

CERIAS Tech Report 2000-13

**“WHAT ARE YOU REALLY SAYING TO ME?”
ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE IN THE
WORKPLACE**

Mihaela Vorvoreanu, Carl H. Botan

Center for Education and Research in
Information Assurance and Security

&

Department of Communication, Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN 47907

“WHAT ARE YOU REALLY SAYING TO ME?”

ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE IN THE WORKPLACE

Paper Presented to the Conference of the
International Communication Association
Acapulco, Mexico
June 2000

CARL BOTAN
MIHAELA VORVOREANU
both of the
CENTER FOR EDUCATION AND RESEARCH IN
INFORMATION ASSURANCE AND SECURITY (CERIAS)
AND
DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION
PURDUE UNIVERSITY
CBOTAN@PURDUE.EDU
{HOMEPAGE} GO.TO/BOTAN
(765) 494-3319.

Panel co-sponsored by the Communication and Technology and the Information Systems Divisions. The work of Vorvoreanu, Holsapple and Botan has been supported by CERIAS grant #1419991431 from the Center for Education And Research in Information Security and Assurance at Purdue University.

INTRODUCTION

The rapid growth of new information technology in the workplace has made possible practices that a few short years ago were the domain of science fiction. One of the fastest growing of these is electronic surveillance, which often is advocated as a means of addressing security, productivity or quality needs. But electronic surveillance is a two-edged sword with unintended negative effects – **panoptic effects** – that may outweigh intended benefits. This paper seeks to address some important social/ethical/communication, and even economic consequences when new information technology is used, not as a tool controlled by workers, but as a tool for controlling them. After establishing the significance of this issue and defining terms, this section concludes by explaining why the workplace is the appropriate focus for research into the effects of electronic surveillance.

Significance

According to the 2000 American Marketing Association study of active [recording, storage, and review of voice, computer and video records only] workplace monitoring and surveillance, . . . nearly three-quarters of major U.S. firms (73.5%) record and review employee communications and activities on the job, including their phone calls, e-mail, internet connections, and computer files. The figure has doubled since 1997, when AMA inaugurated its annual survey, and has increased significantly over the past year. (p. 1)

In the mean time, total workplace monitoring [add SMDR of phones, keystroke counts and video security to the active surveillance figures above] has increased from “nearly two-thirds (63.4%)” in 1997 (AMA, 1997, p.1) to over 78% in 2000 (AMA, 2000).

In spite of how ubiquitous surveillance has become, little has been done to investigate or guard against the possibility that this increasingly common practice may have unintended negative effects in addition to whatever salutary effects are hoped for by those instituting surveillance. Diminishing personal privacy is probably the most ethically important of the panoptic effects resulting from surveillance

because it infringes upon the human right to a private identity and the decision-making autonomy based on it. Privacy researchers and advocacy groups, as well as many liberal arts and humanistic scholars, have begun to address this area of concern over the last decade. But there are many other kinds of panoptic effects – some that may even cancel out the goals of those advocating surveillance – that have not been substantively addressed.

Definitions

Botan and McCreadie (1993) began with the distinction between monitoring and surveillance made by Attewell (1987) and concluded that the term monitoring is generic and can be applied to all automated collecting of information about work, regardless of purpose. Monitoring produces information that can be used for everything from setting bonuses and keeping track of inventory to controlling individual employees. Surveillance, on the other hand, more narrowly refers to a relationship between some authority and those whose behavior it wishes to control (Rule & Brantley, 1992). Monitoring generates the information used in surveillance. All surveillance incorporates monitoring, but not all monitoring is used for surveillance.

Workplace Focus

Surveillance is more pervasive in the workplace than in other sectors of society for at least three reasons (Botan & McCreadie, 1993). First, today's information society is epitomized by an economy in which information handling plays a leading role. As a result workplaces are often already wired with information technologies that have the potential for surveillance. Second, surveillance procedures that would not be cost effective in some other contexts are in the workplace, largely because of economies of scale. In addition, the workplaces involved are not limited to profit-making ones. A political organization, for example, might choose to surveil its representatives to assure that its fundraising lists are not leaked. Third, the doctrine of employment at will, which is "based on the idea that the employer had [sic] the right to set virtually any condition of employment for those who accept his [sic] wages, and to fire any worker for any reason" (Donnelly, 1986, pp. 218-219), provides employers with the legal freedom and ideological justification to carry out surveillance.

