

# New Means of Workplace Surveillance Model: From the Gaze of the Supervisor to the Digitalization of Employee Performance

Hanen Khanchel<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Institute of Advanced Business Studies, Carthage, Tunisia

Correspondence: Hanen Khanchel, Institute of Advanced Business Studies, Carthage, Tunisia

Received: January 12, 2020

Accepted: January 30, 2020

Online Published: January 31, 2020

doi:10.5430/bmr.v8n4p54

URL: <https://doi.org/10.5430/bmr.v8n4p54>

## Abstract

Based on a data collection using the puzzle method. This method allowed us, first, to collect new types of data on Tunisian workers, in order to better quantify and analyse their activities. As a result, this study shows the consequences of the excessive use of employee behaviour monitoring tools and control devices established in Tunisian companies after the events of 14 January 2011. Indeed, it has been found that the system of control and monitoring of employee behaviors can feed the sources of stress and burn-out. Finally, some recommendations were proposed to address these issues.

**Keywords:** performance, control, behavior, stress, workplace

## 1. Introduction

In most companies, employers keep a close eye on their employees' activity to prevent them from doing "something wrong"... Continuous or random checks, anything everywhere, or someone watching what you do. As Philippe Silberzahn, professor of management, emphasized on the Lift scene, most managers are trained primarily to control others and 30% to 50% of their time is dedicated to this monitoring activity. But if this control is supposed to prevent employees from doing "something wrong", do not they prevent them from doing "something good?" "

This is highlighted by Professor Ethan Bernstein of Harvard Business School in an article titled the paradox of transparency, reports the Washington Post. In this article, Ethan Bernstein shows that the productivity of Chinese workers has increased when the surveillance has relaxed... In some cases, putting a simple curtain between workers and their superior has increased productivity by 10 to 15%!

If they are not supervised, workers use their methods of work which are always more effective than the prescribed methods. The performance grew not so much because the workers were hidden from their supervisors, but because they were able to share ideas and put them into practice without remonstrating. At a time when surveillance via digital tools is becoming ubiquitous, Jena McGregor estimates for the Washington Post, the risk is high that surveillance is daunting. And in the end, much less productive than its defenders hope.

Why? Already in the 2000s, Carl Botan, a professor at Purdue University, interested in the effect of surveillance on employees, felt that when they knew they were being watched, employees thought that, for their boss, the amount work is more important than quality. Supervised employees often perceive their work condition as more stressful and are more subject to boredom, anxiety, depression, fatigue and anger than others... Monitoring reduces performance and feelings of personal control.

While the vast majority of studies show that monitoring has a negative impact on productivity, a recent study reported an absolutely opposite result... reports Fast Company. By studying the accounting results of some 400 restaurants where NCR monitoring systems, one of the specialists in the installation of PLCs, have been installed, the figures have shown a decrease in flights and a clear increase in turnover. (+ 7%).

Researchers believe that surveillance has influenced the behavior of employees, pushing them to be more intimate with customers, especially to compensate for losses due to difficulty flying. For researchers, employee misconduct is therefore more the result of management policies than related to differences in ethics and morals between individuals.

Researchers also offer another explanation: by reducing managers' attention to surveillance issues, these systems allow them to be more attentive to service and quality of food...

A reallocation of efforts that could also explain the improvement in productivity and the quality of service observed.

This striking example, however, should not lead us to believe that all I have told you so far is false and that surveillance promotes productivity. It is not so much the surveillance that is at stake here, but the restaurant pay system in the United States, which is often paid a tip or a percentage of what they sell.

To make up for losses due to the difficulty of flying, they have to sell more. Most people who are being watched are not interested in sales, so the virtuous behavior expected of them will not be rewarded. If our graphic designer spent his days on Photoshop, he would not be better paid and besides, if that were the case, he is not sure that his production would be considered sufficiently creative... by his employer.

But what also reminds us against this example is that all trades are different. And that measurement and monitoring systems offer undifferentiated processes, while their effects are not?

How surveillance and automation transform human relationships?

As our human relations are optimized and measured by machines, they change in nature. They are emptied of their variability, a little as if we "usinify" all our human relationships to the golden calf of optimization and efficiency. But do we know how to measure something else? Do we know how to measure the value of human relationships compared to accounting optimization?

