Wages in Motor Vehicle and Parts Plants, April 1963

Author(s): L. Earl Lewis and Frederick L. Bauer

Source: Monthly Labor Review, Vol. 87, No. 2 (February 1964), pp. 161-167

Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/41835558

Accessed: 24-10-2021 23:09 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at https://about.jstor.org/terms



is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to Monthly Labor Review

Summaries of Studies and Reports

Wages in Motor Vehicle and Parts Plants, April 1963

Wages and supplementary wage practices that prevailed in April 1963 in the motor vehicle and the motor vehicle parts industries were surveyed by the Bureau of Labor Statistics as part of its industry wage studies program. The survey was made in a period of high automobile production. In 1962, approximately 6.9 million passenger cars were produced in the United States, representing the industry's second highest production year at that time. This output was exceeded in 1963, although at the time of the report it appeared unlikely that the 7.9-million mark of 1955 would be topped.

Virtually all of the workers in the motor vehicle industry were covered by collective bargaining agreements with the United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America; four-fifths of the workers in parts plants were in union establishments, and several of these plants had agreements with unions other than the UAW. Women accounted for less than 6 percent of the motor vehicle work force, compared with 19 percent in the parts industry. Incentive methods of wage payment applied to only about 2 percent of the motor vehicle workers, compared with 31 percent in the parts industry.

Motor Vehicles

Earnings. The vehicle industry's 460,798 production and related workers covered by the study averaged \$2.90 an hour.² Approximately half of the workers were in Michigan and averaged \$2.92 an hour; workers in the rest of the North Central region averaged \$2.89, and those in the West, \$2.83.

As indicated in table 1, average hourly earnings of three-fifths of the workers were between \$2.70 and \$2.90. Relative dispersion (computed by dividing the interquartile range by the median)

was 6 percent. Thus, the wage rates of half of the workers were within 3 percent of the median rate (\$2.80). This dispersion factor is the lowest for any industry studied by the Bureau during the past decade.

Earnings information was developed separately for 27 occupational classifications which together accounted for nearly three-fifths of the total production workers in the industry (table 2). Nationwide hourly earnings for these jobs ranged from \$4.29 for die sinkers (drop forge dies) and \$4.09 for patternmakers (wood and metal) to \$2.52 for janitors, porters, and cleaners. Line and bench assemblers, accounting for more than a sixth of the work force, averaged \$2.74 an hour.

Average hourly earnings for the skilled maintenance jobs represented in the survey fell within a range of \$3.35 (carpenters) to \$3.50 (machine repairmen). Millwrights, pipefitters, and sheetmetal workers all averaged \$3.38 an hour. Among toolroom jobs, the numerically important classifications of machine-tool operators and tool and

718-358-64---4

¹A more comprehensive account of the study will be presented in BLS Bulletin 1393. Individual releases providing earnings and supplementary benefits data for the motor vehicle parts industry in Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, and Toledo are available upon request.

The study differs from a similar one conducted by the Bureau in July 1957 in one major respect. In 1957, data for a few motor vehicle company-operated plants (employing approximately 46,000 production workers) manufacturing automobile parts sold extensively to other producers were included in the motor vehicle parts study; in the April 1963 study, these plants were included in the motor vehicles study.

For results of the 1957 study, see "Wages in the Motor Vehicle Industry, 1957," Monthly Labor Review, November 1957, pp. 1321-1329, and "Wages in Motor Vehicle Parts Manufacture, 1957," Monthly Labor Review, February 1958, pp. 161-167.

The motor vehicle survey covers all automotive operations (including motor vehicle parts operations) of five passenger car manufacturers, with the exception of the truck division of one firm and steel and glass operations of all companies. Plants primarily producing tractors and industrial engines were excluded, as were all parts depots.

Earnings data reported in this segment of the study relate to straight-time hourly earnings, excluding premium pay for overtime and for work on weekends, holidays, and late shifts. Costof-living bonuses and annual improvement factors were included as part of the workers' regular pay, but incentive payments (applying to less than 2 percent of the workers) and nonproductive bonuses were excluded.