THEORETIC FOUNDATIONS

This section of the paper summarizes some theoretic/conceptual foundations for studying panoptic effects. The third section briefly reviews previously published data and reports previously unpublished findings. The last section discusses some of the implications of the newly presented results.

Panopticon

A panopticon is a prison, workhouse, school, or medical facility in which all parts of the interior are visible from a single point because a central tower is surrounded by a circular building comprised of individual cells that are open on both ends (Mack, 1969). On the inward face, each cell is open to observation from the tower, and on the outward face it is open to the light. The effect is that each cell becomes a hollow shaft, illuminated from one end and open to observation on the other. Each cell is separated from each other cell by a solid wall so that occupants cannot communicate with each other. Windows in the tower allow an observer to see clearly into each cell, but light is blocked within the central tower so that its occupants are invisible from the cells. Cell occupants are always exposed to observation, isolated from each other, and unable to know whether they are being observed.

The panopticon creates a power relationship of the sort with which communication scholars have become increasingly concerned. This specialized kind of relationship is based on the contrast between the visible and the invisible--the latter also referred to as "unverifiable" by Foucault (1977). In a panoptic relationship cell occupants are vulnerable because they are visible, and that vulnerability is magnified by the invisibility of the observer. One of the effects of this relationship is that occupants have to act as if they are being watched, even when they are not.

The "electronic panopticon" is a metaphor used to describe how modern information technology is used today to impose the social power relationship described by Foucault on such dissimilar work places as data entry offices and the cabs of long distance truckers. Modern surveillance technology has, thereby, relieved those seeking greater power and control in the workplace of the need to construct special buildings and towers and has made it possible to extend panoptic relationships beyond the physical confines of a work site.

Social Power

The work of Raven and colleagues provides one theoretic explanation for the breathtaking increases in electronic surveillance in the information workplace reported by the AMA (2000). They basically suggested that surveillance feeds on, or propagates itself. Specifically, Raven and Kruglanski (1970) noted that one important aspect of French and Raven's earlier analysis is that when an influencing agent has coercive power and uses it, the agent in question will "tend to diminish and distrust the target" (Raven, 1993, p. 241). Raven explained that this is so because, "coercive power requires surveillance, compliance is attributed to the use of surveillance, and thus the target is judged as untrustworthy" (p. 241). Raven (1993) also said that:

Having used coercive power, along with surveillance, the power holder attributes any successful influence to the power holder, rather than the target, tending thereby to further devalue and distrust the target. Further influence attempts will be even more coercive, more distrusting, and will tend to further devalue the target, while assuming greater power, and greater privileged status for the power holder. (p. 242)

Components of Panoptic Effect

Botan and McCreadie (1990) suggest that how the panoptic effect works, and to what extent it works, is particular to each situation, but that an interaction of the same four elements, 1) employee perception of being surveilled, 2) surveillance potential of the technology, 3) management policy, and, 4) maturation, are involved.

Employees' perceptions that they are being surveilled are an essential element and actually create the panoptic effect through the internalization of the relationship that Foucault discussed. There can be surveillance without employees being aware of it, but not a panoptic effect. It should be noted that even in the absence of surveillance a suspicion of being surveilled could generate some panoptic effect.

Surveillance potential of the technology is an attribute of the technology itself and has four components:

a) how much the technology makes employees visible, b) how much the technology keeps the surveilling authority invisible, c) how detailed, and how permanent, a record is produced, what Zuboff (1988) called

textualizing, and d) how technologically driven the data analysis can be. These last two characteristics are important because it is often the supervisory time and cost of analyzing data, rather than difficulty in collecting data, that determines surveillance use and effectiveness. Management policy determines when technology that can be used for surveillance actually will be. Botan and McCreadie (1989) reviewed the Taylorist assumptions that often lead supervisors to use new technology to reduce jobs to their simplest and most repetitive level, that is to commodify information, and to strive for more and more control in order to achieve these purposes. Finally, maturation of the particular work situation determines how effectively surveillance technology becomes integrated with management policy, a process that takes time (Smith, 1989). This fourth component is closely related to management policy and might be collapsed into it.

