

# Discharged for off-duty behavior



**ASSIGN  
BUSTER**

Discharged for Off-Duty Behaviour After the selection process by the human resource department, an employee has to go through an induction process. Such an employee gets to know the rules and procedures of the company to inform them and give them guidance in their work. Depending on the type of service an employee does in the company, some rules will govern the behavior of such an employee even when off-duty. This is when an employee's negligence is likely to tarnish the public image of the company or when an employee is likely to make the company incur unnecessary expenses. The human resources department has the responsibility to evoke such employees of the existence of such rules and make them available once needed by the employees. This paper discusses an example of an off-duty behavior of an employee of AEM company called John.

Given the facts of this case, John did not receive a fair treatment. The HR manager was able to mention the existing code of conduct that stated that employee's off-duty behavior should not affect the company, its employees, or sales of its educational materials. Existence of this code of conduct does not explicitly indicate that John knew about it. The code is quite extensive and has not narrowed in to what behaviors that would amount to breaching off-duty performance by an employee. According to Bohlander and Snell (2009), rules should be widely disseminated, widely known by all employees, reviewed periodically, and reasons for the rules explained.

John is right that what he did in his personal life was “no obligation of the company” if the rules were not stipulated properly and explicitly explained to him not to handle pornographic materials. Besides, he explains the reason for the purchase of materials. It was not at will. Discharging an employee as a disciplinary measure is usually the last resort. From this case, John has no

<https://assignbuster.com/discharged-for-off-duty-behavior/>

indiscipline records in his personal record for the last twelve years. We do not hear of any warnings prior to this scenario. According to Bohlander and Snell, the employee must know the rule, be notified of his breach of the rules, and be given reasonable warning before dismissal (Bohlander & Snell, 2009).

Sales representatives of AEM can be held to a higher level of personal conduct than sales representatives of other companies. Despite the global employment laws that regulate businesses, organizations reviews their codes and guidelines yearly to suite their demands. This happens mostly in private companies where rules of conduct are given and explained to the sales representatives before hiring. The sensitivity of the business allows such rules so long as they do not interfere with an employee's privacy. IASB employment issue allows some employees to hold a higher standard than others (IASB, 2004).

Organization should have considered several things before discharging John, one of them his previous records. For the last twelve years, John's employer has been a dedicated employee, with good relations with the junior and high schools he works with, and with an exceptional performance. According to Bohlander and Snell, one of the considerations of disciplining an employee is checking the employees past record. This helps the management to understand the years of service the employee has given the company, years the employee has held the current job, and worker's personal record as a whole especially the disciplinary record (Bohlander & Snell, 2009).

#### References

Bohlander, G. & Snell, S. (2009). *Managing Human Resources*, USA, Cengage learning.

<https://assignbuster.com/discharged-for-off-duty-behavior/>

IASB Employment Issue. (2004). “ Off-Duty misconduct” Retrieved From  
<http://www.ia-sb.org/assets/8275215F-E54C-4399-972D-C4A38E50A8E9.pdf>