

de Henau, Jerome

**Working Paper**

## Costing a feminist plan for a caring economy: The case of free universal childcare in the UK

Open Discussion Papers in Economics, No. 79

**Provided in Cooperation with:**

Department of Economics, Faculty of Social Sciences, The Open University

*Suggested Citation:* de Henau, Jerome (2015) : Costing a feminist plan for a caring economy: The case of free universal childcare in the UK, Open Discussion Papers in Economics, No. 79, The Open University, Economics Department, Milton Keynes

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/147530>

**Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:**

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

**Terms of use:**

*Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.*

*You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.*

*If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.*



———— OPEN —————  
DISCUSSION PAPERS IN  
———— ECONOMICS ————

**Costing a feminist plan for a caring economy:  
the case of free universal childcare in the UK**

Jerome de-Henau

July 2015

**NUMBER 79**

***Copies may be obtained from:***

Economics Department  
Faculty of Social Sciences  
The Open University  
Walton Hall Milton Keynes MK7 6AA  
Telephone: 01908 654437  
Email: [economics@open.ac.uk](mailto:economics@open.ac.uk)  
Fax: 01908 654488

This series is registered under  
ISSN 1753-2590 (Print)  
ISSN 1753-2604 (Online)

## Economics Research at The Open University

Economists at the OU comprise a lively group with a strong track record of internationally recognised research. Economics is practised as an open discipline, with particular emphasis on its interface with the other social sciences, development, technology, philosophy and intellectual history. Our diverse pool of students further shapes our research and teaching portfolio. We also emphasise the practical application of economics, including issues relating to debt and personal finance, innovation policy, health policy in Africa, the impact of tax and benefits on women carers, the measurement of capabilities and the analysis of happiness. Our open approach to economics encourages the use of whichever tools or techniques are most appropriate, from different strands of economic theory or, where relevant, from disciplines outside economics.

Our research is further supported by research centres established at the Open University, which have developed a significant international exposure since their foundation. These include Innovation, Knowledge and Development (IKD), International Development Centre (IDC) and Centre for Citizenship, Identities and Governance (CCIG). The members of our department also have a good history of attracting external research grants, which include ESRC, AHRB, ESF, WHO, NHS, and the UN.

Journal editorial activity includes: *The Adam Smith Review* (Professor Vivienne Brown, Founding editor), *Feminist Economics* (Professor Susan Himmelweit, Associate editor), *Information Economics and Policy* (Professor Mariana Mazzucato, Associate editor), and *Economic Issues* (Dr Andrew Trigg, Book Reviews Editor). Membership of editorial boards also includes *Journal of Socio-Economics* (Professor Paul Anand), *Economics and Philosophy* and *European Journal of the History of Economic Thought* (Professor Vivienne Brown), and *International Journal of Economics* (Dr Andrew Trigg).

Our recent peer-reviewed publications are published in: *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, *Economic History Review*, *European Journal of Development Research*, *Feminist Economics*, *Fiscal Studies*, *Industrial and Corporate Change*, *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, *Journal of Development Studies*, *Journal of Economic Psychology*, *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*, *Journal of Health Economics*, *Journal of International Development*, *Journal of Medical Ethics*, *Journal of Socio-Economics*, *Journal of the Philosophy of History*, *Metroeconomica*, *Public Policy Research*, *Review of Economic Dynamics*, *Review of Social Economy*, *Revue d'Economie Industrielle*, *Revue d'Economie Politique*, *Social Science and Medicine*, *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management*.

Usual disclaimer:

The papers contain results of research which is the sole responsibility of the authors. Opinions expressed in these papers are hence those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect views of the University.

# Costing a feminist plan for a caring economy: the case of free universal childcare in the UK

Jerome De Henau<sup>1</sup>

July 2015

## Abstract

This paper makes the case for providing universal and free childcare services in the UK to contribute to building a care economy as a better alternative to austerity and spending cuts, one that would foster gender equality and quality employment. It estimates the total cost of such services using different assumptions on staff pay and coverage and the related direct employment effects. It discusses the different multipliers that could be derived from such 'investment' and the related tax revenue for the government. It argues that the net public funding of such an extensive and high quality childcare provision for all children aged 6 months to 5 years (prior to primary school entry) can be achieved by reversing some of the tax give-aways implemented since 2010 and which have mainly benefited men. The discussion explores the ways in which universal childcare provision, combined with a reformed parental leave and family benefit system could promote gender equality in both employment and unpaid care.

## Introduction

Since 2010, a conservative liberal democrat coalition government followed in 2015 by a conservative majority government have implemented a vast austerity plan in the UK to deal with the budget deficit and rising public debt in the aftermath of the financial crisis of 2007-08. The claim at the time the plan was launched was that there was no alternative but this Plan A to 'sanitise' public finances and the economy. Such plan has involved drastic spending cuts in social security and public services. Low income households and in particular lone parents and single pensioners have been found to have borne the brunt of the cumulative spending cuts in services and tax-benefit changes (Reed and Portes, 2014). Not only this is damaging women's economic security and employment opportunities but it is also disrupting the fabric of the social infrastructure, with potential long-term negative consequences for the economy, while doing nothing to improve upwards convergence in men's and women's economic perspectives.

This paper examines what an alternative roadmap would look like, one that aims at achieving a caring economy that works for the people, and for gender equality. Feminist scholars and activists in the UK Women's Budget Group – an independent think tank analysing gender implications of fiscal and social policies – have argued for a Plan F, a feminist plan for a caring economy (WBG, 2015a). They argue that investing in care services, guaranteeing decent working conditions and supporting more equitable sharing of unpaid care between men and women are at the core of such an economy. Part of this alternative requires the government to secure funding for the social infrastructure – care, health, education and training services, social security and housing – along

---

<sup>1</sup> Senior Lecturer in Economics at The Open University, UK. Contact: [j.de-henau@open.ac.uk](mailto:j.de-henau@open.ac.uk)

with that already put in place for the physical infrastructure of transport and technology. By fostering social reproduction, investing in social infrastructure is essential to improving well-being while also instrumental in increasing productivity of the workforce, in the short and the longer run (Braunstein et al., 2011). In some ways it is in line with the 'new' social policy paradigm in Europe of the 'social investment strategy' aimed at increasing equal opportunities of future generations through integrating their parents (and themselves later on) into the labour market (Morel et al., 2012). However, the idea of the care economy goes beyond the often too narrow and instrumental perspective of the social investment approach, which has become the social policy paradigm in Europe since the turn of the century. From a care economy perspective, providing quality care is not just seen as a means to achieve greater (female) employment by reducing constraints on labour supply but also a necessary feature of a civilised society that offers social equality and security to its population.

In lights with these aims, the paper investigates the fiscal space available for such an alternative and focuses on universal childcare provision for pre-school children as one of the bedrocks of the social infrastructure that is currently deficient. Along with reduction in working time to accommodate childcare needs and a better sharing of caring tasks between parents, costings are estimated using different assumptions about children's coverage and staff pay. Funding routes are explored for the UK, including by mobilising the tax giveaways identified as benefiting men disproportionately such as rises in personal tax allowances and cuts in fuel and alcohol duties. Other options are examined and alternative employment multipliers discussed. The model proposed is one in which dual-earners dual-carers parents operate in partnership with public care services that are universally provided and of high quality.