Internal and External Effects

Panoptic effects can be both internal--the realization of vulnerability because of the visibility-invisibility contrast--and behavioral, the social behaviors undertaken, or not undertaken, in response to that perceived vulnerability. Panoptic effects, then, begin with the internalizing of a new power relationship but also include stress, and all the health ramifications associated with it, and other effects. Such other effects can include altered social relationships that can result both from the relative isolation often imposed by surveillance practices and from a subject's felt need to maintain aspects of privacy not yet under the control of the surveilled.

Effects include both those that are sought by the employer and those that are expected. Sought for effects, such as forcing employees to internalize of a new power relationship, carry an element of intent with them, so the ethical and practical issues associated with them are relatively clear for all to see. Unexpected panoptic effects should not be relegated to a secondary priority, however, because they may accumulate, unseen and unchecked, until their social or economic ramifications can no longer be ignored.

Surveillance is not an equal-opportunity endeavor, so its effects, both internal and external, are not equally distributed in society or in the workplace. Those holding certain kinds of jobs are disproportionately under surveillance. For example, the Office of Technological Assessment of the U.S.

Congress (1987) reported that. “Because monitoring is most likely to be applied to precisely these lower level jobs, work monitoring is a topic that especially affects women and minorities” (pp. 32-33).

Estimates vary, but many practitioners and researchers (c.f., Botan, 1996; Silberger, 1990) have suggested that as many as 85% of surveilled employees are women. Of course, with the rapid spread of surveillance found in the AMA survey, reported at the start of this paper, more and more males are being surveilled. Nevertheless, although gender equity may be coming by virtue of the emerging ubiquitousness of surveillance, it still disproportionately affects women and minorities, both internally and externally.

The obvious social, ethical and moral issues associated with the practice of electronic surveillance may not motivate those organizational decision makers who see themselves as “bottom-line” oriented to take this issue seriously, however. So the planned multi-year project that CERIAS is providing seed funding for also includes a number of variables that might best be described as “bottom-line” and may be of as much interest to corporate and public policy makers as to academics. Several of these are discussed in the next section.

RESULTS

Current work is aimed at developing approaches and methods that will best fit the study of the complex social phenomenon of panoptic effects. This complexity, of both the causes and outcomes of panoptic effects, has substantial implications for study in the area. For example, given the complex and embedded nature of privacy, uncertainty, and work place communication, it was reasonable to expect that any one factor, including surveillance, would explain only small proportions of variance. The findings, with high statistically significant but only small explained variance, supported this analysis.

High significance and low explained variance do not, in this case, suggest that the variables being studied are unimportant. Indeed, with several of the outcomes reported here interacting, and with literally millions of employees experiencing surveillance every day, even small effect sizes may be important for both individual employees and society (c.f., Frey, Botan & Kreps, 2000). It does, however, suggest that caution is warranted in attaching meaning to the results and that the question should probably be approached multi-methodologically. This section briefly reassesses results published by Botan in 1996

that were derived from a data set collected in 1990. Then, new and unpublished findings from that same database are reported. These newly reported findings take two forms, statistical tests of previously unreported “bottom-line” variables that suggest the possibility of meta-communication when surveillance is active, and more qualitative responses about both the meta-communicative and privacy aspects of surveillance.

Review of Previously Published Results

In 1996 Botan reported on a sample of 465 subjects. Statistically significant panoptic effects were found when employees who considered themselves to be heavily surveilled were compared to their counterparts who feel less surveilled including; a sense of lost privacy ($F = 14.98, p = <.001$), increased uncertainty about the work place ($F = 30.36, p = <.001$) and reduced work place communication ($F = 14.07, p = <.001$). A hypothesis of lowered self-esteem was not supported, however.

