

Table S1
Summary of EPM Literature

Article	Article Type	Brief Summary
Aiello (1993)	Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reviewed the pre-1990 EPM literature. Identified benefits (e.g., increased productivity) and addressed ethical concerns (e.g., privacy). Introduces potential moderators (e.g., employee involvement in EPM decisions, organizational climate, access to EPM data, saliency of EPM).
Aiello & Douthitt (2001)	Conceptual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reviewed the social facilitation literature. Advances a framework for understanding social facilitation effects of EPM.
Aiello & Kolb (1995)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Examined the effects of computer monitoring on individual and work group tasks. Found that monitoring caused low-skilled workers to perform worse on monitored tasks compared to high-skilled individuals, and low-skilled individuals also experienced greater degrees of stress.
Aiello & Svec (1993)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Experimental study that compared performance on a complex test under direct supervision and electronic monitoring. Results did not suggest that EPM elicits significantly different feelings than being physically observed by a supervisor (both are negative). Increasing target control is a way to mitigate negative effects in both conditions. Individuals with external locus of control were found to be more likely to experience stress.
Alder (2007)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student sample engaged in a computerized sorting task. Experimenter manipulated feedback source (computer vs supervisor), control over feedback timing (control vs no control) and feedback valence (constructive vs destructive). Results suggested that allowing participants to control the amount and frequency of feedback enhanced their desire to respond to the feedback.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback constructiveness significantly and positively influenced participants' perceptions of interpersonal fairness. • Feedback source and constructiveness interacted to influence interpersonal fairness with ratings of interpersonal fairness being highest among participants receiving constructive face-to-face feedback from the supervisor.
Alder (2001)	Conceptual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposes a conceptual model of the moderating effect of organizational culture on perceived fairness of electronic monitoring. • Suggests that bureaucratic organizations will be more likely to embrace monitoring compared to supportive organizations. • Argues that EPM systems should be designed in ways that align with the existing organizational culture.
Alder & Ambrose (2005)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experiment that examined feedback attributes (control, constructiveness, medium) and their relationship with monitoring fairness judgments, performance, and satisfaction. • Perceptions of feedback constructiveness significantly and positively predicted fairness judgments. • Supervisor feedback was perceived as fairer than computer mediated feedback. • Fairness judgments mediated the relationships between monitoring characteristics and performance and satisfaction.
Alder & Tompkins (1997)	Conceptual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draws from the justice literature to put forth a series of propositions suggesting that electronic monitoring will be perceived favorably when individuals are given opportunities for input and when monitoring is used for constructive two-way feedback processes. • Proposes that perceptions of organizational justice lead to high levels of organizational identification.
Alder, Noel & Ambrose (2006)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Longitudinal field study with employees at a heavy equipment sales and service center. • Authors collected measures pre- and post-implementation of an internet monitoring system.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results suggest that perceived organizational support moderates the relationship between transparency (advance notice) and post-implementation trust such that advance notice was more important for individuals with low perceived organizational support. • Post-implementation trust mediated the relationship between monitoring practices (advance notice, justification) and work attitudes (satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention).
Alder, Schminke, Noel, & Kuenzi (2007)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre- and post-measures collected from workers at a sales and service center prior to and following the implementation of an internet monitoring system. • Found that ethical orientation (formalism and utilitarianism) interact with beliefs about monitoring (privacy beliefs and usefulness of system to produce employee attitudes (organizational support, organizational trust, supervisor trust, and monitoring fairness).
Alge (2001)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Author proposed and tested a framework for understanding reactions to monitoring using theories of privacy perceptions and justice. • A student sample of participants worked at a simulated organization, in which they were monitored. Participation, relevance (job relatedness) and consistency (equity of monitoring) were manipulated. • Results suggested that monitoring job-related aspects and allowing for employee participation reduced invasion of privacy and enhanced fairness perceptions. • Invasion of privacy mediated relationships between relevance and procedural justice perceptions.
Alge, Ballinger & Green (2004)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experimental study in which a student sample of participants engaged in a team leading exercise. Participants were able to electronically monitor those they were leading. • Results suggest that team leaders electronically monitor subordinates more intensely when dependence on subordinates is high or future performance expectations are low. • Team leaders were more likely to monitor in secret when dependence was high or propensity to trust was low.

Allen, Coopman, Hart, & Walker (2007)	Empirical/Qualitative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applies communication theories to workplace surveillance by conducting and coding 154 interviews with employees from a variety of organizations regarding electronic surveillance. • Results from content coding suggest that the establishment of privacy boundaries early on in employee socialization is related to employee acceptance of monitoring and that individuals tend to rationalize monitoring as either coercive or beneficial for the organization.
Ambrose & Alder (2000)	Conceptual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draws from the justice literature to advance a framework of the effects of monitoring practices on perceptions of justice and fairness perceptions. • Proposes that more invasive forms of monitoring will lead to greater perceptions of procedural fairness violations.
Ambrose & Kulik (1994)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A sample of student participants engaged in an experimental typing task. Synchronicity of feedback delivery was manipulated such that participants were made aware that 1) their performance would be periodically sampled and immediately presented to them; 2) their performance would be periodically sampled, and presented at the end of the task; or 3) their performance would be continuously monitored and presented in a summary table at the end of the task. • Performance pattern was also manipulated such that participants received feedback that performance was improving, getting worse, or stable. • Results suggested that both feedback timing and performance pattern predicted ratings of future performance.
Amick & Smith (1992)	Conceptual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses a psychosocial stress framework to describe the impact of EPM use on worker health. • Proposes a series of monitoring characteristics that will influence worker health, including worker participation in design; allocation of control and coordination functioning between the computer, the supervisor, and the employee; the feedback system; and the work measurement and performance appraisal system.
Arnaud & Chandon (2013)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A cross-sectional study that examines perceptions of an autonomy supportive environment as a mediator between electronic monitoring extensiveness and intrinsic motivation.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results suggest that perceptions of a less autonomy supportive environment mediate the negative relationship between electronic monitoring extensiveness and intrinsic motivation. • Perceived purpose of monitoring did not moderate the relationship between electronic monitoring practices and reports of intrinsic motivation.
Ball (2010)	Commentary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides an overview of the current practices, developments, and controversial issues surrounding surveillance in the workplace. • Argues that electronic monitoring can be conducted in ethical and humane ways, and doing so should mitigate negative reactions to monitoring. • Argues that any investigation of ethical monitoring practices is inadequate if it does not take into account the broader social dynamics of access to procedural and distributive justice.
Ball & Margulis (2011)	Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviews and critiques psychological and sociological research on employee performance monitoring and surveillance and applies a multi-level electronic monitoring framework to call center settings. • Proposes a two-level framework for monitoring that includes: 1) the monitored employee; and 2) the social processes around monitoring.
Ball & Wilson (2000)	Empirical/Qualitative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An observational study of computer monitoring in two financial service organizations. • Qualitative results suggest that individuals in contexts where monitoring is more collaborative are less stressed, but that even in these cases, there is likely to be resistance to monitoring.
Bartels & Nordstrom (2012)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An experimental study with a student sample that examined the effect of EPM purpose on performance, stress, motivation, and satisfaction. • Students engaged in a simple data entry task, and were randomly assigned to a purpose condition in which they were told they were being monitored for administrative (rewards and punishment) purposes, developmental purposes, research purposes, or given no explanation. • Results found that participants in the monitoring for administrative purpose (distributing awards and punishments) condition reported higher motivation than participants in other conditions, without an increase in stress and dissatisfaction levels as compared to other conditions.