### **Making the case for free universal preschool childcare**

The main problems with childcare provision in the UK and elsewhere have been identified for many years and its accessibility and affordability scrutinised by many researchers. The cost to parents is very high in the UK compared to its European neighbours and has been increasing steadily at faster pace than general inflation over the last ten to fifteen years (Rutter and Stocker, 2014; Rutter, 2015). Rutter and Stocker (2014) also point to the lack of places for young children, even among private providers, due to a lack of adequate public funding. Indeed, current state support is too low or inadequate (Rutter and Stocker, 2014; WBG, 2014): public subsidies to offer free childcare for 3-4y olds only cover for 15h a week and for 38 weeks. This is effectively equivalent to 10h of parental work if 48 weeks and commuting time need to be accounted for. Moreover, the subsidy per hour is below the supply cost so that additional hours are overcharged to parents, which could effectively cancel out the support provided in some cases. In addition, a complex system of cash transfers combining Universal Credit and (forthcoming) Tax-Free Childcare entails strong disincentives for second earners to work more than short part-time weeks (if at all). Besides inadequate provision, the UK is also characterised with high levels of inequality of use. Van Lancker (2013) calculates using EU-SILC data for 2009 on FTE childcare use by income quintiles that children under 3 in the bottom 20% of families had a coverage rate six times lower than those in the top 20%, compared to 1.5 in Germany, Belgium and Italy and 1.2 in Denmark and Sweden. And this ratio rose to 7 for children in families where the mother was employed.

Research has shown time and again that lack of affordable and accessible childcare provision is associated with lasting negative effects on gender inequalities over the life course due to a one-and-a-half breadwinner model encapsulated by current childcare and parental leave policies (De Henau et al, 2007a and b; Lewis, 2006). Moreover, lack of formal childcare of high quality for a significant number of hours during the week is detrimental to children's outcomes, especially from disadvantaged background, and even for very young toddlers and infants (Havnes and Mogstad, 2011 and 2014; Karoly et al., 2005, Babchishin et al., 2013; Li et al., 2013; see also Van Lancker 2013 for a discussion).

The solution is thus to invest massively in free full-time formal childcare for all children, with highly trained and well paid staff (De Henau et al. 2007a; NEF, 2014; Ben Ghalim, 2011). Therefore this paper looks at the costing and funding possibilities of such investment for children aged between 6 months and 5 years of age (when they enter primary school). It also explores the synergies between free formal childcare and a reformed parental leave system, for children in their first year. A large part of the cost calculations build on a previous study on costing free universal childcare for children under 3 for England only carried out by the New Economic Foundation in 2014 (NEF, 2014). We extend their scope to all pre-school children in the UK and further analyse different coverage scenarios while we investigate direct, indirect and induced effects on employment, interactions with the tax credit system and funding sources from taxation.

The premise of this paper is that there is enough fiscal space, even within existing current resources, to fund such radical policy. The paper explores how this could be done using the same arguments that the Chancellor employed to justify his austerity-driven spending cuts while at the same time cutting tax to boost employment and only investing comparatively little 'new' money into childcare support (WBG, 2014).

### **Costing the free delivery of full-time universal childcare**

The cost of providing free childcare will depend on five main criteria:

1. Number of children in each age group
2. Staff ratio per child for each age group
3. Ratio of supervisor care staff (highly qualified) to less qualified staff for each age group
4. Level of remuneration of staff
5. Opening hours per week (and per year) and percentage of children covered

In the maximum scenario we assume 100% of children are covered for a full-time equivalent week of work, accounting for commuting time of one hour per day. Hence childcare is available for 40h per week. This takes account of a full-time working week norm based on the current female full-time week of 35h (ONS, 2014). This doesn't mean that childcare is made to remain a woman's issue that needs to fit around women's typical hours; only that if men worked shorter hours, they would free up time to get more involved in caring activities and that should be the way forward within a triple carer model. We also assume that childcare provision is available for 48 weeks, accounting for a 4-week holiday period.

The first three criteria are taken from population statistics and quality regulation and the data are shown in Table 1. We also assume that childcare centres have one manager and each centre has 41 children of mixed ages (NEF, 2014). Supervisor staff is assumed to have higher education-oriented qualification than other caring staff, and more of them are allocated to older children proportionally (Table 1).

Table 1 Number of children and staff ratios

	# children in UK (mid-2013)	Staff: child ratio	% staff supervisor	# places in centre
<i>C1a (6-12m)</i>	<i>396,308</i>			
<i>C1b (12-24m)</i>	<i>821,578</i>			
C1 (6-24m)	1,217,886	0.333	33%	9
C2 (24-36m)	811,850	0.250	50%	16
C3 (36-60m)	1,360,000	0.125	50%	16

Source: population from ONS (2014); rest from NEF (2014)

The fourth criterion about staff pay is the focus of this costing exercise in which high quality childcare provision is explored and thus higher levels of pay for carers are included. We take two possible salary profiles, following some of the suggestions of NEF (2014). The first, 'high quality', option is based on teachers' salary (primary school); the second, 'decent quality', option is based on the average living wage (paid for the lowest qualified category of staff and keeping the same relative pay for supervising staff as per the teacher option). Table 2 shows the hours and pay for each category of staff.

Table 2 Carers' annual and hourly pay and weekly hours (2014)

	Supervising carer	Other carer	Centre manager
Teacher salary £ pa	27,105	20,828	48,156
Living wage £ pa	15,760	12,110	27,999
# hours per week	29.7	29.7	35
Teacher salary £ ph	17.55	13.49	26.46
Living wage £ ph	10.20	7.85	15.38

Source: Department of Education (2014) and Living Wage Foundation (2015)

Notes: Carers' hours are based on teachers' hours in both salary options and calculated as follows: 1265h of teaching for 260 paid days = 82% of working time per day so total per week = 1265/260/0.82\*5 = 29.7. This assumes that carers spend 18% of their day on other activities than direct contact with children (administrative, meetings etc.). Teachers' salaries are mid-point of the scale.

This information allows us to calculate a cost per child per hour for each type of staff and for each age group. We assume, following NEF (2014), that

- Non-wage costs are 23% of unit cost (per child per hour)
- Gross earnings attract pension contributions of 14.1%

Because managers' costs are per centre and not per age group, the following table shows the cost per child per hour with the managers' cost being apportioned to each age group (in proportion of children of each age in the centre)



Table 3 cost of free childcare

	# children covered	Teacher wage		Living wage	
		Cost per hour per child (£)	Total cost pa (£m)	Cost per hour per child (£)	Total cost pa (£m)
6-24m	1,217,886	9.89	23,120	5.59	13,071
24-36m	811,850	8.00	12,465	4.53	7,059
36-60m	1,360,000	4.20	10,977	2.38	6,220
All	3,389,736		46,561		26,350

Note: the cost per hour per child is that of hours of direct care of the child, not hours of carer's work.

At teacher's wage, £47bn would be required per annum to provide universal free childcare, reduced to £26bn if provided at living wage.

This is a huge amount, equivalent to 3% of GDP in the high quality scenario and compares to a mere £5bn of existing annual current expenditure that goes towards the main three forms of childcare support (tax-free childcare or vouchers, childcare tax credit and free childcare for 15h for 3-4y olds and 40% of 2y olds), some of which going to older children.

