

Building our Industrial Strategy Green Paper



Response from the UK Women's Budget Group

April 2017

Executive Summary

WBG welcomes the Green Paper

The UK Women's Budget Group welcomes the Green paper's recognition of the need for a modern industrial strategy to 'help deliver a stronger economy and a fairer society' and the recognition that this requires a 'new, active' role for Government to ensure that 'more people in all corners of the country share in the benefits of its success'.

Need for an assessment of equality impact

Many of the priorities set out in the strategy could be achieved more easily if there was concerted action to address gender and other inequalities. Some policy proposals may exacerbate existing inequalities unless action is taken to prevent this happening. A comprehensive Equality Impact Assessment is needed to ensure both that the Industrial Strategy meets its aims and that the Government fulfils its legal obligations under the Public Sector Equality Duty.

Developing skills

The continued issues of low productivity in the UK economy demonstrate the need for investment in education and training and we welcome the priority given to this in the Green Paper. We call for a system of life-long learning opportunities which would give women the opportunity to update existing skills or retain. Action to address the gender gap in technical and STEM subjects is critical in order to address the skills shortage in STEM and should be reflected in education and training policy. We share the Government's commitment to tackling on-going problems with basic skills, however this will be difficult to achieve in the context of continued real terms cuts to schools funding.

Upgrading infrastructure

Investment in infrastructure is a key part of industrial strategy. The economy depends on both physical infrastructure such as roads and telecoms and social infrastructure such as health, education and care services. Like physical infrastructure, social infrastructure has effects that outlast the current accounting period and should therefore be counted as capital rather than current spending in the System of National Accounts.

Supporting business to start and grow

Self-employed women and small business owners face particular barriers to starting up and growing their businesses. Specifically, access to funding has been identified as a major challenge by women entrepreneurs; twice as many men as women have benefited from the

New Enterprise Allowance. An Industrial Strategy that addressed these barriers could generate significant benefits for self-employed women and the economy as a whole.

Improving procurement

As well as offering an opportunity to support investment in innovation and skills public procurement can be a tool to promote equality and other social and environmental criteria that must be part of any effective Industrial Strategy.

Address low pay, insecure contracts and workplace discrimination

We believe that the primary aim of a UK industrial strategy should be to create an economy that meets the needs of all UK residents and delivers greater equality, including gender equality. At present the UK economy is characterised by inequality, low productivity and too many jobs that are low paid and insecure. WBG calls for the Government to include action to address low pay, insecure contracts and workplace discrimination as part of its Industrial Strategy.

About the Women's Budget Group

The Women's Budget Group (WBG) is an independent and not-for-profit network of leading feminist economists, researchers, policy experts and campaigners committed to achieving a more gender equal future. We have worked towards this since 1989. Our focus is on economic and social policy, particularly those policy changes announced by the UK government at its major fiscal events: its annual budget, its periodic spending reviews and its financial statements.

We analyse the gender implications of such policy changes and assess the government's published attempts to carry out equality impact analysis of them. One of our aims is to encourage the government to carry out such analysis itself and use it in policy formulation.

Our highly-respected research and analysis is regularly cited in Parliamentary debates, by academics, other NGOs and in the media. We have been continually improving our methods over the years.

We also work to build the capacity of women and women's groups to participate in debates about economics and budgeting by running training workshops and developing resources.

We have over 400 members, and are run by a management committee. We have a policy advisory group of about 20 members who carry out the analysis and contribute to our responses to fiscal events. We are grateful to funders and members who have supported our work over many years.

Introduction

The Women's Budget Group is pleased to have the opportunity to comment on the Green Paper "Building our Industrial Strategy".

This first part of our response contains an over-view of the aims and objectives set out in the Green Paper and highlights the need for a meaningful Equality Impact Assessment of the Industrial Strategy and the policies it contains.

