PROCEDURAL FAIRNESS AND ATTITUDES TOWARD ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE
AS PREDICTORS OF ORGANIZATIONAL TRUST AND WORKPLACE RELATIONSHIPS:
FRIEND OR FOE?

A Thesis

by

CARI ELIZABETH LOEFFLER

BA, Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi, 2013

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in

COMMUNICATION

Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi
Corpus Christi, Texas

May 2022

PROCEDURAL FAIRNESS AND ATTITUDES TOWARD ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE
AS PREDICTORS OF ORGANIZATIONAL TRUST AND WORKPLACE RELATIONSHIPS:
FRIEND OR FOE?

A Thesis

by

CARI ELIZABETH LOEFFLER

This thesis meets the standards for scope and quality of
Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi and is hereby approved.

Dr. Michael Sollitto, PhD   Dr. Michelle Maresh-Fuehrer, PhD
Chair   Committee Member

May 2022

ABSTRACT

The rapid and unplanned transition to remote work during the COVID-19 pandemic left employers scrambling to find ways to monitor employee productivity resulting in the increased use of electronic monitoring and surveillance (EMS) technologies to track and observe their employees' activity from afar. Using uncertainty management theory (UMT) as a framework, this study explored how organizational members' procedural fairness judgements and their attitudes towards surveillance impacts organizational trust and the communication that occurs within their supervisor-subordinate and peer coworker relationships. UMT is based on the premise that people use their overall perceptions of fair treatment as a substitute for interpersonal trust when deciding how to react to requests or demands in social situations, including interactions within organizations. Participants completed an online survey assessing their attitudes toward surveillance, perceptions of procedural fairness, leader communication exchange, and cooperative communication. Results revealed that formal treatment predicted positive attitudes toward surveillance and trust in top management. Formal and informal decision making, informal treatment, and positive attitudes toward surveillance predicted trust in immediate supervisors. Informal treatment predicted professional trust, professional development, affective, verbal communication, nonverbal communication, and accessibility dimensions of leader communication exchange. As EMS technology advances, organizations must rationalize and clarify the reasoning behind monitoring organizational members.

Keywords: attitudes toward surveillance, cooperative communication, electronic performance monitoring, leader communication exchange, organizational trust

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

Introduction

On March 11, 2020, the World Health Organization announced that due to the alarming spread and severity, the COVID-19 outbreak would be classified as a pandemic and urged governments to scale up their responses to contain the virus (World Health Organization, 2020). As COVID-19 continued spreading, governments worldwide implemented social distancing measures and nationwide lockdowns that necessitated the shutting down of all activities requiring human gathering and interaction (Aloisi & Stefano, 2020; De et al., 2020; Malik et al., 2020). The lockdown restrictions resulted in a digital surge as individuals adjusted to new ways of life and worked via digital means (Aloisi & Stefano, 2020; De' et al., 2020; Malik et al., 2020).

The COVID-19 pandemic posed a severe threat to organizations' financial stability and organizational members' physical and mental health. In efforts to slow the spread of the virus and minimize potential adverse impacts, many organizations implemented pay cuts, hiring freezes, furloughs, lay-offs, and mandatory remote work policies (Malik et al., 2020). The rapid and unplanned transition to remote work left employers scrambling to find ways to monitor employee productivity resulting in the increased use of electronic monitoring and surveillance (EMS) technologies to track and observe their employees' activity from afar (Aloisi & Stefano, 2020; Jeske, 2022; Malik et al., 2020). It is generally considered good practice for managers to review their subordinates' performance and gather information on their workplace activities (Ball, 2010). However, issues regarding workplace surveillance arise when monitoring goes beyond what is necessary or reasonable, when organizations demand precise information regarding how employees spend their time, and when the implementation of monitoring disrupts working practices or negatively impacts existing levels of autonomy, trust, or control (Ball, 2010, 2021).

1

The sudden shift to remote work has resulted in a digital acceleration of EMS technologies that otherwise may have taken decades to occur (Aloisi & Stefano, 2020; De'et al., 2020; Holland & Tham, 2020; Jeske, 2022). EMS technologies will likely continue to play a pervasive role in the workplace, raising concerns regarding privacy and potential deleterious psychological and behavioral effects of surveillance on organizational members (Aloisi & Stefano, 2020; Jeske, 2022; Malik et al., 2020). The ambiguity regarding the duration of the pandemic has resulted in increased anxiety, concerns for personal and family health and wellbeing, financial insecurities, and uncertainty for employees regarding their status and futures in their organizations (Malik et al., 2020).

Researchers have found that factors such as lay-offs, restructuring, and increased use of EMS technologies in the workplace have resulted in negative emotional and behavioral responses for employees, such as decreased trust and increased levels of suspicion and fear, and employee misconduct (Holland et al., 2015; Malik et al., 2020). Using uncertainty management theory (UMT) as a framework, this study will explore how organizational members' fairness judgements and attitudes towards surveillance on organizational trust and the communication that occurs within their supervisor-subordinate and peer coworker relationships (Colquitt & Zipay, 2015; Malik et al., 2020; van de Bos & Lind, 2002).

UMT is based on the premise that people use their overall perceptions of fair treatment as a substitute for interpersonal trust when deciding how to react to requests or demands in social situations, including interactions within organizations (van den Bos, 2001; van den Bos & Lind, 2002). According to UMT, fairness judgments become more salient for individuals when they experience unpredictable or uncertain events (van den Bos, 2001; van den Bos & Lind, 2002). Fairness judgments are essential to organizational members because they can serve as a

substitute for trust when they do not have information regarding an authority's trustworthiness (Lind, 2001; van den Bos, 2001; van den Bos & Lind, 2002). In other words, fairness judgements allow organizational members to manage their uncertainty when they lack necessary information regarding the trustworthiness of an authority figure, process, policy, or outcome (Lind, 2001; van den Bos, 2001, van den Bos & Lind, 2002).

For various reasons, this study is of practical concern for organizations, managers, and organizational members (Society for Human Resources Management, 2019). First, EMS is an ongoing concern for organizational members. In an era in which it is easier than ever for organizations to examine the work behaviors of their members, those members must account for the extent to which their activities are seen by their authority figures (Walker, 2017). Second, fairness matters to organizational members (Blader & Tyler, 2003a, 2003b; Colquitt & Rodell, 2015). Of all the experiences people have in their organizations, they want fair treatment and a voice in the activities they perform, and knowledge of how those activities will be assessed and used by their organizations (Ball, 2021). Third, the world is uncertain, with organizational members facing unfathomable new complexities every week (Christianson & Barton, 2021). Therefore, organizational members desire humane treatment in the face of EMS. Fourth, managers and organizational members must constantly navigate their work environments to ensure effective productivity and personal fulfillment. Therefore, results from this investigation can prove helpful for organizational members struggling to make sense of their complex work environments while relating to and collaborating with their supervisors and colleagues.

In addition to the practical reasons, this study is of theoretical importance. First, this investigation extends UMT by associating it with organizational members' communication behaviors. Second, this study follows in a recent resurgence of EMS research, stimulated by the

3

COVID-19 pandemic, by situating it within the UMT framework to describe how organizational members fairness perceptions affects their attitudes towards EMS. Third, the present study will expand EMS research by examining the relationship between organizational members' attitudes towards EMS, trust in management, and their communication behaviors within their workplace relationships through the theoretical lens of UMT. Lastly, the findings from this study can be integrated into existing literature on trust in management and cooperative communication.

Introduction Summary

The introduction provided a background of organizations increased and expanded use electronic monitoring and surveillance (EMS) technologies to track their organizational members. The COVID-19 Pandemic accelerated organizations' use of EMS, resulting in questions about fairness and how EMS technologies would affect organizational members' workplace relationships.

CHAPTER II

Literature Review

Literature Review Introduction

The literature review begins by introducing uncertainty management theory (UMT) as an explanatory framework for the effect of EMS on organizational members' supervisory and peer coworker relationships. Following that, literature about electronic performance monitoring (EPM), organizational trust, leader communication exchange, and cooperative communication is discussed.

Uncertainty Management Theory

The study of uncertainty as a communication construct began with the conceptualization of uncertainty reduction theory (URT). URT attempts to explain and predict the communication behaviors of individuals as they experience and respond to uncertainty that occurs in the initial encounters of individuals (Berger & Calabrese, 1975). According to Berger and Calabrese (1975), uncertainty is a cognitive process that occurs when individuals are presented with several possible alternate explanations or predictions. Likewise, "Uncertainty constitutes a lack of confidence in one's perceptions of interpersonal relations, which is reflected in the inability of partners to describe, explain, or predict one another's behavior" (Theiss, 2018, p. 4). URT is based on the premise that uncertainty is an aversive experience for people, and when faced with it, they become motivated to seek information to reduce their uncertainty (Berger & Calabrese, 1975; Bradac, 2001).

Interpersonal relationships are constituted and evolve through the communication between partners (Knobloch, 2008; Theiss, 2018). Interpersonal communication serves as a tactic for reducing uncertainty and is affected by uncertainty reduction (Berger & Calabrese, 1975;

5

Knobloch, 2008; 2014). Berger and Calabrese (1975) proposed that individuals' initial

interactions focus on reducing uncertainty as they communicate to gain clarity about themselves,

their partner, and the environment. During the initiation of relationships, individuals

communicate in ways that are likely to decrease the uncertainty they experience, and uncertainty

reduction is positively related to relationship development (Berger & Bradac, 1982; Berger &

Calabrese, 1975; Knobloch, 2008).

Over time URT evolved to explain how people use communication in a goal-directed

manner to collect information about themselves, others, and their environment to reduce their

uncertainty and evolve their already established relationships (Knobloch, 2008; Theiss, 2018).

Relationship development is conceptualized as coordinated achievement between partners, and

URT explains how people navigate and coordinate, both individually and dyadically, the

emotions and cognitions that lead to communication behaviors that progress the development of

their relationship (Solomon & Vangelisti, 2014).

URT identifies two distinct types of uncertainty that occur within interpersonal

communication interactions: cognitive uncertainty (questions related to their own and their

partner's beliefs) and behavioral uncertainty (questions related to their own and their partner's

behaviors) (Knobloch & McAninch, 2014). According to Berger (1979), three contextual factors

will increase the likelihood people will engage in information-seeking behavior; their partner

deviates from their normative behavior, they anticipate they will communicate with the partner

again soon, or the rewards and costs of the relationship are controlled by their partner.

Interpersonal communication is the primary way people attempt to reduce their

uncertainty by acquiring knowledge through information-seeking behaviors (Knobloch, 2008).

URT describes three types of information-seeking strategies individuals use to reduce their

uncertainty in interpersonal interactions: passive, active, and interactive (Berger, 1979; Berger &

Bradac, 1982; Knobloch & McAninch, 2014). Passive information-seeking refers to observing

the target of one's uncertainty without any direct interaction (Knobloch & McAninch, 2014).

Active information-seeking strategies involve gaining information about the target by

communicating with others or structuring the environment to observe the target in the produced

situation (Knobloch & McAninch, 2014).

Interactive information-seeking strategies require individuals to interact directly with the

target by asking them questions or soliciting reciprocated disclosures (Knobloch & McAninch,

2014). Each type of strategy presents different levels of risk and rewards for the individual

seeking information (Knobloch & McAninch, 2014). Passive information strategies require

minimal effort and risk but are not very effective for obtaining information about the target

(Knobloch & McAninch, 2014). Active strategies involve more effort and risk, but the

information seeker has greater control over the information gained (Knobloch & McAninch,

2014). Interactive strategies involve the most effort and risk and offer the most efficient

strategies for gaining specific information (Knobloch & McAninch, 2014).

Uncertainty is omnipresent within organizations, and organizational members may

experience and respond to uncertainty on the interpersonal, group, and organizational levels

(Lester, 1987; Kramer, 2016). Over the years, URT has been used to examine the experience of

uncertainty in various contexts, including how individuals experience and respond to uncertainty

in organizational settings (Knobloch & McAninch, 2014; Kramer, 2004, 2016). Organizational

scholars define uncertainty as the perceived lack of information, knowledge, beliefs, and feelings

necessary for accomplishing goals (Driskill & Goldstein, 1986). Clampitt and Williams (2017)

stated that uncertainty occurs when people experience doubts in judging the past, assessing the present, and predicting the future.

Although organizational members experience uncertainty throughout their time with an organization, newcomers are especially likely to experience intense uncertainty as they anticipate and join an organization for the first time (Jablin, 1982; Kramer, 2016). Upon entering organizations, members are faced with uncertainty about how to perform their tasks (technical uncertainty), the standards for performing their tasks (referent uncertainty), associating with their coworkers and supervisors (social uncertainty), feedback about their performance (appraisal uncertainty), the organization's culture (normative uncertainty), the organization's functioning (organizational uncertainty), and who has true power in the organization (political uncertainty) (Morrison, 1995, 2002). These seven types of uncertainty necessitate uncertainty management for organizational members to navigate their surroundings (Morrison, 1995, 2002). Therefore, scholars have focused on exploring uncertainty experienced by organizational members throughout the assimilation process of joining and eventually leaving organizations (Jablin, 2001; Kramer, 2016).

Over time scholars discovered several limitations of URT. URT fails to account for how individuals are not always motivated to engage in information-seeking to reduce their uncertainty and that information-seeking can lead to increased rather than decreased uncertainty (Kramer, 2004; Kramer, 2018). Communication scholars have since shifted their efforts to explore the various strategies people use to manage their uncertainties (Kramer, 2018). Uncertainty management is defined as "the process by which individuals create meaning or understanding in situations in which something is unpredictable, unusual, unexpected or out of the ordinary occurs and when there is a need to determine the appropriate meaning" (Kramer, 2018).

Kramer (1999) reconceptualized URT to develop the motivation to reduce uncertainty (MRU) model. The MRU model explains how people experience different levels of motivation to reduce uncertainty and competing goals can result in people engaging in specific communication behaviors to manage their uncertainty (Kramer, 1999). Kramer (2004) further expanded on the MRU model to develop a complex and comprehensive theory of managing uncertainty (TMU) model to describe the processes of managing uncertainty interactions within organizations. The TMU model included several key points to address the limitations associated with the initial conceptualization of URT, including the addition of the following components: cognitive attempts at managing uncertainty without information-seeking (ex. scripts, schemas, denying the uncertainty, tolerating uncertainty, and imagined interactions), competing motives that may prevent an individual from seeking info (ex. impression management, or politeness norms), the impact of information seeking on uncertainty may result in reducing, changing, maintain, or even increasing an individual's uncertainty, and the impact of additional contextual factors on information seeking behaviors (ex. source of uncertainty) (Kramer, 2004; Kramer, 2009; Kramer, 2018).

