

TRADE UNIONS AND WAGE COMPRESSION IN CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE

Iga Magda 2016 Jobs & Development Conference

Background and questions asked

Background

- Weakening of trade unions in CEE countries in the aftermath of transition to market economy
- Current levels of trade union membership and collective bargaining coverage much below the levels in early 1990s and below Western Europe

Background and questions asked

Background

- Weakening of trade unions in CEE countries in the aftermath of transition to market economy
- Current levels of trade union membership and collective bargaining coverage much below the levels in early 1990s and below Western Europe

Questions asked:

- What do unions in CEE do? Do they continue to make a difference?
- Has the impact of the survivals changed over time?
- Are changes in wage dispersion in CEE linked to changes in collective bargaining coverage?

Unions in CEE are weaker: unionization fell



Union density (%), early 1990s and 2012-2013

■ 1992-1994 ■ 2012-2013

Collective bargaining coverage is low



Surviving unions: continue to make a difference ?

. . .

Data

- European Structure of Earnings Survey (repeated cross sectional, 2002, 2006) for Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland
- A harmonized linked employer employee dataset
- Data on earnings, personnel, jobs, and firm characteristics in the manufacturing, construction, and trade and service sectors
- Focus on firms with at least 10 workers in the manufacturing, male workers only
- Around 550 000 obs. for CZ, 56 000 for HU and 200 000 for PL

Empirical strategy: estimating model of earnings for worker *i* at establishment *j*:

$$w_{ij} = \mathbf{X'}_{ij}\mathbf{\beta} + \mathbf{K'}_{ij}\mu + \mathbf{Y'}_{ij}\eta + \gamma F A_j + \delta I A_j + \varepsilon_{ij}$$

 w_{ii} – log monthly earnings

 $\mathbf{X'}_{ij-}$ set of individual characteristics (age, age^2, education) $\mathbf{K'}_{ij-}$ set of job characteristics (type of contract, occupation) $\mathbf{Y'}_{ij}$ – average characteristics of the co workers and firm's age FA_j , IA_j – coverage by an industry or firm level agreement Surviving unions: continue to make a difference ?

Empirical strategy: estimating model of earnings for worker *i* at establishment *j*:

$$w_{ij} = \mathbf{X}_{ij}\mathbf{\beta} + \mathbf{K}_{ij}\mathbf{\mu} + \mathbf{Y}_{ij}\mathbf{\eta} + \mathbf{\gamma} F \mathbf{A}_j + \mathbf{\delta} I \mathbf{A}_j + \varepsilon_{ij}$$

 w_{ii} – log monthly earnings

 $\mathbf{X'}_{ij-}$ set of individual characteristics (age, age^2, education) $\mathbf{K'}_{ij-}$ set of job characteristics (type of contract, occupation) $\mathbf{Y'}_{ij}$ – average characteristics of the co-workers and firm's age FA_j , IA_j – coverage by an industry or firm level agreement

. .

| | 2002 | | | | | 2006 | | | |
|--------------------------|----------------|---------|---------|--|----------|----------|----------|--|--|
| | [1] | [2] | [3] | | [4] | [5] | [6] | | |
| | Czech Republic | | | | | | | | |
| firm level agreement | 0.022 | 0.022 | 0.020 | | 0.002 | 0.012 | 0.006 | | |
| industry level agreement | 0.019 | 0.013 | 0.011 | | 0.037 | 0.044 | 0.048* | | |
| | Poland | | | | | | | | |
| firm level agreement | 0.01 | 0.011 | 0.011 | | 0.029* | 0.024 | 0.030* | | |
| industry level agreement | 0.074 | 0.076 | 0.074 | | 0.152*** | 0.137*** | 0.143*** | | |
| | Hungary | | | | | | | | |
| firm level agreement | 0.059** | 0.061** | 0.065** | | 0.117*** | 0.088** | 0.105*** | | |
| industry level agreement | 0.058 | 0.034 | 0.061 | | 0.154*** | 0.111** | 0.157*** | | |