The second section comments on the 'pillars' in the Green Paper that are most relevant to WBG's concerns. Finally, we discuss an additional 'pillar' that we think should be included in any Industrial Strategy; the need to address low pay, insecure contracts and workplace discrimination.

Over-view of aims and objectives

The WBG welcomes the government's ambitious aim that "*Our modern industrial strategy*" should "*help to deliver a stronger economy and a fairer society*", that it should "*help our young people develop the skills they need to do the high-paid, high-skilled jobs of the future*".

And we agree that to achieve this will require a "*new approach to government*" ... "*stepping up to a new, active role that . . . ensures more people in all corners of the country share in the benefits of its success*". We also agree that raising productivity, where it can genuinely be raised without reducing quality, is key to increasing overall prosperity both in material terms, and in letting people be properly remunerated when they fulfil roles that are vital, but not properly valued, in today's society.

However, we also believe that the primary aim of a UK industrial strategy should be to create an economy that meets the needs and promotes the well-being of all UK residents. This cannot be done without creating greater equality than we have in Britain today, including greater gender equality. At present the UK economy is characterised by too many jobs that are low paid and insecure and too many people relying on the unpaid care of others to meet their needs. And the crisis in care and in the health service shows that we are also failing to meet the needs of too many people in the UK, particularly the most vulnerable.

There are two objectives set out in the Green Paper, "to improve living standards and economic growth". We agree with the objective of improving living standards, provided these are interpreted widely enough to include benefits in kind and the results of unpaid labour. However, we would like to see "promoting greater equality" and "meeting the needs of all UK residents" substituted for the objective of increasing economic growth, by which we assume is meant growth of GDP. GDP is not a good measure of how far needs are met because it does not count the fulfilment of the large proportion of needs, especially care needs, that takes place outside the market.

If no-one spent time on unpaid care, GDP could be greatly raised even if current unpaid carers then worked in poor quality, low productivity jobs. But that would not be a society in which UK residents' needs were better met (or a more equal one or one with improved living standards). GDP is not an adequate measure of the well-being of a population, its living standards or the health of an economy, and increasing it *per se* should not be an aim

of industrial strategy. In practice, it is likely that GDP would grow if as a country we became better at fulfilling needs. However, targeting GDP is the wrong objective and as such it biases policies so that they do not achieve what should be their true objectives in the most efficient manner.

Equality Impact Assessment

To ensure its Industrial Strategy promotes equality and meets the needs of all UK residents the government should subject it, and any prospective policy within it, to Equality Impact Assessment. We would argue promoting equality should be explicitly included as one of the objectives of the Industrial Strategy. But even it were not, the priorities set out in the Green Paper could be achieved more easily if there was concerted action to address gender inequality. For example, closing the gender gap in STEM is necessary if the STEM skills shortage is to be tackled. Action to improve the gender gap in access to finance would help achieve the government's aim of enabling small businesses to start and grow.ⁱ Productivity could be improved if there was action to tackle the under-investment in training and skills among low paid workers, most whom are women.

An Equality Impact Assessment of the policies set out in the Green Paper would highlight the relationship between meeting the priorities in the Government's industrial strategy and addressing these long-standing inequalities. It would also ensure that proposed policies do not have the unintended consequence of exacerbating existing inequalities. For example, investment in physical infrastructure may increase the gender employment gap unless action is taken to improve women's participation in male-dominated industries that are most likely to be involved in creating physical infrastructure. Finally, an Equality Impact Assessment would allow the Government to demonstrate that it is meeting its legal obligation to have due regard to equality under the Public Sector Equality Duty.

Developing Skills

The continued issues of low productivity in the UK economy demonstrate the need for investment in education and a life-long training infrastructure. We welcome the commitment in the Green Paper to tackle continued problems with basic skills, improve opportunities for technical education and address the skills shortage in STEM subjects. However, we are concerned that improvements in basic skills will be difficult to achieve with current cuts to real terms funding for schools. Improving technical education and addressing the skills shortage in STEM subjects will require action to address the gender gap in technical and STEM subjects in education and training.