Uncertainty is an aversive experience that affects a person's cognitions, perceptions, feelings, and behaviors, and fairness matters to organizational members because it provides a means for them to manage their uncertainty (van de Bos & Lind, 2002). According to the fairness heuristic theory, all relationships, including those found within organizations, involve repeated encounters with the fundamental social dilemma (Lind, 2001). Lind (2001) defined the fundamental social dilemma as the tensions individuals experience as they attempt to balance their desire to identify with others and sacrifice their immediate self-interests for the common good and the risk of being exploited by others. Organizational members are concerned with

linking their identity in a relationship, role, or organization due to potential issues associated with their social identity and social interdependence should rejection occur (Lind, 2001).

Fairness heuristics provide shortcuts for responding to requests in social situations, allowing individuals to focus their cognitive resources elsewhere (Lind, 2001). Lind (2001) argued that the most critical element of fairness heuristic theory is the identification of a mechanism (the perception of fair treatment) that moderates the transition from individual to group mode. According to Lind (2001), people use their perception of fair treatment as a heuristic device to guide their decisions to cooperate in social situations. Fair treatment communicates that the group and organization value a person and that their relationships with and within the organization are strong (Lind, 2001). In addition, fair treatment provides a cognitive shortcut that prompts an individual to focus on the group's needs rather than personal desires, resulting in an increased likelihood of responding cooperatively to requests or demands from other organizational members (Lind, 2001). In contrast, if individuals perceive unfair treatment, they will likely reject the cooperative group orientation and focus on serving their self-interests (Lind, 2001).

Scholars expanded on the propositions of fairness heuristic theory and UMT to conceptualize the link between fairness perceptions and uncertainty management by arguing that fairness perceptions help people manage their uncertainty (Colquitt & Zipay, 2015; Proudfoot & Lind, 2015). UMT extended many of the propositions outlined in fairness heuristic theory and expanded the treatment of uncertainty to include any form, even if it has no logical connection to justice rules (Colquitt & Zipay, 2015). According to UMT, coping with the uncertainties is one of the biggest challenges people face (Lind & van de Bos, 2002; van de Bos & Lind, 2002).

Since uncertainty produces discomfort, people try to find ways to tolerate it or make it more manageable (van de Bos & Lind, 2002).

Fairness related information in an individual's work environment can provide a way to cope with uncertainty, as employees focus on justice as indirect evidence of trustworthiness when they are unsure of an authority figure or procedure (Colquitt & Zipay, 2015; Lind & Van de Bos, 2002; Proudfoot & Lind, 2015; van de Bos & Lind, 2002). Environmental uncertainty causes fairness concerns to become more salient for employees resulting in an increased tendency to respond negatively to unfair events while experiencing uncertainty (Lind & van de Bos, 2002; van de Bos & Lind, 2002). Van de Bos (2001) conducted an experiment in which feelings of uncertainty were induced by asking participants to write about the thoughts, feelings, and physical symptoms they experienced during times of uncertainty. The findings indicated that justice perceptions had a stronger effect on reactions for the participants who had been primed with the uncertainty manipulation and provided further evidence to support the UMT premise that uncertainty increases individuals' awareness of fairness and people use fairness information to manage their uncertainty (van de Bos, 2001).

According to UMT, negative emotions such as fear and anxiety strengthen the interaction between an individual's affect and justice information when forming fairness perceptions (Colquitt & Zipay, 2015; Proudfoot & Lind, 2015; van de Bos. 2001). Experiments conducted by van de Bos (2003) found that inducing feelings of uncertainty for participants resulted in a stronger relationship between affect and fairness perceptions than in the uncertainty non-salient condition providing further evidence that affect can help fill in the gaps when people are missing relevant justice data (Colquitt & Zipay, 2015).

Surveillance in the Workplace

Surveillance refers to the purposeful collection and analysis of information about something or someone to influence the behavior of the original surveillance target and is characterized as an exercise in power (Ball, 2021). According to Ball (2021), the surveillance and monitoring of employees is inextricably linked to organizational life. In the past, workplace surveillance often required employees to use time clocks to clock in and out, weighing or counting the output of employees, and piece-rate payment systems (Ball, 2021). With the development of information systems, large organizations were enabled to begin policing their internal structures and organizational members to gain an advantage over competitors (Ball, 2021). Recently, two key factors have resulted in an increase in workplace surveillance within organizations: access to large amounts of data about employees and their activities and the gathering of employee data within new organizational forms such as remote work and platform work that have broken down previously existing external organizational boundaries (Ball, 2021).

Electronic Performance Monitoring

Electronic performance monitoring (EPM) refers to organizations' use of technological systems to observe, record, and analyze information related to employees' job performance (Bhave, 2014; Stanton, 2000). Recent advances in EPM technology have drastically changed how organizations and supervisors monitor their employees. Over the past few decades, several factors have contributed to the growth of EPM, including substantial developments in information and communication technologies, reduced cost of monitoring and surveillance technologies, and the increasing prevalence of remote work arrangements and geographically dispersed work teams (Holland et al., 2015; Kizza & Ssanyu, 2005).

Several factors distinguish EPM from traditional performance monitoring. EPM allows for the continuous, random, and intermittent tracking of individual employees that would be impractical, if not impossible, with traditional monitoring strategies such as direct supervision (Ball, 2021; Ravid et al., 2020; Stanton, 2000). In addition, EPM technologies can record voluminous, detailed, and permanent data on employee behaviors that may or may not be directly related to their job performance and provide easy access to these records for supervisors (Ball, 2021; Ravid et al., 2020; Stanton, 2000). EPM also allows organizations to monitor the internal states and private behaviors of employees through the tracking of their attitudes and emotions expressed in monitored email exchanges and social media monitoring that provides organizations with data regarding the relationships and social networks their employees are involved in both within and outside of the organization (Ravid et al., 2020). Recent EPM technologies have allowed organizations to utilize biometric data on body heat emission and heart rates to track their employees' physiological states (Astor, 2017; Morris et al., 2017; Ravid et al., 2020). Finally, EPM technologies allow employers to collect vast and diverse data, often with ambiguous purposes (Ravid et al., 2020).

Forms of EPM. For decades, organizations have used various forms of EPM to supervise employees, such as call monitoring, email forwarding, and monitoring, video surveillance and recording, keystroke monitoring, internet usage monitoring, and content blocking, GPS tracking, and electronic time clock systems (Bartels & Nordstrom, 2012; Kizza & Ssanyu, 2005; Ravid et al., 2020). Advancements in EMS technologies combined with reductions in costs have resulted in a significant shift in organizations' type, availability, and intensity of electronic monitoring and surveillance technologies (Holland et al., 2015; Kalischko & Riedl, 2021).

New Monitoring Targets. In recent years, organizations have increased their use of personal data, biometrics, and covert electronic surveillance technologies to monitor their employees' performance and behavior, leading to broader debates regarding information use and employees' right to privacy (Ball, 2021; Malik et al., 2020). Organizations' monitoring and surveillance practices have evolved to include four new monitoring targets: thoughts, feelings, and physiology, movement and location, task, and relationships and reputation (Ball, 2021; Ravid et al., 2020).

Characteristics of EPM

Purpose. The purpose of EPM refers to the explicit or implied rationale for its use within the organization (Ravid et al., 2020). Ravid et al. (2020) developed a typology of EPM characteristics that identified four distinct categories of purpose for EPM systems: performance EPM, development EPM, admin and safety, and surveillance EPM. Performance EPM allows supervisors to make between-individual comparisons, discourage deviant workplace behaviors, incentivize employee effort and performance, and hold employees accountable for their performance through the use of rewards and punishments (Ravid et al., 2020; Wells et al., 2007). Development EPM is used for within-person comparisons to provide individual employees constructive feedback, identify their strengths and weaknesses, and help with skill development and performance improvement, and is reliant on the employee's motivation to learn a new skill or further develop their existing skills (Bartels & Nordstrom, 2012; Ravid et al., 2020; Wells et al., 2007). Admin and safety EPM systems protect organizations and their members from harm and legal liability and help ensure the safety of those monitored (Ravid et al., 2020). Surveillance EPM refers to EPM systems with no explicit or implicit purpose or rationale other than collecting

employee data for the organization and usually result in negative responses from those being monitored (Ravid et al., 2020).

EPM used constructively to provide feedback for employee development and training purposes or to ensure safety can result in positive outcomes for organizations members in the forms of increased motivation, organizational commitment, task satisfaction, perceptions of procedural justice, job satisfaction, and reciprocity (Ball, 2021; Holman et al., 2002; Sewell et al., 2012; Wells et al., 2007). The perceived purpose of an EPM system communicates the organization's values and expectations of employees and provides valuable insights regarding employees' status and trustworthiness within the organization, which in turn influences their beliefs about the purpose and their responses (Ball, 2021; Bartels & Nordstrom, 2012; Jeske & Kapasi, 2018; McNall & Stanton, 2011; Ravid et al., 2020; Wells et al., 2007). A study by Stanton and Julian (2002) found that EPM systems that focus on quantity or outputs may diminish work quality as employees will focus more on the quantity of work they produce to align with the perceived organizational values the EPM system communicates. In contrast, if employees perceive there is no explicit purpose for the implementation of the EPM system or if it is used punitively, adverse outcomes such as decreased justice and fairness perceptions, increased stress, and decreased satisfaction (Ball, 2021; Bartles & Nordstrom, 2012; Becker & Marique, 2014; McNall & Roch, 2007).

Invasiveness. EPM systems vary in invasiveness, which refers to their intrusion on an individual's privacy, autonomy, or personal boundaries (Ravid et al., 2020). Ravid et al. (2020) identified four categories of EPM invasiveness: scope (breadth and specificity of EPM), target (attitudes and physiology, person and location, or task), constraints (high or low parameters regarding how data is used and who can access it), and target control (high control over

15

monitoring or low control over monitoring). Organizational members consider monitoring to be less invasive when it is task-focused, focused on a group rather than an individual, they have control over when the monitoring takes place, and they are allowed to place constraints on how the data and information gathered is used by the organization (Alge, 2001; Ball, 2021; Jeske & Santuzzi, 2015; McNall and Stanton, 2011; Zweig & Webster, 2003).

Several detrimental outcomes of excessive electronic surveillance for employees have been identified, including privacy violations, reduced creative behavior, decreased job satisfaction, decreased organizational commitment, decreased performance, reduced trust in the organization and management, increased absences from work, increased stress, increased burnout, increased workplace deviance, increased resistance behaviors, and increased uncertainty (Adams & Mastracci, 2019; Alder & Ambrose, 2005a; Alder & Ambrose, 2005b; Alge, 2001; Ball, 2010; Botan, 1996; Chory et al., 2016; Davidson & Henderson, 2000; Elovainio et al., 2005; Holland et al., 2015; Malik et al., 2020; Moorman & Wells, 2003; Stanton, 2000; Watkins Allen et al., 2007).

Synchronicity. Synchronicity refers to the temporal characteristics of EPM systems that impact the learning and behavioral responses of those monitored (Ravid et al., 2020). The timing for the collection of performance data (high real-time or continuous monitoring or low-intermittent or discontinuous monitoring) and the timing of feedback delivery (high- continuous real-time or low- aggregated, summarized, or intermittent) impact employees' reactions to EPM (Ravid et al., 2020). In contrast to findings from earlier studies on the synchronicity of EPM systems, researchers have recently discovered that there are no significant differences between continuous and intermittent monitoring in regard to employee behavior, as employees tend to act as though they are about to be monitored in both situations (Ball, 2021).

Transparency. EPM transparency refers to the extent to which employees are informed about the characteristics of EPM use within the organization (Ravid et al., 2020). An organization's honesty and transparency regarding EPM systems can affect employees' perceptions of justice, fairness, and task satisfaction within the workplace (Hovorka-Mead et al., 2002; Ravid et al., 2020). Researchers have found that low transparency increases the likelihood that employees will perceive the monitoring as purposeless and authoritarian (Alder et al., 2006). In contrast, greater transparency can result in positive outcomes for organizations and their members, including increased trust in management, greater perceptions of informational justice, positive affect, increased performance, and decreased turnover (Ball, 2021; Hovorka-Mead, 2002; McNall & Roach, 2007).

Contextual and Individual Factors. Researchers have found that employees' attitudes and fairness and justice perceptions regarding the EPM system will vary as a function of organizational culture and EPM system factors including, justification, advanced notification, perceived organizational support, feedback tone, and involvement of employees in designing the system (Alder, 2001; Alder & Ambrose, 2005a, Alder & Ambrose, 2005b; Alder et al., 2006; McNall & Roch, 2009; Wells et al., 2007). Researchers have identified several individual factors that influence how organizational members will react to monitoring and surveillance in the workplace (Ball, 2021). Findings from previous studies indicate that certain personality traits such as low extraversion, low emotional stability, or high neuroticism can result in negative attitudes toward monitoring and increase the likelihood that an individual will perceive monitoring as unfair (Ball, 2021). In addition, Yost et al. (2019) found that the presence of trait reaction was correlated with an increased likelihood of individuals having an angry reaction to

17

monitoring, which in turn may negatively impact workplace relationships and violate the psychological contract between organizational members.

The way in which an EPM system is designed, implemented, and communicated to organizational members is critical as decades of organizational justice research have found that employee attitudes are related to their behaviors (Ball, 2021; Tomczak et al., 2018). When implemented incorrectly, EPM systems can result in organizational members developing negative attitudes towards management and the organization, which in turn may lead to negative emotional and behavioral outcomes for organizations and their members (Ball, 2021). Previous studies have identified several negative outcomes that may result from the implementation of EMS technology and EPM systems including, feelings of privacy invasion (McNall & Roch, 2007; McNall & Stanton, 2011; Stanton, 2000), decreased job satisfaction, and decreased organizational commitment (Wells et al., 2007).

<div align="center">Organizational Justice and Fairness</div>

Fairness and justice issues play a vital role in the functioning of organizations and their members. Although the terms justice and fairness are often used interchangeably, they represent two distinct yet related constructs (Colquitt & Zipay, 2015). Justice refers to "the perceived adherence to rules that represents appropriateness in decision context" (Colquitt & Zipay, 2015, p. 75). Fairness refers to "a global perception of appropriateness that lies downstream of justice" (Colquitt & Zipay, 2015, p. 75). Decades of research on organizational justice have produced substantial evidence of the powerful effect of fairness on employees' attitudes and behaviors (Colquitt & Zipay, 2015; Garner & Dougherty, 2017; Proudfoot & Lind, 2015).

