

*Alla Ilyenko,
assistant professor,
Department of personnel
management and labour Economics
Kyiv National Economic University
named after V. Hetman,*

METHODOLOGY OF INTER-BRANCH REGULATION WAGE WORKERS

In the article methodical aspects of interbranch parities in the regulation of worker wages are considered. The article contains an advanced technique of interbranch parities in worker wages. The technique switches on influence of four factors: a work complexity, a working conditions, a labour intensity and a importance of a branch economic activities.

Key words. Factors of work complexity, technique of interbranch regulation in worker wages.

Introduction. At the present stage of the study of inter-branch regulation wage found in the sphere of collective bargaining. Problems of collective bargaining, wages are engaged A. Kolot, O. Poplavskaya T. Kostyshyna, S. Tsymbalyuk and others. However, development of methods of inter-branch wage regulation little studied.

Issues of inter-branch wage workers have been developed and presented in the research works of A. Aganbegyan, V. Mayer, Ya. Batkayev, V. Markov, Ya. Gomberg, G. Gendler, Ye. Kapustina, L. Sushkina and a number of other economists. However, there is only one in the sphere of methodology of inter-industry relations in wages L. Sushkina, that has a scientific basis. In all other cases, as indicated by L. Sushkina “multi-sectoral ratio... dare visually, on the basis of the seats in the row of the distribution of industries by level of wages depending on the objectives of a particular period. This is not a scientifically sound...” [1, p. 2].

Statement of the problem. The main objectives in the article is a research of the existing methods of inter-branch wage workers, the evaluation of methods and

improvement with regard to conditions of the modern economy.

The results of the research work. Methodology (author L.Sushkina) of inter-industry relations in the worker wages and determining factors, provides for the quantitative determination of the 4 factors of influence: complexity, conditions, intensity of the worker labour and the value of industry(economic activity) for the employees. The essence of the impact values is determined by the following formulas 1-5 [1, p.13-16]:

$$\Phi_{cn} = \frac{L(q-1)}{T(\text{чу} - 3)} 100 \quad (1)$$

Φ_{cn} - value factor of payment differentiation for workers on the labour complexity ;

L – first tariff rate wage for time-worker employed in normal conditions;

q - the average tariff coefficient;

T – average tariff rate wage rate of the workers;

3 – average salary of the workers.

$$\Phi_{ycn} = \frac{A^T m_2 + A^{OT} m_3 + A^P m_n}{m_o T(\text{чу} - 3)} 100 \quad (2)$$

Φ_{ycn} - value factor of payment differentiation of workers on working conditions;

A^T - mean differences in tariff wage rates of the head workers employed in heavy (harmful) and normal working condition;

A^{OT} - average differences in in tariff wage rates of the workers with extremely hazardous and harmful and normal working condition;

A^P - the mean differences in tariff wage rates of the workers employed in underground and open the shaft surface;

m_1, m_2, m_3 – the number of workers employed working in harmful (hazardous), particularly arduous and harmful labor conditions, and underground work;

m_o - the total number of workers in the industry.

$$\Phi_{\phi} = \frac{b(m_c + m_m)}{m_o T(\text{чу} - 3)} 100$$

(3)

$\Phi\phi$ – value factor of payment differentiation of workers from the applied payment forms;

b – differences in tariff wage rates for pieceworkers and timeworkers with normal working condition;

m_c –the number of pieceworkers in industry;

m_m – the number of timeworkers are paid at the wage rates as working pieceworkers.

$$\Phi_{u/x} = \frac{L_{mi} - L_{m1}}{T(u-3)} 100 \quad (4)$$

$\Phi\phi$ – value factor of payment differentiation of workers depending on the value in the industry (economic activity);

L_{mi} - minimum wage tariff rate in the i-th industry;

L_{m1} – minimum tariff rate region with the lower this rate.

or

$$\Phi_{u/x} = T - (M + \Phi_{cl} + \Phi_{ycl} + \Phi_{\phi}) \quad (5)$$

T - the base salary of the workers;

M - minimum wages per month.

This technique is a little known among economists-laborists and has a number of shortcomings(a number of them are defined L.Sushkina):

- 1) the method gives a rough determination of the quantitative estimates for the tariff differentiation factors, due to shortcomings in the organization of the labor and lack of adequate statistics [1, p.16];
- 2) methods was focused on the actual definition of influence factors rather than learning the economic nature of the impact basic wage tariff elements;
- 3) the method takes into account the peculiarities of the USSR wage policy. All this

makes it impossible to use this technique, because:

- there is a single tariff wage schedule and not a few who were differentiated within particular sectors by a factor such as working conditions, which makes it impossible to deduction of the impact of such factors as the labour heaviness (factor of labour conditions in the methodology). However, this is not to deny the importance and influence of this factor on the formation of the wage tariff, but through another wage policy, the calculation of this factor is not possible ;
- there were other new wage plans and systems, which is not included in the methodology technique.

