

# Free term paper on human resources

[Education](#), [Discipline](#)



## **Human resources**

### Introduction

Certainly, trail offs are likely to occur amongst personnel working across different contexts including organizations and business enterprises. For this reason, requisite procedures occur as crucial approaches utilized in finding solutions to such differences. Speaking of requisite procedures, this comprises of progressive discipline procedures, as well as the positive discipline procedures, which are disciplinary systems purposed at offering viable responses to problems aligned to conduct and discipline amongst employees. The progressive discipline procedure focuses mainly on according disciplinary measures on disobedient employees based on the severity and nature of their misconduct (Mathis, & Jackson, 2011). Precisely, disciplinary action on disobedient employees is carried out in a series of steps beginning with an oral warning. If the problem continues, such employees are suspended for some time without being given their benefits. Thereafter, a final warning is given to such employees if the problem continues with termination being the final step of the disciplinary action. On the other hand, positive discipline procedures mainly based on decision making whereby disobedient employees are suspended, and upon recalled they are asked to make a final decision whether they will change their code of conduct.

## **Similarities between progressive discipline procedure and the positive discipline procedure**

The progressive discipline procedure and the positive discipline procedure are similar in that the disciplinary actions are imposed progressively depending on the seriousness of the emerging employee problem. Precisely, seriousness accorded in tackling the problem increases depending on the severity of the problem. In addition, the two approaches purpose in regulating negative behaviours amongst employees by instilling positive discipline (Snell & Bohlander, 2012). In fact, both the disciplinary procedures motivate employees to voluntarily rectify their misconduct. As such, both result in an increase in employee performance levels for the better. Notably, procedures imposed by both procedures are dependent on several factors with regard to the uniqueness of various workplace situations. The similarity of the two procedures is also based on the fact that they both comprise of established communication systems that provide feedback to employees whom disciplinary actions (contained in the two disciplinary procedures) have been imposed on. Notable similarities are also evident in the two approaches based on the fact that the actions involve similar participants who are mainly composed of employees within similar organizational contexts.

## **Differences between progressive discipline procedure and the positive discipline procedure**

The progressive discipline approach is mainly founded on the premise that misconduct amongst employees must result in punishment. On the contrary, the positive discipline strategy is based on the premise that disobedience

must not necessarily result in punishment but rather should control negative attitudes and behaviours amongst employees in a bid to transform them to better employees (Mathis, & Jackson, 2011). For this purpose, as the progressive discipline strategy postulates for punishment and termination warnings against disobedient employees, it offers a mixture of employee rehabilitation and retribution techniques, which is rather undiplomatic and does not provide a platform for employees to address emerging concerns. In fact, negative punishment imposed by the approach offers short term solutions that may result in employee dissatisfaction. Consequently, employee productivity reduces, which reduces the competitive capability of business enterprises. Positive discipline approach is different in that it imposes corrective actions on disobedient employees that motivate them to change and improve their performance levels and that of their organizations. In addition, the progressive discipline approach mainly relies on managers to carry out monitoring and evaluation of employee actions. This is different from the positive discipline approach whereby employees are encouraged to monitor their behavior and take responsibility their actions (Snell & Bohlander, 2012). As a result, the use of progressive discipline encourages employees to deceive their managers or supervisors as they seek to create a positive reputation at the expense of correcting their actions for the mutual increase in their performance levels. Therefore, in the positive discipline approach, it is important to train supervisors on how to adequately counsel employees to take responsibility for their actions as they monitor themselves.

Differences also exist in the system of communication between the progressive discipline procedure and the positive discipline procedure. Within the progressive discipline approach, organizations develop a formalized communication system that gives an indication of employee performance. Precisely, employee supervisors keep articulated records of meetings held between them and employees, which give a reflection on the corrections that have occurred on misconduct previously existent amongst employees (Kulik, 2004). In the positive discipline approach, communication systems are mainly dependent on the decision making capabilities of employees. As such, the communication systems are mainly oral and emphasize on the need to instill positive behavior attitudes amongst employees. In fact, communication in the positive discipline approach occurs in the form of oral reminders and not reprimands as it is the case in the progressive discipline approach. Overall, notable differences exist in the two approaches is based on the fact that the progressive discipline approach relies on standardized procedures utilized in addressing misconduct amongst employees whereas procedures utilized in the positive discipline approach are flexible depending on the severity of misconduct amongst employees.

### **HR responsibilities in implementing employee disciplinary procedures**

Deductively, the progressive and positive discipline procedures purpose in providing constructive solutions related to employee misconduct. For this reason, the HR puts in various efforts aimed at facilitating the execution of procedures contained in the two approaches. The major responsibility of the HR is to honestly inform employees on the reasons for utilization of the

above connoted approaches, as this enables the employees face emerging problems and actions taken against them in a constructive manner (Snell & Bohlander, 2012). The HR articulates policies that act as guidelines for employees on the possible reasons that may warrant disciplinary action to be taken against their actions.

The HR further gives clear indications to employees on the recommended code of conduct amongst employees in order to ensure efficient, orderly, and safe execution of an organization's activities (Kulik, 2004). Due to the likelihood of occurrence of reprisals between supervisors and employees in implementation of both the progressive and positive discipline procedures, the HR is responsible for providing step review procedures, which offer platforms for employees to prepare a complaint case against rulings based on the two approaches. Overall, in implementation of progressive and positive discipline procedures, the HR is responsible for streamlining the whole process in order to ensure that is carried out in an objective manner.

### **Alternative approach in changing employee performance**

Failure of the progressive discipline procedure and the positive discipline procedure in changing employee behavior calls for the formulation of another approach that can increase employee performance levels. With advancement in technology, the electronic employee monitoring system offers a viable approach to track employee performance, which can be utilized as the alternative employee behavioral monitoring approach.

Precisely, the electronic system utilizes computer and telephone technology,

which is legitimate in controlling various forms of misconduct amongst employees.

## **Conclusion**

Deductively, employee misconduct within an organizational context occurs as a result of different behaviours attitudes amongst employees. For this reason, the progressive and positive discipline procedures offer progressive strategies aimed at correcting such misconducts and motivating employees to improve their performance levels. However, the changing trends in employee behavior call for development of other problem solving approaches that are more efficient in changing employee performance for the better.

## **Kulik, C. (2004). Human resource for the Non-HR manager. Boston: Taylor & Francis.**

Mathis, R., & Jackson, J. (2011). Human resource management: Essential perspectives. New York: Cengage Learning.

Snell, S., & Bohlander, G. (2012). Managing human resources. London: Cengage Learning.