TABLE 1. PERCENT DISTRIBUTION PRODUCTION OF Workers in Motor Vehicle Establishments, by AVERAGE STRAIGHT-TIME HOURLY EARNINGS, UNITED STATES AND SELECTED REGIONS, APRIL 1963

Average hourly earnings 1	United	North (
	States 2	Michigan	Except Michigan	West 4
Under \$2.60 \$2.60 and under \$2.70 \$2.70 and under \$2.80 \$2.80 and under \$3.00 \$3.00 and under \$3.10 \$3.10 and under \$3.10 \$3.10 and under \$3.20 \$3.20 and under \$3.30 \$3.30 and under \$3.40 \$3.40 and under \$3.60 \$3.60 and under \$3.50 \$3.60 and under \$3.70 \$3.70 and over	35. 4 24. 0 6. 2 . 8 . 9 . 9 2. 0 4. 3	6. 5 9. 7 36. 2 21. 1 6. 5 . 7 7 1. 8 4. 9 4. 2 4. 3	3.3 12.8 34.0 27.3 5.4 1.2 1.1 1.2 2.1 3.5 3.6	3.1 7.22 44.7 30.0 6.4 1.0 .8 1.2 1.1 3.3 .7
Total.	100.0	2.9	100.0	100.0
Numbers of workersAverage hourly earnings 1	460, 798 \$2. 90	231, 265 \$2. 92	150, 274 \$2. 89	15, 117 \$2. 83

Note: Because of rounding, sums of individual items may not equal 100.

die makers averaged \$3.49 and \$3.62 an hour, respectively.

There was comparatively little variation in occupational pay levels by region. A comparison of averages in Michigan with those in other North Central States indicates that identical average rates were recorded for 4 of the 27 classifications, and they varied by only 1 or 2 cents in 15 others. Among the 18 jobs for which comparisons could be made between Michigan and the West, identical averages were recorded for 4, with differences of only 1 or 2 cents noted in 6 others.

For nearly all of the selected occupations, individual wage rates were closely grouped about the U.S. average for the occupations. In 23 of the 27 jobs studied, rates for a majority of the workers differed from the nationwide average by no more than 2 percent. In a majority of the jobs, four-fifths of the workers or more had rates that fell within the ± 2 percent range.³

Occupational wage relationships in 1963 were nearly the same as in 1957, but differed in several instances from those in 1950. For each year, the average hourly rate for janitors was used as a base (100); averages for selected jobs were expressed as indexes of this base, as shown in the following tabulation:

		(average janitore	
Occupation	1965	1957	1950
Patternmakers, metal and wood	162	164	154
Tool and die makers	144	143	145
Machine-tool operators, toolroom	138	136	138
Electricians	137	136	135
Pipefitters	134	133	132
Millwrights	134	133	131
Carpenters	133	132	131
Punch-press operators	110	111	119
Assemblers, line and bench	109	110	116
Truckers, power	108	108	111
Laborers, material handling	106	105	108

Metal and wood patternmakers averaged 62 percent more than janitors in 1963, compared with 64 percent in 1957; in 1950, the difference was 54 percent. Line and bench assemblers averaged 9 and 10 percent more than janitors in 1963 and 1957, respectively; in 1950, the difference was 16 percent. Differentials between the average rates for skilled maintenance and most toolroom jobs and the average rate for janitors were generally similar in all 3 years. The special wage increase for skilled workers in 1958 appears to have maintained the wage relationship between these jobs and others.

Establishment Practices. Information was also obtained on shift differential payments for production workers and on selected supplementary benefits for production and office workers.4

Premium pay for production workers assigned to the second shift amounted to 5 percent of regular pay, including overtime premium, in 4 of the 5 motor vehicle companies; in one of the smaller companies, the second-shift differential was 8 percent. In all five companies, the third-shift premium was 10 percent. Shift definitions, however, varied considerably among the companies. Information was not available on the proportions of workers employed on the various shifts at the time of the study. Employment on extra shifts tends to fluctuate throughout the year as the volume of production changes.

forthcoming bulletin.

Excludes incentive payments and premium pay for overtime and for work on weekends, holidays, and late shifts.
 Includes data for regions in addition to those shown separately.
 Includes Illionis, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, and Wisconsin.
 Includes Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming.
 Less than 0.05 percent.