Bates & Holton (1995)	Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviews the computer monitoring literature. • Examines research on individual outcomes of 1) work attitudes; 2) stress perceptions; and 3) performance, as well as the monitoring process.
Batt, Colvin, & Keefe (2002)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposes a framework of explaining the relationships between HR practices and employee turnover, and tests the framework using archival data from the telecommuting industry. • Results show that electronic monitoring was associated with a 2.1% increase in quit rates, which is very small compared to other cost-cutting HR practices.
Becker & Marique (2014)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two experimental studies examining the effects of video monitoring on task performance and attitudes using samples of business students engaging in a simple motor task. • Results from study 1 suggest that individuals perform worse when electronically monitored, yet monitoring increases interquartile variance and reduces outliers. • Results from study 2 replicated findings from study 1 while controlling for cognitive ability and emotions. • Suggests that different implicit decision rules (e.g., be more careful) are engaged when individuals are monitored.
Bhave (2014)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two field studies using call center employees and supervisors. • Study 1 finds that time between call monitored assessments is negatively related to task performance. • Study 2 matches call center employees to supervisors to find that greater use of call monitoring by supervisor was associated with increased performance in subordinates and more positive evaluations of organizational commitment behavior from supervisors.
Bolderdijk & Postmes (2013)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three empirical studies examining the effect of electronic energy metering on individual attitudes including privacy concerns. • Results suggest that employees are less likely to express privacy concerns in response to monitoring for sustainability purposes when they are led to believe that efficient resource use is tied to rewards.

Bradbury (2017)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Archival study that uses umpire data from MLB to examine the effect of electronic monitoring on shirking behaviors (deviations from umpiring mandates). • Results suggest that electronic monitoring has a small negative effect on umpire shirking behaviors (monitored umpires shirked less), but neither monitored nor unmonitored umpires displayed high levels of shirking.
Brewer (1995)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examined the effect of electronic monitoring on task performance at the individual and group level using a student sample. • Results suggest that when electronically monitored at the individual level, individuals will focus on a monitored task at the expense of an unmonitored task. • When electronically monitored at the group level, individuals tend to work on monitored and unmonitored tasks equally.
Carayon (1994)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposes a model describing the effect of EPM on worker stress through EPM's effect on job design and tests the model with two cross-sectional studies. • Study 1 found that electronically monitored individuals reported differences in other job design aspects compared to those who were not electronically monitored, but differences in reports of stress were not found. • Study 2 found that monitored employees reported more stress and negative perceptions of working conditions compared to participants who were not electronically monitored at work. • Concludes that EPM likely has an indirect effect on work stress.
Carayon (1993)	Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviews the literature on electronic monitoring and job stress. • Develops a framework for understanding the effect of electronic monitoring on job design (job demands, job control, and social support), and includes direct and indirect effects of electronic monitoring on job stress in the framework.
Carlson, Carlson, Zivnuska, Harris, Harris (2017)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examines the effect of electronic monitoring on technology-based job overload, job tension, and workplace attitudes, based on the job demands-resources model.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finds that electronic monitoring is significantly and positively related to technology job overload and job tension, and indirectly negatively related to organizational commitment and job satisfaction.
Chalykoff & Kochan (1989)	Empirical/Qualitative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses qualitative interviews to develop a framework for the effect of electronic monitoring on job attitudes and turnover propensity. • Develops a measure of monitoring characteristics and administers to a sample of employees. • Suggests that monitoring practices affect individual attitudes and turnover propensity.
Chen & Ross (2007)	Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviews evidence for the influence of individual differences (e.g., personality characteristics) on the relationship between electronic monitoring and individual reactions at work. • Proposes a two-dimension framework for organizing electronic monitoring practices, with the first dimension representing the probability that monitoring will lead to successful work, and the second dimension representing the probability that monitoring will be accepted.
Chen & Ross (2005)	Conceptual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviews the literature on electronic monitoring. • Proposes a framework for the organizational and environmental conditions that are likely to lead to the decision to electronically monitor.
Chivacowsky & Wulf (2002)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compares the effects of self-controlled computerized feedback to uncontrolled feedback in a computerized temporal sequencing task. • Results suggest that individuals perform better when given control over feedback timing.
Claypoole & Szalma (2019)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examines the effect of electronic monitoring on vigilance (i.e. sustained task attention) performance (response time and target detection) in two experimental studies. • Results suggest electronic monitoring increases vigilance performance, and the most robust effects were found when two forms of monitoring (web camera and video camera) were used simultaneously.
Claypoole, Neigel, Waldfogle, & Szalma (2019)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compares the effect of in-person observation to electronic observation on vigilance performance and stress in a computerized target detection task.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results suggest that evaluative observation improves vigilance performance, but significant differences were not found between electronic monitoring and in-person evaluative monitoring.
D'Urso (2006)	Conceptual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reviews the electronic monitoring literature and proposes a structural-perceptual model of electronic monitoring that incorporates communication technology use, organizational factors, and organizational electronic monitoring policies. Provides propositions about the panoptic effects of EPM.
Davidson & Henderson (2000)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Examines the interactive social facilitation effects of monitoring on task performance and subjective mood states. Concludes that the presence of monitoring lead to increases in task performance on a low complexity task and decreases in performance on a high complexity task. Observes the same pattern for the effects of monitoring on mood state (monitoring increased mood state during the low complexity task and decreased mood state during the high complexity task) and task stress.
DeTienne (1994)	Empirical/Qualitative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analyzes survey and qualitative data regarding computer monitoring, stress, and satisfaction from airline attendants working for three different airlines. Finds that individuals felt more stress when they had a more negative view of the appropriateness monitoring data use. Suggests that employees have more favorable perceptions of monitoring when it is used for coaching, and less favorable perceptions when it provides negative appraisals.
Douthitt & Aiello (2001)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Experimental study in which participants engaged in a high complexity computerized problem-solving task where participant opportunity for voice and monitoring approach (monitoring with control, monitoring without control, no monitoring) were manipulated. Monitoring was associated with decreases in task performance in the no control condition, but not in the monitored with control condition, as compared to the no monitoring condition.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Voice opportunities are associated with greater justice perceptions and satisfaction with the task.
Earley (1988)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Field experiment that examined the influence of computer-generated feedback characteristics on task performance. • Participants were recruited to spend two weeks working in a clerical job where performance was electronically tracked, and feedback was delivered either in person or via electronic means. Feedback specificity was also manipulated. • Results indicate that computer-based feedback generated from the self (rather than the supervisor) has a greater positive impact on performance. • Specific (rather than general) feedback was also found to improve task performance, but trust in the source of feedback was not found as a significant moderator of the relationship between feedback source and task performance.
Ellway (2013)	Qualitative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative study that examined the practice of electronic peer monitoring in call centers. • Observed several ways in which the peer monitoring system did not function effectively, including employee resistance. • Peer monitoring was associated with increased animosity between teams.
Fenner, Lerch, & Kulik (1993)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experimental study where participants were tasked with supervising four simulated employees, and participants were given information about the prior performance of the employees they were supervising, but employee performance during the task was manipulated. • When the performance of those being monitored was incongruent with past performance, participants increased monitoring (requested more monitoring data) than when the performance was congruent with prior performance. • Results suggested that managers may increase monitoring when they are less certain about performance behaviors.
Galinsky, Schleifer, & Pan (1995)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examined the effect of electronic monitoring and performance feedback (speed of typing) on task speed and accuracy on a typing task.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants were assigned to either an EPM condition or a control condition where participants in the EPM condition were told that their performance was being continuously monitored and provided performance feedback about task speed, while participants in the control condition were neither monitored nor provided performance feedback. • Results indicate that electronic monitoring and feedback lead to significant increases in typing speed, but also lead to significant increases in typing errors.
George (1996)	Empirical/Qualitative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case study of five organizations with different monitoring policies that examines the effects of computer monitoring on employee stress. • Observed that monitoring itself was less impactful on employee attitudes than how the monitored data was perceived to be used. • Suggests that stress from monitoring comes from a mismatch between employee and management perceptions about what is most important for job performance.
Goomas (2007)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employs a 3-phase experiment to examine the effect of EPM on task performance for “man-up” drivers who use equipment to pick up and transport cartons in warehouses. • Suggests that using EPM to provide drivers with goal times and immediate performance feedback tailored to their specific units increases performance.
Goomas & Ludwig (2009)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measured warehouse worker performance during the pre- and post-implementation of an electronic tracking system. • Performance immediately increased following the implementation of the electronic monitoring system and maintained for the duration of the study.
Grant & Higgins (1989)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross-sectional study of employees from Canadian service firms that surveyed employees on perceptions about electronic monitoring practices. • Results indicate that individuals respond most favorably to narrow monitoring of those behaviors that are deemed as the most important aspects of performance.
Grant, Higgins & Irving (1988)	Empirical/Qualitative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposes a framework for the effect of performance appraisal on motivation and conducted interviews with electronically monitored and

