Similar mechanisms could potentially reduce political risk in the U.S. context while establishing predictable adaptation pathways for demographic and economic changes.

Implementation Considerations

Contextual Barriers and Structural Considerations:

Unlike the examined European models, the U.S. operates within a distinct political economy characterized by institutional fragmentation, limited corporatist traditions, and heightened polarization around fiscal policies (Hacker, 2004). This institutional environment substantially complicates the implementation of comprehensive reforms similar to those observed in Norway or Denmark, where stronger social partner involvement and more centralized decision-making facilitate systemic adjustment. Furthermore, the scale differential between the U.S. and the examined cases presents additional challenges, as administration of comparable programs would require coordination across a substantially larger and more diverse population spanning numerous jurisdictions with varying administrative capacities and political orientations.

Demographic and Labor Market Dynamics:

Demographic and labor market structures in the United States present both advantages and challenges for social security reform relative to high-HDI comparators. While the U.S. maintains a comparatively favorable age dependency ratio, with 23.5% of the population aged 60+ compared to Denmark's 26.3% and Germany's 28.6%, this demographic advantage is rapidly diminishing due to accelerating retirement rates among the baby boomer generation (Social Security Administration, 2023). Additionally, the U.S. labor market exhibits distinctive characteristics that complicate straightforward policy transfer, including lower unionization rates (10.1% compared to Norway's 49.7%), higher levels of income inequality, and more substantial informal employment sectors that remain outside traditional social insurance frameworks (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2022). These structural differences suggest that successful implementation of European-style reforms would require simultaneous adjustments to labor market institutions to establish more effective contribution collection mechanisms and coverage pathways.

Funding Mechanism Adaptation:
Funding mechanisms employed by high-HDI nations demonstrate potential adaptability to the U.S. context despite significant constraints. Switzerland's multi-pillar approach incorporating both public and private elements aligns conceptually with existing U.S. structures combining Social Security, employer-sponsored plans, and individual retirement accounts, suggesting evolutionary rather than revolutionary reform pathways. However, the progressive funding structures observed in Denmark (tax-based) and Norway (sovereign wealth integration) would encounter substantial implementation barriers given American tax resistance and limited resource endowments comparable to Norway's petroleum reserves. A more feasible approach might involve targeted expansion of the contribution base beyond current payroll tax parameters, potentially including higher income caps and investment income contributions, while maintaining the core contribution framework that enjoys established legitimacy (Diamond & Orszag, 2018).

Benefit Structure Transferability:
The benefit structures employed across high-HDI nations offer several promising elements for potential transfer to the U.S. context, particularly regarding flexibility and targeted adequacy. Germany's flexible retirement pathways and Switzerland's multi-pillar benefit integration provide models that could address current U.S. system rigidities without fundamental restructuring. Of particular relevance is the incorporation of caregiving credits observed in multiple European systems, which could help address gender-based retirement security disparities in the United States, where women's retirement benefits average 80% of men's due to career interruptions for unpaid care work (Munnell & Sass, 2021). Additionally, the progressive minimum benefit guarantees implemented in Ireland and Norway could enhance protection for vulnerable populations while maintaining overall system structure, potentially reducing elderly poverty rates from the current 9.3% toward the 3-4% levels achieved in the examined European systems.

Implementation Pathways and Political Feasibility:
Implementation pathways for transferring high-performing features from European models to the U.S. context require careful sequencing and coalition building within existing institutional constraints. Rather than comprehensive restructuring, which faces prohibitive political barriers, successful reform likely requires targeted interventions addressing specific system deficiencies while expanding upon existing institutional foundations. The experience of

Ireland—transitioning from a relatively residual welfare state toward more comprehensive protection through incremental reforms—offers particularly relevant lessons for the American context. Implementation sequencing might prioritize administrative integration and benefit flexibility in initial phases, followed by modest expansion of mandatory occupational coverage modeled on Switzerland's approach, before addressing more contentious funding adjustments once operational improvements demonstrate tangible benefits (Thaler & Sunstein, 2021).

