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## 1

## Concepts of Compensation

This paper will explore some new measures of the total hourly compensation of manufacturing wage carners. This smbject is obvionsly of importance because of its bearing on both the welfare of the wage earner and the costs of production. The measnre now in general use is the U.S. Burean of L.abor Statistics series "average homty eamings in all mamfacturing." This is a satisfactory monthly series for current use, but for some analytical and historical purposes it has two serious drawbacks. First, it takes no account of the increasingly important part of wage-earner compensation made up of wage supplements. Second, it does not allow for changes in the anount of tinc paid for but not worked. I shall present here some estimates that attempt to remedy these drawbacks-estimates of average compensation per hour at work, where compensation is the sum of wages and wage supplements. Manufacturing wage earners or production workers are covered; salaried employees are excluded.

Largely because of the differences in concept mentioned above, the new NBER series "total compensation per hour at work" rises mose rapidly after 1929 than the BLS series "average hourly eamings." The two series are compared in Chart 1. From 1929 to 195 , the NBER scoics rises 325 per cent, while the BL $S$ series rises 966 per cent. The spread between the two scries widens steadily toward the end of the period, suggesting that the conceptual differences may become even more important in the futme. Before 1929 , the differences in concept do not affect the comparison between the series. There are, however, differences resulting from the use of different sources of data and methods of estimation.

## Money Earnings

The first colum of Table 1 shows the new estimates of average money earnings per hour at work. Column 2 presents the familiar scries of the

## CHART 1

Two Measures of Wage-Earner Compensation, 1914.5?


Bureau of Labor Statistics, average earnings per hour paid for. The years 1915-18 have becn added, using the all-manufacturing estimates of Paul H . Douglas as an interpolator. ${ }^{1}$
The conceptual difference between carnings per hour at work and per hour paid for is important only after 1939 . When earnings are measured per hour at work, an increase in the time represented by paid vacations, paid sick leave, or paid holidays will increase average hourly eamings. In the BI.S series, an increase in time paid for but not worked leaves hourly carnings unchanged. The former concept seems preferable 1 Real Wages in the United States, 1890-1925, Boston, Houghton Miftin Co., 1990,
108.

## Concepts of Combensation

TARLE 1
Awrage Hourly Compensation in Mandacturing, 1914.57

| Year | Average Earaings per Hour at Work, NBER (1) | Average Earnings per Homr l'aid for, BLS <br> (2) | Wage Supplements prer Hour at Work <br> (3) | '1oual <br> Compensation per 1 Hown at Work <br> (4) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1914 | .220) | . 223 |  | . 230 |
| 1915 | . 226 | . 230 |  | .226 |
| 1916 | . 26 ? | . 265 |  | . 262 |
| 1917 | . 316 | . 310 |  | . 316 |
| 1918 | . 417 | . 393 |  | . 417 |
| 1919 | . 477 | . 477 |  | . 477 |
| 1920 | . 553 | . 555 |  | . 55.3 |
| 1921 | . 488 | . 515 |  | . 488 |
| 1922 | . 451 | . 487 |  | . 451 |
| 1923 | . 499 | . 522 |  | . 499 |
| 1924 | . 516 | . 547 |  | . 516 |
| 1925 | . 513 | . 547 |  | . 513 |
| 1926 | . 517 | . 548 |  | . 317 |
| 1927 | . 522 | . 550 |  | . 522 |
| 1928 | . 522 | . 562 |  | . 522 |
| 1929 | . 530 | . 566 | . 004 | . 3.4 |
| 1930 | . 526 | . 55 ? | . 004 | .53) |
| 1931 | . 502 | . 515 | . 004 | . 306 |
| 1932 | . 441 | . 446 | . 005 | . 446 |
| 1933 | . 437 | . 442 | . 00.4 | 441 |
| 1934 | . 523 | . 532 | .1704 | 527 |
| 1935 | . 537 | . 550 | . 005 | . 542 |
| 1936 | . 542 | . 556 | . 011 | 553 |
| 1937 | . 606 | . 624 | .027 | .6.3.3 |
| 1938 | . 603 | . 627 | .036 | .6.39 |
| 1939 | . 603 | .633 | . 035 | . 6.38 |
| 1940 | . 634 | . 661 | . 036 | .670 |
| 1941 | . 701 | . 729 | . 036 | .7.7\% |
| 1942 | . 827 | . 853 | .037 | . 864 |
| 1943 | . 934 | . 961 | .041 | . 975 |
| 1944 | 1.00 | 1.02 | . 047 | 1.05 |
| 1945 | 1.01 | 1.62 | . 052 | 1.06 |
| 1946 | 1.08 | 1.09 | . 051 | 1.13 |
| 194? | 1.24 | 1.24 | . 059 | 1.30 |
| 1948 | 1.35 | 1. 35 | . 061 | 1.41 |
| 1949 | 1.39 | 1. 40 | . 073 | 1.46 |
| 1950 | 1.46 | 1.46 | . 094 | 1.55 |
| 1951 | 1.61 | 1.59 | . 11.5 | 1.73 |