The net cost to the Exchequer could be reduced through revenue raised from carers' new jobs and parents care time being freed up to take-up paid employment. Let alone indirect and induced multiplier effects in the rest of the economy.

## Employment effects

### *Labour demand effects*

The main immediate employment effect is to create demand for jobs in the care sector. The number of full-time equivalent (FTE) caring jobs created as a result of the maximum scenario is given in Table 4.

Table 4 Number of jobs (FTE) created in care services

	Supervising carer	Other carer	Manager	Total
C1 (6-24m)	222,504	445,007		667,511
C2 (24-36m)	166,862	166,862		333,725
C3 (36-60m)	139,763	139,763		279,526
Total	529,129	751,632	94,487	1,375,249

Source: own calculations

The 1.4 million new jobs created correspond to 41 full-time jobs for every 100 children offered a full-time slot for free in a childcare centre.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> This is higher than the headline staff:child ratio derived from Table 1 of 23 carers for every 100 children. The difference is due to the fact that carers' full-time week is only 30h while children are to be looked after for 40h. Also not all the carers' time is used for time with children (18% was factored in for admin and meetings)

Of course not all of these jobs would be new since childcare providers already exist. In April-June 2014, there were 337,000 people employed as nursery nurses, childminders and playworkers<sup>3</sup>, 98% of whom were women and 55% full-time employed (ONS, 2014b). That's about 260,000 FTE (about 19% of the total FTE staff in care that would be created by the universal childcare reform), although it would be slightly more when accounting for the existing teaching professionals in nursery education and managerial staff<sup>4</sup>.

A second type of employment effect is the indirect multiplier (also known as Type I multiplier) stemming from employment created through increased demand for inputs from other sectors into the additional childcare services (food, construction, transport, etc.), usually estimated with input-output tables (Antonopoulos et al., 2010). The ONS provides estimates on such indirect effects using data from 2010, for different sectors of the UK economy. The social sector which includes childcare services in the classification has a multiplier of 2.76 (for non-market activities, that is provided publicly). However, given the structure of social care services (mainly procuring to private providers), it is not clear how this multiplier would look like if the full childcare provision was publicly funded and publicly delivered. In comparison, private sector social care activities have a multiplier of 1.34. Perhaps the multiplier for the education sector is closer to what this exercise is aiming to achieve, given the wage levels of teachers assumed in the high quality scenario. In this sector, the multiplier is much lower at 1.17. This would still add an extra 234,000 FTE jobs to the total, therefore reaching 1.6 million.

A third type of employment effect (also known as Type II) is the induced impact on economic growth, due to an income effect on consumption and thus internal demand by the newly employed population. Estimates of such multiplier is not available for the UK but Scotland has carried out an exercise in calculating both Type I and Type II multipliers using Scottish input-output matrices. Given the sector analysed – education – which is expected to attract mainly local employment, we could use the Scottish estimate as proxy for the UK induced employment multiplier. In 2010, the indirect multiplier was 1.10 while the induced multiplier was 1.27 (Scottish Government, 2015). If we apply the same ratio to the UK indirect multiplier of 1.17, we would have an induced multiplier of 1.35 for the UK. This means, an additional 250,000 FTE jobs.

However, estimating such effect with more accuracy would actually require a full-blown macroeconomic simulation tool outside of the scope of this paper (Bargawi and Cozzi, 2014; Hansen and Andersen, 2014). The same goes for estimating a fourth employment effect over the longer run related to improved child outcomes, including with increased productivity due to a higher quality and more inclusive early education system.

### *Matching labour supply*

---

<sup>3</sup> Respectively categories 6121, 6122 and 6123 of the SOC 2010 occupations in the Labour Force Survey.

<sup>4</sup> It is difficult to estimate the exact current number of workers in childcare-related occupations given the existing statistical classification that treats primary school teachers and nursery classes teachers (the latter being for 3 and 4 year-olds usually) as part of the same occupation. There were about 431,000 primary and nursery school teaching professionals in 2014 compared to 411,000 secondary education teaching professionals so we can assume that relatively few in the first group were employed as professionals in nursery education (ONS, 2014b).

On the supply side, boosting availability of high quality childcare is expected to free up the time of current unpaid carers (mainly parents but could also be relatives or friends) so they can take up employment or increase their working time. This will depend on the number of unpaid carers whose time would be freed up relative to the number of jobs created in the childcare sector. And on their willingness (and other constraints) to supply more labour.

Using data on FTE employment rates for parents whose youngest child is under the age of 5, we can estimate the employment gap between fathers and mothers and use it as an indicator of the potential increase in labour supply for mothers. This is one way of estimating a labour supply model that assumes men’s and women’s characteristics (such as education, skills, motivations and experience) are the same other than their caring time constraint. This makes sense insofar as such gender differences in personal characteristics have significantly reduced over the past few decades (Goldin, 2006).

The FTE employment rate of mothers of children aged 0-4 was 40% in 2014 and that of fathers was 93%<sup>5</sup>. The employment gap is thus 53 percentage points. If we take the total fertility rate (TFR) of 1.83 as an indicator of the average number of children per woman (ONS, 2015), we have 55 mothers for every 100 children. Therefore for every 100 additional children in childcare, 29 (=0.53\*55) more unpaid carers (mothers) could see their FTE caring constraint freed up to take up employment/increase working hours. That’s around 973,000 FTE, or 61% of the direct and indirect increase in demand, thus showing spare capacity.

Female employment rate (16-64) in 2014 was 68% in headcount and 53% in FTE (based on female full-time hours). Depending on the multiplier and if we assume all the new jobs are taken up by women (see above), the increase in employment rate (16-64) would be between 6.7 points with a multiplier of 1 and 9.1 points with a multiplier of 1.35. Table 5 shows the employment creation effects according to the three demand-side multipliers.

Table 5 job creation in care and other sectors

	Direct	Direct + indirect	Direct + indirect + induced
Multiplier	1	1.17	1.35
# FTE jobs created			
Direct (care)	1,375,249	1,375,249	1,375,249
Indirect	0	233,792	233,792
Induced	0	0	248,670
Total	1,375,249	1,609,041	1,857,711
Point rise in f empl. rate	6.7	7.9	9.1

<sup>5</sup> Headcount rates are derived from the ONS series on working families and FTE calculations are based on proportions of employed men and women with young children working part-time (15% and 55% respectively) and using average working hours of part-time men and women overall (around 16 hours). We assume a full-time working week based on the female full-time average of 35 hours. Elsewhere in this exercise we have assumed a full-time week of 40h. Note that full-time working men work 5h more on average than their female counterparts and this was accounted for in their FTE calculation. All data are from ONS (2014b).

The full multiplier scenario of 1.35 would lead to an increase by nine points in the overall female employment rate, thereby nearly closing the current ten-point headcount employment gap between all men and women aged 16-64. In FTE, the increase in female employment rate to 62% would still be 20 points below the male rate of 82%. This shows that there is significant spare capacity for the additional employment effects in Table 5 to be matched with increased female labour supply beyond just that of mothers of young children, provided relevant constraints are alleviated (especially other types of care), including with increased male involvement in unpaid care activities.