. . .

| | 2002 | | | | | 2006 | | | |
|--------------------------|----------------|---------|---------|--|----------|----------|----------|--|--|
| | [1] | [2] | [3] | | [4] | [5] | [6] | | |
| | Czech Republic | | | | | | | | |
| firm level agreement | 0.022 | 0.022 | 0.020 | | 0.002 | 0.012 | 0.006 | | |
| industry level agreement | 0.019 | 0.013 | 0.011 | | 0.037 | 0.044 | 0.048* | | |
| | Poland | | | | | | | | |
| firm level agreement | 0.01 | 0.011 | 0.011 | | 0.029* | 0.024 | 0.030* | | |
| industry level agreement | 0.074 | 0.076 | 0.074 | | 0.152*** | 0.137*** | 0.143*** | | |
| | Hungary | | | | | | | | |
| firm level agreement | 0.059** | 0.061** | 0.065** | | 0.117*** | 0.088** | 0.105*** | | |
| industry level agreement | 0.058 | 0.034 | 0.061 | | 0.154*** | 0.111** | 0.157*** | | |

. .

| | 2002 | | | | | 2006 | | | |
|--------------------------|----------------|---------|---------|--|----------|----------|----------|--|--|
| | [1] | [2] | [3] | | [4] | [5] | [6] | | |
| | Czech Republic | | | | | | | | |
| firm level agreement | 0.022 | 0.022 | 0.020 | | 0.002 | 0.012 | 0.006 | | |
| industry level agreement | 0.019 | 0.013 | 0.011 | | 0.037 | 0.044 | 0.048* | | |
| | Poland | | | | | | | | |
| firm level agreement | 0.01 | 0.011 | 0.011 | | 0.029* | 0.024 | 0.030* | | |
| industry level agreement | 0.074 | 0.076 | 0.074 | | 0.152*** | 0.137*** | 0.143*** | | |
| | Hungary | | | | | | | | |
| firm level agreement | 0.059** | 0.061** | 0.065** | | 0.117*** | 0.088** | 0.105*** | | |
| industry level agreement | 0.058 | 0.034 | 0.061 | | 0.154*** | 0.111** | 0.157*** | | |

. .

| | 2002 | | | | | 2006 | | | |
|--------------------------|----------------|---------|---------|--|----------|----------|----------|--|--|
| | [1] | [2] | [3] | | [4] | [5] | [6] | | |
| | Czech Republic | | | | | | | | |
| firm level agreement | 0.022 | 0.022 | 0.020 | | 0.002 | 0.012 | 0.006 | | |
| industry level agreement | 0.019 | 0.013 | 0.011 | | 0.037 | 0.044 | 0.048* | | |
| | Poland | | | | | | | | |
| firm level agreement | 0.01 | 0.011 | 0.011 | | 0.029* | 0.024 | 0.030* | | |
| industry level agreement | 0.074 | 0.076 | 0.074 | | 0.152*** | 0.137*** | 0.143*** | | |
| | Hungary | | | | | | | | |
| firm level agreement | 0.059** | 0.061** | 0.065** | | 0.117*** | 0.088** | 0.105*** | | |
| industry level agreement | 0.058 | 0.034 | 0.061 | | 0.154*** | 0.111** | 0.157*** | | |

Surviving unions: compressing wage distribution ?

| 2006 | P10 | P25 | P50 | P75 | P90 | | | | |
|--------------------------|----------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|--|--|--|--|
| | Czech Republic | | | | | | | | |
| Firm level agreement | 0.038* | 0.009 | 0.009 | 0.022 | -0.060** | | | | |
| Industry level agreement | 0.048 | 0.054 | 0.034 | 0.029 | 0.003 | | | | |
| | Poland | | | | | | | | |
| Firm level agreement | 0.043** | 0.036* | 0.018 | 0.02 | 0.028 | | | | |
| Industry level agreement | 0.284** | 0.219*** | 0.159*** | 0.088* | 0.015 | | | | |
| | Hungary | | | | | | | | |
| Firm level agreement | 0.156*** | 0.132*** | 0.128*** | 0.107** | 0.071** | | | | |
| Industry level agreement | 0.279*** | 0.238*** | 0.194*** | 0.156*** | 0.116** | | | | |

