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**Discussion One**

The essential difference between executive and non-executive pay is that the division heads determine non-executive pay in deliberations with the human capital division. In contrast, executive pay is determined by the top directors. The executive pay is far higher than non-executive pay and customarily entails salary, perks, and incentives. Senior management and executive-level workers play a significant role in the organization as they make approaches, taking definite opinions. It is always practical to set the right compensation package to keep the employees motivated. The executive pay is negotiable between the employer and budding executive and can disregard the organizational measures on benefits to legitimate workers (Pissaris et al., 2017).

In non-executive pay, an executive will almost always provide pay within a range of opening salaries. The employer is evasive and impotent to enhance a benefit outside of that alignment because of budget and practicality components. Employers anguish about wages remaining market competitive, but they are also uptight that they have workers functioning in the same jobs, at the same levels of the organization. The common controversy with executive salary is that they get beneficial benefits even if the organization executives do not function to the wanted levels of stakeholders. A few critics have been examined if such practices may hamper some executives’ incentive to bring about attractive performance**.** Non-executive pay applies much pressure because employees are paid based on performance while the executive employees are paid based on negotiations. If non-executives do not perform to anticipated levels, they will not earn salaries, but the executives receive incentives regardless.

**Discussion Two**

Contingent workers are doing a more significant duty in today’s company and are favorable to employers. The organization's salary package, mostly only full-time and compensated workers, is extravagant. Benefits and compensation packages are low in an organization, with much of the labor force being contingent employees**.** Contingent employees have flexible time to choose their specific hours of work or exemption to adjust work agendas from one week to the next contingent upon their obligations. Under the flextime plan, the workers might be needed to work an approved number of core hours. Contingent workers provide valuable expertise. Many companies are finding it more ambitious to find employees with demanding skill sets in today's market. Facing an objection to linking skills divergences in their personnel, organizations are swinging to the contingent workforce to amass top talent. Competent contract employeesare always feasible at short instruction and offer an immediate solution (Martocchio, 2011).

The process of hiring contingent workers is appreciably more cost compelling than composing an enduring hire. The expenses linked to hiring lasting workers can be diminished by alluring with non-permanent employees. Contingent workers mainly do not earn wages. Instead, they earn payment or commission for the work done. Contingent workers are not amenable for compensations like contracted workers and are liable for their taxes. Contingent workers are not entitled to sick pay, holiday pay, taxes, social security, or unemployment. Contingent workers impact the compensation plans for organizations. The organizations attain decreased labor expenses via lower hourly salaries and the deficiency of benefits payments. Contingent workers allow employers to alleviate overloads and prevent a succession of expensive hires.

**Discussion Three**

Home country salary refers to the wage paid for the worker’s job on task if it were done in their home country before taxes are made. The strengths of home-based salary include allowing dependable treatment of emigrants of the same country, offering disparate levels for divergent nationalities, and the emigrants have no remuneration relationship with local employees**.** However, the home country-based pay has weaknesses because this pay strategy is not conveniently executed to the individual worker, and there is adifference in remuneration with certain circumstances workers can wind up losing money when workers authorize to a high expense host country.

The headquarters-based method compensates all workers with the same pay scale that isused at headquarters. The headquarters based-pay is the easiest method to utilize and easy to execute since it administers the pay definitive of one nation to all workers’ despite the region of their alien tasks. The major weaknesses of the headquarters-based payment are the loss incurred during currency conversion and decrement in the package mobility (Martocchio, 2011).

Host country-based pay means that the employees' basic pay is determined based on the host country pay system. The strength of the host country-based pay includes employees not incurring losses in currency conversion. The weakness of host country-based pay is that employees may not benefit from many incentives and extra benefits provided in the home country.

Some of the factors to consider when determining the appropriate international pay strategy include potential for market growth, and the competitive structure of the sector to which the company belongs in the new market. When using the tax comparison, the employer appraises the hypothetical tax and takes the taxes out during the year. The employer compensates all the enacts due to both alien and indigenous that outpace what was withstood of their pay (Martocchio, 2011). The compensation plans impact the employees’ willingness to take foreign tasks by being complex, arduous by oscillating exchange rates, and confronting locations in developing markets.

**Discussion Four**

I choose Canada to compare to pay and benefit practices that are used in the United States. Canada has a sanctioned minimum salary mandate. The United States has an interstate salary law, and the states have their wage law. This is where the cost of living comes in. If there is a difference between the two wage laws, the corporation must honor the highest of the two. Compensation in both countries is controlled by law, tax law, and history. Health insurance is a prevalent worker benefit because there is no state-financed national health coverage in the United States. The salaries for most employees are set by market strengths, where a work union debates on the employees’ behalf. In Canada, the provincial and federal regulations and ideals that administer the employment relationship secure every employee containing foreign citizens.

Most foreign citizens working in Canada are designated to the minimum models set in employment standards laws, including a minimum salary and rights to certain types of leave**.** Canadian employment regulations can also enhance extraterritorially if a worker is briefly functioning overseas in their definite employment commitment. Canada has a universal pension plan. The programs are financed by employer and employee grants, which are authorized by law. The minimum advantage feasible to an individual under this program will be relatively $800 per month. The United States pension plan encompasses most people who work in the United States. To entitle to compensation under the pension plan of the United States, you must have granted the program for a minimum period.
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