Basic skills and schools funding

The Green Paper rightly highlights the UK's continuing problem with basic skills. However, WBG believes that it will be hard to tackle this issue in the context of real terms cuts to schools funding. Institute for Fiscal Studies forecasts that by 2020 funding per pupil will have been cut in real terms by 6.5% for schools, and funding for 16-18 education will be at a similar level to 30 years ago.ⁱⁱ Funding is being diverted from schools with high levels of deprivation to those with average levels. A 2017 poll of head teachers by the Sutton Trust found that 80% had cut the number of teachers or teaching assistants as a result of funding cuts and almost a third (30%) said they were using money from the pupil premium, intended to support the most disadvantaged pupils, to plug gaps in their school's budget. Schools with disadvantaged intakes were more likely to report cuts to staff numbers.ⁱⁱⁱ There is a well-established link between economic deprivation and lower educational attainment^{iv} which would suggest that schools in deprived areas need more funding, not less, if basic skills are to be improved.

The prioritisation of funding for free schools in the 2017 Budget, particularly where these are to be selective, over funding for mainstream education is likely to further entrench inequalities in basic skills. The Sutton Trust has reported that disadvantaged children from low income families are under-represented in selective schools, with only 3% of grammar school students being eligible for free school meals compared to 18% of students in non-selective schools in the same area.^v The £20 million allocated in the Spring Budget 2017 toward free transport for pupils eligible for free school meals to grammar schools will not go far enough to address this fundamental inequality. A review by the Institute for Fiscal Studies finds that, while pupils attending selective schools do better within these settings, this is outweighed by the negative impact on the majority of pupils who are not selected.^{vi}

Improving technical education

WBG welcomed the additional investment in technical education announced in the 2017 budget.^{vii} However, we urge the government to ensure that initiatives are put in place to address gender segregation in technical education, which continues to see women clustered in training for lower paid occupations. Of apprenticeships completed in 2014/15 women made up 16.9% of ITC apprenticeships, 8.2 of Engineering and Manufacturing Technologies apprenticeships and only 1.7% of Construction, Planning and the Built Environment apprenticeships^{viii}.

STEM

Closing the gender gap in STEM is critical to addressing the skills shortage in STEM subjects.^{ix} Women make up only 25% of those graduating from degrees in STEM subjects. The proportion in engineering is still lower (14%).^x This feeds through into the labour market where women make up only 21% of those working in STEM. In engineering the proportion of women is again particularly low (8%).

Unfortunately, there is no mention of the on-going shortage of women studying or working in STEM in the Green Paper. Action is needed at every stage from schools, through further and higher education, entry into the labour market and labour market retention. Organisations like Women in Science and Engineering (WISE)^{xi} and Women in STEM^{xii} are leading work in this area and should be consulted as part of the development of the skills strategy.

Life-long learning

Successive governments have failed to develop a training culture, that accepts that high productivity and the good employment conditions required to produce it both need the development of skills, both by the state and by encouraging/requiring employers to train. This is not a sensible strategy for a relatively rich country such as the UK. It has led to British workers being less productive, paid less well and treated worse than those of currently much poorer countries.

A life-long training infrastructure could be provided by a combination of public sector education and by employers giving back to the community by contributing to training – for example by:

- i. Supporting businesses that provide excellent training with back-up college courses; and possibly subsidising their training if the skills they provide are transferable
- ii. Requiring employers who don't train to raise their game or pay into a central fund (more than the current training levy). Every business that employs unskilled workers and does nothing about enabling them to get better skilled work is a free-rider (particularly those who pay wage at levels that still require state support to keep people out of poverty).

The training infrastructure should aim to promote greater equality in wages, skills and opportunities, including the transformation of traditionally single sex occupations (this may involve changes within work organisation as well as training). One aspect of that could be a particular focus on those women who, rather being given the opportunity to use and update existing skills or retrain, currently take unskilled work that is more compatible with childcare responsibilities and may thus be permanently lost to the skilled workforce. Childcare while training is also an important issue since mothers may not be able to afford or find it while still training.