#### *Interaction with means-tested benefits*

So far labour supply responses have assumed childcare cost and availability as the main budget constraint, at least for mothers of young children. However in the UK, an important aspect to keep in mind is the role of the current tax credit system (or the similar Universal Credit system being phased in). Although increased employment in families would potentially reduce the tax credit bill given the means-tested nature of the system, the net effect would be somewhat ambiguous. The structure of these means-tested cash transfers inherently disincentivise second earners in low income households to take up (full-time) employment, even with free childcare, because cash transfers in the Universal Credit system are tapered down at a rate of 65p for every earned pound at the household level.

Table 6 summarises the main average effective tax rate (AETR) for a couple in which the second earner moves from no paid employment to relevant number of paid hours, and the first earner is on 40 hours a week paid at the same wage rate. The AETR is the percentage of additional gross earnings taken away in reduced benefits and increased costs (taxation and childcare) when taking up a certain number of hours of paid employment.

Table 6 Effect of childcare costs on AETR of couples with 2 children (1y and 3y)

	Second earner's hours	Min. W	Living W	Median W	80th pct W
Hourly W £		6.5	7.85	11.61	19.59
Gross hh inc. £	0	13,520	16,328	24,149	40,747
Net hh inc. £	0	22,176	22,844	24,705	32,433
2c current cc					
AETR	20	80.5%	78.0%	76.3%	45.0%
AETR	30	83.4%	82.1%	80.2%	53.1%
AETR	35	94.3%	91.2%	86.3%	55.4%
AETR	40	109.6%	103.9%	89.2%	57.1%
2c no cc cost					
AETR	20	65.0%	65.1%	37.0%	17.5%
AETR	30	66.0%	65.2%	35.3%	22.3%
AETR	35	67.5%	60.4%	34.9%	23.7%

AETR	40	68.6%	56.9%	34.5%	24.7%
% pts AETR diff	20	15.5	12.9	39.3	27.5
% pts AETR diff	30	17.4	17.0	44.9	30.8
% pts AETR diff	35	26.8	30.8	51.5	31.7
% pts AETR diff	40	41.1	47.0	54.7	32.4

Note: Own calculations using the following assumptions: currently planned system of Universal Credit covering 85% of childcare costs up to a limit and 20% 'tax-free' childcare up to £2000 per child (to be introduced in 2015); childcare costs of £4.4 an hour per child (Rutter and Stocker, 2014) for 48 weeks; 15h of free childcare per week for 38 weeks for the oldest child aged 4 (the youngest is 1 year old); both earners on same hourly wage rate (examples of rates are as of November 2014); first earner is employed 40h a week; Income tax, NICs and tax credit figures are all from the 2014-15 fiscal year.

For couples on minimum wage with two young children in free full-time childcare (i.e. no childcare cost), taking up employment for the second earner after maternity leave implies that 65% of the additional gross income (from earnings and child-related benefits and UC) would be taken away whether they were to work up to 30 hours and up to 69% if working 40 hours (as they start paying income tax and NICs). The same holds if the spouses earned the living wage, although the AETR would be reduced to 57% at 40 hours. At median wages (as in our estimated employment effect above), such high AETR is only for small hours of employment (below 10 hours – not shown): at 20h, the AETR is down to 37% and to 34% at 40 hours, although still a third higher than for much higher wages.

Nevertheless, providing free childcare for all children would help considerably reduce the AETR compared to the currently phased-in system of UC and tax-free childcare (difference in percentage points of the AETR are shown in the last three rows of Table 6). This is especially the case for middle income families whose earnings are too high to benefit more from UC and too low to compensate for the hourly cost of childcare.

These results show that despite significant reduction when childcare is provided free, the employment disincentive for second earners remains high for low earning families. Therefore, in order to make universal childcare more effective in increasing parental employment (that was the main objective), reforming the means-tested benefit system becomes necessary too. Means-tested benefit systems are also complex to administer and usually fraught with low take-up (Aldridge et al., 2012; Gugushvili and Hirsch, 2014). One argument is to separate taxation of earnings from supporting consumption costs of children, as in most Scandinavian countries, using universal child benefit instead (De Henau et al., 2010). A more complete analysis of the interaction between the different elements of the tax-benefit system that relates to employment disincentives in the presence of young children would require a full-blown tax-benefit simulation tool. This would also allow a more accurate estimation of the reduction in total spending on tax credits from providing universal childcare and thus increasing employment.

### **Tax revenue**

The revenue effect of the increased jobs in childcare and indirect effects can be estimated. This would include primarily income tax and national insurance contributions of employees and of

employers. We assume non-care jobs are paid at the full-time median wage per annum of £23,889. Table 5 summarises the tax revenue and thus the net additional funding needs for the government (assuming the current £5bn annual childcare budget is used).

Table 5 Tax revenue from job creation and net funding needs

Multiplier	Teacher wage			Living wage		
	1	1.17	1.35	1	1.17	1.35
Tax revenue from jobs (£m)						
Care	10,309	10,309	10,309	3,626	3,626	3,626
Other	0	1,610	3,323	0	1,610	3,323
Total	10,309	11,919	13,632	3,626	5,237	6,950
Current funding cc (£m)	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
Net funding need (£m)	31,253	29,642	27,929	17,723	16,113	14,400

The net funding needs remain at a very high level in the tens of billions. However they could be related to the current tax-giveaways of the personal tax allowance (and transferable tax allowance for married couples) and the alcohol and fuel duties going mainly to men, and totalling £20bn per year in 2015-16 (OBR, 2015). This is more than the £18bn of net funding needed in the living wage scenario, assuming no multiplier, and significantly more than the £14bn if we assume induced multiplier effects. For the teacher salary scenario, the shortfall of £8bn that would still remain (assuming induced multiplier) if these tax-giveaways were reversed imply that the 40m adults could be asked to contribute an additional £200 per person per annum on average. That's £3.8 per week per person, the equivalent of a pint of beer or cider to use a popular analogy. In its Green Budget 2015, the IFS estimates that increasing either the VAT standard rate or the basic income tax rate by 1 percentage point could raise £5bn a year (IFS, 2015).

Alternatively, this could be coming from companies: as a reminder the successive cuts in the corporation tax rate – which were sold by the government as a job creation policy – amount to about £7bn per year in foregone revenue in 2015-16, nearly enough to fill the remaining £8bn shortfall. The direct gendered nature of this tax give-away is less clear although wealthier shareholders and business owners are mainly men (WBG, 2015).

Table 5 only accounts for direct taxation effects whereas increased employment would also boost indirect taxation from increased consumption and thus reduce the net bill further. In any case, the net funding needs – even in the higher quality scenario – are well below the foregone revenue due to tax avoidance and evasion, even using the government cautious estimate of £34bn (which compares to up to £120bn according to Sikka, 2015).

### Alternative scenarios for childcare provision

If the sources of revenue explored above (including reversing tax give-aways and accounting for reduced benefit payments) are too speculative or politically unfeasible, other spending avenues could be explored. One could be to reduce the number of hours of free coverage. Another could be to reduce the number of children targeted by the free childcare places (either selecting children or

assuming not all parents will want their children to stay in a centre for 40h from 6 months to 60 months) however of high quality. The third could be to charge a fee to parents, which for the purpose of this exercise (looking at total costs) would be equivalent to reducing the proportion of children that are covered free of charge and/or full-time. If we were to look at distributional aspects then this third option should be considered separately.<sup>6</sup>

The following options are examined:

- Option 1 is the scenario above with 40h coverage including one hour per day for commuting
- Option 2 covers all children for three days a week, assuming the 35h week model, hence seven hours a day (therefore 24h opening hours a week to allow for three hours commuting time, rounded up to 25h to match Labour and SNP 2015 general election proposals)
- Option 3 is the existing (pre-2015 election) provision of 15h free but extended to all pre-school children
- Option 4 provides 30h weekly coverage for 75% of children in each age group, to match the hours proposed by the current Government in its 2015 election manifesto
- Option 5 provides full-time coverage for 100% of 3-4y olds but only for 60% of those aged between 6 months and 36 months
- Option 6 is the same as option 5 in terms of number of children covered but only for three days a week.