## TABIEF 1 (Continued)

Average Hourly Compensation in Manufacturing, 1914-57

| Year | Average Earnings per Hour at Work, NBERa (1) | Average <br> Earnings per Hour Paid for, BLS <br> (2) | Wage Supplements per Hour at Work <br> (3) | Total <br> Compensation per Hour at Work <br> (4) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1952 | 1.71 | 1.67 | . 121 | 1.83 |
| 1953 | 1.81 | 1.77 | . 127 | 1.94 |
| 1954 | 1.83 | 1.81 | . 139 | 1.97 |
| 1955 | 1.90 | 1.88 | . 149 | 2.05 |
| 1956 | 1.99 | 1.98 | . 163 | 2.15 |
| 1957 | 2.09 | 2.07 | . 185 | 2.27 |

Cohmn 1. For somees and methods, see Section 2.
Column 2. Source: Morthly Labor Reatre, July 1955, pp. 801-806, and Douglas, heal II ages in the tinited States, p. 108.
Column 3. For sourees and methods, see Section 3.
Cohmm 4. Sum of colounns 1 and 3. Detail may not add to total because of rounding.
"The NBER figures for 1920-31 and 1954-57 differ in most cases from those in Wages, Pricer, Profits, and Producitidy, New York, 1959. For the earher period the differences are dhe tochanges in the method of estimation; for the later, to the ase of more recent data.
as a measure both of the hourly income of workers and of the hourly labor costs of employers. There can be little doubt that an additional paid holiday, for example, increases both the attractiveness of a job to a worker and the cost of obtaining a given amount of work.
The series shown in column 1 does not account for forms of time paid for but not worked other than those mentioned above. It thus understates the rise in eamings per hour of actual work to the extent that there has been an increase in pay for such things as lunch periods, coffec breaks, wash-up time, call-in time, and jury duty. According to a survey by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, such items amounted to 2.5 per cent of payroll for manufacturing firms in $1957 . .^{2}$ Because the firms surveyed are substantially larger than the average of all manufacturing firms, they probably made higher payments for time not worked than did all firms.

The series on earnings per hour at work is based largely on data from the Census of Manufactures and the Anmal Surveys of Mamifactures.
2 Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Fringe Benefits, 1957, Washington, $195^{8}$, p. 13 , sum of lines 3 and 4 d. For farther discussion of the sampling bias in the Chamber of Commerce daia, sec pp. $24-25$ below:

## Concepts of Compensation

In 1957, homs of work as meamed by the Survey of Mannfactures were 5.1 per cent lower than hours paid for as reported by BLS. This in itself should canse naminge per homr at work to be 54 yer cent higher than earnings per hour paid for. In addition to this conceptnal difference, however, there is a difference in the sample of establishments covered. The survey uses a probability sample, whereas BLS, which needs prompt and frequent reporting, uses a "cutof"" sample that excludes the smallest firms. In each of the years since World War II, the concepmal difference and the sampling difference have roughly offset one another, so that the figures in cohmms 1 and 2 differ litule or not at all. Before 1940 only the sampling difference is important, for there was iittle paid leave. Cohmm 1 lies below cohmm 2 from 1932 to 1940 for this reason.