Organizational justice refers to organizational members' perceived fairness of interpersonal relationships, outcomes, and processes (Colquitt & Zipay, 2015; Cropanzano &

Greenberg, 1997; Garner & Dougherty, 2017; Proudfoot & Lind, 2015). Individuals assess fairness within their organizations along four distinct types of justice: distributive, procedural, interactional, and informational (Colquitt, 2001; Colquitt & Zipay, 2015). Distributive justice refers to organizational members' perceived fairness of the outcomes of organizational decisions or events (Adams, 1965; Colquitt, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001; Leventhal, 1980). Early research on organizational justice focused on exploring distributive justice through the lenses of social exchange and equity theories and focused on exploring individuals' concerns over the fairness of organizational outcomes they received (Adams, 1965; Chen & Park, 2005; Garner & Dougherty, 2017). Thibault and Walker (1975) recognized that distributive justice was insufficient to explain the development of fairness and justice perceptions and proposed the process of decision making as an important factor in individuals' reactions to outcomes and events, resulting in the introduction of procedural justice. Procedural justice reflects the perceived fairness of the process of decision making and allocations (Colquitt, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001; Colquitt et al., 2006; Colquitt & Zipay, 2015; Garner & Dougherty, 2017; Leventhal, 1980; Thibaut & Walker, 1975). More recently, scholars have begun to focus on exploring the dimensions of interactional and informational justice (Garner & Dougherty, 2017). Interactional justice refers perceived fairness of how procedures are enacted, and the level of respect and dignity communicated in the enactment of procedures (Bies & Moag, 1986; Colquitt et al., 2001; Colquitt et al., 2006, Colquitt & Zipay, 2015; Garner & Dougherty, 2017). Informational justice reflects the perceived fairness and honesty of justifications for procedures and decisions (Colquitt et al., 2001; Colquitt et al., 2006, Colquitt & Zipay, 2015; Garner & Dougherty, 2017).

Previous research on organizational justice has identified various factors that impact the development of fairness and justice perceptions for organizational members (Alder & Ambrose,

19

2005b; Garner & Dougherty, 2017). One prominent line of research on the antecedents of justice

perceptions investigates how supervisors' feedback impacts organizational members' perceptions

of justice (Garner & Dougherty, 2017). Organizational members perceive feedback to be fairer

when it is provided in a manner that is clear, consistent, and constructive, given privately, and

delivered through a richer communication channel (Chory & Westerman, 2009; Garner &

Dougherty, 2017; Westerman et al., 2014; Westerman & Westerman, 2013).

Scholars have also examined organizational justice from a relational perspective by

exploring how the characteristics of supervisor-subordinate relationships impact organizational

members' perceptions of justice (Garner & Dougherty, 2017). A study by Lee (2001) found that

individuals who reported having a lower quality relationship with their supervisor perceived less

distributive and procedural justice than those who reported high-quality relationships indicating

that the interpersonal dynamics of supervisor-subordinate relationships play a key role in the

development of organizational members' justice perceptions. In addition, supervisors who build

up rapport with their subordinates and use positive communication tactics such as self-

disclosure, sympathy, and praise are perceived as fairer, which can become incredibly important

during times when they must make decisions that will be unpopular with their staff (Campbell et

al., 2007; Garner & Dougherty, 2017).

Justice serves as a primary framework around which organizational members interact,

and the communication that occurs within those interactions constitutes individuals' perceptions

of fairness within their organizational relationships (Garner & Dougherty, 2017). Organizational

members' perceptions of justice and fairness in the workplace have been shown to predict a

variety of attitudinal and behavioral variables including organizational commitment, job

attitudes, job performance, (Colquitt & Zipay, 2015; Garner & Dougherty, 2017; Moorman et al.,

2003; Proudfoot & Lind, 2015). Previous organizational justice research has found that organizational members' perception of fair treatment is positively related to their acceptance of organizational procedures (Alder & Ambrose, 2005; Colquitt et al., 2001; Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997). Therefore, this study proposes that organizational members' fairness perceptions will affect their attitudes towards surveillance in the workplace.

RQ1: What is the relationship between organizational members perceptions of procedural fairness and their attitudes towards surveillance in the workplace?

Trust

Trust is primarily a communication-based concept formed, evolved, and changed through our communicative encounters with others (Shockley-Zalabak & Ellis, 2006; Shockley-Zalabak et al., 2000). Over the past 100 years, communication scholars have examined the relationship between trust and various other concepts, including trustworthiness, distrust, relationship formation and maintenance, impression management, and uncertainty reduction (Pascual-Ferra, 2020). Trust impacts interactions and relationships at every level and is considered the foundation for cooperation and stability within organizations (Hubbell & Chory-Assad, 2005; Shockley-Zalabak & Ellis, 2006). Organizational trust is defined "as positive expectations individuals have about the intent and behaviors of multiple organizational members based on organization, roles, relationships, experiences, and interdependencies" (Shockley-Zalabak et al., 2000, p. 37). According to Shockley et al. (2000), perceptions of organizational trust are influenced by organizational and individual conceptions of uncertainty, influence, and behavior expectations.

Organizational trust is a dynamic and multileveled construct that spans all interaction levels within an organization including, co-worker, team, leadership, organizational and

21

interorganizational levels (Colquitt et al., 2007; Dietz & Hartog, 2006; Ellis & Shockley-Zalabak, 2001; Holland et al., 2015; Shockley-Zalabak & Ellis, 2006; Shockley-Zalabak et al., 2000). Although there has been much debate among scholars regarding the critical dimensions of organizational trust, it is conceptualized as a multidimensional construct that consists of three key elements: cognitive (trust as an assessment of another's trustworthiness), emotional (trust as a decision based on one's reactions to people or events), and behavioral (trust as an action based on cognitive and emotional reactions to others and events) (Dietz & Hartog, 2006; Ellis & Shockley-Zalabak, 2001; Shockley-Zalabak & Ellis, 2006; Shockley-Zalabak et al., 2000). Shockley-Zalabak et al. (2000) developed a path model of organizational trust that identified five critical dimensions of organizational trust: competence, openness and honesty, concern for employees, reliability, and identification.

Previous studies have identified several individual and organizational characteristics that serve as antecedents to the development of trust. An individual's trust propensity, or their predisposition to trusting others, is influenced by several dispositional factors such as personality traits, cultural values and norms, and their political persuasion (Colquitt et al., 2007; Dietz & Hartog, 2006). Researchers have identified four attributes of the trustee that impact others' perception of their trustworthiness: benevolence, ability, integrity, and predictability (Colquitt et al., 2007; Dietz & Hartog, 2006; Holland et al., 2015). In addition, the quality and nature of the relationship between the trustor and the trustee impacts the degree or level of trust between the parties (Dietz & Hartog, 2006). Organizational justice, which refers to perceptions of fairness of workplace processes and outcomes, has been found to have a positive relationship with employees' perceptions of managerial and organizational trust (Hubbell & Chory, 2005). High levels of organizational trust have been linked with several positive outcomes for

organizations and their members including, adaptive organizational structures, innovation, reduced litigation and transaction costs, improved economic performance, positive employee relationships, effective crisis management, increased job satisfaction, increased risk-taking behaviors, improved task performance, increased organizational citizenship behaviors, increased organizational commitment, and decreased counterproductive work behaviors (CWBs) (Alder et al., 2006; Colquitt et al., 2006; Ellis & Shockley-Zalabak, 2001; Shockley-Zalabak & Ellis, 2006; Shockley et al., 2000).

EPM systems in the workplace serve as a proxy for the level of trust managers have for their employees (Ball, 2021). The monitoring and surveillance of employees communicates the organization's value system to its members and excessive monitoring may signal to employees that their organization is questioning their organizational commitment, competence, and honesty (Ball, 2021). According to Ball (2021), there are three components of trust: Benevolence, competence, and integrity. If employees perceive the monitoring in their workplace to be excessive, they will feel that their managers do not trust them (Ball, 2021). Low trust supervisor-subordinate relationships negatively impact employees' perceptions of privacy, fairness, and justice within the workplace and may result in the development of a negative cycle in which punitive surveillance becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy (Ball, 2021). Therefore, this study aims to explore the relationship between organizational members' perceptions of procedural fairness, attitudes toward surveillance and their reported trust in top management and trust in their immediate supervisor.

> RQ2: What is the relationship between organizational members' perceptions of procedural fairness, attitudes toward surveillance, and their trust in top management?

RQ3: What is the relationship between organizational members' perceptions of

procedural fairness, attitudes toward top management, and their trust in their

immediate supervisor?

Workplace Relationships

Organizations represent a system of relationships, and their functioning is inextricably

tied to the quality of the relationships between organizational members (Sias et al., 2002; Sias et

al., 2020; Sias & Shin, 2020; Wheatley, 2000). Workplace relationships are dynamic and

ongoing communicative entities characterized by patterned interdependent interactions between

organizational members (Keyton, 2017; Kramer, 2017; Sias, 2009; Sias & Shin, 2020).

Workplace relationships function as systems of information exchange, support, competition, and

collaboration for organizational members and are considered to be the primary site of organizing

(Sias et al., 2020, Sias, 2009; Sias & Shin, 2020). The three most important relationships for

organizational members are the supervisor-subordinate relationship, peer coworker relationships,

and the sum of all workgroup members (supervisor and coworkers) (Omilion-Hodges et al.,

2016).

Supervisor-subordinate relationships. An integral relationship for organizational

members at all stages of their organizational membership (Kramer & Sias, 2014), Jablin (1979)

described supervisor-subordinate relationship as the connection between members in which one

person has formal authority over other members of the organization. Early research on workplace

relationships began with the study of supervisor-subordinate relationships and primarily focused

on the leaders' traits and assumed subordinates were merely passive recipients of leadership

(Kramer, 2017; Sias, 2009; Sias & Shin, 2020). In his seminal synthesis of supervisor-

subordinate communication, Jablin (1979) asserted that researchers focused their attention on

24

interaction patterns and related attitudes, communication openness, upward distortion, upward influence, semantic-information distance, effective versus ineffective supervisors, personal characteristics, and feedback. These topics set the tone for supervisor-subordinate relationships to become one of the most explored topics in organizational communication research (Garner et al., 2016).

The development of leader-member-exchange (LMX) theory represented a key turning point in the study of supervisor-subordinate relationships (Sias & Shin, 2020). LMX theory recognized the dyadic nature of the supervisor-subordinate relationship and emphasized the subordinate's active role in the development and evolution of the relationship (Sias, 2009; Sias & Shin, 2020). The primary contribution of LMX was conceptualizing the leader-member relationship as an exchange relationship that involves both parties serving as active agents in the exchange of resources (Sias, 2009; Sias & Shin, 2020). LMX theory assumes that leaders (supervisors) form unique dyadic relationships with each of their subordinates that vary in terms of quality from high to low (Kramer, 2017; Sias & Shin, 2020).

According to LMX theory, the supervisor-subordinate relationship is a type of social exchange relationship that is created and evolved through the communicative exchanges between both parties (Abu Bakar et al., 2010; Abu Bakar & Sheer, 2013; Sias, 2005, 2009; Sias & Jablin, 1995). Three primary types of supervisor-subordinate relationships have been identified: partnership or in-group (high-quality exchange), overseer or out-group (low-quality exchange), and middle group (moderate-quality exchange). Subordinates who have a partnership or in-group relationship with their supervisor enjoy a mutually influential, open, and trusting relationship (Kramer, 2017; Sias & Shin, 2020). Organizational members in an overseer or out-group relationship with their supervisor tend to experience less open communication, low levels of

support and trust, and more authoritative and controlling supervision tactics (Kramer, 2017; Sias & Shin, 2020). Middle group relationships are characterized by communication beyond the level of overseer or out-group relationship but does not quite reach the level of close personal communication experienced in a partnership LMX relationship (Kramer, 2017).

The development of functional, high quality workplace relationships is positively related to employees' reported levels of happiness, satisfaction, performance, and motivation (Kramer, 2017; Sias & Shin, 2020). Researchers have identified several factors that influence the likelihood that a high-quality LMX relationship will develop, including an employee's job competence and the supervisor's ability to train and assist employees (Sias & Shin, 2020). In addition, subordinates who develop high-quality LMX relationships with their supervisor are more likely to be career-oriented, dependable, optimistic, have an internal locus of control, and share similar cognitive and demographic characteristics with their supervisor (Kramer, 2017; Sias & Shin, 2020).

The quality of supervisor-subordinate relationships shapes the perceptions of members and influences the interpersonal communication within the work group (Abu Bakar et al., 2010; Abu Bakar & Sheer, 2013; Lee, 2005; Sias, 2005; Sias & Jablin, 1995). Researchers have found that supervisor's differing treatment of subordinates often leads to coworkers discussing the differential treatment among themselves, thus reinforcing their perceptions of unfairness (Abu et al., 2010; Abu Bakar & Sheer, 2013; Sias, 2005; Sias & Jablin, 1995). These findings suggest that organizational members' perceptions of fairness are socially constructed through the discourse among work group members (Abu Bakar et al., 2010; Abu Bakar & Sheer, 2013; Sias, 2005; Sias & Jablin, 1995). Consistent with this research, this study aims to explore the

relationship between organizational members' perceived fairness of EPM and their reported positive leader-member communication exchanges.

RQ4: What is the relationship between organizational members perceptions of procedural fairness, attitudes toward surveillance, and their reported positive leader-member communication exchanges?

Peer coworker relationships. Originally, discovered as alternatives to traditional supervisory or mentorship relationships (Kram & Isabella, 1985), peer coworker relationships refer to the interpersonal relationships between organizational members at the same hierarchical level (Sias, 2009; Sias et al., 2020; Sias & Shin, 2020). Researchers have identified three primary types of peer coworker relationships: information peers, collegial peers, and special peers (Kram & Isabella, 1985; Sias & Shin, 2020). Information peer relationships are low-quality exchange relationships that involve the sharing of superficial information such as work-related topics and are characterized by low levels of trust and self-disclosure (Kram & Isabella, 1985; Sias & Shin, 2020). Nearly all peer coworker relationships begin as information peers, and these information-based relationships can help organizational members immensely in executing their jobs' daily functions (Sias & Shin, 2020). Some peer coworker relationships develop into friendships in the form of collegial peers (Kram & Isabella, 1985; Sias & Shin, 2020). Collegial peer relationships are moderate-quality exchange relationships characterized by a moderate level of trust, self-disclosure, friendship, emotional support, and feedback (Kram & Isabella, 1985; Sias & Shin, 2020). Collegial peer relationships can develop into special peer relationships that are high-quality exchange relationships characterized by high levels of trust, self-disclosure, emotional support, feedback, and close friendship (Kram & Isabella, 1985; Sias & Shin, 2020).