Cultural Factors and Public Attitudes:
Cultural factors and public attitudes represent perhaps the most significant constraint on transferability, requiring careful adaptation rather than direct importation of European models. Survey data consistently demonstrate lower institutional trust levels in the United States (39% expressing trust in government) compared to Nordic nations (ranging from 58-73%), alongside stronger individualistic orientations and skepticism toward collective risk-pooling mechanisms (Rothstein, 2011). However, these attitudinal differences vary substantially across demographic segments, with younger cohorts demonstrating greater receptivity to expanded social protection frameworks. Strategic reform approaches might leverage these generational differences by emphasizing personal agency within collective structures—similar to Switzerland's balanced approach—while framing reforms in terms of investment rather than expenditure, thereby aligning with American cultural preferences for productivity and self-reliance while addressing emerging economic insecurities (Brady et al., 2013).

CONCLUSION

This comparative analysis of social security systems in high-HDI nations reveals several important lessons for addressing the challenges facing the United States' social security framework. Through examination of the distinctive approaches implemented in Norway, Switzerland, Ireland, Germany, and Denmark, key structural elements that contribute to both effective social protection and long-term sustainability have been identified. Most notably, successful systems typically incorporate multi-pillar frameworks that distribute responsibility across public, occupational, and private domains. Additionally, flexible retirement provisions, progressive funding mechanisms, and integrated service delivery appear consistently across high-performing systems, though implemented through diverse institutional arrangements reflecting specific national contexts.

While direct policy transfer faces significant constraints due to America's distinct political, economic, and cultural environment, selective adaptation remains feasible. The U.S. can build upon existing institutional foundations by strengthening mandatory occupational coverage similar to Switzerland's approach, implementing flexible retirement pathways resembling Germany's model, and expanding progressive funding mechanisms inspired by Norway's diversified revenue structure. Such adaptations would address critical vulnerabilities in the current system without requiring wholesale restructuring that would likely encounter prohibitive political resistance.

Implementation pathways should acknowledge both institutional constraints and demographic realities. As the baby boomer generation continues transitioning into retirement, the urgency of reform increases, yet so do the political barriers to substantial adjustment. Sequenced reform

URL: http://doi.org/10.14738/abr.1306.18930

emphasizing initial administrative improvements followed by gradual structural enhancements offers a potentially viable approach within these constraints. Such an approach aligns with Ireland's experience transitioning from a relatively limited welfare state toward more comprehensive protection through incremental yet purposeful reforms.

Perhaps most critically, successful reform requires reframing social security enhancement as an investment rather than merely an expenditure. High-performing European systems demonstrate that effective social protection contributes to economic productivity through workforce stability, extended working lives, and reduced poverty-related social costs. By emphasizing these productive aspects while maintaining America's distinctive emphasis on individual responsibility within collective frameworks, reform advocates might generate broader support across demographic and ideological divides.

The evidence from high-HDI nations clearly indicates that addressing America's emerging social security challenges requires systemic rather than merely parametric adjustments. Simply modifying benefit formulas or retirement ages without addressing fundamental structural limitations will likely prove insufficient given demographic projections and evolving labor market dynamics. However, by learning from diverse international experiences while acknowledging contextual constraints, policymakers can develop reform approaches that enhance economic security while ensuring system sustainability for future generations.

Future research should examine implementation pathways in greater detail, analyzing potential sequencing strategies and coalition-building opportunities. Additionally, microsimulation modeling incorporating behavioral responses to policy changes could enhance understanding of how proposed reforms might affect diverse population segments, addressing distributional concerns that often undermine reform initiatives. Through continued comparative analysis and evidence-based policy development, the path toward a more sustainable and effective social security system remains achievable, though requiring significant political will and institutional innovation.

References

Atkinson, A. B., and John Hills. "Social Security in Developed Countries: Are There Lessons for Developing Countries?" *Oup.com*, 2022, academic.oup.com/book/2148/chapter/142109513.

Bertelsmann Stiftung. "SGI 2024 | Switzerland | Social Sustainability." *Sgi-Network.org*, 2024, www.sgi-network.org/2024/Switzerland/Social_Sustainability. Accessed 19 Apr. 2025. Switzerland, ranked by sgi indicators, including population health systems.

Betsalel, Assouline. "Swiss Social Security Contributions: Key Rates & Compliance | ALPINEGATE Business Advisors." *ALPINEGATE Business Advisors AG - Feel Your Business Advantage*, 2025, alpinegate.ch/understanding-social-security-contributions-and-rates-in-switzerland/. Accessed 17 May 2025.