		<p>unmonitored employees who, aside from monitoring, have very similar jobs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Observed that monitored employees were more likely to indicate that production quantity (rather than quality) was emphasized in supervisor ratings. • Although monitored employees perceive greater pressure to increase productivity, differences were not observed between monitored and unmonitored employees' actual productivity.
Griffith (1993a)	Empirical/Qualitative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative study of individuals working at an aircraft company who are electronically monitored. • Interviews with those who are monitored indicate that monitoring is viewed favorably when it is viewed as useful (captures useful task information) and used to provide constructive feedback.
Griffith (1993b)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Study examining the effect of supervisor vs electronic monitoring on performance and satisfaction in a data entry task. • While significant differences in overall performance were not observed between conditions, profile analysis revealed differences in the work patterns between electronic and directly monitored individuals. • Performance patterns remained relatively stable in those who were electronically monitored, but performance spiked for those who were directly monitored at times when active monitoring was present and declined when active monitoring was not present.
Haley, Flint, McNally (2012)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross-sectional study of call center employees where authors examined the effect of attitudes towards electronic monitoring practices (internal call monitoring, external call monitoring, and monitoring time between call) on turnover intentions. • Results suggest that more negative perceptions of electronic monitoring practices were significantly and positively related to turnover intention.
Hawk (1994)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross-sectional field study of individuals working at a telecommunication firm that were asked to estimate the weight that their supervisor placed on call monitoring data. Individuals also completed measures of satisfaction, stress, and health.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results indicate that greater perceptions of supervisor reliance on call monitoring data was significantly and negatively related to job satisfaction. • No significant relationship was observed between perceptions of supervisor reliance on call monitoring data and stress or health outcomes.
Henderson, Mahar, Saliba, Deane, & Napier (1998)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examined the physiological and performance effects of two electronic monitoring systems (security/performance) where participants completed a clinical case note task. • In the first session, participants were required to enter the case notes while keystroke data were collected, whereas the second session was divided into three discrete stages. In the performance monitoring condition, participants were informed that their data entry speed was monitored and they were placed on a response-cost schedule for poor performance. • Improvements in performance were not observed in the performance monitoring condition, but performance monitoring was associated with increases in participant heart rate and blood pressure.
Henle, Kohut, & Booth (2009)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two studies were conducted using samples of business students, and a third study was conducted using individuals working in organizations. • In both study 1 and study 2, participants read hypothetical electronic monitoring policies in which description of consent was manipulated. In study 2, subject to discipline and opportunity to appeal were also manipulated. In study 3, individuals were surveyed about their organization's monitoring policies and completed a measure of cyberloafing. • Results indicate that asking for consent and opportunity to appeal were related to higher perceptions of policy fairness while periodic monitoring was related to less cyberloafing.
Holland, Cooper, & Hecker (2015)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Used archival data from Australian Workplace Survey to examine the relationship between electronic monitoring and trust in management. • Results indicated that occupation type moderated the relationship between electronic monitoring and trust in management such that a negative relationship was found between electronic monitoring and trust in management for workers in manual jobs, but no such relationship was found for individuals working in non-manual occupations.

Holman, Chissick, & Totterdell (2002)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examined the relationships among job characteristics, electronic monitoring, and attitudinal outcomes in a cross-sectional sample of customer service agents. • Perceived purpose of monitoring (developmental rather than punitive) was positively associated with employee well-being. • Perceived EPM intensity was negatively related to well-being and emotional exhaustion. • Supervisor support was found to moderate the relationship between monitoring intensity and well-being such that the relationship was weaker for participants who perceived greater supervisor support.
Holt, Lang, & Sutton (2016)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two studies were conducted to examine the effect of electronic performance monitoring on applicant perceptions of organizational attractiveness and job acceptance. • Participants in both studies were asked to imagine they were job applicants for an imaginary organization. In both studies, pay and EPM presence at the imaginary organization were manipulated. In study two, justification for monitoring was also manipulated. • Results from both studies suggest that electronic monitoring was negatively related to intention to accept a position at the organization and perceptions the organizations ethics, yet no moderating effect was found for justification for electronic monitoring.
Hovorka-Mead, Ross, Whipple, & Renchin (2002)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two studies were conducted to examine the moderating effect of transparency (advance notice) on the relationship between electronic monitoring and attitudinal and behaviorally outcomes. • Study 1 employed a quasi-experimental design with seasonal lifeguards at an amusement park. One department of lifeguards were given advance notice that their performance would be intermittently recorded via video camera for performance purposes, while another department was not given advance notice. Advance notice was positively related to perceptions of procedural justice, and intention to return the following summer. • Study 2 was an experimental scenario-based study, which found that both advance notice and justification for monitoring (strong or weak) were related to procedural justice perceptions

Irving, Higgins, & Safayeni (1986)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compared exploratory survey measures from samples of clerical workers from organization that use electronic monitoring with those of samples of clerical workers from organizations that do not use electronic monitoring systems. • Results indicate that computerized monitoring was associated with perceptions of increased productivity, more accurate and complete assessment of workers' performance, and higher levels of organizational control. • Results also indicate that electronic monitoring was associated with lower satisfaction, higher stress, and lower quality of relationship with peers and managers.
Jeske & Santuzzi (2015)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross-sectional study of student employees to examine the effect of electronic monitoring characteristics (monitoring type, individual or group monitoring, predictable or unpredictable, performance data use) on work attitudes. • Suggests EPM indirectly decreases OCBs and increases turnover behaviors through perceptions of lower control, satisfaction and commitment. • Close performance monitoring (via cameras, data entry, chat and phone recording) had significant negative effects on job attitudes such as job satisfaction and affective commitment, as well as employee self-efficacy and perceived control. • Attitudes were further negatively impacted when the monitoring was focused on individuals and unpredictable, which also reduced organizational citizenship behavior, although continuous monitoring was associated with reduced self-efficacy.
Jeske & Santuzzi (2014)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross-sectional time-lagged survey design with a sample of students working in part time positions that examines how the presence of electronic performance monitoring at work affects perceptions of control, job satisfaction, and commitment. • The presence of electronic performance monitoring was found to have a significant negative relationship with perceived control and job attitudes. • Electronic monitoring indirectly predicted more self-reported turnover behavior through perceived control, job attitudes, and intentions.