Note that the option of three days a week (25h opening times) could be seen as five days a week for fewer hours (say 4 to 5 hours) but the idea of three days a week is convenient and would tie in well with more sharing in parental caring time so that parents work on a 4/5 shift, each looking after their child one day a week on their own.<sup>7</sup> For lone parents, an equivalent option would need to remain at 4 days a week (32h childcare). Table 5 summarises the main results for each option and for both types of pay for carers, using the full (induced) employment multiplier.

All of the options offer a more generous scenario than any party's proposal in their 2015 election manifesto. The Conservative government elected in May 2015 is offering 30h free childcare for 3-4y olds (also SNP policy in Scotland). Labour proposal was for 25h (supported by the SNP for England). The Liberal Democrats' long term plan was to aim for 20h for all children aged from 9 months to 5 years, starting with 15h to all 2y olds. However, all explicitly focused on access to children whose parents are both in paid employment. Only the Greens pledged a free childcare scenario for all children regardless of the working status of their parents but they did not give a figure of hours per week. None of these parties made clear whether they would extend the free hours offer from 38 weeks to 48 weeks a year. Given some of the costing included in some of the manifestos, it is unlikely that the proposals envisaged paying the care staff at teachers' wage levels.

---

<sup>6</sup> Of course, incentives will vary insofar as a flat rate fee affects parents of different incomes differently. However, many systems that have subsidised childcare in place in exchange of a modest fee usually charge less for lower income families (Van Lancker, 2013).

<sup>7</sup> See also discussion in NEF (2014)

Table 7 Options for free childcare

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6
	100% cov. / 40h pw	100% cov. / 25h pw	100% cov. / 15h pw	75% cov. / 30h pw	60% cov. 6-36m; 100% 3- 4y / 40h pw	60% cov. 6-36m; 100% 3- 4y / 25h pw
Total cost p.a. (£m)						
Teacher wage	46,561	29,101	17,461	26,191	32,328	20,205
Living wage	26,350	16,468	9,881	14,822	18,298	11,436
# FTE care jobs (30h pw)	1,375,249	859,530	515,718	773,577	952,123	595,077
# FTE non care jobs (35h pw)	482,462	301,539	180,923	271,385	334,022	208,764
Tax revenue from jobs (£m)						
Teacher wage	13,632	8,520	5,112	7,668	9,543	5,964
Living wage	6,950	4,344	2,606	3,909	4,870	3,044
Net funding need p.a. (£m)						
Teacher wage	27,929	15,581	7,349	13,523	17,785	9,240
Living wage	14,400	7,125	2,275	5,912	8,428	3,392

This table yields the following observations:

- The net cost (net funding need) of £16bn and £18bn in Option 2 and 5 respectively (teacher's salary) are just under the current total tax give-away in PTA and duties
- Funding teacher wages in Option 4 (which roughly corresponds to the Tories and SNP plans if we assume employment rate increases as a result) is similar to the full coverage at living wage in Option 1, and just above the give-away in personal tax allowance and transferable tax allowance for married couples estimated at about £13bn per annum (WBG, 2015b).
- The net funding need of £9bn in Option 6 is well below the equivalent in foregone revenue due to the rise in the personal tax allowance. And the same give-away would cover the gross funding need for the living wage scenario in option 6.
- The 'cheapest' option is obviously Option 3 and the living wage scenario would require a net amount (£2.3bn) equivalent to a third of the annual give-away in duties.

### Parental leave equivalent

The above exercise considers childcare coverage from the age of 6 months. In some EU countries typical non parental childcare starts from three months onwards (Belgium, France, Denmark) or one year (Sweden). Maternity leave in the UK is currently for one year, of which 6 weeks are paid in proportion of earnings and 33 weeks at a low flat rate. It now has a transferable component whereby both parents can take some leave (although sharing the same pay).

We could use this childcare costing exercise to think about a groundbreaking change in the parental leave system by using the money spent on childcare during the last six months of the first year of a child to increase parental leave pay. The leave system itself could be based on a model similar to that of Iceland but with less generous replacement rate, unless additional funding is being earmarked too. In order to provide incentives to parents to take it up and to fathers to play their



part, evidence has shown that the best systems are individualised with relatively high replacement rates (see De Henau et al., 2007b, for a discussion). Therefore, the new model could take the form of:

- Each parent gets 6 months individual leave (with flexibility on blocks of leave to be taken, perhaps two days a week or one month full-time at a time or all of these, provided notice is served)
- 3 months can be transferred to the other parent (so that each parent has a take-it-or-leave-it period of 3 months), although this should be reduced to a minimum to foster equal take-up between mothers and fathers.
- Lone parents could be entitled to up to 12 months (although 9 months would be incentivised, perhaps with higher pay but this would need to come from additional sources)

To calculate the level of pay, we assume the cost of the child is based on the teacher salary option which for children in their first year was estimated at £9.9 per hour per child (see above). That's £395 per week per child (at 40h). If combined with existing provision of statutory maternity and paternity pay (and assuming the 90% earnings replacement rate for the first six weeks is calculated at mean full-time female earnings) then the average amount available per week when all these sources are combined is £347 for the couple (per child) over the first year.

The leave could be set at 67% of previous earnings (like in Germany) between an arbitrary minimum of £189, corresponding to 67% of the 10<sup>th</sup> percentile of full-time earnings (regular pay excluding overtime, which was £282 in 2014) and a maximum of £505 (65% of the 80<sup>th</sup> percentile) (ONS, 2014c). The minimum is quite low (38% of median full-time earnings and 73% of full-time earnings at minimum wage) but still 36% higher than the current weekly amount of SMP. If not proportional to earnings but flat rate, then the £347 received amounts to 70% of median full-time wages.

If childcare is paid at the living wage then the average weekly pay available in the first year changes from £347 to £261 (52% of median earnings) and if we keep the minimum at the same level as above, the maximum ought to be £333 per week (43% of the 80<sup>th</sup> percentile).

Because the amount is taken per child, there is no change in government funding whether parents decide to use formal childcare or take the leave option. For individual parents, the options are not identical as the childcare option would allow working parents to retain their full salary, advantaging higher earners, while the leave option would advantage those on low income given the minimum guaranteed payment. Research in other countries has advocated against such division between higher and lower earning parents due to long term career progression disadvantages (Ray et al., 2010). However, most studies looked at the perverse effects of long absences from work on low pay (of more than a year) such as in the French, Finnish, Austrian and Spanish systems. In this case though, the leave would be limited to 6 months (max 9 months) for each parent (12 months for lone parents).

This exercise only works for Option 1 of the childcare scenarios (100% coverage of children under 1y for 40h). The weekly amount available would be reduced if opening hours were shorter and if not all children of that age group were covered as in the other options. Note that quite apart from this

equivalence exercise where childcare funding was diverted to fund parental leave, more generous leave payments could be funded through additional national insurance contributions for example.