Peer coworker relationships serve several vital functions for organizational members, including serving as sources of information exchange, social support, and mentoring (Sias, 2009; Sias & Shin, 2020). Myers et al. (2018) discovered that organizational members differed in their perceptions of the appropriateness, importance, and frequency of seeking different types of information from information, collegial, and special peer coworkers. Organizational members with collegial and special peer relationships reported that it was more appropriate and important to seek technical, referent, social, and appraisal from special peers than informational or collegial peers and they more frequently sought information from special peers (Myers et al., 2018).

Communication scholars have identified several positive outcomes for organizational members who develop collegial and special relationships including, being more informed (Kramer, 1994; Sias, 2005), better adjusted (Kramer, 1996), greater perceived trust and solidarity (Myers & Johnson, 2004), and more openness in their workplace relationships (Myers et al., 1999). In addition, organizational members who report developing collegial and special peer relationships are more competent and affirming in their communication (Sollitto, 2017) and use more affinity seeking strategies (Gordon & Hartman, 2009).

<div align="center">Cooperative Communication</div>

Based on the notion that cooperation occurs when organizational members perceive their goal attainment as positively aligned with their coworker's goals (Tjosvold, 1984), *c*ooperative communication is defined as "message exchange behaviors and activities designed to facilitate the joint achievement of work group goals" (Lee, 1997, 2001, p. 268). Tjosvold's (1984) reasoned that cooperation is helpful for strengthening work relationships, boosting morale, and enhancing productivity, especially for complex tasks. Organizational members can engage in a variety of cooperative communication behaviors including, sharing resources and ideas,

exchanging information, displaying concern for others, providing encouragement, expressing

interest in other group members, being responsive to others, showing support and sensitivity, and

displaying a willingness to compromise and negotiate to achieve agreement within the work

group as they work towards shared goals (Abu Bakar & Sheer, 2013; Chen et al., 2006; Lee,

1997, 2001; Tjosvold et al., 1984). These results suggest that cooperation and organizational

members' interaction toward achieving cooperation enhance the quality of communication and

the use of influence strategies to achieve goals, which can create open-minded discussions

among members about conflict and ultimately lead to constructive conflict resolution (Tjosvold

et al., 2014).

Researchers have reasoned and discovered that organizational design and complete

communication from organizational leadership play a role in cooperation (Tjosvold, 1984).

Likewise, a cooperative communication climate results in positive outcomes such as improved

attitudes towards work, development of interpersonal relationships, reduced conflict, reduced

turnover, and increased social cohesion (Abu Bakar & Sheer, 2013; Lee, 1997, 2001, 2005;

Pillemer et al., 2003; Sias, 2005; Sias & Jablin, 1995). According to Lee (2005), *cooperative*

communication is a powerful factor that enhances the relationship between supervisor-

subordinate exchange quality and co-worker exchange quality.

Organizational members' perceptions of justice have been identified as an antecedent to

the development of *cooperative communication* relationships between workgroup members (Lee,

2001). A study by Lee (2001) examined the relationship between perceived fairness and

cooperative communication behaviors and discovered that participants who reported less

perceived distributive and procedural fairness engaged in fewer exchanges of information, ideas,

and resources with their coworkers. According to Lee (2001), organizational members that

perceive unfairness in processes or outcomes may engage in less *cooperative communication* behaviors to retaliate against their unjust treatment.

UMT is based on the premise that people use their overall perceptions of fair treatment as a substitute for interpersonal trust when deciding how to react to requests or demands in their relationships (Lind, 2001). If an individual believes they are treated fairly by their organization this results in a shortcut decision to focus on the needs of the group rather than their own personal desires (Lind, 2001). Therefore, organizational members that perceive fair treatment from their organization will likely respond more cooperatively to the requests of others and the group. In contrast, those who perceive unfair treatment will reject the cooperative group orientation and shift to a self-interested orientation.

RQ5: What is the relationship between organizational members' perceptions of procedural fairness, attitudes toward surveillance, and cooperative communication?

Literature Review Summary

Building toward a set of research questions about the relationship between organizational members' perceptions of procedural fairness, EPM, and workplace relationships, the literature review synthesized key research findings related to those constructs. A rationale for the research questions was provided following the synthesis of literature.

CHAPTER III

Method

Method Introduction

The method section describes how the study was conducted. Specifically, the method section explains that participants were recruited through Amazon's MTurk and through personal email to participate in an online questionnaire. Participants completed survey items measuring their perceptions of procedural fairness, organizational trust, attitudes toward surveillance, leader communication exchange and cooperative communication.

Participants and Procedures

Upon approval from the institution's Institutional Review Board, data for this thesis were collected via an online questionnaire. Individuals over the age of 18 and employed full-time (worked more than 35 hours a week) in the United States were recruited for the study through Amazon's Mechanical Turk (MTurk) and through personal email asking individuals to participate. First, an explanation of the study and the link to the online questionnaire were posted on Amazon's MTurk (www.mturk.com; Amazon Mechanical Turk, 2022). MTurk is an open online marketplace consisting of over 100,000 individuals from a variety of countries who perform tasks for requesters in exchange for monetary rewards (Buhrmester et al., 2018). Launched in 2005, MTurk has exploded in popularity among researchers as a platform for gathering survey data. In fact, according to Keith et al. (2017), between 2012 and 2015, published studies in organization studies, psychology, education, and business increased 800%. In recent years, communication scholars have used MTurk to gather data about affection in interpersonal relationships (Floyd et al., 2021), organizational members' perceptions of their

supervisor's credibility (Mikkleson et al., 2021), and the relational load romantic partners

experience when their spouses are unemployed (Crowley & Pederson, 2022).

MTurk functions as a crowdsourcing platform where researchers, individuals, and

businesses (requesters) can pay a fee to workers (Turkers) to complete Human Intelligence Tasks

(HITs). Requesters can post a HIT by providing the title, the description of their HIT, keywords

allowing workers to search for the HIT, the time allotted for the HIT, and the compensation

(Amazon Mechanical Turk, 2022). Turkers can locate HITs directly on MTurk, but they often

rely on message boards such as Reddit to share information about good HITs and requesters and

to socialize or complain about their experiences (Keith et al., 2019). In the academic community,

HITs often include surveys, experiments, and coding tasks (Keith et al., 2017; Keith et al., 2019).

Though researchers have complained that samples collected through MTurk lack external

validity and are susceptible to cheaters, or low-quality workers (Ford, 2017), a wealth of

evidence suggests that MTurk is an effective, valid, and reliable tool for gather large samples for

a variety of studies (Buhrmester et al., 2018; Kees et al., 2017; Snowberg & Yariv, 2021).

For this thesis study, the author posted the HIT title (Workplace

Monitoring/Surveillance), description (this survey assesses your experiences with performance

monitoring and your workplace behaviors), keywords (survey, workplace behavior), the time

allotted (1 hour) and compensation ($1) on MTurk. Turkers who met the inclusion criteria

participated by clicking the link which took them to the questionnaire. The instruments

completed by the participants included the Procedural Fairness Scale, the Surveillance at Work

Scale, the Organizational Trust Scale, the Leader Communication Exchange Scale: Positive, and

the Cooperative Communication Scale. Upon completing the questionnaire, individuals were

paid $1.00 for their work. The average amount of time for completing the questionnaire was 18 minutes and 33 seconds.

Participants included 72 adults working full-time in a variety of organizations in the United States. The sample was composed of 33 men, 38 women, and 1 unidentified. Participants ranged in age from 22 to 69 ($M = 41.91$, $SD = 9.33$) years. Ethnicity of participants included Caucasian/White ($n = 54$), Asian American/Asian ($n = 4$), Native American ($n = 1$), African American/Black ($n = 3$), Hispanic/Latino ($n = 8$), and 2 unidentified. Job industries represented in the sample included retail ($n = 10$), manufacturing ($n = 1$), government ($n = 2$), services ($n = 12$), medical ($n = 8$), financial ($n = 3$), educational ($n = 26$), and 10 unidentified job industries. Length of employment ranged from 1 to 32 years ($M = 8.84$, $SD = 7.05$). The managerial status represented in the sample included top management ($n = 4$), management ($n = 24$), non-management (n = 39), and 4 unidentified.

<center>Procedures and Measurement</center>

Procedural Fairness was measured with Blader and Tyler's (2003a) Procedural Fairness Measure, a 32-item instrument assessing individuals' perceptions of fairness in their organizations across four dimensions: quality of formal decision-making procedures, quality of informal decision-making procedures, quality of formal treatment, and quality of informal treatment. Responses were solicited using a five-point Likert scale ranging from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (5). Previous Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients ranged from .87 to .98 (Blader & Tyler, 2003a). The Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients in this study were .89 ($M = 3.62$, $SD = 1.03$) for quality of formal decision-making procedures, .95 ($M = 3.68$, $SD = 1.06$), for quality of informal decision-making procedures, .95 ($M = 3.40$, $SD = .97$) for quality of formal treatment, and .97 ($M = 3.77$, $SD = .94$) for quality of informal treatment.

Attitudes Toward Surveillance was measured with Furnham and Swami's (2015) Surveillance at Work Scale, a 16-item instrument assessing individuals' perspectives on the monitoring procedures used by their organizations across two dimensions: negative aspects of surveillance and positive aspects of surveillance. Responses were solicited using a seven-point Likert-type scale ranging from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (7). Previous Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients ranged from .81 to .87 (Furnham & Swami, 2015). The Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients in this study were .96 ($M = 3.99$, $SD = 1.69$) for negative aspects of surveillance and .92 ($M = 4.11$, $SD = 1.42$) for positive aspects of surveillance.

Organizational Trust was measured with Ellis and Shockley-Zalabak's (2001) Organizational Trust Scale, a 20-item instrument assessing individuals' confidence in their organizations' conduct and performance across two dimensions: trust in top management and trust in immediate supervisors. Responses were solicited using a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (5). Previous Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients ranged from .91 to .95 (Cistulli & Snyder, 2022; Ellis & Shockley-Zalabak, 2001). The Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients in this study were .96 ($M = 3.30$, $SD = 1.05$) for trust in top management and .97 ($M = 3.83$, $SD = .88$) for trust in immediate supervisors.

Leader Communication Exchange was measured with Omilion-Hodges and Baker's (2017) Leader Communication Exchange Scale: Positive, a 19-item instrument assessing individuals' supportive communication interactions with their supervisors across six dimensions: professional trust, professional development, affective, verbal communication, nonverbal communication, and accessibility. Responses were solicited using a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (5). Previous Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients ranged from .88 to .96 (Omilion-Hodges & Baker, 2017). The Cronbach alpha

reliability coefficients in this study were .86 ($M = 3.65$, $SD = .92$) for professional trust, .85 ($M = 3.74$, $SD = .92$) for professional development, .94 ($M = 3.82$, $SD = .99$) for affective, .94 ($M = 3.77$, $SD = 1.07$) for verbal communication, and .88 ($M = 4.01$, $SD = .86$) for nonverbal communication. Test re-test reliability for the one item measuring accessibility was *r= .68, (M=4.07, SD=.90).*

$\quad$ *Cooperative Communication* was measured with Lee's (1997) Cooperative Communication Scale, a seven-item instrument assessing individuals' interdependent communication with their coworkers. Responses were solicited using a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (5). Previous Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients ranged from .76 to .80 (Cranmer & Myers, 2015; Lee, 1997, 2001). The Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient in this study was .86 ($M = 5.12$, $SD = 1.22$).

Method Summary

$\quad$ Contained in this section was an explanation of the procedures, participants, and measurement tools involved in conducting the study. Participants were organizational members over the age of 18 working full-time jobs. They reported about their organizational experiences, specifically about their perceptions of procedural fairness, organizational trust, attitudes toward surveillance, leader communication exchange and cooperative communication.

CHAPTER IV

Results

Results Introduction

The results section contains information about how the data were analyzed via multiple regression. Five research questions were posed with multiple regression being used to answer those research questions.

The first research question asked about the relationship between organizational members' perceptions of procedural fairness and their attitudes towards surveillance in the workplace. A multiple regression was conducted for both negative and positive attitudes toward surveillance. Results of a multiple regression revealed a significant model that accounted for 21% of the variance in positive attitudes towards surveillance ($F(4, 66) = 5.29, p < .001$). A closer examination of the beta weights revealed formal treatment ($\beta = .63$) as a significant predictor of positive attitudes toward surveillance. A multiple regression revealed a significant model for negative attitudes toward surveillance. Results of a multiple regression revealed a significant model that accounted for 8% of the variance in negative attitudes towards surveillance ($F(4, 65) = 2.56, p < .05$). However, none of the dimensions of procedural fairness significantly predicted negative attitudes toward surveillance.

The second and third research questions asked about the relationship between organizational members' perceptions of procedural fairness, attitudes toward surveillance, and their trust in the organization. A multiple regression was conducted for both trust in top management and trust in immediate supervisor. Results of a multiple regression revealed a significant model that accounted for 66% of the variance in trust in top management ($F(4, 61) = 20.48, p < .001$). A closer examination of the beta weights revealed formal treatment ($\beta = .96$) as

the only significant predictor of trust in top management. A multiple regression revealed a significant model for trust in immediate supervisor. Results of a multiple regression revealed a significant model that accounted for 89% of the variance in trust in direct supervisor ($F(6, 64) = 90.86, p < .001$). A closer examination of the beta weights revealed formal quality of decision making ($\beta = -.16$), informal quality of decision making ($\beta = .19$), informal treatment ($\beta = .74$), and positive attitudes toward surveillance ($\beta = .12$) as significant predictors of trust in immediate supervisor.

The fourth research question asked about the relationship between organizational members' perceptions of procedural fairness, attitudes toward surveillance, and their reported leader member communication exchanges. A multiple regression was conducted for each of the six dimensions of LCX.

Results of a multiple regression revealed a significant model that accounted for 58% of the variance in professional trust ($F(6, 63) = 15.56, p < .001$). A closer examination of the beta weights revealed formal quality of decision making ($\beta = -.31$) and informal treatment ($\beta = .85$) significant predictor of professional trust.

A multiple regression revealed a significant model for professional development. Results of a multiple regression revealed a significant model that accounted for 54% of the variance in professional development ($F(6, 64) = 13.52, p < .001$). A closer examination of the beta weights revealed informal treatment ($\beta = .80$) as a significant predictor of professional development.

Results of a multiple regression revealed a significant model that accounted for 78% of the variance in affect ($F(6, 64) = 38.38, p < .001$). A closer examination of the beta weights revealed informal treatment ($\beta = .99$) and positive attitudes toward surveillance ($\beta = -.18$) as significant predictors of affect.

Results of a multiple regression revealed a significant model that accounted for 62% of the variance in verbal communication ($F(6, 63) = 18.15, p < .001$). A closer examination of the beta weights revealed informal treatment ($\beta = .87$) as the only significant predictor for verbal communication.