Karim, Kaminsky, & Behrend (2014)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experimental study involving a remotely proctored cognitive task where crowdsourced participants were randomly assigned to a web monitoring or no monitoring condition. • No relationship was found between performance on the cognitive task and monitoring condition. • Participants in the monitored condition reported significantly more privacy concerns and felt more pressure/tension during the task compared to those in the no monitoring condition.
Kaupins & Coco (2017)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Study that used a sample of HR managers and a cross-sectional design to examine perceptions of fairness of HR monitoring practices. • Physiological monitoring, computer monitoring, and location monitoring activities loaded onto three separate factors in a factor analysis of justice perceptions of workplace monitoring activities. • HR managers tended to report the most negative views of physiological monitoring activities.
Kidwell & Bennett (1994a)	Conceptual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draws from the justice literature to propose a framework of electronic monitoring characteristics on justice perceptions and worker attitudes. • Develops a series of propositions to explain the relationships between monitoring characteristics and employee attitudes.
Kidwell & Bennett (1994b)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross-sectional study that surveyed data entry operators and first line supervisors at five organizations about electronic monitoring practices and work attitudes. • Perceived procedural fairness of electronic monitoring practices was significantly and positively related to satisfaction with electronic monitoring systems, which in turn was significantly and positively related to job satisfaction.
Kidwell & Kidwell (1997)	Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organizes EPM research into a theoretical framework made up of three levels of analysis: social psychological (social exchange theory, machine approach, organism approach), structural (organizational learning, org culture), and ecological (contingency theory, institutional theory).
Kidwell & Sprague (2009)	Commentary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examines the ethical and cultural evaluations that must be made when evaluating the appropriateness of electronic monitoring in the workplace.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggests guidelines for when and how to use electronic monitoring.
Kolb & Aiello (1997)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experimental study where students engaged in two computerized tasks, a very easy task, and a task of moderate difficulty. • Participants were randomly assigned to one of four electronic monitoring conditions: easy task monitoring, difficult task monitoring, monitored during both easy and difficult tasks, or monitored on neither task. • Participants who were monitored only on the relatively easy task tended to work at a faster rate on both their monitored and non-monitored tasks, in comparison to people who were not monitored at all. • Participants who were monitored only on a task of moderate difficulty did not work any faster or more accurately than people who were not monitored.
Kolb & Aiello (1996)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An experimental study where students engaged in two computerized tasks: a numerical data entry task and a vowel/consonant identification task. • Participants were led to believe that performance on both or neither of the tasks would be electronically monitored. Locus of control and perceived stress were measured following the task. • Locus of control was found to moderate the relationship between electronic monitoring and perceived stress such that those with internal locus of control felt more stress when their work was monitored. Conversely, those with external locus of control felt more stress when their work was not monitored.
Kulik & Ambrose (1993)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draws from the DeNisi, Cafferty, & Meglino's (1984) model of raters' cognitive processes to discuss how computer monitoring affects the performance appraisal process. • Used a 2 (positive vs negative) x 2 (direct observation vs EPM) design to examine how performance ratings differ when viewing behaviors directly vs viewing behaviors via computer monitoring (performance data) • Results indicate that participants who viewed positive visual performance had more accurate recall of the behaviors they observed and were quicker to make performance appraisal decisions as compared to those who viewed positive behaviors via EPM.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results also indicated that negative behaviors were rated less negatively when viewed via EPM than when viewed directly.
Laird, Bailey, & Hester (2018)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants engaged in a series of pattern recognition problem-solving tasks, and were randomly placed into an electronically monitored condition, a directly monitored condition, or a no monitoring condition. Results indicate that individuals in the electronic monitoring condition showed lower pattern recognition than those in other conditions. Those in the direct monitoring conditions were less likely than those other conditions to fall victim to the Einstellung effect (neglecting other, perhaps simpler, solutions to a series of problems). Results indicated that individuals who believed they had high ability performed better in monitored conditions than non-monitored conditions, while individuals who believed they had low ability performed better in the non-monitored condition than the monitored conditions.
Lawshe, Burruss, Giblin & Schafer (2019)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Investigates the relationship between organizational justice perceptions and attitudes toward body-worn cameras among police officers across three agencies in a mid-size metropolitan area. Authors find no relationship between organizational justice perceptions and attitudes, which directly contradict results from several recent studies.
Lee & Kleiner (2003)	Commentary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highlights the conflicting goals of EPM from the perspective of employees and employers. Reviews existing laws that are relevant within EPM systems (e.g., The Electronic Communications Privacy Act of 1986). Discusses the various effects of EPM (e.g., productivity, stress) and provides employers with a set of recommendations for monitoring.
Lowry, Posey, Bennett & Roberts (2015)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Experiment involving employees from the banking, financial, and insurance industries, looking specifically at organizations that need to increase computer security efforts to thwart computer abuse. Results indicate that organizational trust can mitigate negative employee reactions, such as reactive computer abuse.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trust fully mediated the relationship between explanation adequacy (of the monitoring system) and computer abuse, suggesting that transparency and trust are important in reducing negative reactions to EPM.
Ludwig & Goomas (2009)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experiment in two distribution centers that investigated the performance effects of immediate performance goals and feedback delivered via technology. • Results demonstrate that employees' replenishment performance (putting away cartons and filling up empty stations) improved by 2.14 cartons per hour when accompanied by immediate feedback and specified goal times according to labor standards and tailored for individual work units.
Lund (1992)	Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviews major findings from the early EPM literature. • Findings are categorized into three different facets: defining and making sense of EPM, research designs and strategies for studying EPM, and unanswered questions.
Mallo, Nordstrom, Bartels, & Traxler (2007)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experimental study investigating how EPM affects older workers. • Randomly assigned individuals 85 and older and 77 and younger to complete either a simple or difficult computer data entry task while either being monitored or unmonitored. • Results suggest that EPM decreases performance and increases stress compared to nonmonitored conditions, and older adults seem to be affected by EPM more than younger adults.
Martin, Wellen, & Grimmer (2016)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Survey of Australian employees was used to test a model in which attitudes toward EPM were expected to mediate the relationship between perceived level of monitoring and counterproductive work behaviors (CWBs). • Findings suggest a positive relationship between perceived monitoring and CWBs, and unfavorable monitoring attitudes were not associated with negative effects among employees with high work empowerment.
McNall & Roch (2009)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tests a social exchange model of employee reactions to EPM. • Findings showed that use of EPM for development rather than control was associated with higher interpersonal justice.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Findings suggested that the justification for EPM is associated with higher perception of informational justice Both types of justice were related to increased trust in management.
McNall & Roch (2007)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Experimental study involving undergraduate students, seeking to understand the relationship between EPM characteristics and perceptions of procedural justice, interpersonal justice, and privacy. Participants read vignettes describing various monitoring practices before reporting fairness and privacy reactions. Suggests that computer monitoring is perceived to be the most procedurally just form of monitoring, while direct observation by a supervisor is perceived as the most interpersonally just and least invasive.
McNall & Stanton (2011)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Examines reactions to location-sensing technologies. Using a 2x2 scenario-based design (control x purpose) and a student sample, authors found that control over GPS monitoring (can turn monitoring off in non-work hours) was negatively related to privacy invasion, which mediated the positive relationship between monitoring control and fairness perceptions; no effect for purpose was found.
Miller & Weckert (2000)	Commentary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Argues that privacy is a moral right, and EPM is often presumed to infringe upon employee privacy. Although organizations attempt to justify the use of EPM in several circumstances, the authors argue that the practice is often unwarranted. Future research on this topic is encouraged, and the authors list several unanswered questions for both scholars and managers to consider.
Mishra & Crampton (1998)	Conceptual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reviews various forms of EPM before discussing the many outcomes of the practice (e.g., productivity, safety). Highlights the potential for EPM to invade employee privacy and even affect employee health. Discusses the existing legislation in the area of EPM and provides several recommended guidelines for organizations to consider before adopting the practice.
Moorman & Wells (2003)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Investigates the relationship among opportunities to challenge EPM, feedback tone of EPM, amount of EPM, and fairness perceptions.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fairness perceptions mediated the relationship between EPM characteristics and contextual performance (OCBs, job dedication). • No support was found for relationships with task performance.
Nebeker & Tatum (1993)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using a simulated organization, researchers investigate the effects of computer monitoring under various performance standards and rewards. • Computer monitoring and feedback led to increased key rate for individuals that were aware of monitoring and had performance standards, compared to those that were not aware of the monitoring.
Nussbaum & duRivage (1986)	Commentary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Argues that computer monitoring is not an effective management practice because it is associated with several unwanted consequences. • Discusses the potential for EPM to invade privacy, increase stress, encourage scientific management tactics, and incur substantial costs.
Oz, Glass, Behling (1999)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Survey study in which British employees completed measures of job autonomy, satisfaction, and monitoring attitudes. • Results suggest that monitoring attitudes fall into two factors: positive and negative attitudes to surveillance. • Further, results suggest that higher scores on the negative factor were associated with lower job satisfaction, lower job autonomy, greater perceived discrimination, and more negative attitudes towards authority. • Higher scores on the positive factor were associated with greater job satisfaction and more positive attitudes toward authority.
Panina & Aiello (2005)	Conceptual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposes a model describing the interaction of EPM characteristics and national culture dimensions. • Hypothesizes that EPM characteristics (e.g., purpose) and national culture dimensions (e.g., individualism/collectivism) will interact to influence not only employees' EPM fairness perceptions and EPM acceptance, but also more distal outcomes such as performance, stress, and job satisfaction. • Discusses propositions regarding the outsourcing of technology-based jobs among multinational corporations.
Payne (2018)	Empirical/Qualitative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ethnography of a retail electronics distributor to examine the way that gender shapes responses to electronic surveillance in the workplace.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Observes that surveillance and surveillance data contributed to a masculine culture of competitiveness and status among individuals who worked in the electronics store. • Women employees were often marginalized in this environment.
Posey, Bennett, Roberts, & Lowry (2011)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applies justice and reactance theories to explain how monitoring leads to negative contextual performance. • Findings suggest that computer monitoring increases computer abuse behaviors but not antisocial behaviors. • Perceptions of distributive and procedural injustice lead to computer abuse, but only distributive injustice is an antecedent to antisocial behaviors.
Rafnsdottir & Gudmundsdottir (2011)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Survey study of Icelandic employees with similar jobs in which participants assessed the psychosocial work environment of their organizations. • Results illustrate that employees working under EPM report a less favorable psychosocial work environment than their colleagues who are not electronically monitored.
Robie & Ryan (1999)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experiment seeking to understand the moderating effect of EPM between two measures of conscientiousness and task performance. • Results show a significant interaction between conscientiousness and performance monitoring for predicting task performance, such that performance was highest for monitored participants with high conscientiousness. • There was no significant interaction found for the business-related measure of conscientiousness. • The authors suggest that the explanatory mechanism of these findings may be accountability.
Samaranyake & Gamage (2012)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Survey study investigating the relationship between EPM and job satisfaction among software professionals in Sri Lanka. • Results demonstrate that a majority of respondents accept electronic monitoring if it is relevant and improves work quality. • Results also suggest that EPM may cause job dissatisfaction if monitoring makes tasks more complex.