Previously unreported qualitative responses to an item asking subjects to “state briefly your feelings about being under surveillance at work” further inform at least the privacy results from that report. Many subjects did not respond to the open-ended item at the end of the mail questionnaire, but of those that did respond the largest number chose to address privacy; Table 1 reports selected responses. While some subjects felt that a certain level of surveillance is acceptable, most felt that surveillance is an invasion of their privacy and many expressed anger about it. Another theme in the responses was that surveillance is unproductive, often unnecessary, and may signal that other related management actions are in the offing. Subjects whose responses primarily addressed the meta-communication role of surveillance (discussed below, see Table 2) also address privacy within this broader context, however (see Table 2, Subject ID’s 135, 159, 186, 212, 253, 255, 369, 432, 444). In general, employees appear to feel that surveillance violates their privacy rights and they are both worried about this and resentful of it.

Meta-Communication

The meta-communication role of electronic surveillance may be one of its most important dimension. For example, in the single study reported here, more heavily surveilled employees differed from their less heavily surveilled counterparts in believing more strongly that the organization values

quantity over quality ($F = 11.53, p = <.001$). Some qualitative responses also addressed this meta-communication (Table 2, Subject ID's 136, 281, 300, 308). This finding should motivate managers to attend to the issue of surveillance as meta-communication because it suggests that surveillance initiatives -- often adopted as part of corporate quality improvement drives -- act as a meta-communication that may actually undercut the very quality efforts the drives were intended to serve.

Surveillance communicates messages to employees that management [may or] may not intend to send. For example, the overwhelming meta-message that surveillance seems to send to employees is that they are distrusted (see Table 2, Subject ID's 21, 42, 70, 83, 114, 133, 137, 165, 170, 178, 182, 191, 194, 216, 223, 245, 258, 265, 277, 291, 340, 388, 396, 401, 409, 413, 415, 426, 434, 439, 440, 450 and Table 1, Subject ID's 83, 194, 329, 363, 412). In a closely related interpretation, many employees see surveillance as setting someone, possibly themselves, up for dismissal or discipline (Table 2, Subject ID's 16, 19, 36, 38, 158, 163, 208, 224, 265, 298). For employees to perceive themselves as distrusted when surveilled is entirely consistent with the Social Power theory perspective discussed above.

Many subjects also perceive surveillance as implying that management feels they deserve to be treated as children (Table 2, ID's 34, 137, 160, 227, 253, 267, 328, 329, 449) and heavily surveilled employees reported reduced motivation to do more *quantity* of work ($F = 15.79, p = <.001$) and reduced motivation to do higher *quality* work ($F = 9.23, p = <.002$). Finally, heavily surveilled subjects reported reduced loyalty to the organization ($F = 4.09, p = .044$), increased stress at work ($F = 7.26, p = .007$), and reduced enthusiasm about even going to work ($F = 9.91, p = <.002$), all of which are supported by qualitative comments reported in Table 2 (e.g., reduced loyalty 64; increased stress, 16, 36, 64, 127, 134, 137, 191, 310, 426; reduced enthusiasm, 134, 218). Some of the implications of these results are discussed in our other paper on this panel (Vorvoreanu & Botan, 2000).

Limitations

In addition to the earlier comments about the age of the data base and the small explained variances found in the statistical tests, there are several alternative hypotheses that could explain the consistent discrepancy between the perceptions of heavily surveilled and less heavily surveilled

employees. For example, subjects may start with a belief that the organization values quantity of work more than quality, and this could lead to a perception of being surveilled, rather than the other way around. Subjects could also feel that their employer treats them like children or distrusts them with or without surveillance, so they naturally see surveillance as confirming that previous judgment. In short, although strengthened considerably by the comments reported in Tables 1 and 2, the correlation between perceiving oneself as heavily surveilled and the employer as distrusting, or treating employees in an insulting manner, does not establish a causal relationship between the two. These and other limitations are being addressed in current work on this project.

CONCLUSION

If employees interpret surveillance as telling them that the employer sees them as so child-like, untrustworthy, or dishonest that they need to be watched electronically, they may well feel the need to come to terms with these messages. One theoretic tool for predicting how this might play out, Equity Theory, is being discussed in our other paper on this panel (Vorvoreanu & Botan, 2000). This theory suggests that employees who feel their relationship with the employer has been altered, and that what they have to invest (now including a surrender of previously established levels of privacy AND accepting being treated as child-like or dishonest) is no longer equitably balanced by the returns they get from the relationship, may feel the need to take equally unilateral steps toward rebalancing the relationship. This would explain the lower levels of loyalty and enthusiasm for going into work reported above. The resistance scholarship also suggests that surveillance can contribute to increased absenteeism, turnover, vandalism, and information security breeches, among other costly panoptic effects.