Surviving unions: compressing wage distribution ?

| 2006 | P10 | P25 | P50 | P75 | P90 | | | | |
|--------------------------|----------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|--|--|--|--|
| | Czech Republic | | | | | | | | |
| Firm level agreement | 0.038* | 0.009 | 0.009 | 0.022 | -0.060** | | | | |
| Industry level agreement | 0.048 | 0.054 | 0.034 | 0.029 | 0.003 | | | | |
| | Poland | | | | | | | | |
| Firm level agreement | 0.043** | 0.036* | 0.018 | 0.02 | 0.028 | | | | |
| Industry level agreement | 0.284** | 0.219*** | 0.159*** | 0.088* | 0.015 | | | | |
| | Hungary | | | | | | | | |
| Firm level agreement | 0.156*** | 0.132*** | 0.128*** | 0.107** | 0.071** | | | | |
| Industry level agreement | 0.279*** | 0.238*** | 0.194*** | 0.156*** | 0.116** | | | | |

Surviving unions: compressing wage distribution ?

| 2006 | P10 | P25 | P50 | P75 | P90 | | | | |
|--------------------------|----------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|--|--|--|--|
| | Czech Republic | | | | | | | | |
| Firm level agreement | 0.038* | 0.009 | 0.009 | 0.022 | -0.060** | | | | |
| Industry level agreement | 0.048 | 0.054 | 0.034 | 0.029 | 0.003 | | | | |
| | Poland | | | | | | | | |
| Firm level agreement | 0.043** | 0.036* | 0.018 | 0.02 | 0.028 | | | | |
| Industry level agreement | 0.284** | 0.219*** | 0.159*** | 0.088* | 0.015 | | | | |
| | Hungary | | | | | | | | |
| Firm level agreement | 0.156*** | 0.132*** | 0.128*** | 0.107** | 0.071** | | | | |
| Industry level agreement | 0.279*** | 0.238*** | 0.194*** | 0.156*** | 0.116** | | | | |

What could have strengthened the remaining unions?

• CEE countries **EU Accession** in 2004

- CEE countries **EU Accession** in 2004
- Institutional adjustments preceding Accession -> increased unions' policy engagement, policy making know-how, strengthened their bargaining power and helped to revitalize social dialogue

What could have strengthened the remaining unions?

- CEE countries **EU Accession** in 2004
- Institutional adjustments preceding Accession -> increased unions' policy engagement, policy making know-how, strengthened their bargaining power and helped to revitalize social dialogue
 - **legislative framework**: working time directive, Directive on Information and Consultation of Employees relating to work councils, reinforcement of Labour Inspections, changes in minimum wage and its enforcement
 - Open Method of Coordination & unions' empowerment
 - establishment of tripartite structures and practices to stabilize the transformation process and strengthen the social consensus around it

Further research: wage distribution in CEE & unions?

Convergence in wage inequalities among CEE? (variance of residuals)



...driven by changes in within and between firm dispersion? .



Further work

- Quantifying the contribution of within and between firm wage differentials for the change in wage inequality (increasing between firm wage differentials, decreasing within firm wage inequalities)
- Assess the role of changes in collective bargaining in CEEs for the wage compression
- Extend the previous analysis to 9 CEE countries
- Assess the role of EU Accession using time variation in the EU entry date

- Trade union density in CEE is much lower than in Western Europe, and much lower than it was in early 1990s – common perception of TU's weakness
- There is however evidence that the surviving unions still impact their members outcomes
- Institutional adjustments to the *acquis communautaire* played an important role
- Trade unions, collective barganing and changes in wage distribution in the CEE ?



Iga Magda

lga.magda@ibs.org.pl