Schleifer & Shell (1992)	Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviews the stress-related EPM literature and argues that work standards may produce stress through work overload, negative computer feedback, loss of incentive pay, and threat of job loss. • These stress effects are most likely to occur among employees who struggle to meet work standards or quotas. • The authors recommend a "stress allowance" for individuals in situations where there is a demand-resources imbalance that prevents them from meeting an EPM work standard (e.g., additional rest or personal time to allow the negative effects of cognitive load to replenish).
Sewell & Wilkinson (1992)	Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drawing from Foucault's conception of power/knowledge, the authors argue that just-in-time and total-quality management tactics demand systems of surveillance to instill discipline and enhance central control. • Early versions of surveillance allowed organizations to pinpoint areas of improvement and find employees responsible based on analysis of final products. • "Incomplete surveillance" in modern workplaces suggests that employees are able to cheat or game the system, as well as work at varying paces throughout the workday.
Sewell, Barker, & Nyberg (2012)	Empirical/Qualitative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ethnography at a call center to qualitatively examine the work experiences of individuals who are highly monitored. • Observes that call center employees feel greatly constrained in their autonomy and feel prescriptively micro-managed, but workers appreciate having access to behavioral records in case of disputes.
Smith, Carayon, Sanders, Lim, & LeGrande (1992)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drawing from job design research, the authors conduct a survey study investigating employee stress and health complaints in jobs with and without EPM. • Results suggest that employees who have their performance electronically monitored perceive their working conditions as more stressful, and they also report higher levels of job boredom, psychological tension, anxiety, depression, anger, and health complaints.
Snyder (2010)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross-sectional study that examined the relationship between personality, concerns about e-mail monitoring at work, and relational outcomes.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results indicate that individuals higher in paranoia were more likely to perceive greater levels of e-mail monitoring at work and showed greater concerns about organizational infringement. • Concern about organizational infringement was negatively related to the perceived quality of relationships with peers, supervisors, and in particular, management.
Spitzmuller & Stanton (2006)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposes a framework based on the theory of planned behavior and ethical decision-making research to predict compliance and resistance intentions in response to electronic monitoring. • A sample of non-supervisory employees completed attitudinal and workplace culture measures as well as measures of intentions to comply or resist electronic monitoring. • Results indicate that surveillance attitudes and organizational commitment were the strongest predictors of intention to comply or resist monitoring. • The relationship between surveillance attitudes and intention to resist monitoring was moderated by perceptions of an ethical workplace climate, such that the relationship between negative workplace attitudes and intention to resist was weaker when the individual perceived an ethical climate.
Stanton (2000a)	Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviews the monitoring and electronic monitoring literature. • Proposes a framework that includes monitoring characteristics, organizational characteristics, and individual characteristics to describe employee reactions to monitoring.
Stanton (2000b)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross-sectional study of relationship between monitoring characteristics and individual perceptions of workplace justice. • Results show that monitoring characteristics including consistency of monitoring, justification for monitoring, and control of monitoring significantly influenced perceptions of justice.
Stanton & Barnes-Farrell (1996)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants with ability to delay or prevent EPM indicated higher feelings of personal control and superior task performance. • Participants with exact knowledge of when EPM occurred expressed lower feelings of control than those who had specific knowledge hidden.

Stanton & Julian (2002)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experiment using a social information processing framework to explain the relationship between EPM characteristics and performance. • Aspects of a task that were monitored were perceived as more important and the quantity of work output was affected. • Task satisfaction and motivation were affected by EPM - workers that were more informed about the specifics of monitoring were more satisfied. Individuals who were told that only quantity was being monitored reported higher motivation to perform and complete the task compared to those told that quality was being monitored.
Stanton & Sarkar-Barney (2003)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Investigates differences in task performance across individuals who worked under direct supervision, electronic supervision, or no supervision. • Performance was tracked over time and monitored participants were more sensitive to varying task demands. • Nonmonitored and computer-monitored groups had higher quality of performance compared with the direct human supervision group.
Stanton & Weiss (2003)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two semi-structured interview studies, one of HR managers and one of employees, that contrast the concerns of the two groups in terms of issues related to personnel data, privacy, and technology. • Results show that HR managers and employees agree regarding the importance of trust and justification when collecting personnel data. • Results further show that HR managers and employees differ regarding privacy beliefs, knowledge of HR policies, and legal constraints.
Stanton & Weiss (2000)	Qualitative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exploratory study in which 53 employees completed an anonymous open-ended survey about their experiences with various forms of EPM. • Content analysis results suggest that employees change their behavior at work as a direct response to electronic monitoring. • Results further suggest that monitoring purpose relates to employee attitudes.
Stone, Stone-Romero, & Lukaszewski (2006)	Commentary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposes a model that identifies antecedents of positive and negative outcomes of electronic human resource systems for both individuals and organizations.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Puts forth several hypotheses regarding the effects of EPM on outcomes such as criteria measurement and social interactions.
Tabak and Smith (2005)	Conceptual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drawing from cognitive categorization theory, authors propose a model of managerial cognition and relational trust development. • Explores the influence of experience at a current organization, prior experience at other organizations, and propensity to trust on EPM practices and trust formation between employees and management. • Provides several recommendations to managers regarding trustworthiness and appropriate EPM implementation.
Thompson, Sebastianelli, & Murray (2009)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experimental study drawing from social facilitation theory to investigate the effect of EPM on e-learner's satisfaction, performance, and mental workload (assessed using heart rate variability). • Results indicate that individuals who were aware of electronic monitoring showed physiological signs of greater mental workload, and performed worse on a post-training skills test than individuals who were not aware of monitoring.
Tomczak, Lanzo, & Aguinis (2018)	Commentary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides evidence-based recommendations for using EPM in workplaces. • They suggest that organizations: 1) be transparent with employees about EPM use, (2) be aware of all potential employee reactions to being monitored, (3) use EPM for learning and development rather than deterrence, (4) restrict EPM to only work-related behaviors, and (5) consider organizational makeup when implementing an EPM system.
Townsend & Bennett (2003)	Commentary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commentary on the potential of electronic monitoring to violate individual rights of privacy. • Discusses privacy risks that come along with storing large amounts of personal data collected via electronic monitoring.
Tsvangirai & Chinyamurindi (2019)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross-sectional study that uses a sample of border workers in Zimbabwe to test the moderating effect of motivation on the relationship between electronic surveillance and employee engagement. • Results indicate that employee work motivation moderated the relationship between electronic surveillance and work engagement such that the