The effect of surveillance on workplace communication was discussed by Botan (1996) and deserves special mention. Botan reported that the more employees feel surveilled, the less they feel that they receive adequate feedback on their job performance. In addition, the more employees feel that they are surveilled, the less they feel that they have the opportunity to communicate with fellow employees, either about needed job information or in small group settings. This result is consistent with employees'

being isolated within the virtual cells of an electronic panopticon and suggests that electronic surveillance may damage workplace communication.

The supervisors of those who report reduced communication with supervisors and peers may come to rely more and more on surveillance, as Social Power theory suggests. If this happens, there is the potential for what might be called a vicious cycle of panoptic effects. In such a cycle, predictable panoptic effects lead to more surveillance and, therefore, to increasing panoptic effects. Such a cycle may have an aggregate effect on both communication and other organizational communication practices.

Effects beyond the organizational level are not the focus of this panel, but there are possible economic and societal-level panoptic effects that deserve attention. The fact that other developed countries typically have substantially more social and industrial relations policy addressing the matter of electronic surveillance than the United States suggests that they may see reasons for concern about ethical issues, practical issues, or both. For example, Flaherty (1989) studied surveillance and privacy in Germany, Sweden, France, and Canada before concluding that “the United States carries out data protection differently than other countries, and on the whole does it less well . . .” (p. 305). Indeed, some aspects of trade with the European Community have recently become imperiled by what many Europeans see as a lack of reasonable privacy protections in the United States (Weise, 1998).

If other developed countries are right in their caution, the United States could be setting its feet upon a slippery slope by not researching panoptic effects or addressing the broad questions involved, including privacy, ethics, productivity and work quality. In addition, if the kind of self-propagating effect Social Power theorists have hypothesized at the organizational level also operates at the societal level, the slope may be getting more steep and slippery as more employers come to rely on electronic surveillance without even realizing why they are doing so. It would seem that substantially more research is needed about possible mass-level panoptic effects of the surreptitious surveillance being practiced millions of times each day by the upwards of 78% of American corporations that surveil.

References

American Marketing Association (2000). *Workplace Monitoring & Surveillance: Summary of Key Findings*. American Marketing Association: 1601 Broadway, NY, NY. <http://www.amanet.org>.

American Marketing Association (1997). *Electronic Monitoring & Surveillance*. American Marketing Association: 1601 Broadway, NY, NY. <http://www.amanet.org>.

Attewell, P. (1987). Big Brother and the sweatshop: Computer surveillance in the automated office. *Sociological Theory*, *5*, 87-99.

Botan, C. (1996). Communication work and electronic surveillance: A model for predicting panoptic effects. *Communication Monographs*, *63*, 294-313.

Botan, C. H., & McCreadie, M. H. (1993). Communication, information, and surveillance: Separation and control in organizations. In B. Ruben & J. Schement (Eds.), *Information and Behavior*, *IV*, New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Botan, C. H., & McCreadie, M. H. (1990). *Panopticon: Workplace of the information society*. Paper presented to the International Communication Association Conference, Dublin, Ireland.

Botan, C. H., & McCreadie, M. H. (1989). *Separating minds from hands: Information technology and policy in the work place*. Paper presented to the American Society for Information Science Annual Conference, Washington, and D.C..

Donnelly, H. (1986, March 21). Privacy in the workplace. *Editorial Research Reports*, *1*(11), p. 214.

Flaherty, D. (1989). *Protecting privacy in surveillance societies*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punishment: The birth of prisons* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). New York: Pantheon (Original work published 1975).

Frey, L. H., Botan, C. H., and Kreps, G. (2000). *Investigating Communication* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Garson, B. (1988). The Electronic Sweatshop: How Computers Are Transforming the Office of the Future Into the Factory of the Past. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Mack, M. P. (1969). A Bentham reader. New York: Pergamon.

Raven, B. H., (1993). The bases of Power: Origins and Recent Developments. Journal of Social Issues, 49, 227-251.