BREIT, ERIC, et al. "Modification of Public Policies by Street-Level Organisations: An Institutional Work Perspective." *Journal of Social Policy*, vol. 45, no. 4, 15 Apr. 2016, pp. 709–728, https://doi.org/10.1017/s0047279416000246. Accessed 30 Apr. 2020.

Brinch, Christian N., et al. "How Does Retirement Behavior Respond to Drastic Changes in Social Security Rules? Evidence from the Norwegian 2011 Pension Reform." *NBER*, Sept. 2016, www.nber.org/programs-projects/projects-and-centers/retirement-and-disability-research-center/center-papers/rrc-nb16-10. Accessed 18 May 2025.

Buswell, Gary. "Health Insurance in Switzerland: A Guide for Expats | Expatica." *Expat Guide to Switzerland | Expatica*, 5 May 2025, www.expatica.com/ch/healthcare/healthcare-basics/a-guide-to-swiss-health-insurance-693473/.

Carey, David, et al. "Tax Reform in Switzerland." *OECD Economics Department Working Papers*, 13 Aug. 1999, https://doi.org/10.1787/721511652676.

Centre for Sustainability and Structural Policy and the Division for Economic Policy. *Pension Projection Exercise 2021 Country Fiche Denmark*. 2020.

Compare Your Country. "Expenditure for Social Purposes | Compare Your Country by OECD." *Www.compareyourcountry.org*, www.compareyourcountry.org/social-expenditure.

Conexus Financial. "Global Pension Transparency Benchmark | Countries – Sweden | Global Pension Transparency Benchmark." *Top1000funds.com*, 2019, global-pension-transparency-benchmark.top1000funds.com/global-pension-transparency-benchmark-country-sweden/.

Danish Industry. "The Danish Labour Market Model - Confederation of Danish Industry." *@DanskIndustri*, The Danish Labour Market Model - Confederation of Danish Industry, 2019, www.danskindustri.dk/english/about-di/danish-labour-law. Accessed 18 May 2025.

Durante, Alex. "Social Security: Lessons for Reform." *Tax Foundation*, 26 Sept. 2024, taxfoundation.org/research/all/federal/social-security-reform-options/.

Elif Arbatli, et al. "Automatic Adjustment Mechanisms in Asian Pension Systems." *IMF Working Papers*, vol. 2016, no. 242, 13 Dec. 2016, pp. 1–29, https://doi.org/10.5089/9781475560336.001.a001. Accessed 19 May 2025.

European Commission. *Your Social Security Rights in Norway*. 2024.

Eurostat. "Hours Worked per Week of Full-Time Employment." *Europa.eu*, 2020, ec.europa.eu/eurostat/databrowser/view/tps00071/default/table?lang=en.

Fahle, Christina. "This Is Norwegian Wealth Tax." *Magnuslegal.com*, Magnus Legal AS, 10 Aug. 2023, blog.magnuslegal.com/norwegian-wealth-tax. Accessed 24 Apr. 2025.

FSIO, Federal Social Insurance Office. "Overview of Social Security in Switzerland." *Www.bsv.admin.ch*, www.bsv.admin.ch/bsv/en/home/social-insurance/ueberblick.html.

Fund., Monetary. "Iceland: Financial Sector Assessment Program-Technical Note on Pension Fund Regulation and Supervision." *IMF Staff Country Reports*, vol. 2023, no. 282, 28 July 2023, www.elibrary.imf.org/view/journals/002/2023/282/article-A001-en.xml, https://doi.org/10.5089/9798400252150.002.A001. Accessed 18 May 2025.

Globalen LLC. "Iceland Pension Fund Assets to GDP - Data, Chart | TheGlobalEconomy.com." *TheGlobalEconomy.com*, 2019, www.theglobaleconomy.com/Iceland/pension_funds_assets/. Accessed 18 May 2025.

Government of Iceland. "Social Security and Pensions." *Www.government.is*, www.government.is/topics/social-security-and-pensions/.

GovHK (www.gov.hk). "GovHK: How Social Security Benefits the Public." *Www.gov.hk*, www.gov.hk/en/residents/housing/securityassistance/socialsecurity/socialsecurity.htm.

Grampp, Michael, and Teresa Hug Alonso. "Rethinking Workforce Dynamics for Sustained Growth - Ageing Switzerland." *Deloitte*, 28 Feb. 2025, www.deloitte.com/ch/en/our-thinking/demographics/workforce.html.