		relationship between surveillance and engagement was less negative for individuals who were high in work motivation.
Urbaczewski & Jessup (2002)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two studies to better understand the effects of electronic monitoring of employee Internet usage on behavior and monitoring satisfaction. • Results from Study 1 involving a classroom setting suggest that individuals who are aware of Internet monitoring are more focused on tasks, yet less satisfied than those who are unaware of Internet monitoring. • Results from Study 2 involving a controlled lab setting suggest that individuals are more satisfied with Internet monitoring when
Watson et al. (2013)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examines reactions to electronic monitoring of behavior during computer-mediated training through the lenses of trait activation theory and motivated action theory. • Results indicate that participant apprehension was in part a function of participant goal orientation.
Wells, Moorman, & Werner (2007)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross-sectional study that investigates the relationship among perceptions of EPM purpose and a variety of attitudinal outcomes, including fairness, satisfaction, commitment, and felt obligation. • Results suggest that when EPM is perceived as developmental, employees react more favorably as compared to when EPM is perceived for punishment or deterrence.
West & Bowman (2016)	Conceptual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describes EPM from an ethical perspective, using the "ethics triangle" which includes results ethics (cost-benefit), rules ethics (right vs. wrong), and virtues ethics (individual/community character). • Presents arguments both for and against EPM in reference to each of the three parts of the ethics triangle.
Westin (1992)	Qualitative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case study that examines how employees react to the implementation of new electronic monitoring systems. • Qualitatively observed the implementation of a supervisory monitoring system for 200 customer service agents at a call center. • Call agents considered the new monitoring system unfair and a breach of the company's traditional climate of employee-employer trust.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Employee protests, when communicated to top management, led to discarding the unilaterally-instituted and quantity-oriented monitoring policy and replacing it with a consensually-developed supervisory monitoring system.
Yost, Behrend, Howardson, Darrow, & Jensen (2018)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Links trait reactance to perceptions of privacy invasion and outcomes such as prosocial and counterproductive work behaviors. Using a sample of MTurk participants, the authors find that anger, a component of reactance, is associated with fewer organizational citizenship behaviors and more counterproductive work behaviors in EPM contexts. Results suggest that EPM should be designed such that it does not invade privacy, in order to avoid negative employee discretionary behaviors.
Zweig & Scott (2007)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draws from Blader and Tyler's four-component model of fairness to investigate the effects of monitoring information sources, treatment quality, and decision-making quality. Experiment in which undergraduate students read one of eight vignettes describing various EPM practices before providing their fairness perceptions, satisfaction with the monitoring, and their compliance with the monitoring. Results demonstrate fairness perceptions and satisfaction with monitoring mediate the relationship between procedural justice violations and compliance. Procedural justice violations originating from supervisors tend to be associated with lower perceptions of fairness and satisfaction with monitoring than violations originating from formal organizational policies.
Zweig & Webster (2003)	Empirical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Investigates the moderating effect of personality on monitoring acceptance. Experiment in which undergrad participants were provided descriptions of hypothetical positions that emphasized EPM features (e.g., transparency and control). Results suggest that people low in extraversion and emotional stability are less likely to have positive attitudes toward monitoring, and this is true even when privacy and fairness are promoted within an EPM system.

Zweig & Webster (2002)	Empirical/Qualitative	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Develops and tests a theoretical model of monitoring acceptance, specifically in the context of EPM used to show employee availability.• Uses a two-study approach to test their model, first using a quantitative scenario-based design with engineering alumni and then using a qualitative approach with employees at two organizations.• Results provide strong support for their model overall, demonstrating that privacy plays a key role in determining employee attitudes and acceptance of EPM.
------------------------	-----------------------	---

Note: This table summarizes articles published in peer-reviewed journals through May 2019. It is intended to be comprehensive, but we acknowledge that articles may have appeared in other outlets. These studies do not include EPM articles appearing in medical, nursing, criminal justice, or law review journals, or articles focused on non-employee monitoring.

REFERENCES

- Aiello, J. R., & Svec, C. M. 1993. Computer Monitoring of Work Performance: Extending the Social Facilitation Framework to Electronic Presence. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 23: 537-548.
- Aiello, J. R., & Douthitt, E. A. 2001. Social facilitation from Triplett to electronic performance monitoring. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 5: 163-180.
- Aiello, J. R., & Kolb, K. J. 1995. Electronic performance monitoring and social context: Impact on productivity and stress. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80: 339-353.
- Aiello, J. R., & Svec, C. M. 1993. Computer Monitoring of Work Performance: Extending the Social Facilitation Framework to Electronic Presence. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 23: 537-548.
- Alder, G. S. 2007. Examining the relationship between feedback and performance in a monitored environment: A clarification and extension of feedback intervention theory. *The Journal of High Technology Management Research*, 17: 157-174.
- Alder, G. S. 2001. Employee reactions to electronic performance monitoring: A consequence of organizational culture. *The Journal of High Technology Management Research*, 12: 323-342.
- Alder, G. S., & Ambrose, M. L. 2005. An examination of the effect of computerized performance monitoring feedback on monitoring fairness, performance, and satisfaction. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 97: 161-177.
- Alder, G. S., & Tompkins, P. K. 1997. Electronic performance monitoring: An organizational justice and concertive control perspective. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 10: 259-288.

- 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: 894-903.
- Alder, G. S., Schminke, M., & Noel, T. W. 2007. The impact of individual ethics on reactions to potentially invasive HR practices. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 75: 201-214.
- Alge, B. J. 2001. Effects of computer surveillance on perceptions of privacy and procedural justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86: 797-804.
- Alge, B. J., Ballinger, G. A., & Green, S. G. 2004. Remote control: Predictors of electronic monitoring intensity and secrecy. *Personnel Psychology*, 57: 377-410.
- Allen, M. W., Coopman, S. J., Hart, J. L., & Walker, K. L. 2007. Workplace surveillance and managing privacy boundaries. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 21: 172-200.
- Ambrose, M. L., & Alder, G. S. 2000. Designing, implementing, and utilizing computerized performance monitoring: Enhancing organizational justice. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 18: 187-220.
- Ambrose, M. L., & Kulik, C. T. 1994. The effect of information format and performance pattern on performance appraisal judgments in a computerized performance monitoring context. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 24: 801-823.
- Amick III, B. C., & Smith, M. J. 1992. Stress, computer-based work monitoring and measurement systems: A conceptual overview. *Applied Ergonomics*, 23: 6-16.
- Arnaud, S., & Chandon, J. L. 2013. Will monitoring systems kill intrinsic motivation? An empirical study. *Revue De Gestion Des Ressources Humaines*, 4: 35-53.
- Ball, K. 2010. Workplace surveillance: An overview. *Labor History*, 51: 87-106.

- Ball, K. S. 2001. Situating workplace surveillance: Ethics and computer based performance monitoring. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 3: 209-221.
- Ball, K. S., & Margulis, S. T. 2011. Electronic monitoring and surveillance in call centres: A framework for investigation. *New Technology, Work and Employment*, 26: 113-126.
- Ball, K., & Wilson, D. C. 2000. Power, control and computer-based performance monitoring: Repertoires, resistance and subjectivities. *Organization Studies*, 21: 539-565.
- Bartels, L. K., & Nordstrom, C. R. 2012. Examining big brother's purpose for using electronic performance monitoring. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 25: 65-77.
- Bates, R. A., & Holton III, E. F. 1995. Computerized performance monitoring: A review of human resource issues. *Human Resource Management Review*, 5: 267-288.
- Batt, R., Colvin, A. J., & Keefe, J. 2002. Employee voice, human resource practices, and quit rates: Evidence from the telecommunications industry. *ILR Review*, 55:573-594.
- 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: 541-553.
- Bhave, D. P. 2014. The invisible eye? Electronic performance monitoring and employee job performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 67: 605-635.
- Bolderdijk, J. W., Steg, L., & Postmes, T. 2013. Fostering support for work floor energy conservation policies: Accounting for privacy concerns. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 34: 195-210.
- Bradbury, J. C. 2017. Monitoring and Employee Shirking: Evidence from MLB Umpires. *Journal of Sports Economics*: 1-23.