Results of a multiple regression revealed a significant model that accounted for 60% of the variance in nonverbal communication ($F(6, 64) = 17.07, p < .001$). A closer examination of the beta weights revealed informal treatment ($\beta = 1.05$) as the only significant predictor for nonverbal communication.

Results of a multiple regression revealed a significant model that accounted for 26% of the variance in accessibility ($F(6, 64) = 4.66, p < .001$). A closer examination of the beta weights revealed informal treatment ($\beta = .73$) as the only significant predictor for accessibility.

The fifth research question asked about the relationship between organizational members' perceptions of procedural fairness, attitudes toward surveillance, and cooperative communication. Results of a multiple regression revealed a significant model that accounted for 12% of the variance in cooperative communication ($F(6, 62) = 2.40, p < .05$). However, none of the dimension of procedural fairness or attitudes toward surveillance significantly predicted cooperative communication.

Results Summary

The results section describes the statistical analyses and reports the answers to the five research questions. Generally, informal treatment was a key predictor of leader communication exchange and organizational trust.

CHAPTER V

Discussion

Discussion Introduction

The discussion section provides an interpretation of the results and provides the scholarly and practical implications. Additionally, the limitations of the study are provided in combination with directions for future research.

The present study examined how organizational members' perceptions of procedural fairness and attitudes toward surveillance affected organizational trust, leader communication exchanges, and cooperative communication. The results from this study revealed three major themes about organizational members' experiences. First, procedural fairness, specifically the dimension of quality of informal treatment, represents a key predictor of outcomes related to organizational trust and the communication that occurs within their supervisor-subordinate relationships. The supervisor-subordinate relationship is a major consideration for organizational members and is likely more salient because when they trust and interact with their supervisor informally, they engage in higher quality LCX. Second, fairness is a relational construct and the perception of fair treatment communicates to an individual that they are valued and their relationship with the group is strong (Lind, 2001, van den Bos & Lind, 2002). Third, organizational members' attitudes toward surveillance had a minor impact on organizational trust and communication outcomes.

Findings from the study suggest that the procedural fairness dimension of formal quality of treatment is a significant predictor of positive attitudes toward surveillance. However, none of the procedural fairness dimensions were identified as significant predictors of negative attitudes toward surveillance. These results suggest that when an organization provides clear reasoning for

official policies and procedures regarding EPM and respects their members' rights, members will believe that the organization is implementing EPM to help them succeed as productive organizational members.

Results from the study identified formal quality of treatment as a significant predictor of trust in top management. When the organization provides fair and honest insight into its policies and procedures and implements them in a manner that communicates respect, organizational members will maintain confidence and belief in the top management.

Though the formal quality of decision making negatively predicted trust, informal quality of decision making, informal quality of treatment, and positive attitudes toward surveillance all positively predict trust in immediate supervisor. When members perceive that their supervisors explain processes with thorough detail and provide a fair assessment of procedures, they are confident in their immediate supervisor. Likewise, organizational members trust their immediate supervisor when they treat them with concern, perceive their manager as caring for them, and see surveillance as helpful. Maybe when decisions are too formalized and bureaucratic, members lose trust or become suspicious of their immediate supervisor. In other words, they might see their immediate supervisor as an extension of the nebulous top management.

People are at ease with people who treat them well. The quality of informal treatment is a significant predictor of all six dimensions of LCX when organizational members perceive their supervisor as having their best interest in mind, treating them in an affirming way, and genuinely showing concern that they are more likely to engage in positive interactions with their supervisor. How a supervisor enacts formal policies and procedures impacts organizational members' perceptions of fair treatment. This study supports a wealth of supervisor-subordinate communication research by finding that organizational members like and appreciate fair and

friendly interactions with their supervisors (Horan et al., 2021; Waldron, 1999). Therefore, the finding in this study that organizational members report greater leader communication exchanges with their supervisors when they perceive their supervisors as treating them fairly supports Lee's (2001) finding between perceived justice and leader-member exchange, and it corroborates Waldron's (1991) findings that organizational members with higher-quality relationships with their supervisor report engaging in greater amounts of both formal and informal interactions. In this sense, the results support Omilion-Hodges and Baker's (2017) conclusion that the dialogue and interaction between supervisors and their employees play a vital role in the messages and behaviors they use with one another.

According to Blader and Tyler (2003a, 2003b), procedural fairness perceptions emerge from two sources, formal influences on fairness (official organizational policies and procedures) and informal influences (supervisory action). Since decisions regarding the monitoring and surveillance of employees are usually made in a top-down manner, organizational members' perceptions of procedural fairness and attitudes toward surveillance are unlikely to affect their cooperative communication with peer co-workers.

Theoretical Implications

This study makes several contributions to the literature on EPM, fairness perceptions, organizational trust, and organizational communication. Most previous organizational justice research has examined fairness perceptions via formal organizational policies and procedures (Blader & Tyler, 2003a, 2003b). By using Blader and Tyler's (2003a) four-component model of procedural fairness, this study explored how organizational members are influenced by both the type of procedure (quality of decision making, quality of treatment) they experience from both formal (official policies and procedures) and informal (actions of the supervisor) sources (Blader

41

& Tyler 2003a, 2003b; Zweig & Scott, 2007). In line with previous research, the findings from this study suggest that the quality of informal treatment organizational members receive from their immediate supervisor is more salient to them than other dimensions of procedural fairness and that informal sources can have a powerful impact on fairness perceptions in the workplace (Blader & Tyler, 2003b).

In addition, this study extends UMT into the organizational communication discipline by exploring perceptions of fairness, EPM, and communication outcomes. This study provides further evidence that individuals' procedural fairness judgements can predict organizational members' reactions and attitudes towards new initiatives and decisions made by the organization (Lind, 2001). When people are uncertain about an organizational policy or procedure, they use their overall fairness perceptions to fill in missing justice or trust information (Lind, 2001, Lind & van den Bos, 2002). In this case, if people generally perceive fair treatment within their organization, they will be more likely to accept and react positively to new organizational initiatives such as implementing a new EPM system (Lind, 2001; Lind & van den Bos, 2002).

Practical Implications

This research has several practical implications for organizations and their members. First, in any situation, supervisors must provide updated information to their employees about organizational policies, procedures, and rules (Mintzberg, 2013), including information about EPM (Stanton, 2000; Stanton & Weiss, 2000). In providing updated information, supervisors should provide details in a friendly, engaging, and approachable manner so that their employees can ask questions and feel comfortable adjusting to their new work situations (Blader & Tyler, 2003a; Topchik, 2004). It is especially important for supervisors to provide clear details and

reasoning for EPM to employees who perceive EPM as a threat to themselves and their organizational standing (Yost et al., 2019).

Second, the results of this study indicate that supervisors should practice transparency and openness when making decisions. That is, supervisors must provide clear details and an honest assessment about implementing new directives or policies or risk their organizational members expressing disagreement or challenging the fairness of the new directives (Kassing, 2017; Wolfe et al., 2018). Supervisors who communicate competently are perceived as more credible by their employees (Mikkelson et al., 2021), so supervisors can do themselves a favor by providing essential information in a transparent and believable manner.

Third, if an organization desires to implement EMP, supervisors can smooth the process by explaining the reasoning, answering questions, and listening to their employees' concerns about how the EPM system will affect them. Indeed, EPM can be a serious hot-button issue for organizational members (Furnham & Swami, 2015), so listening to their concerns and showcasing compassion for their perspectives is a worthwhile endeavor (Ball, 2021).

Likewise, organizational members want and need to be treated fairly (Colquitt & Rodell, 2015), so supervisors disclosing their perspectives and affirming the concerns of their members while encouraging cooperation will likely enhance organizational members' trust and confidence that their supervisor and the organization have their best interests in mind (Mikkelson et al., 2021; Shockley-Zalabak et al., 2010; Thomas et al., 2009). Ball (2021) recommends that organizations design EPM systems in a manner that emphasizes safety, training, and job performance. Therefore, to maintain organizational members' trust, organizations should refrain from implementing EPM systems that gradually track an invasive amount of members' personal data, whereabouts, and conversations. Organizations should also refrain from designing and

implementing EPM systems that serve limited discernible functions for their members (Ball, 2021).

Organizations can smooth the implementation process by being transparent with employees about EPM use and allowing organizational members to voice their concerns and suggestions regarding the EPM system. According to Leventhal (1980), transparency regarding the creation of organizational policies and procedures is a key predictor of organizational members' perceptions of fairness. Organizations planning to implement or make changes to an existing EPM system should consider developing training programs for members that explain the reasons behind the use of EPM, how the system collects data, and how that data will be used. Above all, organizations and supervisors must use evidence-based practices that increase perceived procedural fairness when designing EPM policies and implementing EMS technology (Ball, 2021).

Limitations

Before closing, some study limitations should be noted. First, data were gathered for this study using self-report scales to measure procedural fairness perceptions, attitudes toward surveillance, trust in top management, trust in immediate supervisor, leader communication exchanges, and cooperative communication variables. Although self-report measures have long been considered an acceptable way to measure perceptual variables in social science research (McCroskey, 1984; Podsakoff & Organ, 1986), there is an increased risk that the relationships between variables identified in this study were inflated due to common method variance (Podsakoff et al., 2003; Podsakoff et al., 2012; Spector, 2006). However, some scholars have argued that issues stemming from common method variance may be overstated and unlikely to significantly inflate correlations (Spector, 2006). In addition, the relatively small sample size

coupled with the correlational nature of the data increases concerns regarding causality as well as the external validity of the results. Despite a power analysis indicating that the sample size is sufficient for conducting multiple regressions (Kraemer & Blasey, 2016), a larger sample size would provide greater confidence in providing recommendations about organizational practice. In order to mitigate these limitations, future researchers should explore these variables using multiple sources or examine the variables over time in a longitudinal study (Tehseen et al., 2017).

Directions for Future Research

The results of this study provide ample foundation for future research. First, since it appears that attitudes toward surveillance play a minor role in organizational members' relationships, it might be fruitful to explore how EPM associates with or impacts organizational members' perceptions of their organizational and communication climates. Researchers have found that EPM plays a role in how organizational members perceive their organizations (e.g., Alder & Thompkins, 1997; Furnham & Swami, 2015). Therefore, relating EPM and organizational members' attitudes about it could provide helpful insight to researchers and organizational members.

Second, because of the lack of measurement options for assessing organizational members' perceptions of fairness specifically relating to EPM, researchers can develop and test a new survey instrument to use for additional research. Such an instrument could prove helpful in exploring EPM and other communication constructs. Relatedly, experimental designs manipulating various types of EPM and assessing their impact on organizational members' cognitive (e.g., decision making), emotional (e.g., frustration, anger, positivity), and behavioral

(e.g., performance, organizational citizenship behaviors) outcomes offer an intriguing way of advancing knowledge about EPM and how organizational members respond to it.

Fourth, because EPM has become a concern in various contexts, researchers should explore EPM in higher education. As Mangan (2021) pointed out, higher education institutions have increased their use of surveillance to track their students. These actions have raised important questions about where privacy ends and surveillance begins. Therefore, researchers should explore how higher education institutes implement EPM and how faculty, staff, and students respond to EPM.

Conclusion

The primary purpose of this thesis was to use UMT as a framework to explore how organizational members' perceptions of procedural fairness and their attitudes toward EPM predict their organizational trust and communication behaviors with their supervisor and peer co-workers. Five research questions were proposed, with results yielding insight into the quality of informal treatment from supervisors associating it with trust in immediate supervisor and all six dimensions of LCM, professional trust, professional development, affect, verbal communication, nonverbal communication, and accessibility. Results from the study provided further evidence that organizational members' perceptions of procedural fairness can predict their communication behavior with their immediate supervisor. As EPM technology advances, organizations must provide precise details about the reasoning for implementing EPM systems. Likewise, organizational members must constantly adjust to the tension between their privacy and organizational standing.

Discussion Summary

      Overall, the discussion section explains the results of the study and provides clear meaning for how those results expand UMT, organizational communication research, and can help organizational members navigate the complexities of EPM.

REFERENCES

Abu Bakar, H., Dilbeck, K. E., & McCroskey, J. C. (2010). Mediating role of supervisory

communication practices on relations between leader-member exchange and perceived

employee commitment to workgroup. *Communication Monographs, 77*(4), 637-656.

https://doi.org/10.1080/03637751.2010.499104

Abu Bakar, H., & Sheer, V. C. (2013). The mediating role of perceived cooperative

communication in the relationship between interpersonal exchange relationships and

perceived group cohesion. *Management Communication Quarterly, 27*(3), 443-465.

https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318913492564

Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in*

experimental social psychology, (Vol. 2., pp. 267-299). Academic Press.

Adams, I., & Mastracci, S. (2019). Police body-worn cameras: Effects on officers' burnout and

perceived organizational support. *Police Quarterly*, *22*(1), 5-30.

https://doi.org/10.1177/1098611118783987

Alder, G. S. (2001). Employee reactions to electronic performance monitoring: A consequence of

organizational culture. *The Journal of High Technology Management Research*, *12*(2),

323-342. https://doi.org/10.1016/s1047-8310(01)00042-6

Alder, G. S., & Ambrose, M. L. (2005a). An examination of the effect of computerized

performance monitoring feedback on monitoring fairness, performance, and satisfaction.

Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, *97*(2), 161-177.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2005.03.003

Alder, G. S., & Ambrose, M. L. (2005b). Towards understanding fairness judgments associated

    with computer performance monitoring: An integration of the feedback, justice, and

    monitoring research. *Human Resource Management Review*, *15*(1), 43-67.

    https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2005.01.001

Alder, G. S., Noel, T. W., & Ambrose, M. L. (2006). Clarifying the effects of Internet monitoring

    on job attitudes: The mediating role of employee trust. *Information &*

    Management, *43*(7), 894-903. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2006.08.008

Alder, G. S., & Tompkins, P. K. (1997). Electronic performance monitoring: An organizational

    justice and concertive control perspective. *Management Communication Quarterly, 10,*

    259-288. https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318997010003001

Alge, B. J. (2001). Effects of computer surveillance on perceptions of privacy and procedural

    justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*(4), 797-804. https://doi:10.1037/0021-

    9010.86.4.797

Aloisi, A., & De Stefano, V. (2021). Essential jobs, remote work and digital surveillance:

    Addressing the COVID-19 pandemic panopticon. *International Labour Review,* 1-31.

    https://doi.org/10.1111/ilr.12219

Amazon Mechanical Turk (2022). https://www.mturk.com/

Astor, M. (2017). Microchip implants for employees? One company says yes. *The New York*

    Times, July 25. Retrieved from

    https://www.nytimes.com/2017/07/25/technology/microchips-wisconsin-

    companyemployees.html?mcubz=3

Ball, K. (2010). Workplace surveillance: An overview. *Labor History*, *51*(1), 87-106.

    https://doi:10.1080/00236561003654776

Ball, K. (2021). *Electronic surveillance in the workplace: Literature review and policy recommendations*. Publications Office of the European Union. https://www.bollettinoadapt.it/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/jrc125716_electronic_monitoring_and_surveillance_in_the_workplace_final.pdf

Bartels, L. K., & Nordstrom, C. R. (2012). Examining big brother's purpose for using electronic performance monitoring. *Performance improvement Quarterly, 25*(2), 65-77. https://doi.org/10.1002/piq.20140

Becker, T. E., & Marique, G. (2014). Observer effects without demand characteristics: An inductive investigation of video monitoring and performance. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 29*(4), 541-553. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-013-9338-1

Berger, C. R. (1979). Beyond initial interaction: Uncertainty, understanding and development of interpersonal relationships. In H. Giles & R. St. Clair (Eds.), *Language and Social Psychology* (pp. 122–144). University Park Press.