A training strategy should also address the training needs of the self-employed. The Bank of England has warned that the underinvestment in training and skills among the self-employed may be contributing to falling productivity. They estimate that the shift to self-employment could account for around 12.5% of the drop in productivity since 2008.^{xiii}

Upgrading Infrastructure

We welcome the recognition that investment in infrastructure is a key part of industrial strategy. This should include investment in both physical and social infrastructure, on both of which the economy depends. Investment in physical infrastructure should be combined with programmes to address the low numbers of women employed in the traditionally male industries that will benefit from such investment.

Investment in social as well as physical infrastructure

The Green Paper quite rightly sees investment in infrastructure as a key part of industrial strategy; public finance is needed to back or make investments that are important to the longer-term health of the economy but that the private sector will not make on its own. The notion of infrastructure used in the Green Paper is a narrow one, focusing on physical infrastructure such as roads, bridges and telecommunications. However, alongside physical infrastructure, society and the economy also depends on its social infrastructure to provide a well-educated, healthy and well-cared for population. Investment in social infrastructure builds the social and human capital that is just as important to future productivity as investment in physical infrastructure.

The Green Paper does include a pillar on training, which is welcome, though it is not explicitly acknowledged as part of our social infrastructure. However, the other parts of social infrastructure, notably the country's education, health and care systems, are not mentioned at all despite many of the arguments that are made for investment in physical infrastructure applying equally well to education, health and care. These are part of infrastructure because they produce benefits that accrue not only to their direct beneficiaries but also to society as a whole. The Green paper cites health benefits as an argument for high quality infrastructure, but fails to seeing investment in health as infrastructural in itself^{xiv}.

Investment in social infrastructure, has effects that outlast the current accounting period, and should logically therefore be counted as capital rather than current spending. This would require a much needed revision of the System of National Accounts that counts only spending in physical infrastructure as coming from the Capital Account, while spending on social infrastructure, however long lasting its benefits, is seen as coming from the Current Account. These national accounting categories which see only physical construction as capital expenditure are outdated and distort the direction of spending and the economy.

If social infrastructure was counted as part of our infrastructure/capital stock, the UK would not do so badly in comparison with other G7 countries. This is because of our considerable investment in our health infrastructure through the National Health Service. It would be good to see a similar investment in a national care service, covering both adult and child care.

Childcare should be seen as much a part of industrial strategy as building roads or investing in skills. Like roads, high quality childcare helps parents get to work and like investing in skills, it enables parents to take jobs where they can be more productive as well improving children's educational outcomes and therefore national productivity in the long-run. Public investment in a system of high quality early education and childcare for all pre-school

children in the UK provided by well qualified staff would therefore have long-term benefits for children, their parents, and for the economy.

Unlike most other forms of investment spending, investment in care also increases the labour force, by enabling those currently doing unpaid care to take jobs or increase their level of employment. This greatly reduces the net cost of such investment. In a simulation of employment and tax revenue effects of investing in universal childcare for pre-school children in the UK, carried out by the WBG, results show that increased tax revenue from additional earnings (including indirect taxation from increased consumption) and reduced spending on social security benefits would potentially recoup between 96% and 88% of the annual cost of the investment in childcare facilities and staff, depending on the pay and qualification levels of childcare workers^{xv}. This is without counting the gains from the increased productivity of better cared for children in the future or from avoiding the decline of skills due to mothers being out of the labour force.

Finally, social infrastructure has benefits to us all and is important in meeting the population's needs. Investment in it would also be an important contributor to closing the gender employment gap. Research by the WBG has shown that unless occupational gender segregation changes, investment of 2% of GDP per annum in care (as an example of social infrastructure) would reduce the gender employment gap by 28% while similar expenditure on construction (as an example of physical infrastructure) would increase it by 18%. This provides both another reason for investing in social infrastructure, and a good reason for challenging the current occupational gender segregation in the provision of both types of infrastructure.