Raven, B. H., & Kruglanski, A. W. (1970). Conflict and power. In P. G. Swingle (Ed.), The structure of conflict (pp. 69-109). New York: Academic Press.

Rule, J., & Brantley, P. (1992). Computerized surveillance in the workplace: Forms and distributions. Sociological Forum, 7, 405-423.

Silberger, K. (1990, September 18). The electronic snitch: The dark side. Village Voice, 35, p. 83.

Smith, M. R. (1989, May/June). Technologizing office work. Society, 26, 65-72.

U. S. Congress, Office of Technology Assessment (1987). The Electronic Supervisor: New Technology, New Tensions. (OTA Publication No. OTA-CIT-333). Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Vorvoreanu, M., & Botan, C. H. (2000). Examining Electronic Surveillance In The Workplace: A Review Of Theoretical Perspectives And Research Findings. Paper presented at the International Communication Association Conference, Acapulco, Mexico.

Weise, E. (Oct. 21, 1998) EU privacy paradigm may lock U.S. firms out. USA Today. p. 6d.

Zuboff, S. (1988). In the age of the smart machine: The future of work and power. New York: Basic Books.

Table 1: Selected Privacy-Centered Responses to Item
 “Please state briefly your feelings about being under surveillance at work”

ID	Feelings
4	I believe that right to privacy is slowly chipped away and the work place is the starting point of this process
38	I feel it's a direct invasion of privacy which I feel will be used in the future to get rid of selected employees for various reasons, a tool for the company to control employees
73	Surveillance is an invasion of privacy for harassment of employees and to increase quantity of work not quality
83	I feel it is an invasion of my privacy & shows how little respect my company has for my honesty & integrity. The worst jobs given to best people.
101	I feel it is a violation of my rights
105	Surveillance is fine as long as it has to do with security, but when it's used to gather information for increased productivity or monitor an individual employee's work habits I find it an invasion of privacy
120	Surveillance at work is an invasion of privacy. It is used more for disciplinary reasons rather than constructive ones.
138	'Surveillance' that I know about is OK. It is the surveillance that I don't know about that is totally unacceptable!
140	I feel it would cause undue stress on me. It is an invasion of my privacy. I would have enthusiasm for my job and respect for my employers.
149	If someone wants to come out and check on me, or my work, and I know it, fine. I don't want to be subjected to someone hiding or secretly watching me.
194	Invasion of my privacy. Waste of money better spent. Shows company has no trust in employees.
215	As a US citizen I feel that any surveillance on me w/out my permission is a violation of my freedoms as guaranteed by the Constitution. [my company] ROUTINELY uses cameras, video and audio monitors thru their security dept.
219	G. Orwell at it's 'finest'. Complete disregard for our constitution and all the principles for which many people died 200 years ago. Freedom and privacy are quickly vanishing in many areas of all of our lives.
226	I think it's an invasion of privacy everyone knows their job & shouldn't have to be watched.
262	It is definitely an invasion of privacy that, given corporate America's unethical behavior, could be used against employees to threaten, suspend & even terminate workers.
272	Non-productive, invasion of privacy, petty & costly.
282	I think it is an unnecessary infringement of my privacy.
297	To be under surveillance is an invasion of my privacy, and feel it is used against the employee.
305	I do feel it is an invasion of my privacy and I resent it. I also feel that there could be other ways in which they could observe us.
308	Telephone monitoring is an invasion of privacy & abused personal calls are monitored. Surveillance

ID	Feelings
	has already lead to emphasis on quantity, they don't care how you get rid of the work as long as it's done.
319	I feel that it is an invasion of my privacy and it should be against the law.
323	We should have a right to privacy.
328	I feel that a person of my experience does not need sneaking about to check on my work or need a babysitter. It is an invasion into the privacy of the work ethic.
329	Childish -prison- invades my privacy - we are adult. I conduct myself as an adult this stupidious is uncalled for being treated like a kindergarten school or prison.
338	I personally feel being under surveillance gives a lot of stress when stress is already taken from customer complaints all day.
343	Positively invasion of privacy. Not necessary.
350	There is a fine line between surveillance and observation & supervision. I feel that surveillance is an invasion of privacy while the latter is a necessity in many cases to insure quality, productive work operation.
356	I feel it's an invasion of my privacy. Also I feel why should the superiors know when and how many times a person goes into a building.
363	I feel it is an invasion of privacy & it promotes a lack of trust.
412	I am an accountable human being in all aspects of my job, the company will never understand this because I'm not management. This is an invasion of my privacy!
422	I believe it's a legal invasion of privacy that should be made illegal.
424	I think it sucks. It's an invasion of privacy!
435	Invasion of my privacy