Section 2 discusses other differences between the two series and explains the constrnction of the estimates in colnmm 1 . The largest differences between the series occor in the rg2o's, the decade that presents the greatest difficulties in measurement. Althongh the estimates for the 1920's presented here scem to me to be more accurate than the BLS estimates, I do not regard them as definitive. I hope that they can be improved as a result of work now being donc by my colleagues H. Gregg Lewis and Ethel B. Jones.

It should be kept in mind that changes in average hourly carnings for all manufacturing reflect both changes in wage rates for particnlar jobs and changes in the industrial and occupational composition of mamfacturing wage earners. Since the shifts in composition have on the whole been toward high-wage occupations and industries, average homly earnings rise more than would a fixed weight index of wage rates. ${ }^{3}$

According to the estimates of column 1, between 1914 and 1957 the average moncy carnings of mamfacturing wage carners rose from 22 cents per hour of work to $\$ 2.00$, a ninefold increase. To measure the increase in total hourly compensation, we must add to this the increase in wage supplements.

## Wage Supplements

Wage supplements are defined here to include employer contributions to social insurance and to private pensions, insurance, and health and welfare funds. They do not include other items sometimes considered fringe benefits, such as irregular bonuses, subsidics to company cafeterias, or cliscounts on goods bought from the company.

The series on wage supplements shown in cohmon 3 of Table 1 is

[^0]
## Concepts of Compensution

based on the data of the national income accomes on supplements to wages and satioies by type and on mumblished data fumished by the National heome Division, USS. Depattinent of (ommere, which divide "supplements to wages and salaries" in manutacturing into "employer contribations for social insurance" and "other labor income." Fo reach the series used here, rough estimates hat to be mate of the division of supplements betweon wase cancers and salaried workers, and the argregate data had to be divided by estimates of man-hotms worked to put them on am hourly basis. The methods of estimation are discussed in Section 3 .

Data on wage supplements are not avalable before egeg. The bege figum was only o.f (ents per hour at work, most of which probably represented the cost of the workmens compensation. The :mount in arifer years must have been smatler still, and the croor catused by its omission seems negligible.
From 1929 to 1957, the estinated cost of wage supplements per hour at work rose from of econts to is.5 cents. The first big jump comes in the fate 1930 's, following the enatment of the social secturity haw After 1913, private pensions, insurance, and welfare plans become increasingly importimt.

## Total Compensation

Adding money wases and wage supplenents gives total compensation per hour at work, as shown in the fourth cohmm of lable 1 . Total compensation increased from 22.0 cents per home in 1830 to $\$ 2.27$ in 1957 , more than ten times the initial level.

The level of total compensation more than doubled from 1914 to 1920 -years of labor shortages and mpial inflation doring and immediately after World War I. The recession of $1920-2$ brought the sharpest drop in the serics. ${ }^{4}$ By 1923 , it was rising again, though thonghont the prosperous years $1923-29$ it did not regain the level of 1920 . From 1930 to 1933 the Great Depression cansed a fall in the series. Since 1933, the rise in total compensation has been continuous, except for an insignificant drop from $193^{8}$ (o 1939 . The sharpest rises occured daring World War II and the Korcan Wiar.

[^1]
[^0]:    ${ }^{3}$ For data on shifts in the occupational composition of the labor force, see Gertude Bancroft, The American Labor Force: Its Growth and Changing Composition, New York, John Wiley \& Sons, $195^{8 .}$

[^1]:    4 It may be considered strange that the drop in total compensation fer hour at
    
     tion probably lies in the nature of the preceling peaks. The rage leyel of age was teathed as the dimax of at apid indotion. and was witely regariod as abommally ligh. On the ohner hand, wages in ag? had beon roughty constant for semal peas, so that rechetions were made slowly and with more relactance.