Berger, C. R., & Bradac, J. J. (1982). *Language and social knowledge.* Edward Arnold.

Berger, C. R., & Calabrese, R. J. (1975). Some explorations in initial interaction and beyond: Toward a developmental theory of interpersonal communication. *Human Communication Research, 1*(2), 99-112.

Bhave, D. P. (2014). The invisible eye? electronic performance monitoring and employee job performance. *Personnel Psychology, 67*(3), 605-635. https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12046

Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. F. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. In R. J. Lewicki, B. H. Sheppard, & M. H. Bazerman (Eds.), *Research on negotiations in organizations* (Vol. 1, pp. 43-55). JAI Press.

Blader, S. L., & Tyler, T. R. (2003a). A four-component model of procedural justice: Defining the meaning of a "Fair" process. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*(6), 747-758. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167203029006007

Blader, S. L., & Tyler, T. R. (2003b). What constitutes fairness in work settings? A four-component model of procedural justice. *Human Resource Management Review, 13*(1), 107-126. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822(02)00101-8

Botan, C. (1996). Communication work and electronic surveillance: A model for predicting panoptic effects. *Communications Monographs*, *63*(4), 293-313. https://doi:10.1080/03637759609376396

Bradac, J. (2001). Theory comparison: Uncertainty reduction, problematic integration, uncertainty management, and other curious constructs. *Journal of Communication, 51*(3), 456-476. https://doi.org/10.1093/joc/51.3.456

Buhrmester, M. D., Talaifar, S., & Gosling, S. D. (2018). An evaluation of Amazon's Mechanical Turk, its rapid rise, and its effective use. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 13,* 149-154. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691617706516

Campbell, K. S., White, C. D., & Durant, R. (2007). Necessary evils, (in)justice, and rapport management. *The Journal of Business Communication (1973), 44*(2), 161-185. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021943606297904

Chen, J. V., & Park, Y. (2005). The role of control and other factors in the electronic surveillance workplace. *Journal of Information, Communication & Ethics in Society (Online), 3*(2), 79-91. https://doi.org/10.1108/14779960580000263

Chen, G., Tjosvold, D., & Liu, C. (2006). Cooperative goals, leader people and productivity

      values: Their contribution to top management teams in china. *Journal of*

      Management Studies, 43(5), 1177-1200. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-

      6486.2006.00633.x

Chory, R. M., Vela, L. E., & Avtgis, T. A. (2016). Organizational surveillance of

      computermediated workplace communication: Employee privacy concerns and

      responses. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 28*(1), 23-43.

      https://doi:10.1007/s10672-015-9267-4

Chory, R. M., & Westerman, C. Y. K. (2009). Feedback and fairness: The relationship between

      negative performance feedback and organizational justice. *Western Journal of*

      Communication, 73(2), 157-181. https://doi.org/10.1080/10570310902856055

Christianson, M. K., & Barton, M. A. (2021). Sensemaking in the time of COVID-19. *Journal of*

      Management Studies, 58(2), 572-576. https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12658

Cistulli, M. D., & Snyder, J. L. (2022). Student-professor social media relationships: An

      exploratory study of privacy and trust. *Business and Professional Communication*

      Quarterly. Advance Online Publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/23294906221077265

Clampitt, P. G., & Williams, M. L. (2017). Uncertainty. In C. R. Scott & L. Lewis (Eds.), *The*

      international encyclopedia of organizational communication. Wiley.

Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of

      a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(3), 386-400.

      https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.86.3.386

Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L. H., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at

the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice

research. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(3), 425-445. https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-

9010.86.3.425

Colquitt, J. A., & Rodell, J. B. (2015). Measuring justice and fairness. In R. Cropanzano & M.

A. Ambrose (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of justice in the workplace* (pp. 187-202). Oxford

University Press.

Colquitt, J. A., Scott, B. A., Judge, T. A., & Shaw, J. C. (2006). Justice and personality: Using

integrative theories to derive moderators of justice effects. *Organizational Behavior and*

Human Decision Processes, 100(1), 110-127.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2005.09.001

Colquitt, J. A., Scott, B. A., & LePine, J. A. (2007). Trust, trustworthiness, and trust propensity:

A meta-analytic test of their unique relationships with risk taking and job performance.

Journal of Applied Psychology, 92(4), 909-927.

https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.4.909

Colquitt, J. A., & Zipay, K. P. (2015). Justice, fairness, and employee reactions. *Annual Review*

of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 2(1), 75-99.

https://doi:10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032414-111457

Cranmer, G. A., & Myers, S. A. (2015). Sports teams as organizations: A leader-member

exchange perspective of player communication with coaches and teammates.

Communication & Sport, 3, 100-188. https://doi.org/10.1177/2167479513520487

Cronpanzano, R., & Greenberg, J. (1997). Progress in organizational justice: Tunneling through

    the maze. In C. L. Cooper & I. T. Robertson (Eds.), *International review of industrial and*

    organizational psychology, (pp. 317-372). Wiley.

Crowley, J. L., & Pederson, J. R. (2022). Relational load when a romantic partner is

    unemployed: The role of communal coping and social network support. *Communication*

    Quarterly Advance Online Publication. https://doi.org/10.1080/01463373.2022.2053731

Davidson, R., & Henderson, R. (2000). Electronic performance monitoring: A laboratory

    investigation of the influence of monitoring and difficulty on task performance, mood

    state, and self-reported stress levels. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 30*(5), 906-

    920. https://doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2000.tb02502.x

De', R., Pandey, N., & Pal, A. (2020). Impact of digital surge during covid-19 pandemic: A

    viewpoint on research and practice. *International Journal of Information*

    Management, 55, 1-5. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2020.102171

Dietz, G., & Den Hartog, D. (2006). Measuring trust inside organisations. *Personnel Review,*

    35(5), 557-588. https://doi.org/10.1108/00483480610682299

Driskill, L. P., & Goldstein, J. R. (1986). Uncertainty: Theory and practice in organizational

    communication. *The Journal of Business Communication, 23,* 41-56.

    https://doi:10.1177/002194368602300304

Ellis, K., & Shockley-Zalabak, P. (2001). Trust in top management and immediate supervisor:

    The relationship to satisfaction, perceived organizational effectiveness, and information

    receiving. *Communication Quarterly, 49*(4), 382-398.

    https://doi.org/10.1080/01463370109385637

Elovainio, M., van den Bos, K., Linna, A., Kivimäki, M., Ala-Mursula, L., Pentti, J., & Vahtera,

    J. (2005). Combined effects of uncertainty and organizational justice on employee health:

    Testing the uncertainty management model of fairness judgments among Finnish public

    sector employees. *Social Science & Medicine, 61*(12), 2501-2512.

    https://doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2005.04.046

Floyd, K., Morman, M. T., Mare, J., & Holmes, E. (2021). How Americans communicate

    affection: Findings from a representative national sample. *Communication Quarterly, 69,*

    383-409. https://doi.org/10.1080/01463373.2021.1951794

Ford, J. B. (2017). Amazon's Mechanical Turk: A comment. *Journal of Advertising, 46,* 156-

    158. https://doi.org/10.18574/nyu/9781479875214.003.0005

Furnham, A., & Swami, V. (2015). An investigation of attitudes toward surveillance at work and

    its correlates. *Psychology, 6*, 1668–1675.

Garner, J., & Dougherty, K. (2017). Justice. In C. Scott & L. Lewis (Eds.), *International*

    encyclopedia of organizational communication. Wiley

Garner, J. T., Ragland, J. P., Leite, M., Young, J., Berquist, G., Summer, S., … Ivy, T. (2016). A

    long look back: An analysis of organizational communication research (1964-2013).

    Review of Communication Research, 4, 29-64. https://doi:10.12840/issn.2255-

    4165.2016.04.01.009

Gordon, J., & Hartman, R. L. (2009). Affinity-seeking strategies and open communication in

    peer workplace relationships. *Atlantic Journal of Communication, 17*(3), 115-125.

    https://doi.org/10.1080/15456870902873184

Holland, P. J., Cooper, B., & Hecker, R. (2015). Electronic monitoring and surveillance in the

    workplace. *Personnel Review*, *44*(1), 161-175. https://doi:10.1108/PR-11-2013-0211

Holland, P., & Tham, T. L. (2020). Workplace biometrics: Protecting employee privacy one

    fingerprint at a time. *Economic and Industrial Democracy.* Advanced online publication.

    https://doi.org/10.1177/0143831X20917453

Holman, D., Chissick, C., & Totterdell, P. (2002). The effects of performance monitoring on

    emotional labor and well-being in call centers. *Motivation and Emotion, 26*(1), 57-81.

    https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015194108376

Horan, S. M., Chory, R. M., Craw, E. S., & Jones, H. E. (2021). Blended work/life relationships:

    Organizational communication involving workplace peers, friends, and lovers.

    Communication Research Trends, 40, 3-47.

Hovorka-Mead, A. D., Ross, W. H., Jr., Whipple, T., & Renchin, M. B. (2002). Watching the

    detectives: Seasonal student employee reactions to electronic monitoring with and

    without advance notification. *Personnel Psychology, 55*(2), 329-362.

    https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2002.tb00113.x

Hubbell, A. P., & Chory-Assad, R. M. (2005). Motivating factors: Perceptions of justice and

    their relationship with managerial and organizational trust. *Communication*

    Studies, 56(1), 47-70. https://doi.org/10.1080/0008957042000332241

Jablin, F. M. (1979). Superior-subordinate communication: The state of the art. *Psychological*

    Bulletin, 6, 1201-1222. https://doi:10.1037//0033-2909.86.6.1201

Jablin, F. M. (1982). Organizational communication: An assimilation approach. In M. E.

    Roloff & C. R. Berger (Eds.), *Social cognition and communication* (pp. 255-286). Sage.

Jablin, F. M. (2001). Organizational entry, assimilation, and disengagement/exit. In F. M. Jablin

    & L. L. Putnam (Eds.), *The new handbook of organizational communication: Advances*

    in theory, research, and methods (pp. 732-818). Sage.

Jeske, D. (2022). Remote workers' experiences with electronic monitoring during Covid-19: implications and recommendations. *International Journal of Workplace Health Management*. Advance online publication.

Jeske, D., and Kapasi, I. (2018). Electronic performance monitoring: Lessons from the past and future challenges. In F. Cabitza, A. Lazazzara, M. Magni, & S. Za (Eds.), *Organizing for digital economy: Societies, communities and individuals*. *Proceedings of the 14th annual conference of the Italian chapter of the AIS*: 119-132. LUISS University Press.

Jeske, D., & Santuzzi, A. M. (2015). Monitoring what and how: Psychological implications of electronic performance monitoring. *New Technology, Work, and Employment, 30*(1), 62-78. https://doi.org/10.1111/ntwe.12039

Kalischko, T., & Riedl, R. (2021). Electronic performance monitoring in the digital workplace: Conceptualization, review of effects and moderators, and future research opportunities. *Frontiers in Psychology, 12*, 1-15. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.633031

Kassing, J. W. (2017). Dissent. In C. R. Scott & L. Lewis (Eds.), *The international encyclopedia of organizational communication*.

Keith, M. G., Harms, P., & Tay, L. (2019). Mechanical Turk and the gig economy: Exploring differences between gig workers. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 34,* 286-306. https://doi.org/10.1108/jmp-06-2018-0228

Keith, M. G., Tay, L., & Harms, P. D. (2017). Systems perspective of Amazon Mechanical Turk for organizational research: Review and recommendations. *Frontiers in Psychology, 8,* 1-19. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01359

Kees, J., Berry, C., Burton, S., & Sheehan, K. (2017). An analysis of data quality: Professional panels, student subject pools, and Amazon's Mechanical Turk. *Journal of Advertising, 46,* 141-155. https://doi.org/10.1080/00913367.2016.1269304

Keyton, J. (2017). Communication in organizations. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 4,* 501–526. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032516-113341

Kizza, J. M., & Ssanyu, J. (2005). Workplace surveillance. In J. Weckert (Ed.) *Electronic monitoring in the workplace: controversies and solutions* (pp. 1-18). IGI Global.

Knobloch, L. K. (2008). Uncertainty reduction theory. In L. A. Baxter & D. O. Braithwaite (Eds.), *Engaging theories in interpersonal communication: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 133-144). Sage.

Knobloch, L. K., & McAninch, K. G. (2014). Uncertainty management. In C. R. Berger (Ed.), *Interpersonal communication* (pp. 297-319). Walter de Gruyter.

Kram, K. F., & Isabella, L. A. (1985). Mentoring alternatives: The role of peer relationships in career development. *Academy of Management Journal, 28,* 110-132. https://doi:10.2307/256064

Kraemer, H. C., & Blasey, C. (2016). *How many subjects?: Statistical power analysis in research* (2nd ed.). Sage.

Kramer, M. W. (1994). Uncertainty reduction during job transitions: An exploratory study of the communication experiences of newcomers and transferees. *Management Communication Quarterly, 7*(4), 384-412. https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318994007004002

Kramer, M. W. (1996). A longitudinal study of peer communication during job transfers: The impact of frequency, quality, and network multiplexity on adjustment. *Human Communication Research, 23*(1), 59-86. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.1996.tb00387.x

Kramer, M. W. (1999). Motivation to reduce uncertainty: A reconceptualization of uncertainty reduction theory. *Management Communication Quarterly, 13*(2), 305-316. https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318999132007

Kramer, M. W. (2004). *Managing uncertainty in organizational communication*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410609854

Kramer, M. W. (2009). Managing uncertainty in work interactions. In T. D. Afifi & W. A. Afifi (Eds.), *Uncertainty, information management, and disclosure decisions: Theories and applications*. (pp. 164–181). Routledge.