Table 2: Selected Meta-Communication Centered Responses to Item
 “Please state briefly your feelings about being under surveillance at work”

ID	Feelings
16	I feel the company is selectively using the monitoring as a means to weed out who THEY consider potential troublemakers and apply unneeded pressure to people that make this company run
21	I feel that I am not trusted
34	I am not child on work in the USSR
36	It creates stress while working on terminal, after each transaction, the time is displayed. Makes me wonder who is watching and why.
38	I feel it's a direct invasion of privacy which I feel will be used in the future to get rid of selected employees for various reasons, a tool for the company to control employees
42	... Personal surveillance to me is an indication of mistrust and an insult having an absolute negative effect on my job performance, interest, and relationship with management
64	Surveillance at work leads to stress, discontent. It makes employees feel not ... If company has no faith in employees why should employees be loyal. I want to do the job. I consider myself mature adult and feel I should be treated in that manner.
70	Pay and trust employees. More surveillance is a product of paranoia.
83	I feel it is an invasion of my privacy & shows how little respect my company has for my honesty & integrity. The worst jobs given to best people.
114	I would probably retire! That is in my opinion the ultimate of distrust!
127	Degrading, inhumane, non-productive and unhealthy
133	If I was I don't think I would feel trusted at work anymore.
134	Since we've gone to this system, there has been a noticeable increase in tension on the job, a feeling of dehumanization. Just don't enjoy going to work anymore. Can't wait to get out.
135	Don't like the idea at all, it reminds me of the book 1984, where Big Brother is always watching you.
136	You can't work efficiently while having to look back over your shoulder for surveillance. Ridiculous time estimates for each job lead to shortcuts & poor quality work in order to look good on paper.
137	I'm always stressed out, feels like they don't trust me. I feel like a little girl, I do a good job so stop bugging me. When there's only one supervisor on I feel at peace. Knowing they're not listening in on me.
158	I dislike the form of surveillance they do & how easy it is for them to abuse this information when they choose to. I'm more concerned about other types of surveillance, that can be done without a person's knowledge or consent.
159	Constant visual surveillance is irritating, although some is acceptable. Electronic surveillance is insulting and frightening. It smacks of a Big Brother concept that has no place in the USA. Trend towards ES is abhorrent.
160	I don't feel it's necessary since we are not children that have to be checked on.

ID	Feelings
163	I think the company will use this as a way to let people go, or to reduce job titles.
165	They took the word trust out of trustworthy.
170	I feel that testing should be under surveillance to a degree. But I do not like my work load itself being watched, I feel somewhat distrusted.
178	If I can't be trusted after 23 years then I shouldn't be here. I'm not a person just a number.
182	It is a sign of mistrust.
186	I feel like 'Big Brother is watching.' Like we are slowly reverting back to the 30's & it's difficult to do the job right while looking over your shoulder.
191	Surveillance at work create added stress on the job. You can't give your best if you are not trusted.
194	Invasion of my privacy. Waste of money better spent. Shows company has no trust in employees.
201	I feel it's a violation of human rights & human dignity. The capitalist has all the power to do whatever he wants
208	I feel that we are going back to the early 1900's before we had unions. Also I believe that they will try to use surveillance info to fire people to reduce the workforce and increase profits.
212	Keep the KGB in Russia "Big Brother". Surveillance sucks in America.
216	Makes me feel company can't trust employees - makes me feel like a machine - not human.
218	It demoralizes me and my fellow workers. It makes you hate to have to go to work every day. Management has no respect for us.
219	G. Orwell at it's 'finest'. Complete disregard for our constitution and all the principles for which many people died 200 years ago. Freedom and privacy are quickly vanishing in many areas of all of our lives.
223	If the company doesn't trust me after 38 years, then they should have fired me long ago. Lack of understanding and trust!
224	I don't think it's a good idea b/c if someone (a boss) doesn't like you they can build a case & fire you. Besides, I already am beginning to think I live in a police state. They are slowly but surely taking our rights away.
227	Too much stress not knowing if boss is looking or not. Can't do job properly and feel like a kid, especially when you see the boss goofing off a lot.
245	ANY ONE feel pressured and self-conscious when someone watches over their shoulder, and you don't feel trusted. A trusted, good working ADULT doesn't have to be watched.
253	I am a mature woman - I don't need a mother or big sister for my boss - boss is insecure & resents lack of employee control.
255	I feel like 'Big Brother' is watching me (1984 by O. Wells)
258	At times it feels like I'm working for the CIA where no one can be trusted.
265	The word surveillance and its meaning alone give off the feeling that you're not being trusted. You must be watched and your conversation documented for future use to eliminate another worker.

