Worker's Compensation

STUDENTS NAME

DEPARTMENT NAME

COURSE NAME

INSTRUCTORS NAME

October 7,2024

Worker's Compensation

Workers Compensation, is any direct or indirect payments to employees, such as wages, bonuses, stock, and benefits or a form of insurance that provides benefits to employees who suffer from work-related injuries or illnesses(Worker's Compensation Medicare Set-Aside Arrangement(WCMSA),2023) .From an organization's point of view, successful achievement of performance goals requires offering compensation at a level and in a form that attracts, retains, and motivates a workforce having the desired attributes. At the same time, it must carefully manage compensation costs, which are often the single largest operating cost. For example, U.S. employer costs for employee compensation in the civilian sector in early 2022 (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2022) averaged $40.90/hour, with $28.16 in the form of wages, salaries, and other direct pay, and $12.74 ($2.94 legally required) in the form of benefits. Although most organizations do not report labor cost data in their public filings, there are exceptions in the airlines, healthcare, and financial services industries. A sampling indicates that compensation accounts for 30 to 58% of operating expenses and 28 to 46% of revenues (Noe et al., 2023; Table 11.1).

For most employees, compensation received via the employment relationship is their major source of income and instrumental for achieving so many kinds of needs and goals in maintaining the overall health and wellbeing of one's self and one's family outside of work (Leana and Meuris, 2015). Pay is also universally valued, with more pay generally preferred to less unlike other jobs whose attractiveness depends on the employee (Weller et al., 2019). Although some have suggested that once pay rises above a certain level, well-being plateaus like at around $75,000 in 2010, was based on one interpretation of Kahneman and Deaton, 2010), but from recent research, based on 1,725,994 experience-sampling reports from 33,391 employed US adults, that well-being increased linearly with log(income), with an equally steep slope for higher earners as for lower earners and that there was no evidence for an experienced well-being plateau above $75,000 per year (Killingsworth, 2021).

Most employees evaluate and react to their compensation within a social context where perceptions of equity are central. From a societal viewpoint, workers' compensation has important implications for national productivity and thus standards of living. Societal considerations can also be seen in the extensive regulatory framework for compensation in many developed countries.The continued focus of labor unions on compensation issues, and the significant attention to income inequality in both developed and developing countries around the world.

Worker's payment it influences how they do and this applies when higher pay levels substantially reduce turn over (Gerhart,2023), as well as that there is a significant increase in pay that follows voluntary turnover (Gerhart, 2023, Exhibit 17.16), especially among those with high human capital of above 35% (Bidwell, 2015).

To understand more, I have decided to discuss on a specific topic known as Pay for performance (PFP) and related areas like pay dispersion, pay communication or transparency, pay equity, endogeneity, as well as employers and employees view on PFP, and challenges in defining and measuring PFP. Since payment systems effect performance, turnover and other outcomes in different ways for different people, depending on characteristics such as individual differences, relative work group standing and demographics (Fulmer and Shaw, 2018).

Pay for Performance

Employers and Employees view on Pay for Performance

According to Gerhart, (2023), says that employers believe in pay for performance for especially critical jobs as all private and many other organizations use PFP, suggesting that employers believe pay is a key motivator. Even in unionized organizations where within-job pay increases may depend on seniority, advancement to higher job levels with higher pay typically also includes a performance element. Organizations believe that those making most valuable contributions should receive higher pay in return (Gerhart,2023, Exhibit 10.2).

Employees payment is always largely depending on performance as per the type of a particular worker. As payment may encourage employees to work more harder and providing exemplary services due to individual aggregate pay plans (Nyberg et.al,2018).

Pay Transparency

Is the process of organizing communication along multiple dimensions like providing information about pay outcomes, providing information about how pay is determined, formal or informal policies about whether employees are allowed to discuss pay among themselves, and the modes and channels to use to communicate about pay (Arnold and Fulmer, 2019; Fulmer and Arnold, 2020). A lack of pay transparency is referred to as pay secrecy. Historically, in the U.S. private sector, for nonunion employees, there has been little perceived pay transparency in terms of ability to discuss pay with coworkers or ability to access company-provided information on pay, with pay secrecy perceptions continuing to be reported in recent years (Sun et al., 2021). In the U.S., Executive Order 13665, which amended existing Executive Order 11246 and became effective in 2016, as well as recent laws in a growing number of states and other countries, seek to change that, driven by the belief that more transparency will reduce pay discrimination by shining a light on pay inequities. Whether pay transparency is beneficial depends on the perspective employee, organization, societal and circumstances (Brown et al., 2022). Consistent with the logic above, an organization with known pay inequities may decide to avoid pay transparency. An organization may also avoid transparency to limit worker mobility by limiting the information on pay, making comparisons difficult. Of course, mobility is a key to workers moving to their most productive job (Gerhart and Feng, 2021), so while the private return to an organization of pay secrecy may be positive, the effect on individual workers and on society may be negative.