⁸ The job descriptions used in classifying workers in the study tend to be more generalized than those used in individual establishments because allowance had to be made for minor differences among establishments in specific duties performed. Thus, the somewhat greater relative dispersion of rates noted in some jobs may result from the matching of more than one company job category (and rate) with the occupation as defined by the Bureau. ⁴ These provisions will be described in greater detail in the

Provisions for paid holidays in each company were the same for production workers as for office workers. Four companies provided 6 full-day and 2 half-day holidays annually. The fifth company provided 7 full days.

Vacation pay for production workers in four companies was based on the following schedule:

Years of seniority	Vacation payment (hours)
1 and under 3 years	40
3 and under 5 years	60
5 and under 10 years	80
10 and under 15 years	100
15 years and over	120

These companies computed vacation pay on the basis of the employees' straight-time hourly rates, exclusive of late-shift and overtime premiums. The fifth company computed vacation payments for production workers as a percentage of earnings in the year preceding the workers' employment anniversary dates. The payments ranged from 2½ percent for 1 but less than 5 years of service to 7½ percent for 15 years of service or more. Vacation provisions for office employees varied in certain details among the five companies. In all, however, employees with 1 year of service were provided 10 days' vacation pay, and those with 10 years of service or more received 15 days'

Each of the companies paid part of the cost of life insurance (with permanent and total disability provisions) and sickness and accident insurance for their production workers. The cost of these provisions for office workers was borne entirely by one company and shared with the employees in the other four. Hospitalization, surgical, and medical insurance plans were provided without cost to both production and office workers by companies employing a great majority of these workers. Retirement pension plans, paid for en-

TABLE 2. NUMBER AND AVERAGE STRAIGHT-TIME HOURLY EARNINGS 1 OF WORKERS IN SELECTED OCCUPATIONS IN MOTOR VEHICLE ESTABLISHMENTS, UNITED STATES AND SELECTED REGIONS, APRIL 1963

	United States 2		North Central 3				West 4		
Occupation				Michigan		Except Michigan			
	Workers	Earnings 1	Workers	Earnings 1	Workers	Earnings 1	Workers	Earnings 1	
Maintenance									
Carpenters, maintenance	6,038	\$3, 35 3, 46 3, 50 3, 38 3, 38 3, 38	435 3, 300 3, 554 3, 568 2, 025 738	\$3. 36 3. 48 3. 50 3. 39 3. 39 3. 39	156 1, 743 1, 927 1, 945 1, 143 325	\$3. 35 3. 44 3, 51 3. 37 3. 37 3. 38	24 174 15 174 100 10	\$3. 35 3. 43 3. 40 3. 34 3. 38 3. 39	
TOOLROOM									
Die sinkers, drop-forge dies	239 3, 853 1, 497 13, 876	4. 29 3. 49 4. 09 3. 62	148 2, 344 894 7, 809	4. 31 3, 49 4. 11 3. 62	75 1, 132 462 4, 572	4. 19 3, 49 4. 04 3. 62	103		
CUSTODIAL AND MATERIAL HANDLING									
Checkers, receiving and shipping Janitors, porters, and cleaners Laborers, material handling Truckers, power	5, 590 8, 207 8, 028 11, 701	2. 76 2. 52 2. 66 2. 72	2, 936 4, 061 3, 361 6, 120	2. 76 2. 52 2. 66 2. 71	1, 739 2, 765 3, 620 3, 772	2. 76 2. 53 2. 68 2. 73	233 303 260 376	2. 74 2. 52 2. 62 2. 71	
OTHER SELECTED OCCUPATIONS									
Assemblers, line and bench	79, 212 24, 211	2. 74 2. 79	34, 237 12, 627	2. 73 2. 78	28, 587 8, 332	2. 74 2. 80	3, 515 509	2. 75 2. 85	
Bar stock screw-machine operators. Crankshaft grinders. Other	1, 643 917 26, 951 4, 130 570 21, 349 3, 974 4, 750 4, 871 5, 224 15, 451	2.92 2.86 2.89 2.89 2.66 2.87 2.84 2.88 2.81	799 615 15, 322 1, 504 397 12, 072 3, 307 1, 871 1, 754 2, 862 6, 309	2. 95 2. 85 2. 76 2. 89 2. 75 2. 87 2. 87 2. 88 2. 79	668 184 9, 428 1, 620 119 6, 875 666 1, 411 1, 291 1, 618 5, 798	2. 91 2. 93 2. 77 2. 88 2. 78 2. 60 2. 87 2. 85 2. 89 2. 82	243 	2.89	

Excludes incentive payments and premium pay for overtime and for rork on weekends, holidays, and late shifts.
 Includes data for regions in addition to those shown separately.
 See footnote 3, table 1.