Kramer, M. W. (2016). Uncertainty and communication in organizations. In C. R. Berger & M. E. Roloff (Eds.), *The international encyclopedia of interpersonal communication*. Retrieved from https://communicationencyclopedia.com

Kramer, M. (2017). Supervisor–subordinate communication. In C. Scott, J. Barker, T. Kuhn, J. Keyton, P. Turner, & L. Lewis (Eds.), *The international encyclopedia of organizational communication* (Vol. 1, pp. 2316–2330). Wiley.

Kramer, M. W. (2018). Uncertainty management. In A. Farazmand, P. Prysmakova, & D. R. Vienne (Eds.), *Global encyclopedia of public administration, public policy, and governance*. (pp. 1-7). Springer.

Kramer, M. W., & Sias, P. M. (2014). Interpersonal communication in formal organizations. In

    C. R. Berger (Ed.), *Interpersonal communication* (pp. 467-492). De Gruyter Mouton.

    https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110276794.467

Lee, J. (1997). Leader-member exchange, the "Pelz effect," and cooperative communication

    between group members. *Management Communication Quarterly, 11*(2), 266-287.

    https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318997112004

Lee, J. (2001). Leader-member exchange, perceived organizational justice, and cooperative

    communication. *Management Communication Quarterly, 14*(4), 574-589.

    https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318901144002

Lee, J. (2005). Effects of leadership and leader-member exchange on commitment. *Leadership &*

    Organization Development Journal, 26(8), 655-672.

    https://doi.org/10.1108/01437730510633728

Lester, R. E. (1987). Organizational culture, uncertainty reduction, and the socialization of new

    organizational members. In S. Thomas (Ed.), *Culture and communication: Methodology,*

    behaviors, and institutions: Selected proceedings from the fifth international conference

    on culture (pp. 105-113). Ablex.

Leventhal, G.S. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? New approaches to the study

    of fairness in social relationships. In K. J. Gergen, M. S. Greenberg, & R. H. Willis,

    (Eds.), *Social Exchange: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 27-55). Plenum.

    https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4613-3087-5_2

Lind, E. A. (2001). Fairness heuristic theory: Justice judgements as pivotal cognitions in

    organizational relations. In J. Greenberg & R. Cropanzano (Eds.), *Advances in*

    organizational justice (pp. 56-88). Stanford University Press.

Lind, E. A., & van den Bos, K. (2002). When fairness works: Toward a general theory of

uncertainty management. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 24*, 181-223.

https://doi:10.1016/S0191-3085(02)24006-X

Malik, A., Sinha, S., & Goel, S. (2020). The "screen"ing of you and me: Effects of COVID-19 on

counterproductive work behaviors. *IEEE Engineering Management Review, 48*(3), 37-43.

https://doi:10.1109/EMR.2020.3010323

Mangan, K. (2021, February 15). The surveilled student. *Chronicle of Higher Education*.

https://www.chronicle.com/article/the-surveilled-student

McCroskey, J. C. (1984). Self-report measurement. In J. A. Daly & J. C. McCroskey (Eds.),

Avoiding communication: Shyness, reticence, and communication apprehension (pp.191-

216). Sage.

McNall, L. A., & Roch, S. G. (2007). Effects of electronic monitoring types on perceptions of

procedural justice, interpersonal justice, and privacy. *Journal of Applied Social

Psychology, 37*(3), 658-682. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2007.00179.x

McNall, L. A., & Roch, S. G. (2009). A social exchange model of employee reactions to

electronic performance monitoring. *Human Performance, 22*(3), 204-224.

https://doi:10.1080/08959280902970385

McNall, L. A., & Stanton, J. M. (2011). Private eyes are watching you: Reactions to location

sensing technologies. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 26*(3), 299-

309. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-010-9189-y

Mikkelson, A. C., Sloan, D., & Tietsort, C. J. (2021). Employee perceptions of supervisor

communication competence and associations with supervisor credibility. *Communication

Studies, 72,* 600-617. https://doi.org/10.1080/10510974.2021.1953093

Mintzberg, H. (2013). *Simply managing: What managers can do-and do better*. Berrett-Koehler.

Moorman, R. H., & Wells, D. L. (2003). Can electronic performance monitoring be fair?

exploring relationships among monitoring characteristics, perceived fairness, and job

performance. *The Journal of Leadership Studies, 10*(2), 2-16.

https://doi:10.1177/107179190301000202

Morris, S., Griffin, D., & Gower, P. (2017). Barclays puts in sensors to see which bankers are at

their desks. *Bloomberg,* August 18. Retrieved from

https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2017-08-18/barclays-putsin-sensors-to-

seewhich-bankers-are-at-their-desks

Morrison, E. W. (1995). Information usefulness and acquisition during organizational encounter.

Management Communication Quarterly, 9, 131-155.

https://doi:10.1177/0893318995009002001

Morrison, E. W. (2002). Information seeking within organizations. *Human communication

research*, *28*(2), 229-242. https://doi.org/10.5465/3069430

Myers, S. A., Cranmer, G. A., Goldman, Z. W., Sollitto, M., Gillen, H. G., & Ball, H. (2018).

Differences in information seeking among organizational peers: Perceptions of

appropriateness, importance, and frequency. *International Journal of Business

Communication, 55*(1), 30-43. https://doi.org/10.1177/2329488415573928

Myers, S. A., & Johnson, A. D. (2004). Perceived solidarity, self-disclosure, and trust in

organizational peer relationships. *Communication Research Reports, 21*(1), 75-83.

https://doi.org/10.1080/08824090409359969

Myers, S. A., Knox, R. L., Pawlowski, D. R., & Ropog, B. L. (1999). Perceived communication openness and functional communication skills among organizational peers. *Communication Reports, 12*(2), 71-83. https://doi.org/10.1080/08934219909367712

Omilion-Hodges, L. M., & Baker, C. R. (2017). Communicating leader-member relationship quality: The development of leader communication exchange scales to measure relationship building and maintenance through the exchange of communication-based goods. *International Journal of Business Communication, 54*(2), 115-145. https://doi.org/10.1177/2329488416687052

Omilion-Hodges, L. M., Ptacek, J. K., & Zerilli, D. H. (2016). A comprehensive review and communication research agenda of the contextualized workgroup: The evolution and future of leader-member exchange, coworker exchange, and team-member exchange. *Annals of the International Communication Association, 40*(1), 343-377. https://doi.org/10.1080/23808985.2015.11735265

Pascual-Ferra, P. (2020). The measurement of trust in communication research: Part 1. *Communication Research Trends, 39*(4), 4-36.

Pillemer, K., Suitor, J. J., Henderson, C. R., Meador, R., Schultz, L., Robison, J., & Hegeman, C. (2003). A cooperative communication intervention for nursing home staff and family members of residents. *The Gerontologist, 43*, 96-106. https://doi.org/10.1093/geront/43.suppl_2.96

Podsakoff, N. P., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method

    biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended

    remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88,* 879-903. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-

    9010.88.5.879

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2012). Sources of method bias in social

    science research and recommendations on how to control it. *Annual Review of*

    Psychology, 63, 539-569. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-120710-100452

Podsakoff, P. M., & Organ, D. W. (1986). Self-reports in organizational research: Problems

    and prospects. *Journal of Management, 12,* 531-544.

    https://doi:10.1177/014920638601200408

Proudfoot, D., & Lind, E. A. (2015). Fairness heuristic theory, the uncertainty management

    model, and fairness at work. In R. Cropanzano & M. L. Ambrose (Eds.), *The Oxford*

    handbook of justice in the workplace (pp. 371-385). Oxford University Press.

Ravid, D. M., Tomczak, D. L., White, J. C., & Behrend, T. S. (2020). EPM 20/20: A review,

    framework, and research agenda for electronic performance monitoring. *Journal of*

    Management, 46(1), 100-126. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206319869435

Sewell, G., Barker, J. R., & Nyberg, D. (2012). Working under intensive surveillance: When

    does 'measuring everything that moves' become intolerable? *Human Relations (New*

    York), 65(2), 189-215. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726711428958

Shockley-Zalabak, P., & Ellis, K. (2006). The communication of trust. In T. L. Gillis (Ed.), *The*

    IABC handbook of organizational communication (pp. 44-55). Jossey-Bass.

Shockley-Zalabak, P., Ellis, K., & Winograd, G. (2000). Organizational trust: What it means, why it matters. *Organization Development Journal, 18*(4), 35-48.

Shockley-Zalabak, P. S., Morreale, S. P., & Hackman, M. Z. (2010). *Building the high-trust organization: Strategies for supporting five key dimensions of trust*. Jossey-Bass.

Sias, P. M. (2005). Workplace relationship quality and employee information experiences. *Communication Studies, 56*(4), 375-395. https://doi.org/10.1080/10510970500319450

Sias, P. M. (2009). *Organizing relationships: Traditional and emerging perspectives on workplace relationships*. Sage. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452204031

Sias, P., & Jablin, F. (1995). Differential superior-subordinate relations, perceptions of fairness, and coworker communication. *Human Communication Research, 22*(1), 5-38.

Sias, P. M., Krone, K. J., & Jablin, F. M. (2002). An ecological systems perspective on workplace relationships. In M. Knapp & J. Daly (Eds.), *Handbook of interpersonal communication,* (pp. 615-642). Sage.

Sias, P. M., Tsetsi, E., Woo, N., & Smith, A. D. (2020). With A little help from my friends: Perceived task interdependence, coworker communication, and workplace friendship. *Communication Studies, 71*(4), 528-549. https://doi.org/10.1080/10510974.2020.1749863

Sias, P. M., & Shin, Y. (2020). Workplace relationships. In A. M. Nicotera (Ed.), *Origins and traditions of organizational communication: A comprehensive introduction to the field,* (pp. 187-206). Routledge.

Snowberg, E., & Yariv, L. (2021). Testing the waters: Behaviors across participant pools. *American Economic Review, 111,* 687-719. https://doi.org/10.3386/w24781

Society for Human Resources Management (2019, March 13). Managing workplace monitoring

    and surveillance. https://www.shrm.org/resourcesandtools/tools-and-

    samples/toolkits/pages/workplaceprivacy.aspx

Sollitto, M. (2017). Communication characteristics in peer coworker relationships: Exploration

    of affirming communicator style and communication competence. *Texas Speech*

    Communication Journal, 41(1), 24-36.

Solomon, D. H., & Vangelisti, A. L. (2014). Relationship development. In P. J. Schultz, P.

    Cobley, & C. R. Berger (Eds.), *Handbooks of communication science: Vol. 6.*

    Interpersonal communication (pp. 347–369). De Gruyter Mouton.

Spector, P. E. (2006). Method variance in organizational research: Truth or urban

    legend? *Organizational Research Methods, 9*(2), 221-232.

    https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428105284955

Snowberg, E., & Yariv, L. (2021). Testing the waters: Behaviors across participant pools.

    American Economic Review, 111, 687-719. https://doi.org/10.3386/w24781

Stanton, J. M. (2000). Reactions to employee performance monitoring: Framework, review, and

    research directions. *Human Performance, 13*(1), 85-113.

    https://doi:10.1207/S15327043HUP1301_4

Stanton, J. M., & Julian, A. L. (2002). The impact of electronic monitoring on quality and

    quantity of performance. *Computers in Human Behavior, 18*(1), 85-101.

    https://doi.org/10.1016/S0747-5632(01)00029-2

Stanton, J. M., & Weiss, E. M. (2000). Electronic monitoring in their own words: An exploratory

    study of employees' experiences with new types of surveillance. *Computers in Human*

    Behavior, 16, 423-440. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0747-5632(00)00018-2

Tehseen, S., Ramayah, T., & Sajilan, S. (2017). Testing and controlling for common method variance: A review of available methods. *Journal of Management Science, 4,* 146-175. https://doi.org/10.20547/jms.2014.1704202

Theiss, J. A. (2018). *The experience and expression of uncertainty in close relationships: Advances in personal relationships*. Cambridge.

Thibaut, J. W., & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural justice: A psychological analysis*. L. Erlbaum Associates.

Thomas, G. F., Zolin, R., & Hartman, J. L. (2009). The central role of communication in developing trust and its effect on employee involvement. *Journal of Business Communication, 46,* 287-310. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021943609333522

Tjosvold, D. (1984). Cooperation theory and organizations. *Human relations, 37*, 743.767. https://doi.org/10.1177/001872678403700903

Tjosvold, D., Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. (1984). Influence strategy, perspective-taking, and relationships between high- and low-power individuals in cooperative and competitive contexts. *The Journal of Psychology, 116*(2), 187-202. https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.1984.9923636

Tjosvold, D., Wong, A. S. H., & Chen, N. Y. F. (2014). Constructively managing conflicts in organizations. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 1,* 545-568. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091306

Topchik, G. S. (2004). *The accidental manager: Get the skills you need to excel in your new career*. AMACOM.

van den Bos, K. (2001). Uncertainty management: The influence of uncertainty salience on

　　reactions to perceived procedural fairness. *Journal of Personality and Social*

　　Psychology, 80(6), 931-941.

van den Bos, K. (2003). On the subjective quality of social justice: The role of affect as

　　information in the psychology of justice judgments. *Journal of Personality and Social*

　　Psychology, 85(3), 482-498. https://doi:10.1037/0022-3514.85.3.482

van den Bos, K., & Lind, E. A. (2002). Uncertainty management by means of fairness

　　judgments. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol.

　　34, pp. 1–60). Academic.

Waldron, V. R. (1991). Achieving communication goals in superior-subordinate relationships:

　　The multi-functionality of upward maintenance tactics. *Communication Monographs, 58,*

　　289-306. https://doi:10.1080/03637759109376231

Waldron, V. R. (1999). Communication practices of followers, members, and proteges: The case

　　of upward influence tactics. In M. Roloff (Ed.). *Communication yearbook 22* (pp. 251-

　　299). Sage.

Walker, K. L. (2017). Surveillance. In C. R. Scott & L. Lewis (Eds.), *The international*

　　encyclopedia of organizational communication. Wiley.

Watkins Allen, M., Coopman, S. J., Hart, J. L., & Walker, K. L. (2007). Workplace surveillance

　　and managing privacy boundaries. *Management Communication Quarterly, 21*(2), 172-

　　200. https://doi:10.1177/0893318907306033

Wells, D. L., Moorman, R. H., & Werner, J. M. (2007). The impact of the perceived purpose of

　　electronic performance monitoring on an array of attitudinal variables. *Human Resource*

　　Development Quarterly, 18(1), 121-138. https://doi:10.1002/hrdq.1194

Westerman, C. Y. K., Heuett, K. B., Reno, K. M., & Curry, R. (2014). What makes performance feedback seem just? Synchronicity, channel, and valence effects on perceptions of organizational justice in feedback delivery. *Management Communication Quarterly, 28*(2), 244-263. https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318914524060

Westerman, C. Y. K., & Westerman, D. K. (2013). What's fair? public and private delivery of project feedback. *The Journal of Business Communication, 50*(2), 190-207. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021943612474991

Wheatley, M. J. (2000). *Leadership and the new science: Learning about organization from an orderly universe.* Berrett-Koehler.