Gender and other equality audits of infrastructure investment

Nevertheless, physical infrastructure also needs renewal. It is important that such renewal is used as an opportunity to challenge occupational segregation and not lead to a worsening of the gender employment gap (and related pay gaps). This will require special programmes to encourage the training and employment of more women in traditionally male occupations such as engineering. It should be the ambition of this government to have parity of employment on all projects that it funds.

Further, there are many potential investments that would help create both physical and social infrastructure. For example, investment in high quality sheltered housing, suitable for the elderly and disabled, could be combined with providing accessible social and community social care resources in the same location. This should not only improve social care services for users, but enable providers to be more efficient through reduced transport time.

All infrastructure projects should be subject to Equality Impact Assessment, covering all protected characteristics. Doing such assessments and taking their results seriously may well lead to quite a different set of priorities for updating our infrastructure.

Supporting businesses to start and grow

The Green Paper highlights the fact that while the UK ranks 3rd in an OECD survey of business start-ups many of these face problems scaling up. However, the Green Paper does not acknowledge the particular barriers faced by self-employed and small business owning women.

Low pay of self-employed women

Despite the large increase in the number of people working for themselves, as a group the self-employed are contributing significantly less to UK economic growth and revenues. Between 2008 and 2015, the number of self-employed people increased by 650,000, 58% of whom were women.^{xvi} However, from 2009 to 2013 their income as a group declined by around £8 billion (from £88.4 to £80.6 billion).^{xvii}

This fall in self-employed incomes is not just an issue for the self-employed and their families, but also for the UK economy as it amounts to a significant increase in tax credits paid.^{xviii} It also contributes to the UK's declining productivity level. Since 2008, the productivity of the self-employed has declined by 32.4%, while the number of self-employed has increased by 22%.^{xix}

Self-employed women are the majority of the newly self-employed. Since the 2008 downturn 58% of the newly self-employed have been female. In 2014, 70% of those becoming self-employed were women suggesting that the post-recession increase in self-employment for men was a 'blip', while for women it represents a structural shift.

For many women self-employment is a positive option allowing them to pursue fulfilling and flexible work. However, there is an increasing number of women for whom self-employment is a necessity rather than a choice; driven by factors such as public sector job losses, the uprating of the female retirement age, or a need to accommodate caring responsibilities. There is an additional issue of bogus self-employment, which is increasing in traditionally female dominated sectors with low pay, including caring and cleaning according to work by Citizen's Advice Bureaux^{xx}.

As well as providing start-up and growth support to those who wish to start their own business the Government's Industrial Strategy should include policies to address the growth in forced and bogus self-employment, which reflects an attempt by employers to evade their responsibilities rather than increased entrepreneurship. This should include revoking the increase in Employment Tribunal fees which are a significant barrier to challenging bogus self-employment.

Barriers to growing business for women entrepreneurs

For women, self-employment is often a route into low pay. OECD analysis shows a gender pay gap for the self-employed of 41%. In 2014, self-employed men earned £17,000 on average, while average earnings for self-employed women stood at £9,800. It is worth noting that official figures on the gender pay gap do not currently include the self-employed; if they did the UK position is likely to have worsened considerably.^{xxi}

According to research by Nat West women face more barriers when starting and growing their own business than men, including access to funding and lack of training.^{xxii} Nat West

also reported that women were more willing than men to earn less in order to have the flexibility of running their own business (52% of women compared to 44% of men). Women are more likely to want to work flexibly than men because women still carry out the majority of unpaid caring work within families; improved access to childcare and greater sharing of unpaid care between women and men could enable women business owners to increase their earnings.