However, an alternative approach to allocating funds could make the leave system more generous despite lower coverage of childcare. Parental leave funding could be decoupled from that of childcare. If another option for childcare is chosen, requiring less total funding (such as option 2), the difference with option 1 (coming from reversing tax give-aways) could be used to fund more generous parental leave systems, thereby making it more attractive, especially to fathers. For instance, in the case of option 2, an extra £12bn could be made available to fund more generous parental leave, and that could provide for 90% of earnings with a minimum of £282 (i.e. 10<sup>th</sup> percentile of FT earnings, which is just above the minimum wage) and a maximum of £1462 (corresponding to 150% of the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile of FT earnings). Anything in between (for example by imposing a maximum at the actual 90<sup>th</sup> percentile, around £1000 a week, still very high) would require less funding while still be extremely generous by European standards.

## **Conclusion**

This short exercise has demonstrated that investing in free childcare is a costly but feasible endeavour using existing resources more effectively. The Chancellor claimed in his 2015 summer budget that the 2.3m jobs created since he took office in 2010 (2m FTE) were possible thanks to the tax cuts the government endeavoured. Whether they have caused the increase in employment remains to be shown but in any case, the childcare policy presented above shows that almost the equivalent in terms of FTE employment could be created, with much clearer causal effects (given the direct investment in public employment), and with more decent earnings conditions than many of the private sector jobs (25% of which were self-employment, many with low earnings) created since 2010 (WBG, 2015b).

Be that as it may, building the social infrastructure and providing the care that people need is not just about creating employment, boosting economic growth and therefore investing in productive assets – children – for the return they can bring. The case made here is about what a civilised society needs to do. Providing free and universal childcare will enhance children's social interaction and education with knock-on effects on future outcomes, including spending on education and remediation. Significant amounts are required – the full-time coverage at teacher wages amounts to 3% of GDP – but reversing the main three tax give-aways of the coalition 2010-2015 government alone would be enough to cover for the bulk of the costs, while the employment creation in care services and elsewhere would pay for the rest through tax revenue.

The paper also explored opportunity to transform the current parental leave system and make it more gender equal, thereby fostering a genuine route towards a more gender equal triple-carer/dual-earner model. At the core of this plan would be the move towards reducing the full-time working week to a four-day week – starting with parents of young children – during which both mothers and fathers alternate one day of care at home. This is an essential step towards building a caring economy that doesn't only rely on formal services but also on providing quality time and protection to unpaid carers.

Further developments would need to look at more sophisticated models for evaluating demand and supply effects as well as the interactions with other cash and in-kind transfers. In the mean time, addressing the lack of funding in adult social care is as important as discussing universal provision of childcare, although evaluating the needs and related caring times by professionals is more difficult given the wide variety of factors to take into account (about levels of personal autonomy and types of services).

## References

- Aldridge, H., Kenway, P., MacInnes, T., and Parekh, A. (2012) *Monitoring Poverty and Social Exclusion 2012*, New Policy Institute, York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation
- Antonopoulos, R., Kim, K., Masterson, T. and Zacharias, A. (2010) 'Investing in care: A strategy for effective and equitable job creation', Working paper, Levy Economics Institute, No. 610
- Babchishin, L., Weegar, K. And Romano, E. (2013), 'Early Child Care Effects on Later Behavioral Outcomes Using a Canadian Nation-Wide Sample', *Journal of Educational and Developmental Psychology*, 3 (2), pp 15-29, available at <https://www.ruor.uottawa.ca/bitstream/10393/31986/1/Romano.pdf> (accessed 23/04/2015)
- Bargawi, H. and Cozzi G. (2014) 'Engendering recovery for Europe: Modelling alternatives to austerity', FEPS Policy Brief, March, Foundation for European Progressive Studies, available at <http://www.feps-europe.eu/en/publications/details/276> (accessed 12/04/2015)
- Ben Ghalim, D. (2011), 'Making the case for universal childcare', Briefing, Institute for Public Policy Research
- Braunstein, E., van Staveren, I., Tavani, D. (2011) 'Embedding care and unpaid work in macroeconomic modelling: a structuralist approach', *Feminist Economics*, 17(4) pp. 5-31
- De Henau, J. and Himmelweit, S. (2013) 'Examining public policy from a gendered intra-household perspective: changes in family-related policies in the UK, Australia and Germany since the mid-nineties', *Oñati Socio-Legal Series* 3(7), 2013, pp. 1222-1248
- De Henau, J., Himmelweit, S. and Santos, C. (2010), "Gender and Taxation: A UK Case Study" in Grown, Caren and Valodia, Imraan (eds), *Gender and Taxation across countries*, New York: Routledge, pp. 261-298
- De Henau, J., Meulders, D. and O'Dorchai, S. (2007a). 'Making Time for Working Parents. Comparing Public Childcare Provision across EU-15', In: Del Boca, D. and C. Wetzels (Eds.) *Social Policies, Labour Markets and Motherhood: a Comparative Analysis of European Countries*, Cambridge University Press, pp. 28-62
- De Henau, J., Meulders, D. and O'Dorchai, S. (2007b). 'Parents' Care and Career. Comparing Parental Leave Policies across EU-15', In: Del Boca, D. and C. Wetzels (Eds.) *Social Policies, Labour Markets and Motherhood: a Comparative Analysis of European Countries*, Cambridge University Press, pp. 63-106

- Department for Education (2014), School teachers pay and conditions, September, London, available at [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/341951/School\\_teachers\\_pay\\_and\\_conditions\\_2014.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/341951/School_teachers_pay_and_conditions_2014.pdf) (accessed 21/02/2015).
- Goldin, C. (2006), 'The quiet revolution that transformed women's employment, education, and family', *American Economic Review* 96, pp 1-21.
- Gugushvili, D and Hirsch, D (2014), 'Means-tested and universal approaches to poverty: international evidence and how the UK compares', Working paper, Loughborough: Centre for Research in Social Policy
- Hansen, S. and Andersen, L. (2014) 'A gendered investment plan'. FEPS Economic Policy Brief No.2, February, Foundation for European Progressive Studies, available at <http://www.feps-europe.eu/assets/73f79ad5-23f2-4a69-aae5-41b5745e9d02/2014-18-2-pb-no-2-a-gendered-investment-plan-eclm-feps.pdf> (accessed 20/04/2015)
- Havnes, T. And Mogstad, M. (2011), 'No Child Left Behind: Universal Child Care and Children's Long-Run Outcomes', *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* 3(2), pp. 97-129 (see IZA Discussion paper 4561, available at <http://ftp.iza.org/dp4561.pdf>)
- Havnes, T. And Mogstad, M. (2014), 'Is Universal Child Care Leveling the Playing Field? Evidence from Non-Linear Difference-in-Differences', IZA Discussion paper 4978, available at <http://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/36832/1/62740314X.pdf> (accessed 23/04/2015)
- IFS (2015), Green Budget 2015, February, London: Institute for Fiscal Studies
- Karoly, I.A., Kilburn, M.R. and Cannon, J.S. (2005), *Early Childhood Interventions: Proven Results, Future Promise*, Santa Monica: RAND Corporation, CA
- Lewis, J. (2006) (ed.), *Children, Changing Families and Welfare States*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar
- Li, W.; Farkas, G.; Duncan, G. J.; Burchinal, M. R.; Vandell, D. L. (2013), 'Timing of high-quality child care and cognitive, language, and preacademic development', *Developmental Psychology*, 49(8), pp 1440-1451. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0030613>, available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4034459/> (accessed 23/04/2015)
- Living Wage foundation (2015) Calculation of the living wage, [online] <http://www.livingwage.org.uk/calculation> (Accessed 21/03/2015)
- Morel, N., Palier, B. and Palme, J. (eds.) (2012) *Towards a Social Investment Welfare State? Ideas, Policies and Challenges*. Bristol: The Policy Press
- New Economic foundation (NEF) (2014), The value of childcare, London, February
- OBR (2015) Budget/PBR/Autumn Statement measures database, Office for Budget Responsibility, available at <http://budgetresponsibility.org.uk/policy-measures-database/> (accessed 14/03/2015)
- ONS (2015), 'Births in England and Wales, 2014', Statistical Bulletin, Office for National Statistics, 15 July 2015, available at [http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/dcp171778\\_410897.pdf](http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/dcp171778_410897.pdf) (accessed 24/07/2015)