Wolfe, S. E., Rojek, J., Manjarrez, V. M., & Rojeck, A. (2018). Why does organizational justice matter?: Uncertainty management among law enforcement officers. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 54,* 20-29. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2017.11.003

World Health Organization (2020). *WHO Director General.* https://www.who.int/director-general/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020

Yost, A. B., Behrend, T. S., Howardson, G., Badger Darrow, J., & Jensen, J. M. (2019;). Reactance to electronic surveillance: A test of antecedents and outcomes. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 34*(1), 71-86. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-018-9532-2

Zweig, D., & Scott, K. (2007). When unfairness matters most: Supervisory violations of electronic monitoring practices. *Human Resource Management Journal, 17*(3), 227-247. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-8583.2007.00040.x

Zweig, D., & Webster, J. (2003). Personality as a moderator of monitoring

    acceptance. *Computers in Human Behavior, 19*(4), 479- 493.

    https://doi.org/10.1016/S0747-5632(02)00075-4

SURVEILLANCE AND WORK BEHAVIOR SURVEY

Surveillance and Work Behavior

Consent to Participate in a Research Study at Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi Using Uncertainty Management Theory to Explore the Effects of Electronic Monitoring/Surveillance
 Traditional

Introduction
The purpose of this form is to provide you information to help to make the decision on whether to participate in this research study. Please read the information below and ask questions before you make a choice.

You have been asked to participate in a research project investigating how organizational members respond to electronic surveillance strategies in their workplace.

Who is doing this study?
A study team led by Michael Sollitto is doing this research study. This study is also being conducted with Cari Loeffler as a requirement for her MA in Communication.

Why is this research being done?
The research study is being conducted to discover greater detail about how people experience electronic surveillance, their feelings about it, and the actions they engage because of it.

Who can be in this study?
We are asking you to be a part of this research study because you are age 18 or older and a full-time employ of your organization. To be in this study you must be 18 years of age or older and be considered a full-time employee at your organization. To be eligible to be in this study, you must not be under 18 years of age or a part-time employee of your organization. Up to 300 individuals will be asked to be in this study.

What will I be asked to do?
If you agree to be in this study, you will be asked to respond to an online questionnaire containing a series of survey items about your experiences, perceptions, and actions regarding electronic surveillance in your organization. If you agree to participate in this study, the online questionnaire will take approximately 15-20 minutes to complete.

What are the risks involved in this study?

This research involves minimal risks or risks that are no more than what you may experience in everyday life. Potential risks may include:

Confidentiality risk: Your participation will involve collecting information about you. There is a slight risk of loss of confidentiality. Your confidentiality will be protected to the greatest extent possible. You do not have to give any information to the study that you do not want to give.

Survey Questions: Some questions may be embarrassing or uncomfortable to answer. An example of a question you may be asked is "My manager keeps his/her commitments to team members." You do not have to answer questions you do not want to. Once data analysis is complete, your identifiers will be removed from the research data. Your information collected as part of this research, even after identifiers are removed, will not be used or distributed for future research studies.

If you have any of these problems or changes in the way you feel about being in the study, you should tell the study team as soon as possible.

What about protecting my information?
This study is anonymous. The information collected from you will not include any identifiers (like names, addresses, phone numbers, and social security or individual taxpayer identification (ITIN) numbers). Your identity will not be known by the research team to protect your confidentiality. Please do not include any identifiers in the study documents.

Your information will be protected by:
Anonymous survey: The survey will not ask or collect any identifiers from you so researchers will not know who participated and who did not.

What are the alternatives to being in this study?
Instead of being in this study, you may choose not to be in the research study.

What are the possible benefits of this study?
There is **no** direct benefit to you from being in this research study.

What will I receive if I am in the study?
By participating in the questionnaire through Amazon Mechanical Turk account (https://www.mturk.com/mturk/welcome), you will be paid $1.00 for completing the questionnaire.

Do I have to participate?
No. **Being in a research study is voluntary.** If you choose not to participate, there will be no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

What if I change my mind?
You **may quit at any time**. There will be no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are

otherwise entitled. Your decision not to participate or quit will not affect your current or future relations with Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi or any cooperating institution.

If you withdraw from the study early for any reason, the information that already has been collected will be kept in the research study and included in the data analysis. No further information will be collected for the study. The information that already has been collected will be de-identified (the information cannot be traced back to you individually). Because you cannot be identified from the information there is no further risk to your privacy. This information will continue to be used for research even after you withdraw.

Who can I contact with questions about the research?
Michael Sollitto is in charge of this research study. You may call Michael Sollitto at 361-825-2443 or email at (michael.sollitto@tamucc.edu) with questions at any time during the study. You may also call Cari Loeffler at 361-825-5977 or email at (cari.loeffler@tamucc.edu) with any questions you may have.

Who can I contact about my rights as a research participant?
You may also call Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi Institutional Review Board (IRB) with questions or complaints about this study at irb@tamucc.edu or 361-825-2497. The IRB is a committee of faculty members, statisticians, researchers, community advocates, and others that ensures that a research study is ethical and that the rights of study participants are protected.

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE
If you do not agree to participate in the research study, please exit this form and do not fill out the survey.

To participate in this research study, click continue to begin to fill out the survey.

By clicking continue and filling out the survey, you are agreeing to participate in the study. By participating in this study, you are also certifying that you are 18 years of age or older.

○ I am at least 18 years old and employed full-time in my organization. (4)

For this survey you will reflect on your current organization. Please keep your organization in mind as you answer all following questions.

Age:

_____

Sex:

    ○ Male (1)

    ○ Female (2)

    ○ Other (3)

    ○ Prefer not to say (4)

Ethnic Background

    ○ Caucasian/White (1)

    ○ African American/Black (2)

    ○ Hispanic/Latino (3)

    ○ Native American (4)

    ○ Asian American/Asian (5)

    ○ Other (6)

How many years of overall work experience do you have?

_____

How many years have you been employed at your current organization?

_____

Which term best describes your position?

○ Top Management (1)

○ Management (2)

○ Non-Management (3)

○ Other (4)

Which best describes your organization?

○ Retail (1)

○ Manufacturing (2)

○ Government (4)

○ Service (5)

○ Medical (6)

○ Financial (7)

○ Educational (8)

○ Other (9)

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
My organization monitors the activities of employees to prevent wrongdoing. (1)	○	○	○	○	○
My organization monitors the activities of employees to detect possible misconduct or fraud. (5)	○	○	○	○	○
My organization monitors the activities of employees to discourage them from doing something wrong. (6)	○	○	○	○	○
My organization monitors the activities of employees to help me perform my job better. (7)	○	○	○	○	○

My organization monitors the activities of employees to produce examples of correct procedures that can be used to train others. (8)	○	○	○	○	○
My organization monitors the activities of employees to point out areas of my performance that need improvement. (9)	○	○	○	○	○
I trust top management. (3)	○	○	○	○	○
Top management is sincere in their efforts to communicate with employees. (15)	○	○	○	○	○
Top management listens to employees' concerns. (16)	○	○	○	○	○

Top management keeps its commitments to employees. (17)	○	○	○	○	○
Top management is concerned about employees' wellbeing. (18)	○	○	○	○	○
Those in top management keep their word to employees. (19)	○	○	○	○	○

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Moderately Disagree (3)	Undecided (4)	Moderately Agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly Agree (7)
Surveillance demoralizes me and my colleagues. (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Surveillance reduces creativity at work. (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Surveillance at work makes employees feel weak and powerless compared to the employer. (6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
The use of surveillance at work implies that employers do not trust their employees. (7)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Surveillance at work erodes trust between employers and employees. (8)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Surveillance at work increases my levels of stress. (9)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Surveillance alienates employees because it makes them more likely to self-police each other. (10)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Surveillance at work represents a violation of my right to privacy. (11)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
There is nothing wrong with surveillance at work because if a person isn't doing something wrong, then they should have anything to fear. (12)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Knowing that surveillance systems exist at work gives me a sense of security. (13)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Surveillance helps to reduce sexual harassment in the workplace. (14)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Surveillance helps to reduce bullying in the workplace. (15)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
The use of surveillance increases work safety by allowing supervisors to act before a crime is committed. (16)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Surveillance systems at work are useful because they make employees less willing to commit a crime if they know they are being watched. (17)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Surveillance at work is acceptable if it concerns the security of the workplace. (18)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Surveillance at work helps to improve employee productivity. (19)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

	Strongly Disagree (8)	Disagree (9)	Neither agree nor disagree (10)	Agree (11)	Strongly Agree (12)
I trust my manager. (1)	○	○	○	○	○
I can tell my manager when things are going wrong. (4)	○	○	○	○	○
I am free to disagree with my manager. (5)	○	○	○	○	○
My manager keeps confidences. (6)	○	○	○	○	○
My manager listens to me. (7)	○	○	○	○	○
My manager is concerned about my personal well-being. (8)	○	○	○	○	○
My manager is sincere in his/her efforts to communicate with team members. (9)	○	○	○	○	○
My manager speaks positively about subordinates in front of others. (10)	○	○	○	○	○
My manager followers through with what he/she says. (11)	○	○	○	○	○

My manager behaves in a consistent manner from day to day. (12)	○	○	○	○	○
My manager keeps his/her commitments to team members. (13)	○	○	○	○	○
I feel connected to my manager. (14)	○	○	○	○	○
My values are similar to the values of my manager. (15)	○	○	○	○	○
My manager avoids gossip. (16)	○	○	○	○	○
My manager trusts me to make recommendations to other departments or clients. (17)	○	○	○	○	○
My manager recommends me for high profile projects. (18)	○	○	○	○	○
My manager brings me in on projects with his/her peers. (19)	○	○	○	○	○
My manager asks me for my opinion on projects. (20)	○	○	○	○	○

My manager provides me with opportunities to improve my professional skills. (21)	○	○	○	○	○
My manager takes time to talk to me about my professional progress. (22)	○	○	○	○	○
My manager provides feedback on my work so that I enhance my skills. (23)	○	○	○	○	○
My manager cares about me. (24)	○	○	○	○	○
My manager considers my emotional wellbeing. (25)	○	○	○	○	○
My manager demonstrates concern for me. (26)	○	○	○	○	○
My manager compliments me. (27)	○	○	○	○	○
My manager formally recognizes my work efforts. (28)	○	○	○	○	○
My manager tells me that he/she appreciates me. (29)	○	○	○	○	○
My manager praises me in front of others. (30)	○	○	○	○	○

My manager looks me in the eye when we communicate. (31)	○	○	○	○	○
My manager indicates through head gestures that he or she is listening to me. (32)	○	○	○	○	○
My manager not only hears what I say, be sincerely pays attention. (33)	○	○	○	○	○
My manager is friendly with me. (34)	○	○	○	○	○
My manager is accessible to me. (35)	○	○	○	○	○

	Strongly Disagree (8)	Disagree (9)	Neither agree nor disagree (10)	Agree (11)	Strongly Agree (12)
The rules dictate that decisions should be fair and unbiased. (46)	○	○	○	○	○
The rules and procedures are applied consistently across people and situations. (47)	○	○	○	○	○
The rules ensure that decisions are made based on the facts, not personal biases and opinions. (48)	○	○	○	○	○
The rules and procedures are equally fair to everyone. (49)	○	○	○	○	○
My manager's decisions are consistent across people and situations. (50)	○	○	○	○	○
My manager's decisions are made based on facts, not their personal biases and opinions. (51)	○	○	○	○	○

My manager's decisions are equally fair to everyone. (52)	○	○	○	○	○
The rules lead to fair treatment when decisions are being made. (53)	○	○	○	○	○
The rules lead to fair treatment when decisions are being implemented. (54)	○	○	○	○	○
The rules require that I get an honest explanation for how decisions are made. (55)	○	○	○	○	○
My views are considered when rules are being applied. (56)	○	○	○	○	○
The rules ensure that my needs will be taken into account. (57)	○	○	○	○	○
I trust my organization to do what is best for me. (58)	○	○	○	○	○
The rules respect my rights as an employee. (59)	○	○	○	○	○

The rules respect my rights as a person. (60)	○	○	○	○	○
I am treated with dignity by my organization. (61)	○	○	○	○	○
My organization follow through on the promises it makes. (62)	○	○	○	○	○
My organization really cares about my well-being. (63)	○	○	○	○	○
My organization cares about my satisfaction. (64)	○	○	○	○	○
My manager treats me fairly when decisions are being made. (65)	○	○	○	○	○
My manager treats me fairly when decisions are being implemented. (66)	○	○	○	○	○
My manager listens to me when I express my views. (67)	○	○	○	○	○

My manager usually gives me an honest explanation for the decisions he/she makes. (68)	○	○	○	○	○
My manager considers my views when decisions are being made. (69)	○	○	○	○	○
My manager takes account of my needs when making decisions. (70)	○	○	○	○	○
I trust my manager to do what is best for me. (71)	○	○	○	○	○
My manager respects my rights as an employee. (72)	○	○	○	○	○
My manager respects my rights as a person. (73)	○	○	○	○	○
My manager treats me with dignity. (74)	○	○	○	○	○
My manager follows through on the decisions and promises he/she makes. (75)	○	○	○	○	○

My manager really cares about my well-being. (76)	○	○	○	○	○
My manager cares about my satisfaction. (77)	○	○	○	○	○
The resources and outcomes I receive in my organization are fair. (78)	○	○	○	○	○
The resources and outcomes in my organization exceed my expectations. (79)	○	○	○	○	○
My salary is favorable to me. (80)	○	○	○	○	○
My job responsibilities are favorable to me. (81)	○	○	○	○	○
My workload is favorable to me. (82)	○	○	○	○	○

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly Agree (7)
Relevant information is exchanged openly among my coworkers. (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
In general, it is difficult to approach other coworkers. (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Coworkers often criticize other coworkers. (6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Some individuals in my organization intentionally provide misleading information to other members. (7)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
If disagreements arise, coworkers are usually able to solve them. (8)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
My coworkers openly share ideas with other coworkers. (9)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

My coworkers
often fail to
communicate
information to
each other.
(10)

○   ○   ○   ○   ○   ○   ○

*

What is your birth year?

_____

Thank you for your time.

Here is your Mechanical Turk Code:

WS-${rand://int/10000:99999}-CM