Conclusions. In our opinion, the calculation method of impact on the tariff wage factors in branches, which aimed at the definition of the actual impact will have these characteristics:

- methodology may not be permanent, because dynamic is the wage policy;
- methodology does not allow to obtain exact results that the formation of tariff wage rates are a number of other factors, such as the state (minimum tariff rate of increase, the establishment of borders диференціації remuneration, etc), the contract regulation (sectoral regulation of wages, labor protection etc.) etc., the impact of which may not always coincide with economic nature of tariff rates;
- lack of necessary statistical information.

In modern conditions more helpful would be the use of improved methods, the program would calculate using the following formulas(6-8):

$$\Phi_{скл} = \left(\frac{\frac{\Phi_n}{K_n} T1 + \frac{\Phi_{\beta}}{K_{\beta}} T2 + \frac{\Phi_H}{K_H} T3 + \sum \left(\frac{\Phi_i}{K_i} T4 \right)}{\frac{\Phi_H / \varepsilon}{K_H / \varepsilon} T5} \right) * 100\% \quad (6)$$

where $\Phi_{скл}$ - value factor of payment differentiation for workers on the labour complexity in the calculation branch ;

$\Phi_n, \Phi_{\beta}, \Phi_H, \Phi_{H/\Gamma}$ - actual basic wage Fund of workers in the calculation branch over a period of time(time based, piece rate, other forms of wage) and the economy

as a whole forms of remuneration (monetary units);

Φ_i - basic wages Fund for a certain time period of workers are not charged;

$K_n, K_B, K_i, K_H, K_{H/\Gamma}$ - the actual number of man-hours worked in the calculation branch for a certain period time for timeworkers, pieceworkers, workers who has other payment plans and systems (except for workers, not rated), workers are not rated and for the national economy in General;

T_1, T_2, T_4, T_3, T_5 - average coefficients of the performed work complexity for a certain period time for timeworkers, pieceworkers, workers who has other payment plans and systems (except for workers, not rated), workers are not rated and for the national economy in General.

$$\Phi_{B.CKL} = \left(\frac{\frac{\Phi_{B.n}/T_{B1}}{K_{B.n}} + \frac{\Phi_{B.B}/T_{B2}}{K_{B.B}} + \frac{\Phi_{B.H}/T_{B3}}{K_{B.H}} + \sum \left(\frac{\Phi_{B.i}/T_{B4}}{K_{B.i}} \right)}{\frac{\Phi_{B.H/\Gamma}/T_{B5}}{K_{B.H/\Gamma}}} \right) * 100\% \quad (7)$$

$\Phi_{B.CKL}$ - value factor of payment worker differentiation for the labour complexity with working conditions for 3-6 severity category in the calculation branch; all other values in the formula has been similar, which calculated for working with 3-6 severity category of labour.

$$\Phi_{H/\Gamma} = \frac{T_{\Gamma} - T_M}{T_{H/\Gamma}} 100 \quad (8)$$

$\Phi_{H/\Gamma}$ - factor value of payment worker differentiation for job according to their importance for the economy in General;

T_{Γ} - the average size of the tariff worker rate formed in the studied branch for 1 man-hour;

T_M - average minimum amount of the tariff wage worker rate in the branch that has the lowest rate is for 1 man-hour;

$T_{H/\Gamma}$ - average amount in the economy of the tariff wage worker rate for 1 man-hour.

In General, this methodology with the available information can only be calculated value of the factor according to the value of economic activity. Factor of labour complexity is possible to calculate the average performance for the industry, that is offset by the effect of the labour intensity, which is reflected in various forms of remuneration. The factor same conditions in tariff statistical information is not conducted. In this case, it is possible to calculate it only tankard from the average tariff rate for the industry minimum wages factor of complexity and factor value for type of the economic activity. Generally, the influence of working conditions on existing wage policy is in each branch of the amount of the factor of labour conditions and monetary allowances for 3-6 category severity of labour on average per employee.

Finally, having considered the methodology L.Sushkina (in addition to traditional methods of forming wage tariff), our opinion, affects the formation of tariff and payment policy, the situation in our country, one can say that neither of the methods is universal, therefore they should be considered in relationship to make a real assessment of the tariff wage elements.

Areas for further research may be a combination of traditional methods of establishing tariff rates with the justification of economic feasibility in terms of the complexity of the work, the rights of the employed and economic feasibility of the employer.

Literature

1.Сушкина Л.П. Межотраслевые соотношения в заработной плате рабочих и определяющие их факторы. Автореф. дис. экон. наук. Москва – 1973, 22с.