

Off-the-job behavior

Psychology, Behaviorism



TextbookCase StudyOff-the-Job Behavior 1. Do you believe Oiler's employee rights were violated? Explain your position. Peter Oiler's termination from his job by the Winn-Dixie Corporation was an obvious violation of his employee rights. Though balancing employee rights with proper discipline is a constant challenge for HR professionals. But in this case of Oiler, the work place behavior of the employer had not changed and there is no problem, with the co-employers also. Also in the own time, the company have no rights about the way he dress.

Hence there is also no such challenge for the Winn-Dixie that it has to terminate Oiler. Hence I would consider that Winn-Dixie has violated the employee rights of Oiler. Also his social security has been compromised. When we consider the situation here is more normal than a similar case in 2005, which happened in Georgia. According to that, the courts consider this as sexualdiscriminationunder 42 U. S. C. Sec. 1983 and Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment of the Constitution.

And the development of trans-gender transitions has a real concern and the laws accept the claims of discrimination under employer's categorizing of genders. Thus Oiler's claim is acceptable and Winn-Dixie has to oblige to the claims of Oiler. Here Oiler's can be taken as an example of opposition of trans-genders in the general public. Though the laws are guarding them, the manipulation of thought caused by these cases is more than the actual violation. Since the court ruled out as not a violation, it will be a wrong guideline as the decision can be referenced in consecutive references. . What do you see as the consequences of organizations that punish employees for certain off-the-job behaviors? Explain. In the case of

punishment of the employees, the people have united against this unrightfully action. Also it had created an uneasy environment among the workers. Most organizations which do the punishment of workers for off-job behaviors as they feel as their right, run the risk of being faced with numerous lawsuits and allegations of partiality and discriminatory practices.

Hence these organizations end up with a bad reputation and a question mark for credibility. Which in turn costs, they also face losing customers, business partners and stockholders. There will be a greater number of individuals who do not agree with these abrupt decisions than who support it. Hence they will decide to cut their ties with organizations who favor such practices. It would be safe to assume that many businesses that were previously a part of the Winn-Dixie organizations like financial institutions, suppliers etc. made the decision to no longer be associated with a company that would practice such unethical and immoral standards of business. This will in turn destroy the past achievement and the support it had earned and also future trades with other organization is also threatened. Hence it completely obliterates the potential success of any business or organization. Any business organization must have rules and regulations which must be followed to and by all employees. Additionally, businesses must have particular methods in place to discipline individuals who do not follow the rules. 3.

Would you consider Winn-Dixie an organization that exhibits characteristics of progressive discipline or the hot stove approach? Defend your position. According to me, Winn-Dixie is an organization which exhibits hot stove characteristics. This can be made on seeing the action taken by Winn-Dixie. Oiler has a clean organizational behavior and has a perfect work record.

His career track record is also proper and he is considered as an asset by all the workers. When we consider about the harshness of the Disciplinary action, terminating the employee is considered as a most severe disciplinary action.

And the Winn-Dixie had done this, hence it is a Hot stove characteristic. The hot-stove approach punishes all unacceptable behaviors with identical disciplinary actions whereas the progressive approach, warns individuals depending on the harshness and/or the reoccurrence of actions and behaviors which they have previously been warned against. The severe disciplinary action can be taken for an offense is so serious that immediate dismissal is appropriate such as theft, sexual harassment, violence, plagiarism etc.

And since the person involved has not done anything, hence he should not be taken severe discipline. Also before taking a decision of terminating the employee, the company neither talked to Oiler for an explanation nor it has given Oiler a verbal warning so that he can be more careful in future. Thus it had taken the action immediately and without giving time to Oiler for confirming his position or giving any explanation. Hence Winn-Dixie is following hot stove procedure in disciplinary actions.