Greater Geneva Bern area. "Working in Switzerland: Social Security | GGBa." *Greater Geneva Bern Area*, 27 Feb. 2023, ggba.swiss/en/working-in-switzerland-social-security/. Accessed 19 Apr. 2025.

Gudmundsson, Már. "Iceland's Economy, Financial Markets and Pension System Már Gudmundsson Chief Economist, Central Bank of Iceland* North European Pensions & Investing Summit Stockholm, May 30-31, 2002 * Views Expressed Are Mine and Do Not Necessarily Reflect the Views of the CBI." *Slideplayer.com*, 2019, slideplayer.com/slide/4817330/. Accessed 18 May 2025.

Hansson, Gunnar. “Ekkert Norrænt Velferðarkerfi á Íslandi - RÚV.is.” *RÚV*, ruv.is, 7 May 2018, www.ruv.is/oflokka-eldra-efni/ekkert-norraent-velferdarkerfi-a-islandi. Accessed 19 May 2025.

Hellevik, Tale, and Katharina Herlofson. “67+ and Still Working.” *Nordisk Välfärdsforskning | Nordic Welfare Research*, vol. 5, no. 2, 17 Dec. 2020, pp. 95–108, https://doi.org/10.18261/issn.2464-4161-2020-02-03. Accessed 24 Mar. 2022.

Hernæs, Erik, et al. “Pension Reform and Labor Supply.” *Journal of Public Economics*, vol. 142, Oct. 2016, pp. 39–55, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2016.08.009. Accessed 8 Mar. 2021.

History of Social Security in Switzerland. “History of Social Security-Switzerland in International Comparison.” *Historyofsocialsecurity.ch*, 2015, www.historyofsocialsecurity.ch/topics/switzerland-in-international-comparison. Accessed 19 Apr. 2025.

Hong Kong's Social Welfare Department. “Fact Sheet | Publications | about Us | Social Welfare Department.” *Www.swd.gov.hk*, 2025, www.swd.gov.hk/en/aboutus/publication/fact/.

International Monetary Fund. “Denmark: 2021 Article IV Consultation-Press Release; Staff Report; and Staff Supplement.” *IMF Staff Country Reports*, vol. 2021, no. 112, 14 June 2021, www.elibrary.imf.org/view/journals/002/2021/112/article-A001-en.xml, https://doi.org/10.5089/9781513573212.002.A001. Accessed 19 May 2025.

Jensen, Per H. “Denmark.” *Springer EBooks*, 1 Jan. 2020, pp. 229–239, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-40985-2_16. Accessed 19 May 2025.

Johnson, Richard, and Karen Smith. “If Social Security Runs out of Money, Poverty among Older Adults and People with Disabilities Will Soar.” *Urban Institute*, 19 July 2024, www.urban.org/urban-wire/if-social-security-runs-out-money-poverty-among-older-adults-and-people-disabilities.

Juntunen, Pirkko. “A Growing Asset Class for Icelandic Investors - HedgeNordic.” *HedgeNordic*, 25 Nov. 2024, hedgenordic.com/2024/11/a-growing-asset-class-for-icelandic-investors/. Accessed 18 May 2025.

Kenneally, Kelly, and Tyler Bond. “Americans’ Views of Social Security - National Institute on Retirement Security.” *National Institute on Retirement Security*, 22 July 2024, www.nirsonline.org/reports/socialsecurity2024/.

Lehmann, Olivier Tim, et al. “DSpace-CRIS.” *Arbor.bfh.ch*, 2025, arbor.bfh.ch/handle/arbor/37100. Accessed 17 May 2025.

Leung, Roy. “Understanding Hong Kong MPF: A Comprehensive Guide - Navigator Insurance.” *Navigator Insurance* -, 9 Apr. 2025, www.navigator-insurance.com/blog/understanding-hong-kong-mpf-a-comprehensive-guide/. Accessed 18 May 2025.

Library of Congress. “Social Security: Trust Fund Status in the Early 1980s and Today and the 1980s Greenspan Commission.” *Congress.gov*, 2025, www.congress.gov/crs-product/R47040.

lifeindenmark.dk. “State Pension.” *Borger.dk*, 2025, lifeindenmark.borger.dk/pension/state-pension?cookiebanner=true. Accessed 19 May 2025.