⁴ See footnote 4, table 1.

Note: Dashes indicate no data reported or data that do not meet publica-

tirely by the employer, were provided for both production and office workers by all companies. In addition, the large majority of the office employees were permitted to increase their retirement benefits by membership in contributory plans to which the employer paid part of the cost.

The five companies had virtually identical supplemental unemployment benefit (SUB) plans for production and related workers. Office employees of one company were covered by the provisions of the SUB plan for production workers. Short workweek benefits for production workers were included in the SUB plans. Companies typically provided monetary allowances for both production and office workers who were laid off or separated from the company under certain circumstances and met specified eligibility requirements. Allowances toward expenses incurred by production workers transferred from one plant location to another were provided by most companies.⁵ The incidence of such benefits was not determined for office workers.

The union contracts of all the companies had provisions for payment to workers serving on juries. The most common payment for production workers was a sum equal to the amount paid by the court or \$10 a day for a maximum of 60 days, whichever was greater. Office workers, in most instances, could expect to receive their full salary while serving on juries.

Motor Vehicle Parts

Earnings. Straight-time hourly earnings of the estimated 186,684 production and related workers in establishments manufacturing motor vehicle parts averaged \$2.59 (table 3).6 Men, accounting for four-fifths of the production workers in the industry, averaged \$2.72 an hour, compared with \$2.01 for women. Production workers in the North Central region, accounting for three-fourths of the industry's work force, averaged \$2.68 an hour (table 4). Corresponding averages in the Northeast and South were \$2.58 and \$1.82, respectively.

Production workers in establishments manufacturing motor vehicle parts and accessories, who comprised two-thirds of the industry's work force, averaged \$2.65 an hour. Workers in plants manufacturing automotive stampings averaged \$2.68 an hour; those in plants making pistons, piston

rings and carburetors, \$2.58; and those in plants manufacturing automotive electrical engine parts, \$2.11.

Regional averages for workers in plants manufacturing motor vehicle parts and accessories were \$2.75 an hour in the North Central region, \$2.49 in the Northeast, and \$1.95 in the South. Data for other industry branches are provided only for the North Central region, where nearly identical averages (\$2.68 and \$2.69, respectively) were recorded for the automotive stampings branch and for plants manufacturing pistons, piston rings, and carburetors. Workers in plants making electrical engine parts averaged \$2.04 an hour.

The national average for workers in plants with 1,000 employees or more was \$2.93 an hour, compared with \$2.53 for workers in plants employing 500 but less than 1,000 persons, and \$2.24 for those in plants with fewer than 500. This general relationship held in each of the regions for which data are presented.

Individual earnings in the motor vehicle parts industry, unlike those in the motor vehicle industry, were widely dispersed—the largest concentration within any 20-cent interval amounting to one-sixth of the employees (in the \$2.70 to \$2.90 interval). In the earnings array, the middle half of the workers earned between \$2.17 and \$2.98 an hour. The index of dispersion was 31 percent, compared with 6 percent in the motor vehicle industry.

Straight-time hourly earnings for this segment of the study excludes premium pay for overtime and for work on weekends, holidays, and late shifts. Incentive payments, such as those resulting from piecework or production bonus systems, and cost-of-living bonuses were included as part of the workers' regular pay, but nonproduction bonuses were excluded.

⁵ See Philip Taft, "Interplant Transfers in the Automobile Industry," Monthly Labor Review, March 1963, pp. 276-278.

⁶ The survey included establishments (other than those operated by passenger car manufacturers) employing 50 workers or more and primarily engaged in manufacturing automotive hardwarepart of industry 3429; automotive stampings-part of industry 3461; auto springs-part of industry 3493; automotive pistons, piston rings, carburetors—part of industry 3599; automotive electrical instruments—part of industry 3611; automobile lights—part of industry 3642; automotive electrical engine parts—part of industry 3694; passenger car bodies—industry 3712; motor vehicle parts and accessories-industry 3714; and automotive mechanical instruments-part of industry 3821, as defined in the 1957 edition of the Standard Industrial Classification Manual prepared by the U.S. Bureau of the Budget. Establishments primarily engaged in manufacturing any of the abovenamed parts for use in trucks or buses were included; however, manufacturers of large truck units, such as whole engines, bodies, or chassis, were excluded. Separate auxiliary units such as central offices were also excluded.