According to Brown et al, (2022). Pay transparency has links to pay dispersion given that the effects of pay dispersion likely depend on whether it is viewed as fair or not, and that evaluation (and to some degree its accuracy) depends on having information about the pay of peers and other social comparisons (Trevor et al., 2012). Likewise,according to (Abdulsalam et al., 2021), deals of PFP is also connected to the degree that there are offsetting effects positive for those receiving i-deals, potentially negative for those not driven by social comparisons, which again depend on having sufficient information on pay and performance.

Pay Dispersion

Pay dispersion refers to variation in pay among members of a group. The most basic theoretical use has been to suggest that more pay dispersion makes sense when required interdependence is limited. Hence, pay dispersion or inequality is more equitable and thus more likely to foster cooperation. Dispersion, when created via use of PFP, has been associated with better performance, less turnover and enhanced attraction of high performers (Shaw, 2014).

According to Fulmer and Li, (2022), they anticipated that a complex interrelationship among pay dispersion, PFP, and pay transparency, greater transparency enhances the link between expected performance and pay, which would normally be a positive for performance outcomes, but transparency also enhances the opportunity for social comparisons. But on other hand social comparisons that do not involve transparency but proximity finds that under some circumstances, easier social comparisons can result in negative effects, offsetting some of the positive incentive effects of performance-based pay differences (Obloj and Zenger,2017).

Pay Equity

Pay equity is the principle that employees should receive equal pay for performing work of equal value regardless of their gender, ethnicity, age, race, religion or other non-related factors. In recent world, pay inequity have become rampant as difference in work experience, occupation and industry. Such as women have experienced access discrimination, thus being underrepresented in some occupations and and industries and race-based discrimination (Lang and Kahn-Lang Spitzer, 2020).

Within organizations, women's lack of representation at higher job pay levels as a key factor in their lower pay. According to (Gerhart, 2023, Exhibit 17.15), says that although women are 45% of employees in 500 companies, they are 37% of first/mid-level officials/managers, 27% of executive/senior level officials/managers, 21% of Board seats, and 6% of CEOs. This reinforces the importance of examining the role of promotion in compensation.

Endogeneity in compensation

Endogeneity exists when the covariance is nonzero between the exogenous variable and the regression equation error term. When endogeneity is present, using ordinary least squares regression results in a biased estimate of the compensation regression coefficient.

Sources of endogeneity are omitted variables, simultaneity, selection bias, and measurement error (Hill et al., 2021).

Simultaneity could be a concern in compensation research, such as if in response to high employee turnover, wages are raised and retention incentive is introduced. Without addressing the endogeneity, cross-sectional data might indicate a negative relationship between the compensation programs intended to reduce turnover, without revealing that, in fact, turnover would have been higher without these programs. Another simultaneity challenge is determining whether pay performance . According to the Trevor et al. (2012), example they used instrumental variables to test team compensation.

Challenges in defining and measuring PFP

The main challenge in defining PFP is at the individual level, PFP in organizations is often thought of as the annual merit pay exercise. Sometime leads to skepticism about whether there is enough PFP to be motivating. Like in recent years, the average annual merit increase has been 3%–4% and 85% of employees receive either a three or a four- merit rating on a five-point scale with a three receiving an average merit increase of 2.6% versus 3.6% for a four (Gerhart, 2023, Chapter 10). On an annual salary of $80,000, that would amount to a difference of $800/year, $15.38/week, less still after taxes.

However, PFP is likely much stronger if observed over a longer time period, thus capturing the fact that higher performers are promoted to higher job levels, which, in turn have not only higher base pay levels, but also higher levels of short- and long-term incentives (Gerhart and Fang, 2014). A promotion to a higher job level brings a much larger pay increase. The modal midpoint progression is 15% (WorldatWork and Deloitte, 2019).In addition, short-term incentives such as merit bonuses, which have grown substantially in use (Gerhart and Fang, 2014), are often more strongly linked to performance than merit raises and likewise can have stronger effects on performance (Nyberg et al., 2016). Therefore, PFP can be conceptualized and measured over different time periods and with different measures of pay. PFP will be stronger to the degree the time period is longer than a single year and to the degree that the measure of pay includes not only annual merit pay increases, but also short-term and long-term incentives.