Innovate UK reported last year that securing funding is by far the single biggest challenge for women innovators, particularly in small businesses and new start-ups. 62% of the women surveyed identified securing funding as the most challenging part of developing their business. Innovation funding organisations were viewed by the women in the Innovate survey as being male dominated and inaccessible with bureaucratic, time consuming and opaque processes for applying for funding.^{xxiii}

Government funding for business, such as the New Enterprise Allowance, can play an important role in supporting business start-ups. However, between 2011 and 2014 half as many women as men (15,720 compared to 31,800) received funding from the New Enterprise Allowance Scheme.^{xxiv} The flagship Start-up Loans scheme, which was introduced in September 2012, has delivered support worth more than £165 million to over 31,000 new businesses. However, only 38% of these loans went to businesses led by women and women tend to take out smaller loans on average, so the overall percentage of the scheme's funds invested in women's businesses is likely to be lower still.^{xxv}

In May 2014, a small number of targeted initiatives for self-employed women were introduced by the Coalition Government's Minister for Women. Investment in those schemes was around £3 million in 2014, or less than 1% of the investment in the Regional Growth Fund. RGF investment has been targeted at male dominated industries such as manufacturing, transport and energy.

Despite these barriers, research suggests that when firm characteristics such as size, sector, age and funding are controlled for, women-owned firms outperform those owned by their male counterparts.^{xxvi} Equalising women's productivity and employment levels with those of men could increase UK GDP by 35%.^{xxvii} This suggests that a specific focus on the barriers to women's entrepreneurship could have significant benefits for the UK economy, as well as the women concerned, and should therefore be part of the Government's Industrial Strategy.

Improving procurement

We are pleased to see that the Green paper advocates taking a strategic approach to government procurement. We agree with using procurement to support investment in innovation and skills. We support the aim of increasing the share of SMEs in central procurement.

However, we see procurement as being a useful tool for supporting other objectives of industrial strategy too, including improving training, working conditions, ending discrimination and promoting equality at work. The EHRC, in their 'Buying Better Outcomes' guidance, shows how public bodies can use their purchasing power to advance equality and, where appropriate, achieve wider social benefits, such as creating training or employment opportunities.^{xxviii}

The EHRC highlights the fact that in some cases equality criteria should be central to public procurement in order to meet the obligation to have due regard to equality under the Public Sector Equality Duty. The EHRC also argues that:

Case law recognises that the criteria for the evaluation of contracts need not be purely economic but can, in appropriate cases, include social and environmental criteria. It may be possible to include the provision of clearly identifiable and measurable social benefits as part of the contract specification and develop appropriate evaluation criteria accordingly. Examples may include the targeted recruitment and training benefits, such as providing a specified number of apprenticeships, or providing work for the long-term unemployed. It may be appropriate to include identifiable and measurable social or community benefits in particular contracts

Government contracts should be written in such a way that only firms that improve the skills of their workers, have active anti-discrimination policies and acceptable working conditions are able to bid for contracts. Exceeding minimum standards in these respects should also be part of the "balanced scorecard" by which contracts are allocated.

Address low pay, insecure contracts and workplace discrimination

We believe that the primary aim of a UK industrial strategy should be to create an economy that delivers greater equality, including gender equality and that meets the needs of all UK residents. At present the UK economy is characterised by inequality, low productivity and too many jobs that are low paid and insecure for both women and men, but particularly for women. Productivity will not rise while such jobs are allowed to exist. In addition to the 'pillars' set out in the Green Paper, the Government's Industrial Strategy should include an additional pillar to address these issues.

Too many jobs in the UK are low paid, and insecure with zero hours contracts and bogus self-employment on the rise. Women are particularly likely to be in low paid employment. The gender pay gap for full time workers is 9.6%. However, 40% of women work part-time; the overall pay gap for all workers is 18.1%^{xxix}. Low wage sectors are also marked by low productivity, since being able to pay low wages removes the incentive to employers to improve productivity. Research by the Institute of Public Policy Research (IPPR) showed that retail, accommodation, food and administrative services, which employ a third of all workers are on average 29% less productive than the economy as a whole^{xxx}. Workers in low paid sectors are less likely to be offered training, and less likely to be able to afford their own training. Low wage sector firms also invest less in innovation, including in information and communication technologies.