Magesan, Arvind, et al. “The Impact of Social Security on Pension Claiming and Retirement.” *CEPR*, 12 Jan. 2021, cepr.org/voxeu/columns/impact-social-security-pension-claiming-and-retirement. Accessed 19 Apr. 2025. overview of the impact of womens pensions on social security in Switzerland?

Martela, Frank, et al. “The Nordic Exceptionalism: What Explains Why the Nordic Countries Are Constantly among the Happiest in the World.” *World Happiness Report*, 20 Mar. 2020, worldhappiness.report/ed/2020/the-nordic-exceptionalism-what-explains-why-the-nordic-countries-are-constantly-among-the-happiest-in-the-world/.cultural factors incentivize populations to do more work and contribute more.

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark. “Danish Labour Market.” *Denmark.dk*, 2018, denmark.dk/society-and-business/the-danish-labour-market.

Misicka, Susan. “How Swiss Welfare Works.” *SWI Swissinfo.ch*, 25 Feb. 2020, www.swissinfo.ch/eng/society/poverty_how-swiss-welfare-works/45575954.

Nav. "Membership of the National Insurance Scheme." *NAV*, www.nav.no/en/home/rules-and-regulations/membership-of-the-national-insurance-scheme.

Nordic Co-operation. "Danish Retirement Pension | Nordic Cooperation." *Www.norden.org*, www.norden.org/en/info-norden/danish-retirement-pension.

---. "The Icelandic Pension System." *Nordic Cooperation*, 2025, www.norden.org/en/info-norden/icelandic-pension-system. Accessed 26 Apr. 2025.

---. "The Swedish Pension System | Nordic Cooperation." *Www.norden.org*, www.norden.org/en/info-norden/swedish-pension-system.

Norges Bank Investment Management. "About the Fund | Norges Bank Investment Management." *Norges Bank Investment Management*, 2024, www.nbim.no/en/about-us/about-the-fund/.

Norwegian Ministry of Labour and Social Inclusion. *The Norwegian Social Insurance Scheme*. 2024.

OECD. *Pensions at a Glance 2023 PUBE*. 2023.

---. "Social Policy." *OECD*, 2024, www.oecd.org/en/topics/social-policy.html.

OECD Statistics. "Sizing up Welfare States: How Do OECD Countries Compare?" *Oecdstatistics.blog*, 2 Feb. 2023, oecdstatistics.blog/2023/02/02/sizing-up-welfare-states-how-do-oecd-countries-compare/.

Palmer, Edward, and Bo Könberg. *The Swedish NDC Scheme: Success on Track with Room for Reflection*. 2019.

Pechter, Kerry. "Iceland's Tiny but Great Collective DC Plan." *Retirement Income Journal*, 14 Jan. 2024, retirementincomejournal.com/article/icelands-tiny-but-great-collective-dc-plan/.

Pension Funds Online. "Pension System in Iceland - Pension Funds Online." *Pensionfundsonline.co.uk*, 2025, www.pensionfundsonline.co.uk/content/country-profiles/iceland. Accessed 18 May 2025.

Petersen, Klaus, and Cecelie Bjerre. "Social Policy in Denmark." *Social Work*, 21 Feb. 2022, https://doi.org/10.1093/obo/9780195389678-0314.

QERY. "Human Development Index Data Tracker." *Qery*, 17 Apr. 2024, qery.no/undp-human-development-index/. human development index.

Rivermate. "Employee Benefits in Iceland." *Rivermate*, 2025, www.rivermate.com/guides/iceland/benefits.

Romig, Kathleen. "Social Security Is Not "Bankrupt" | Center on Budget and Policy Priorities." *Center on Budget and Policy Priorities*, 29 Mar. 2023, www.cbpp.org/blog/social-security-is-not-bankrupt.

Røysum, Anita. "The Reform of the Welfare Services in Norway: One Office – One Way of Thinking?" *European Journal of Social Work*, vol. 16, no. 5, Nov. 2013, pp. 708–723, https://doi.org/10.1080/13691457.2012.722982. Accessed 28 Oct. 2020.

Schell, Melanie. "Pensions in Switzerland – the Three-Pillar System." *Swiss Life*, 15 Dec. 2024, www.swisslife.ch/en/individuals/future-provisions-assets/guide/drei-saeulen-system-schweiz.html. Accessed 17 May 2025.

Sherman, Sally. *Public Attitudes toward Social Security*. Dec. 1989.