- ONS (2014a), Population Estimates for UK, England and Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland, Mid-2013, reference tables, Office for National Statistics, available at <http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/publications/re-reference-tables.html?edition=tcm%3A77-322718> (access 21/02/2015)
- ONS (2014b), Labour Force Survey, reference tables, Office for National Statistics, available at <http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/datasets-and-tables> (accessed 23/04/2015)
- ONS (2014c), Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings, provisional tables 2014, Office for National Statistics, available at <http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/datasets-and-tables> (accessed 12/02/2015)
- Ray, R., Gornick, J. and Schmitt, J. (2010), 'Who cares? Assessing generosity and gender equality in parental leave policy designs in 21 countries', *Journal of European Social Policy*, 20 (3), pp. 196-216
- Reed, H. and Portes, J. (2014) 'Cumulative Impact Assessment: A Research Report by Landman Economics and the National Institute of Economic and Social Research (NIESR) for the Equality and Human Rights Commission', EHRM Research report 94
- Rutter, J. (2015), *Childcare Costs Survey 2015*, London: Family and Childcare Trust
- Rutter, J. and Stocker, K. (2014), *Childcare Costs Survey 2014*, London: Family and Childcare Trust
- Sikka, P. (2015), 'This election, remember that cracking down on tax avoidance could end austerity', *The Conversation*, 9 March, available at <http://theconversation.com/this-election-remember-that-cracking-down-on-tax-avoidance-could-end-austerity-38464> (accessed 19/03/2015)
- Scottish Government (2015), 'Input-Output Tables 1998-2012 - Leontief Type 1 Table', available at <http://www.gov.scot/Topics/Statistics/Browse/Economy/Input-Output/Downloads/IO1998-2012L1> (accessed 23 July 2015)
- Women's Budget Group (WBG) (2015a), 'PLAN F: A Feminist Economic Strategy for a Caring and Sustainable Economy', Women's Budget Group Briefing paper, available at <http://wbg.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/PLAN-F-2015.pdf> (accessed 20/04/2015)
- Women's Budget Group (WBG) (2015b), 'Response to Budget 2015 – The WBG calls for rebuilding the foundations before fixing the roof', Women's Budget Group Budget Analysis, available at <http://wbg.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/WBG-Budget-2015.pdf> (accessed 20/04/2015)
- Women's Budget Group (WBG) (2014), 'The impact on women of Budget 2014: No recovery for women', Women's Budget Group Budget Analysis, available at <http://wbg.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/WBG-Budget-2015.pdf> (accessed 20/04/2015)

***Titles available in the series:***

- Number 1 Valuing the environmental impacts of open cast coalmining: the case of the Trent Valley in North Staffordshire  
*Andrew B Trigg and W Richard Dubourg, June 1993*
- Number 2 Scarcity and stability in a very simple general equilibrium model  
*Vivienne Brown, February 1994*
- Number 3 A conflict model, with rational expectations, of the disinflation of the early 1980s  
*Graham Dawson, February 1994*
- Number 4 Foreign Investment, Globalisation and International Economic Governance  
*Grahame Thompson, May 1994*
- Number 5 Testing the Small Country Hypothesis for Developing Countries  
*Jonathan Perraton, December 1994*
- Number 6 The Discovery of 'Unpaid Work': the social consequences of the expansion of 'work'  
*Susan Himmelweit, June 1995*
- Number 7 Exit, Voice and Values in Economic Institutions  
*Graham Dawson, June 1995*
- Number 8 Residential Summer Schools Attendance and Students' Assessed Performances on Open University Foundation Courses  
*Alan Gillie and Alan Woodley, June 1995*
- Number 9 Putting Words into People's Mouths? Economic Culture and its Implications for Local Government  
*Maureen Mackintosh, December 1995*
- Number 10 What is a Fair Wage? A Critique of the Concept of the Value of Labour-Power  
*Susan Himmelweit, December 1995*
- Number 11 The Origin of the Poverty Line  
*Alan Gillie, December 1995*
- Number 12 The Determinants of Product and Process Innovations  
*Roberto Simonetti, Daniele Archibugi, Rinaldo Evangelista, February 1996*
- Number 13 Technical Change and Firm Growth: 'Creative Destruction' in the Fortune List, 1963-1987  
*Roberto Simonetti, February 1996*
- Number 14 Utilities vs. Rights to Publicly Provided Goods: Arguments and Evidence from Health-Care Rationing  
*Paul Anand and Allan Wailoo, January 2000*
- Number 15 Proceeding to the Paddling Pool: The Selection and Shaping of Call Centre Labour  
*George Callaghan and Paul Thompson, January 2000*
- Number 16 Doing 'Qualitative Research' in Economics: Two Examples and Some Reflections  
*Elizabeth Hill and Gabrielle Meagher, November 1999*
- Number 17 Veblen, Bourdieu and Conspicuous Consumption  
*Andrew B Trigg, January 2000*

- Number 18      The Effect of Idiosyncratic Events on the Feedback between Firm Size and Innovation  
*Mariana Mazzucato, January 2000*
- Number 19      Non-market relationships in health care  
*Maureen Mackintosh and Lucy Gilson, January 2000*
- Number 20      Selling pollution and safeguarding lives: international justice, emissions trading and the Kyoto Protocol  
*Graham Dawson, October 2000*
- Number 21      Entrepreneurship by Alliance  
*Judith Mehta and Barbara Krug, September 2000*
- Number 22      A disorderly household - voicing the noise  
*Judith Mehta, October 2000*
- Number 23      Sustainable redistribution with health care markets?  
Rethinking regulatory intervention in the Tanzanian context  
*Maureen Mackintosh and Paula Tibandebage, November 2000*
- Number 24      Surplus Value and the Keynesian Multiplier  
*Andrew B Trigg, October 2000*
- Number 25      Edwards Revised: Technical Control and Call Centres  
*George Callaghan and Paul Thompson, November 2000*
- Number 26      Social Norms, Occupational Groups and Income Tax Evasion: A Survey In The UK Construction Industry  
*Maria Sigala, November 2000*
- Number 27      Procedural Fairness in Economic and Social Choice: Evidence from a Survey of Voters  
*Paul Anand, December 2000*
- Number 28      Alternative rationalities, or why do economists become parents?  
*Susan Himmelweit, December 2000*
- Number 29      Agglomeration and Growth: A Study of the Cambridge Hi-Tech Cluster  
*Suma Athreya, December 2000*
- Number 30      Sources of Increasing Returns and Regional Innovation in the UK  
*Suma Athreya and David Keeble, January 2001*
- Number 31      The Evolution of the UK software market: scale of demand and the role of competencies  
*Suma Athreya, September 2000*
- Number 32      Evolution of Markets in the Software Industry  
*Suma Athreya, January 2001*
- Number 33      Specialised Markets and the Behaviour of Firms: Evidence from the UK's Regional Economies  
*Suma Athreya and David Keeble, January 2001*
- Number 34      Markets and Feminisms  
*Graham Dawson, January 2001*
- Number 35      Externalities and the UK Regional Divide in Innovative Behaviour  
*Suma Athreya and David Keeble, January 2001*
- Number 36      Inequality and redistribution: analytical and empirical issues for developmental social policy  
*Maureen Mackintosh, March 2001*