- Brewer, N. 1995. The Effects of Monitoring Individual and Group Performance on the Distribution of Effort Across Tasks 1. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 25: 760-777.
- Carayon, P. 1994. Effects of electronic performance monitoring on job design and worker stress: Results of two studies. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, 6: 177-190.
- Carayon, P. 1993. Effect of electronic performance monitoring on job design and worker stress: Review of the literature and conceptual model. *Human Factors*, 35: 385-395.
- Carlson, J. R., Carlson, D. S., Zivnuska, S., Harris, R. B., & Harris, K. J. 2017. Applying the job demands resources model to understand technology as a predictor of turnover intentions. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 77: 317-325.
- Chalykoff, J., & Kochan, T. A. 1989. Computer-aided monitoring: Its influence on employee job satisfaction and turnover. *Personnel Psychology*, 42: 807-834.
- Chen, J. V., & Ross, W. H. 2007. Individual differences and electronic monitoring at work. *Information, Community and Society*, 10: 488-505.
- Chen, J. V., & Ross, W. H. 2005. The managerial decision to implement electronic surveillance at work: A research framework. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 13: 244-268.
- Chiviackowsky, S., & Wulf, G. 2002. Self-controlled feedback: Does it enhance learning because performers get feedback when they need it? *Research Quarterly For Exercise and Sport*, 73: 408-415.

- Claypoole, V. L., & Szalma, J. L. 2019. Electronic Performance Monitoring and sustained attention: Social facilitation for modern applications. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 94: 25-34.
- Claypoole, V. L., Neigel, A. R., Waldfogle, G. E., & Szalma, J. L. 2019. Evaluative social presence can improve vigilance performance, but vigilance is still hard work and is stressful. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 45: 616-627.
- D'urso, S. C. 2006. Who's watching us at work? Toward a structural-perceptual model of electronic monitoring and surveillance in organizations. *Communication Theory*, 16: 281-303.
- 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: 906-920.
- DeTienne, K. B. 1994. Big Brother is watching: Computer monitoring and communication. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication*: 37: 5-10.
- Douthitt, E. A., & Aiello, J. R. 2001. The role of participation and control in the effects of computer monitoring on fairness perceptions, task satisfaction, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86: 867-874.
- Earley, P. C. 1988. Computer-generated performance feedback in the magazine-subscription industry. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 41: 50-64.
- Ellway, B. P. 2013. Making it personal in a call centre: electronic peer surveillance. *New Technology, Work and Employment*, 28: 37-50.

- Fenner, D. B., Lerch, F. J., & Kulik, C. T. 1993. The Impact of Computerized Performance Monitoring and Prior Performance Knowledge on Performance Evaluation 1. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 23: 573-601.
- Galinsky, T. L., Schleifer, L. M., & Pan, C. S. 1995. The influence of performance standards and feedback on speed and accuracy in an electronically monitored data-entry task. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, 7: 25-36.
- George, J. F. 1996. Computer-based monitoring: Common perceptions and empirical results. *Mis Quarterly*: 459-480.
- Goomas, D. T. 2007. Electronic performance self-monitoring and engineered labor standards for “man-up” drivers in a distribution center. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 21: 541-558.
- Goomas, D. T., & Ludwig, T. D. 2009. Standardized goals and performance feedback aggregated beyond the work unit: Optimizing the use of engineered labor standards and electronic performance monitoring. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 39: 2425-2437.
- Grant, R., & Higgins, C. 1989. Monitoring service workers via computer: The effect on employees, productivity, and service. *National Productivity Review*, 8: 101-113.
- Grant, R. A., Higgins, C. A., & Irving, R. H. 1988. Computerized performance monitors: Are they costing you customers? *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 29: 39-45.
- Griffith, T. L. 1993. Teaching big brother to be a team player: Computer monitoring and quality. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 7: 73-80.
- Griffith, T. L. 1993b. Monitoring and performance: A comparison of computer and supervisor monitoring. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 23: 549-572.

- Haley, L. M., Flint, D., & McNally, J. J. 2012. The effects of employee perceptions of monitoring procedures on turnover. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 10: 75-82.
- Hawk, S. R. 1994. The effects of computerized performance monitoring: An ethical perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 13: 949-957.
- Henderson, R., Mahar, D., Saliba, A., Deane, F., & Napier, R. 1998. Electronic monitoring systems: an examination of physiological activity and task performance within a simulated keystroke security and electronic performance monitoring system. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 48: 143-157.
- Henle C. A., Kohut, G., & Booth, R. 2009. Designing electronic use policies to enhance employee perceptions of fairness and to reduce cyberloafing: An empirical test of justice theory. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 25: 902-910
- Holland, P. J., Cooper, B., & Hecker, R. 2014. Electronic monitoring and surveillance in the workplace: The effects on trust in management, and the moderating role of occupational type. *Personnel Review*, 44: 161-175.
- 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: 57-81.
- Holt, M., Lang, B., & Sutton, S. G. 2016. Potential employees' ethical perceptions of active monitoring: The dark side of data analytics. *Journal of Information Systems*, 31: 107-124.
- Hovorka-Mead, A. D., Ross Jr., W. H., Whipple, T., & Renchin, M. B. 2002. Watching the detectives: Seasonal student employee reactions to electronic monitoring with and without advance notification. *Personnel Psychology*, 55: 329-362.

- Irving, R. H., Higgins, C. A., & Safayeni, F. R. 1986. Computerized performance monitoring systems: Use and abuse. *Communications of the ACM*, 29: 794-801.
- Jeske, D., & Santuzzi, A. M. 2015. Monitoring what and how: Psychological implications of electronic performance monitoring. *New Technology, Work and Employment*, 30: 62-78.
- Jeske, D., & Santuzzi, A. 2014. Part-time workers' responses to electronic performance monitoring. *International Journal of Working Conditions*, 8: 63-82.
- Karim, M. N., Kaminsky, S. E., & Behrend, T. S. 2014. Cheating, reactions, and performance in remotely proctored testing: An exploratory experimental study. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 29: 555-572.
- Kaupins, G., & Coco, M. 2017. Perceptions of internet-of-things surveillance by human resource managers. *SAM Advanced Management Journal*, 82: 53-64.
- Kidwell Jr, R. E., & Bennett, N. 1994a. Electronic surveillance as employee control: A procedural justice interpretation. *The Journal of High Technology Management Research*, 5: 39-57.
- Kidwell Jr, R. E., & Bennett, N. 1994b. Employee reactions to electronic control systems: The role of procedural fairness. *Group & Organization Management*, 19: 203-218.
- Kidwell, L. A., & Kidwell Jr, R. E. 1997. Toward a multilevel framework for studying electronic control systems. *Journal of Accounting and Public Policy*, 16: 89-109.
- Kidwell, R. E., & Sprague, R. 2009. Electronic surveillance in the global workplace: Laws, ethics, research and practice. *New Technology, Work and Employment*, 24:194-208.
- Kolb, K. J., & Aiello, J. R. 1997. Computer-based performance monitoring and productivity in a multiple task environment. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 12: 189-204.