Data were tabulated separately for a number of occupational classifications, several of which are listed in table 3.7 Nationwide averages for the jobs studied separately ranged from \$3.63 an hour for die sinkers (drop forge dies) to \$2.12 for routine (class C) assemblers. Tool and die makers, numerically the largest skilled job studied separately, averaged \$3.31 an hour. With the exception of carpenters who averaged \$2.90 an hour, averages for the skilled maintenance jobs ranged from \$3.18 to \$3.24.

Nearly a sixth of the workers were employed as assemblers and slightly more than a tenth were machine-tool operators engaged in production work. Averages for assemblers ranged from \$2.90 an hour for a relatively small group (virtually all men) making complex or precision assemblies (class A) to \$2.12 for a much larger group of routine (class C) assemblers (dominated by women 3 to 2). Similarly, averages for machinetool operators (production) ranged from \$3.10 for those performing class A work to \$2.55 for class C workers. Men largely dominated the machine-tool operator groups, especially classes A and B.

Table 3. Number and Average Straight-Time Hourly Earnings 1 of Production Workers in Motor Vehicle Parts Establishments, by Selected Characteristics, United States and Selected Regions,2 April 1963

Characteristic	United States 3		Northeast		North Central		South	
	Workers	Earnings 1	Workers	Earnings ¹	Workers	Earnings ¹	Workers	Earnings 1
ALL PRODUCTION WORKERS Total Men Women	186, 684 151, 756 34, 928	\$2. 59 2. 72 2. 01	26, 337 19, 287 7, 050	\$2. 58 2. 77 2. 05	141, 205 118, 003 23, 202	\$2. 68 2. 80 2. 10	15, 995 11, 849 4, 146	\$1.82 1.93 1.52
ESTABLISHMENT SIZE 50-499 workers	71, 088 34, 949 80, 647	\$2. 24 2. 53 2. 93	9, 673 3, 245 13, 419	\$2. 12 2. 33 2. 97	47, 949 26, 028 67, 228	\$2, 35 2, 69 2, 92		\$1.82
SELECTED INDUSTRY BRANCHES 4 Motor vehicle parts and accessories	124, 999 22, 151 15, 094 13, 270	2. 65 2. 68 2. 58 2. 11	13, 652		98, 864 14, 320 12, 501 8, 671	2. 75 2. 68 2. 69 2. 04		1. 95
SELECTED OCCUPATIONS	8, 041 12, 309	2. 90 2. 81 3. 04 2. 12 2. 12 2. 40 1. 94 3. 63	201 928 729 199 3, 447 773 2, 674	2. 57 3. 19 3. 35 2. 63 2. 11 2. 89 1. 89	838 4, 993 3, 501 1, 492 13, 400 5, 769 7, 631	2. 99 2. 82 3. 14 2. 07 2. 27 2. 55 2. 06 3. 94	129 639 590 49 3,418 1,456 1,962	2. 82 2. 07 2. 12 1. 51 1. 53 1. 53 1. 52
Electricians, maintenance (all men)	1, 536 1, 087 1, 308 3, 788	3. 19 2. 71 2. 92 2. 66 2. 40 2. 57 2. 24 2. 25 2. 23	214 70 197 362 805 115 690 341 847	3. 04 2. 39 2. 72 2. 65 2. 11 2. 19 2. 09 2. 19 2. 05	1, 232 930 1, 048 3, 107 5, 059 2, 614 2, 445 2, 467 4, 387	3. 25 2. 79 2. 98 2. 70 2. 49 2. 64 2. 32 2. 33 2. 36	76 74 54 189 352 211 141 265 699	2. 61 1. 98 2. 51 2. 11 1. 80 1. 93 1. 59 1. 61 1. 69
Machine-tool operators, production: Class A (5,335 men and 40 women) Class B (9,512 men and 176 women) Class C (5,254 men and 1,493 women) Machine-tool operators, toolroom (all men) Punch-press operators, light and medium Men Women Tool and die makers (all men) Truckers, power (3,224 men and 2 women) Welders, hand (3,585 men and 61 women)	9, 688 6, 747 2, 536 10, 676 7, 348 3, 328 5, 037	3. 10 2. 86 2. 55 3. 24 2. 40 2. 58 2. 02 3. 31 2. 49 3. 09	756 1, 240 765 355 835 535 300 1, 076 164 227	2. 85 2. 72 2. 39 2. 92 2. 39 2. 54 2. 11 3. 21 2. 46 2. 95	4, 121 7, 951 4, 820 2, 107 8, 852 6, 471 2, 381 3, 634 2, 874 3, 325	3. 16 2. 91 2. 77 3. 32 2. 48 2. 60 2. 16 3. 37 2. 53 3. 12	381 443 954 55 849 202 647 259 148 67	2. 96 2. 26 1. 65 2. 23 1. 56 1. 88 1. 46 2. 86 1. 80 2. 49

