

I remember how we mastered the principles of team contracts. In less than ten years the team built twenty five-storey residential buildings, two kindergartens, several stores, and a polyclinic. There were about 200 people in the team, and our yearly volume of work was valued at up to five million rubles. This was a plan for solid construction management. We brought the annual output per person up to 20,000 rubles - twice the average work productivity for residential construction in Tyumen!.

It's a well-known fact, however, that the team contract method in construction met with great difficulty on its way to becoming a reality. According to reports, the number of contract collectives reached 60-70 percent. But they were only contract collectives on paper. Rampant disorganization was eating away at their roots. The "levelling" principle -offspring of the administrative-command system -did its utmost to suffocate everything. And the story of how our collective fell apart is further proof of this.

I have already mentioned that in terms of work productivity we exceeded the average by a factor of two. It would seem that the team members, who were working harder and more efficiently than others, should have been earning significantly more. But that was never the case. Why? Perhaps by keeping the pace high, we drove away the rejects and consequently lost their wages at redistribution? No, there were no problems with quality.

The reason was that since the earliest days wages in construction have been adjusted artificially to some single level by planning different standards of wage fund formation for different teams, both the