- Kolb, K. J., & Aiello, J. R. 1996. The effects of electronic performance monitoring on stress: Locus of control as a moderator variable. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 12: 407-423.
- Kulik, C. T., & Ambrose, M. L. 1993. The impact of computerized performance monitoring design features on the performance appraisal process. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 2: 182-197.
- Laird, B. K., Bailey, C. D., & Hester, K. 2018. The effects of monitoring environment on problem-solving performance. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 158: 215-219.
- Lawshe, N. L., Burruss, G. W., Giblin, M. J., & Schafer, J. A. 2019. Behind the lens: police attitudes toward body-worn cameras and organizational justice. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 42: 78-97.
- Lee, S., & Kleiner, B. H. 2003. Electronic surveillance in the workplace. *Management Research News*, 26: 72-81.
- Lowry, P. B., Posey, C., Bennett, R. B. J., & Roberts, T. L. 2015. Leveraging fairness and reactance theories to deter reactive computer abuse following enhanced organisational information security policies: An empirical study of the influence of counterfactual reasoning and organisational trust. *Information Systems Journal*, 25: 193-273.
- Ludwig, T. D., & Goomas, D. T. (2009). Real-time performance monitoring, goal-setting, and feedback for forklift drivers in a distribution centre. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 82: 391-403.
- Lund, J. 1992. Electronic performance monitoring: A review of research issues. *Applied Ergonomics*, 23: 54-58.
- Mallo, J., Nordstrom, C. R., Bartels, L. K., & Traxler, A. 2007. The effect of age and task difficulty. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 20: 49-63.

- Martin, A. J., Wellen, J. M., & Grimmer, M. R. 2016. An eye on your work: How empowerment affects the relationship between electronic surveillance and counterproductive work behaviours. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 27: 2635-2651.
- McNall, L. A., & Roch, S. G. 2009. A social exchange model of employee reactions to electronic performance monitoring. *Human Performance*, 22: 204-224.
- 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: 658-682.
- McNall, L. A., & Stanton, J. M. 2011. Private eyes are watching you: Reactions to location sensing technologies. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 26: 299-309.
- Miller, S., & Weckert, J. 2000. Privacy, the workplace and the Internet. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 28: 255-265.
- Mishra, J. M., & Crampton, S. M. 1998. Employee monitoring: privacy in the workplace? *SAM Advanced Management Journal*, 63: 4-14.
- Moorman, R. H., & Wells, D. L. 2003. Can electronic performance monitoring be fair? Exploring relationships among monitoring characteristics, perceived fairness, and job performance. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 10: 2-16.
- Nebeker, D. M., & Tatum, B. C. 1993. The effects of computer monitoring, standards, and rewards on work performance, job satisfaction, and stress. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 23: 508-536.
- Nussbaum, K., & DuRivage, V. 1986. Computer monitoring: Mismanagement by remote control. *Business and Society Review*, 56: 16-20.

- Oz, E., Glass, R., & Behling, R. 1999. Electronic workplace monitoring: what employees think. *Omega*, 27: 167-177.
- Panina, D., & Aiello, J. R. 2005. Acceptance of electronic monitoring and its consequences in different cultural contexts: A conceptual model. *Journal of International Management*, 11: 269-292.
- Payne, J. 2018. Manufacturing Masculinity: Exploring Gender and Workplace Surveillance. *Work and Occupations*, 45: 346-383.
- Posey, C., Bennett, B., Roberts, T., & Lowry, P. 2011. When computer monitoring backfires: Invasion of privacy and organizational injustice as precursors to computer abuse. *Journal of Information Systems Security*, 7: 24-47.
- Rafnsdóttir, G. L., & Gudmundsdóttir, M. L. (2011). EPM technology and the psychosocial work environment. *New Technology, Work and Employment*, 26: 210-221.
- Robie, C., & Ryan, A. M. 1999. Performance monitoring as a moderator of the relations between two conscientiousness measures and task performance. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 13: 391-406.
- Samaranayake, V., & Gamage, C. 2012. Employee perception towards electronic monitoring at work place and its impact on job satisfaction of software professionals in Sri Lanka. *Telematics and Informatics*, 29: 233-244.
- Schleifer, L. M., & Shell, R. L. 1992. A review and reappraisal of electronic performance monitoring, performance standards and stress allowances. *Applied Ergonomics*, 23: 49-53.
- Sewell, G., & Wilkinson, B. 1992. Someone to watch over me': surveillance, discipline and the just-in-time labour process. *Sociology*, 26: 271-289.

- Sewell, G., Barker, J. R., & Nyberg, D. 2012. Working under intensive surveillance: when does 'measuring everything that moves' become intolerable? *Human Relations*, 65: 189-215.
- Smith, M. J., Carayon, P., Sanders, K. J., Lim, S. Y., & LeGrande, D. 1992. Employee stress and health complaints in jobs with and without electronic performance monitoring. *Applied Ergonomics*, 23: 17-27.
- Snyder, J. L. 2010. E-mail privacy in the workplace: A boundary regulation perspective. *The Journal of Business Communication* (1973), 47: 266-294.
- Spitzmüller, C., & Stanton, J. M. 2006. Examining employee compliance with organizational surveillance and monitoring. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 79: 245-272.
- Stanton, J. M. 2000a. Reactions to employee performance monitoring: Framework, review, and research directions. *Human Performance*, 13: 85-113.
- Stanton, J. M. 2000b. Traditional and electronic monitoring from an organizational justice perspective. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 15: 129-147
- Stanton, J. M., & Barnes-Farrell, J. L. 1996. Effects of electronic performance monitoring on personal control, task satisfaction, and task performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81: 738-745.
- Stanton, J. M., & Julian, A. L. 2002. The impact of electronic monitoring on quality and quantity of performance. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 18: 85-101.
- Stanton, J. M., & Sarkar-Barney, S. T. 2003. A detailed analysis of task performance with and without computer monitoring. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, 16: 345-366.

- Stanton, J. M., & Weiss, E. M. 2003. Organisational databases of personnel information: Contrasting the concerns of human resource managers and employees. *Behaviour & Information Technology*, 22: 291-304.
- 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.
- Stone, D. L., Stone-Romero, E. F., & Lukaszewski, K. 2006. Factors affecting the acceptance and effectiveness of electronic human resource systems. *Human Resource Management Review*, 16: 229-244.
- Tabak, F., & Smith, W. P. 2005. Privacy and electronic monitoring in the workplace: A model of managerial cognition and relational trust development. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 17: 173-189.
- Thompson, L. F., Sebastianelli, J. D., & Murray, N. P. 2009. Monitoring online training behaviors: Awareness of electronic surveillance hinders e-learners. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 39: 2191-2212.
- Tomeczak, D. L., Lanzo, L. A., & Aguinis, H. 2018. Evidence-based recommendations for employee performance monitoring. *Business Horizons*, 61: 251-259.
- Townsend, A. M., & Bennett, J. T. 2003. Privacy, technology, and conflict: Emerging issues and action in workplace privacy. *Journal of Labor Research*, 24: 195-205.
- Tsvangirai, F. P., & Chinyamurindi, W. T. 2019. The moderating effect of employee motivation on workplace surveillance and employee engagement amongst employees at the Zimbabwe Revenue Authority. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 17: 1-8.

- Urbaczewski, A., & Jessup, L. M. 2002. Does electronic monitoring of employee internet usage work? *Communications of the ACM*, 45: 80-83.
- Watson, A. M., Foster Thompson, L., Rudolph, J. V., Whelan, T. J., Behrend, T. S., & Gissel, A. L. 2013. When big brother is watching: Goal orientation shapes reactions to electronic monitoring during online training. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98: 642-657.
- 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: 121-138.
- West, J. P., & Bowman, J. S. 2016. Electronic surveillance at work: An ethical analysis. *Administration & Society*, 48: 628-651.
- Westin, A. F. 1992. Two key factors that belong in a macroergonomic analysis of electronic monitoring: Employee perceptions of fairness and the climate of organizational trust or distrust. *Applied Ergonomics*, 23: 35-42.
- Yost, A. B., Behrend, T. S., Howardson, G., Darrow, J. B., & Jensen, J. M. 2018. Reactance to electronic surveillance: A test of antecedents and outcomes. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 34: 1-16.
- Zweig, D., & Scott, K. 2007. When unfairness matters most: supervisory violations of electronic monitoring practices. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 17: 227-247.
- Zweig, D., & Webster, J. 2003. Personality as a moderator of monitoring acceptance. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 19: 479-493.
- Zweig, D., & Webster, J. 2002. Where is the line between benign and invasive? An examination of psychological barriers to the acceptance of awareness monitoring systems. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23: 605-633.