Conclusion

Worker's compensation continues to a vital areadespite its clear importance to employees' lives and its economic significance for organizations and society. This encourages employees to solve more issues and problems that they may encounter in process of working and thus the pay they receive helps them to solve the problems.

References

Abdulsalam, D., Nyberg. (2021). Individualized Pay for Performance Arrangements: Peer Reactions and Consequences. Journal of Applied Psychology, **106**(8), 1202–1223. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000820

Arnold, A., & Fulmer, I. S. (2019). Pay Transparency. In S.J. Perkins(Ed.) The Routledge Companion to Reward Management (pp. 87–96). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.2307/256705

Bidwell, M. (2015). What happened to long-term employment? The role of worker power and environmental turbulence in explaining declines in worker tenure. Organization Science, **24**(2), 1061–1082. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1120.0816

Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2022). https://www.bls.gov/news.release/ecec.nr0.htm

Brown, M., Nyberg, A. J., Weller, I., & Strizver, S. D. (2022). Pay Information Disclosure: Review and Recommendations for Research Spanning the Pay Secrecy-Pay Transparency Continuum. Journal of Management, **48**(6), 1661–1694. https://doi.org/10.1177/01492063221079249

Fulmer, I. S., & Arnold, A. (2020). Pay Communication: A global look at Practices and Preferences. Journal of Total Rewards, **29**(2), 4th Quarter, 25–35.

Fulmer, I. S., & Li, J. (2022). Compensation, Benefits, and Total Rewards: A bird's-eye (re)view. Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, **9**, 147–169. **https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012420-055903**

Fulmer, I. S., & Shaw, J. D. (2018). Person-Based Differences in Pay Reactions. Journal of Applied Psychology, **103**(9), 939–958. **https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000310**

Gerhart, B. (2023). Compensation. McGraw-Hill, 14th edition.

Gerhart, B., & Fang, M. (2014). Pay for Individual Performance. Human Resource Management Review. **https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2013.08.010**

Gerhart, B., & Feng, J. (2021). The resource-based view of the firm, human resources, and human capital. Journal of Management,.**https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206320978799**

Hill, A. D., Johnson, S. G., Greco, L. M., O'Boyle, E. H., & Walter, S. L. (2021). Endogeneity: A Review and Agenda for the Methodology-Practice divide affecting Micro and Macro Research. Journal of Management, **47**(1), 105–143. **https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206320960533**

Kahneman, D., & Deaton, A. (2010). High Income Improves Evaluation of l]Life but not Emotional Well-being. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, **107**(38), 16489–16493. **https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1011492107**

Killingsworth, M. A. (2021). Experienced well-being Rises with Income, even above $75,000 per year. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, **118**(4), e2016976118. **https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2016976118**

Lang, K., & Kahn-Lang, S. A. (2020). Race Discrimination: An Economic Perspective. Journal of Economic Perspectives, **34**(2), 68–89. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.34.2.68

Leana, C. R., & Meuris, J. (2015). Living to Work and Working to Live: Income as a Driver of Organizational Behavior. Academy of Management Annals, **9**(1), 55–95. https://doi.org/10.5465/19416520.2015.1007654

Noe, R. A., Hollenbeck, J. R., Gerhart, B., & Wright, P. M. (2023). Human Resource Management: Gaining a Competitive advantage. McGraw-Hill, 13th edition.

Obloj, T., & Zenger, T. (2017). Organization Design. Organization Science. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2016.1103

Shaw, J. D. (2014). Pay dispersion. Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, **1**, 521–544. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091253

Sun, S., Rosenfeld, J., & Denice, P. (2021). On the books, off the record: Examining the Effectiveness of Pay Secrecy Laws in the U.S. Institute for Women's Policy Research. Policy Brief, IWPR #C494.

Trevor, C. O., Reilly, G., & Gerhart, B. (2012). Reconsidering Pay Dispersion's Effect on the Performance of Interdependent Work. Pay Inequality. Academy of Management Journal, **55**(3), 585–610. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2006.0127

Weller, I., Hymer, C. B., Nyberg, A. J., & Ebert, J. (2019). How Matching Creates Value: Cogs and Wheels for Human Capital Resources Research. Academy of Management Annals, **13**(1), 188–214. https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2016.0117

WorldatWork and Deloitte. (2019). 2019 Survey of salary structure policies and practices.

Worker's Compensation Medicare Set-Aside Arrangement (WCMSA).2023.