¹ Excludes premium pay for overtime and for work on weekends, holidays,

Data for additional occupations will be provided in the forthcoming bulletin.

and late shifts.

The regions for which separate data are shown include: Northeast—Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Vermont; North Central—Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, and Wisconsin; and South—Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia.

³ Includes data for the Western region in addition to those shown

separately.

4 Establishments were classified on the basis of major type(s) of product(s) manufactured. The all-production worker total shown above includes data for establishments producing other types of parts in addition to those for which separate data are shown. For definition of industry branches, see text footnote 6.

Note: Dashes indicate no data reported or data that do not meet pub-

Highest occupational averages were usually recorded in the North Central region, although in a few instances, averages in the Northeast were highest. Almost without exception, occupational averages were lowest in the South.

The North Central was the only region for which separate data are presented for each of the four major industry branches. Most commonly, occupational averages in this region were highest in the motor vehicle parts and accessories branch and lowest among plants manufacturing automotive electrical engine parts.

Highest nationwide occupational averages were nearly always recorded for establishments employing 1,000 or more; and averages in establishments with 500 but less than 1,000 were usually higher than those in establishments with fewer than 500 workers. This general relationship held in each of the regions.

Workers paid on an incentive basis nearly always earned substantially more than time-rated workers in the same job. The size of this wage differential varied considerably by occupation. Thus, for men class A assemblers, the nationwide difference amounted to 12 cents an hour, compared with 99 cents for men class B assemblers. In the North Central region, the comparable differentials were 4 and 83 cents, respectively.

Earnings of individual workers also varied within the same job, location, and method of wage payment. In many instances, particularly for jobs paid on an incentive basis, hourly earnings of the highest paid workers exceeded those of the lowest paid in the same job and area by \$1 or more.

Establishment Practices. Work schedules of 40 hours a week were in effect in motor vehicle parts establishments employing slightly more than ninetenths of the production and office workers. At the time of the study, second-shift operations employed about one-fourth of the workers; third or other late shifts accounted for a comparatively small proportion (5 percent) of the industry's

Table 4. Percent Distribution of Production Workers in Motor Vehicle Parts Establishments, by Average Straight-Time Hourly Earnings, United States and Selected Regions 2 and Selected Industry Branches, 3 **APRIL 1963**