- Number 37      Modelling the Dynamics of Industry Populations  
*Mariana Mazzucato and P A Geroski, January 2001*
- Number 38      Advertising and the Evolution of Market Structure in the US Car Industry during the Post-War Period (withdrawn)  
*Mariana Mazzucato and P A Geroski, January 2001*
- Number 39      The Determinants of Stock Price Volatility: An Industry Study  
*Mariana Mazzucato and Willi Semmler, February 2001*
- Number 40      Surplus Value and the Kalecki Principle in Marx's Reproduction Schema  
*Andrew B Trigg, March 2001*
- Number 41      Risk, Variety and Volatility in the Early Auto and PC Industry  
*Mariana Mazzucato, March 2003*
- Number 42      Making visible the hidden economy: the case for gender impact analysis of economic policy  
*Susan Himmelweit, August 2001*
- Number 43      Learning and the Sources of Corporate Growth  
*Mariana Mazzucato and P A Geroski, June 2001*
- Number 44      Social Choice, Health and Fairness  
*Paul Anand, September 2002*
- Number 45      The Integration of Claims to Health-Care: a Programming Approach  
*Paul Anand, November 2002*
- Number 46      Pasinetti, Keynes and the principle of Effective Demand  
*Andrew B Trigg and Frederic S Lee, June 2003*
- Number 47      Capabilities and Wellbeing: Evidence Based on the Sen-Nussbaum Approach to Welfare  
*Paul Anand, Graham Hunter and Ron Smith, January 2004*
- Number 48      Entry, Competence-Destroying Innovations, volatility and growth: Lessons from different industries  
*Mariana Mazzucato, June 2004*
- Number 49      Taking risks with ethical principles: a critical examination of the ethics of 'ethical investment'  
*Graham Dawson, November 2004*
- Number 50      Innovation and Idiosyncratic Risk: an Industry & Firm Level Analysis  
*Mariana Mazzucato and Massimiliano Tancioni, November 2005*
- Number 51      Industrial Concentration in a Liberalising Economy: a Study of Indian Manufacturing  
*Suma Athreya and Sandeep Kapur, October 2004*
- Number 52      Creating Competition? Globalisation and the emergence of new technology producers  
*Suma Athreya and John Cantwell, October 2005*
- Number 53      Measuring Human Capabilities (previously entitled "The Development of Capability Indicators and their Relation of Life Satisfaction", released in September 2005)  
*Paul Anand, Graham Hunter, Ian Carter, Keith Dowding, Francesco Guala, Martin van Hees, January 2007*
- Number 54      Does International Trade Transfer Technology to Emerging Countries? A Patent Citation Analysis  
*Elif Bascavusoglu, August 2006*



- Number 55 Stock Price Volatility and Patent Citation Dynamics: the case of the pharmaceutical industry (first version published in December 2006)  
*Mariana Mazzucato and Massimiliano Tancioni September 2007*
- Number 56 Violent Crime, Gender Inequalities and Well-Being: Models based on a Survey of Individual Capabilities and Crime Rates for England and Wales  
*Paul Anand and Cristina Santos, January 2007*
- Number 57 Innovation and Firm Growth in High-Tech Sectors: A Quantile Regression Approach  
*Alex Coad (CES-Matisse) and Rekha Rao (LEM) January 2007*
- Number 58 Estimating Linear Birth Cohort Effects. Revisiting the Age-Happiness Profile  
*Cristina Santos January 2007*
- Number 59 Prices of Production are Proportional to Real Costs  
*Ian Wright January 2007*
- Number 60 Temporary Work in Tuscany: a Multinomial Nested Logit Analysis  
*Lorenzo Corsini (Pisa University) and Marco Guerrazzi (Pisa University) May 2007*
- Number 61 Wage Bargaining in an Optimal Control Framework: A Dynamic Version of the Right-to-Manage Model  
*Marco Guerrazzi (Pisa University) June 2007*
- Number 62 Innovation and Knowledge Spillovers in Developing Countries  
*Elif Bascavusoglu July 2007*
- Number 63 Firm Growth Dynamics Under Different Knowledge Regimes: the case of the pharmaceutical industry  
*Pelin Demirel and Mariana Mazzucato September 2007*
- Number 64 Planning and Market Regulation: Strengths, Weaknesses and Interactions in the Provision of Less Inequitable and Better Quality Health Care  
*Maureen Mackintosh October 2007*
- Number 65 Investigating the Desperate Housewives: Using gender-role attitudes to explain women's employment decisions in twenty-three European countries  
*Jerome De Henau October 2007*
- Number 66 Struggle over the pie? The gendered distribution of power and subjective financial well-being within UK households  
*Jerome De Henau and Susan Himmelweit October 2007*
- Number 67 The Measurement of Capabilities  
*Paul Anand, Cristina Santos and Ron Smith November 2007*
- Number 68 Modelling Bourdieu: An Extension of The Axelrod Cultural Diffusion model  
*Andrew B Trigg, Andrew J. Bertie and Susan F Himmelweit January 2008*
- Number 69 Nonstandard labour values  
*Ian Wright November 2007*
- Number 70 Impact of SME Policies on Innovation: The Turkish Case  
*Elif Bascavusoglu-Moreau February 2008*
- Number 71 Estimating individual total costs of domestic violence  
*Cristina Santos March 2012*

- Number 72 Agency and discourse: revisiting the Adam Smith problem  
*Vivienne Brown August 2008*
- Number 73 Gender incidence analysis of indirect taxes in the UK  
*Cristina Santos January 2009*
- Number 74 Change, Choice and Cash in Social Care Policies: Some Lessons from  
Comparing Childcare and Elder Care  
*Sue Himmelweit and Hilary Land August 2010*
- Number 75 Convergence to natural prices in simple production  
*Ian Wright March 2011*
- Number 76 Classical macrodynamics and the labor theory of value  
*Ian Wright March 2011*
- Number 77 Wellbeing Over 50: A Capabilities Approach  
*Paul Anand, Ranjeeta Thomas and Alastair Gray August 2012*
- Number 78 A Capabilities Approach to Housing and Quality of Life: The Evidence  
from Germany  
Dermot Coates, Paul Anand, and Michelle Norris, May 2015