ID	Feelings
267	I think I am an adult & I do my work as well as anyone - I do not need direct supervision or surveillance or monitoring.
277	I see no reason for surveillance on my job. If they don't trust me they should say so.
281	Management is looking for quantity and care nothing for quality - everything is a numbers game.
291	It is nauseating and insulting. It aids in perpetrating the distrust and tension between employee/company.
298	Most of the time I don't care. What is annoying is the reason, which is to have someone to blame if something is wrong.
*300	I agree with your last statement. Surveillance would lead to too much emphasis on quantity not quality. (*Subject appears to be referencing the last item on the Likert-style questionnaire. See quantitative results reported in results section, others do not appear to have interpreted the questionnaire as a statement of researcher preferences.)
308	Telephone monitoring is an invasion of privacy & abused personal calls are monitored. Surveillance has already lead to emphasis on quantity, they don't care how you get rid of the work as long as it's done.
310	I understand its necessity in the business. However, it is stressful and demeaning.
328	I feel that a person of my experience does not need sneaking about to check on my work or need a babysitter. It is an invasion into the privacy of the work ethic.
329	Childish -prison- invade my privacy - we are adult. I conduct myself as an adult this stupidious is uncalled for being treated like a kindergarten school or prison.
340	I feel as though I am looked upon as an untrustworthy person. I realize there are always individuals who can't be trusted but surveillance puts me in the same category.
369	Big Brother!!!
374	Don't like the idea - would make me feel like a criminal - always being watched.
375	The only reports are to point fingers at other craftsmen, to make the reporters people look good (better). Negative feedback.
388	If I'm not trusted, why am I here?
396	It tends to intimidate you to the point that you concentrate more on surveillance than your actual duties. You start to distrust more people to the point that you isolate yourself from others.
400	I believe it is unnecessary and demeaning.
401	Employer doesn't trust, respect me or have confidence in me when they surveil. People are most creative when they are not under pressure.
405	It sucks. Working for [employer] is like being employed by Adolph Hitler. "Zig Heil"
409	Creates a suspicious atmosphere. Loyalty is questionable. Your thought of us as a number not as an individual. No enjoyment of work. Distrustful of management statements.
413	It gives the feeling of not being trusted. I feel imprisoned in my job.
415	It is counterproductive. Because it causes distrust for both sides and if monitor system is set for

ID	Feelings
	marginal limits that's all that will be met, lowering quality standards.
426	Surveillance causes tremendous stress and distrust between the workforce & management. To me they don't trust me to do my job after 20 years - I cannot produce for someone who does not trust me!
432	It's like being in a [?] spy novella, being watched and listened to all day. And I'm one of the good guys. Is this what Hoover's FBI was all about?
434	It means your employer doesn't trust you.
439	Shows mistrust to the employee.
440	I have a feeling of not being trusted to do my job.
444	Big Brother is watching you! No one gains from this method except perhaps nosey foremen. Abuse of phones should be directed to the guilty - they are evident without electronics!
449	I find it extremely childish - like being in school - certainly not conducive to creating good will between clerks & management. I am self motivated I do not need constant supervision to do my work!
450	Surveillance makes the employee feel mistrusted, unappreciated, and irresponsible in the eyes of the employer.