TUC research suggests that one in ten workers in the UK (3.2 million people) experience insecure work:

- More than 800,000 are now employed on a zero hours contract
- 760,000 are in temporary, agency or casual work
- 7.1 million are in low paid self-employment, earning below the living wage set by government^{xxxi}

Zero-hours contracts are particularly concentrated in the social care sector, in which women predominate. Around a quarter of adult social care workers are on zero hours' contracts, including half in domiciliary care services^{xxxii}.

Half a million people on zero hours contracts or in insecure temporary work earn less than £112 a week, meaning they do not qualify for Statutory Sick Pay, full maternity pay or paternity pay. Women can claim Maternity Allowance as an alternative to maternity pay, but men who do not qualify for paternity pay have no right to paid time off.

Women continue to suffer pregnancy and maternity discrimination in the workplace. A recent EHRC survey showed that 77% of mothers had experienced a negative, or discriminatory experience during pregnancy, maternity leave or on their return from leave^{xxxiii}. However only 1% of these women took a case to an employment tribunal. The number of employment tribunal cases relating to harassment and discrimination has fallen dramatically since the introduction of a fee of £1200 in 2013. Between April/June 2013 and April/June 2014 the number of cases for pregnancy discrimination fell by 46%, while the number for sex discrimination fell by 91%^{xxxiv}. The high levels of discrimination and

harassment reported in the EHRC survey suggest that this fall relates to the £1200 fee, rather than an improvement in workplace practice.

Addressing these issues would require:

- Work with business and unions to boost pay and productivity across the economy
- Stronger employment rights, including rights to paid sick, maternity and paternity leave and protection from unfair dismissal. Anti-discrimination legislation should be tightened to allow class actions. Consider making caring status a protected characteristic.
- The abolition of employment tribunal fees as part of wider efforts to increase enforcement of employment rights

These are important issues for our Industrial Strategy to address. An economy based on low pay, insecure employment and workplace discrimination is inevitably a low productivity economy, as well as one that fails to deliver greater well-being and equality.

Conclusions

The Government's Industrial Strategy is welcome, and we support many of its priorities. However, we believe that increasing equality and improving the well-being of all UK residents should be central to any Industrial Strategy. This would help the Government achieve its aim of delivering a fairer society.

We welcome the recognition of the need for infrastructure investment. Such investment should include both the social and physical infrastructure on which the economy relies.

Many of the issues covered in the Green Paper are closely linked with on-going gender inequalities. Action to address these inequalities is critical if the objectives set out in the Green Paper are to be achieved.

The Green Paper as a whole does not demonstrate awareness of the ways in which the UK economy is gendered. This highlights the need for a Gender Impact Assessment of the Government's Industrial Strategy to ensure that it is effective in meeting its own goals and works for both women and men.

ⁱ <https://www.ft.com/content/7270bf6a-cc9f-11e4-b5a5-00144feab7de>

ⁱⁱ <https://www.ifs.org.uk/publications/9075>

ⁱⁱⁱ <http://www.suttontrust.com/researcharchive/pupil-premium-polling-2017/>

^{iv} <http://dera.ioe.ac.uk/9431/1/DCSF-RTP-09-01.pdf>

^v Poor Grammar: Entry Into Grammar Schools Disadvantaged Pupils In England, Sutton Trust 2013

^{vi} <https://www.ifs.org.uk/publications/8469>

^{vii} http://wbg.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/WBG_Budget2017_Fullresponse-1.pdf

^{viii} <https://www.wisecampaign.org.uk/resources/2016/09/apprenticeship-achievements-and-starts-201415>