Sjogren Lindquist, Gabriella, and Eskil Wadensjo. "Social Security and Pension Income in Sweden." *Social Security and Pension Reform: International Perspectives*, 4 Feb. 2014, pp. 63–100, https://doi.org/10.17848/9780880994705.ch4. Accessed 19 May 2025.

Social Security Administration. "Historical Background and Development of Social Security." *Social Security*, 2013, www.ssa.gov/history/briefhistory3.html.

---. "International Programs -U.S.-Swiss Social Security Agreement - Part 4." *Ssa.gov*, 2025, www.ssa.gov/international/Agreement_Texts/annotations/switzrld/switzrld_part_iv.htm.

---. "Social Security History." *Ssa.gov*, 2017, www.ssa.gov/history/thismonth4.html. Accessed 15 Mar. 2025.

---. “Social Security Programs throughout the World: Asia and the Pacific, 2018 - Guide to Reading the Country Summaries.” *Social Security Administration Research, Statistics, and Policy Analysis*, 2018, www.ssa.gov/policy/docs/progdesc/ssptw/2018-2019/asia/guide.html. Accessed 15 Mar. 2025.

---. “Social Security Programs throughout the World: Asia and the Pacific, 2018 - Hong Kong (China).” *Social Security Administration Research, Statistics, and Policy Analysis*, 2018, www.ssa.gov/policy/docs/progdesc/ssptw/2018-2019/asia/hong-kong.html.

Statistics Norway. “Seniors in Norway 2024.” *SSB*, Statistisk sentralbyrå, 4 Feb. 2025, www.ssb.no/en/sosiale-forhold-og-kriminalitet/levekar/artikler/seniors-in-norway-2024.

Swiss Federal Authorities. “Social Aspects.” *Admin.ch*, 2024, www.aboutswitzerland.eda.admin.ch/en/social-aspects.

The Danish Agency for Labour Market and Recruitment. “Flexicurity.” *Star.dk*, 2024, www.star.dk/en/about-the-danish-agency-for-labour-market-and-recruitment/flexicurity.

Tikkanen, Roosa, et al. “Norway.” *The Commonwealth Fund*, 5 June 2020, www.commonwealthfund.org/international-health-policy-center/countries/norway.

---. “Switzerland | Commonwealth Fund.” *Www.commonwealthfund.org*, The Commonwealth Fund, 2020, www.commonwealthfund.org/international-health-policy-center/countries/switzerland.

Trading Economics. “Switzerland Employment Rate.” *Tradingeconomics.com*, TRADING ECONOMICS, 7 Oct. 2019, tradingeconomics.com/switzerland/employment-rate.

Turner, John A. “How Does Social Security Work?” *Sustaining Social Security in an Era of Population Aging*, by John A. Turner, W.E. Upjohn Institute, 2016, pp. 1–18. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctvh4zdxx.4.

---. “Sustainability and Financing Reform.” *Sustaining Social Security in an Era of Population Aging*, by John A. Turner, W.E. Upjohn Institute, 2016, pp. 19–34. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctvh4zdxx.5.

its hard to do reform rn, here’s pathways to financing reform.

UBS Insights. “The Three-Pillar Principle: The Pension System in Simple Terms.” *Services*, UBS, 20 Mar. 2025, www.ubs.com/ch/en/services/guide/pension/articles/three-pillar-system.html.

Wagner, Ines. “Equal Pay for Work of Equal Value? Iceland and the Equal Pay Standard.” *Social Politics*, vol. 29, no. 2, 2020, https://doi.org/10.1093/sp/jxaa032.

Weaver, R Kent. “Bridging the Social Security Divide: Lessons from Abroad.” *Brookings*, 19 June 2008, www.brookings.edu/articles/bridging-the-social-security-divide-lessons-from-abroad/. Accessed 21 Apr. 2025.

Weber, Anders. “A-Kasse - Unemployment Insurance.” *A-Kasser.dk*, 2 Oct. 2018, www.a-kasser.dk/unemployment-insurance/index.html. Accessed 19 May 2025.

Wood, Johnny. “Employing Older Workers Is Beneficial | These Countries Are Already Gaining.” *World Economic Forum*, 17 Aug. 2018, www.weforum.org/stories/2018/08/older-workers-employment-oecd-economies/.

World Population Review. “Developed Countries List 2022.” *Worldpopulationreview.com*, 2022, worldpopulationreview.com/country-rankings/developed-countries.