	All industry branches 4				Selected industry branches 3				
Average hourly earnings 1	United States	Northeast	North Central	South	Motor vehicle parts and accessoris	Automotive stampings	Automotive pistons, piston rings, and carbu- retors	Automotive electrical engine parts	
					United States	United States	United States	United States	
Under \$1.50	2.68 2.82 3.04 4.86 7.68 4.66 4.66 4.64 3.42	3. 9 2. 4 4. 7 4. 9 3. 0 2. 7 3. 6 5. 2 3. 8 5. 2 3. 8 5. 2 3. 1 4. 2 4. 2 4. 4 4. 2 4. 2 4. 4 4. 2 4. 2	3. 4 1.7 2.0 1.6 2.6 2.2 2.6 3.4 4.3 6.3 8.7 9.8 8.3 9.8 9.8 3.5 3.5 3.6 3.5 9.8 9.8 9.8 9.8 9.8 9.8 9.8 9.8 9.8 9.8	31. 5 12. 0 7. 9 8. 3 10. 9 5. 4 2. 8 2. 2 2. 5 1. 8 2. 6 1. 2 1. 3 1. 0 1. 1 1. 7	4. 7 2. 3 2. 9 1. 9 2. 1 2. 5 3. 0 2. 6 3. 2 3. 3 5. 9 9. 3 5. 1 4. 0 3. 7 3. 3 3. 3 5. 9 9. 3 5. 1 4. 0 3. 7 8. 8 9. 3 9. 3 9. 3 9. 3 9. 3 9. 3 9. 3 9. 3	8.8 2.0 .9 1.1 2.8 2.6 3.4 4.6 4.2 5.9 4.0 5.0 6.4 4.7 8.5 2.7 1.5 2.9 4.6 4.2 4.6 4.2 4.6 4.7 8.5 2.6 4.6 4.6 4.7 8.5 2.6 8.5 2.6 4.6 8.5 2.6 8.5 2.6 8.5 2.6 8.5 2.6 8.5 8.5 8.5 8.5 8.5 8.5 8.5 8.5 8.5 8.5	0.3 4.5 5.2 3.4 4.5 3.8 4.6 5.9 7.5 6.7 11.3 9.7 8.7 8.7 8.9 4.9 3.5 2.6 1.4 1.5 1.9	16. 7 12. 1 8. 2 5. 2 5. 2 8. 5. 6 3. 9 2. 9 1. 7 3. 4 3. 5 4. 3 2. 3 2. 1 3. 4 2. 3 3. 5 3. 6 4. 2 3. 2 5. 6 5. 2 5. 2 5. 2 5. 2 5. 2 5. 2 5. 2 5. 2	
Number of workersAverage hourly earnings 1	186, 684 \$2, 59	26, 337 \$2. 58	141, 205 \$2. 68	15, 995 \$1. 82	124, 999 \$2. 65	22, 151 \$2, 68	15, 094 \$2. 58	13, 270 \$2. 11	

Excludes premium pay for overtime and for work on weekends, holidays, and late shifts.
 For definition of regions, see footnote 2, table 3.
 For definition of industry branches, see text footnote 6.
 Includes data for industry branches in addition to those shown separately.

Includes data for the Western region in addition to regions shown

Note: Because of rounding, sums of individual items may not equal 100.

workers. Nearly all late-shift workers received pay differentials over day-shift rates, usually on a cents-per-hour basis ranging from 3 to 16 cents for second-shift work and from 5 to as much as 16 cents for work on third or other late shifts. Most of the other shift workers were paid a uniform percentage differential ranging from 4 to 11.5 percent.

Paid holidays were provided by plants employing virtually all of the workers in the industry. Approximately two-fifths of the production and office workers were provided 6 days plus 2 half days annually; 7 days were provided by establishments employing a fourth of the production and a fifth of the office workers.

Paid vacations after qualifying periods of service were in effect in plants accounting for nearly all workers in the industry. Seven-tenths of the production workers were in plants having provisions for 1 week of vacation pay after 1 year's service and for 2 weeks' pay after 5 years; about three-fifths were provided 3 weeks' pay after 20 years, and a fifth were in plants with provisions for 4 weeks after 25 years. Three-fourths of the office workers were in plants with provisions for 2 weeks' paid vacation after 1 year's service; slightly more than four-fifths worked in plants with provisions for 3 weeks after 15 years and three-tenths received 4 weeks after 25 years.

Life, hospitalization, and surgical insurance for which employers paid at least part of the cost were available to virtually all production and office workers. Somewhat more than nine-tenths of both groups of workers were in plants providing payments during illness or accident disability and more than three-fourths were in plants having accidental death and dismemberment and medical insurance.

Retirement pension benefits (other than those available under Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance) were provided by plants employing about four-fifths of the production workers and a slightly larger proportion of office workers. Provisions for lump-sum retirement severance payments were available in plants accounting for about one-eighth of the production employees. Less than 5 percent of the office workers were in establishments providing such benefits to these workers.

Supplemental unemployment benefits (SUB) were available to a little more than two-fifths of the production workers and to a tenth of the office workers. Among the different types of plans, the UAW plan in which the companies contribute to companywide pooled funds was most common. Short workweek benefits were also available to three-tenths of the industry's production workers and to about 5 percent of the office workers. Provisions for at least partial payment of moving expenses to those required to move were available to about an eighth of the production workers and to 5 percent of the office workers. Technological severance pay was practically nonexistent in the industry.

—L. EARL LEWIS AND FREDERICK L. BAUER
Division of Occupational Pay