^{ix} <https://www.wisecampaign.org.uk/resources/2016/11/women-in-the-stem-workforce-2016>

^x <https://www.wisecampaign.org.uk/resources/2017/02/higher-education-statistics-2016>

^{xi} <https://www.wisecampaign.org.uk/>

^{xii} <http://www.womeninstem.co.uk/>

^{xiii} The Bank of England has warned that the underinvestment in training and skills among the self-employed may be contributing to falling productivity. They estimate that the shift to self-employment could account for around 12.5% of the drop in productivity since 2008

^{xiv} Elson, D (2015) "Gender Budgeting and Macroeconomic Policy" and S. Himmelwei "Childcare as an Investment in Infrastructure", both in J. Campbell and M. Gillespie (eds) *Feminist Economics and Public Policy: Reflections on the work and impact of Ailsa McKay*. Abingdon and New York: Routledge

^{xv} See <http://wbg.org.uk/analysis/costing-funding-free-universal-childcare-high-quality/>

^{xvi} Prowess analysis of ONS Labour Force Survey statistics. ONS 2008-2015.

^{xvii} Flip Chart Fairy Tales (2015) 'UK Self-employment: Success story or basket case?', available at:

<https://flipchartfairytales.wordpress.com/2015/02/06/uk-self-employment-success-story-or-basket-case/>

^{xviii} Flip Chart Fairy Tales (2014) 'Self-employed: the nouveau pauvre,' available at

<https://flipchartfairytales.wordpress.com/2014/04/25/self-employed-the-nouveau-pauvre/>

^{xix} Murphy, R (2013) Disappearing fast: the falling income of the UK's self-employed people. Available for download at:

<http://www.taxresearch.org.uk/Documents/SEI2013.pdf>

^{xx} Citizens Advice (2015) Neither one thing nor the other: how reducing bogus self-employment could benefit workers, business and the Exchequer. Available for download at:

<https://www.citizensadvice.org.uk/Global/CitizensAdvice/Work%20Publications/Neither%20one%20thing%20nor%20the%20other.pdf>

^{xxi} Self-employed income statistics are not broken down by hours of work. More than half of self-employed women (53%) work part-time compared to 17% of self-employed men. (ONS Labour Market Statistics, September 2014)

^{xxii} <http://www.rbs.com/news/2016/09/natwest-research-finds-women-see-more-barriers-to-entrepreneursh.html>

^{xxiii}

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/545202/Women_In_Innovation_Ebiquity_Report_August_2016_FINAL.pdf

^{xxiv} https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/320565/new-enterprise-allowance-official-statistics-june-2014.pdf

^{xxv} Start Up Loans (n.d.) 'About us,' available at: <https://www.startuploans.co.uk/about-us/>

^{xxvi} <http://www.rbs.com/content/dam/rbs/Documents/Sustainability/Women-in-Enterprise.pdf>

^{xxvii}

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/545202/Women_In_Innovation_Ebiquity_Report_August_2016_FINAL.pdf

^{xxxviii} <https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/publication-download/buying-better-outcomes-mainstreaming-equality-considerations-procurement-guide>

^{xxxix}

<https://www.ons.gov.uk/employmentandlabourmarket/peopleinwork/earningsandworkinghours/bulletins/annualsurveyofhoursandearnings/2016provisionalresults>

^{xxx} <http://www.ippr.org/publications/boosting-britains-low-wage-sectors-a-strategy-for-productivity-innovation-and-growth>

^{xxxi} TUC (2016) Living on the edge: the rise of job insecurity in modern Britain

^{xxxii} <https://www.nmds-sc-online.org.uk/Get.aspx?id=980099>

^{xxxiii} <https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/managing-pregnancy-and-maternity-workplace/pregnancy-and-maternity-discrimination-research-findings>

^{xxxiv} <https://www.tuc.org.uk/equality-issues/workplace-issues/employment-rights/tribunal-fees-denying-harassed-and-abused-workers>