Surveillance cameras, coin changers and automatic cash registers have plenty of strengths, but by strengthening control, they are sources of new tensions... as Pascal Barbier explained in the life of the ideas by evoking the works of Sophie Bernard in his book work and service automation: the end cashiers or those of Marlène Benquet in *Accept or*, as pointed out an excellent forum sociologist Baptist Coulmont in *LeMonde.fr* on putting the customer work, the eponymous book by William Tiffon.

When we automate, when we "machin" human relationships, we act on the foundations of human relationships... socialization that is to say on what founds the social norm (respect, politeness, etc.), since it is moved by the machine. Many things that are not taken into account by the metrics and automatisms set up.

In fact, sociologist Guillaume Tiffon tells us, labor sociologists mainly look at how these devices transform the work of employees as the customer experiences these transformations. For the customer, the automation is experienced very differently depending on the configuration of the machines, the fees they offer customers, their practicality... and of course according to customers.

"Those who are familiar with these exercises, often the youngest ones, use them more easily without always questioning them, while the older ones often remain reluctant, and all the more so since the costs of entry to their use may be demanding or that the expectation of service is different. While some customers have incorporated the new consumer standard of self-service, this is not the case for everyone. The heterogeneity of the answers depends on both the automata and the customers, their age of sensitivity... Some use the machines with ease, sensitive to the promise of saving time (even if it is not always present), others are more indecisive, others are lost to the use of these machines that develop inequalities and exclusions of facts, others, finally, are in opposition in principle, whether for questions of dehumanization of the relationship or for political questions (particularly threats to employment)."

"The question of measurement tools, automata, refers to a fundamental transformation related to the development of the control society." The control created suspicion. Cashiers who are in charge of monitoring automatic pay stations say it well. "In addition to intensification, they feel like they're gendarmes. "Similarly the client side," the suspicion changes the nature of the relationship. Civility disappears: there is no more hello, thank you and goodbye, even if they were not systematic. If all goes well, the cashier is invisible, but not when there is a problem. And this of course influences the interactions, it has an impact on the nature of the relationships: employees and customers are only connected when things are not right."

"The development of self-service has changed the role of the client, but also that of the employee," says the sociologist. "He is not here to advise. He is there to supply, to do the logistics. His workload and his assessment are made on the number of products he puts on the shelf and no longer on the commercial dimension, always difficult to measure. In France, the economist Jean Gadrey ( blog ) in his book, *Services: Productivity in questions* showed that the calculation of productivity gains was unable to account for performance, particularly in services. If our capitalist society has been able to make productivity gains in the industry, in services, they are much weaker, which makes it difficult to optimize or standardize techniques... In services, the improvement of productivity goes through computerization and its

corollary, the development of automation, as well as the putting to work of the customer, solutions to compress costs by outsourcing tasks to the customer.

"The challenge is to build other indicators to measure the performance of services that are not only productivist. Is business accounting capable of considering quality of service consideration rather than focusing on revenue performance per employee? ", Asks William Tiffon.

The excess to change indicators?

We have seen the misdeeds of surveillance and management by coercion; how rules, rituals, processes, surveillance have become our new forms of authority. However, the challenge remains the same everywhere: to find more relevant indicators to better measure productive relationships... without always being aware of the impact that these new forms of surveillance will have on productive relationships. To change indicators, the challenge is often to multiply them. Is immoderation the only way to solve the problem of measurement?

As digital tools multiply and become more intimate, new metrics interfere in productive relationships. As James Wilson explained for The Wall Street Journal, the sensors that we carry around, the tools from the quantified self, the movement of self-measurement, are finding their first practical applications in the world of business and sports. The football teams equip their players with sensors under their jerseys to measure their fatigue and their movements. In offices, employees are equipped with badges that monitor their level of commitment or stress, like the sociometric badges that we have mentioned several times.

Perspectives that tell Nicholas Carr on his blog that, like many other tools before them, release tools, self-measuring devices are becoming control devices. Taylor's dream of perfect optimization is being achieved by fitting into our intimacy and the intimacy of our social relationships. We thought the internet was going to free us... We were wrong. His role is to control us. The system remains a priority!

However, is the excessiveness introduced by these new behavioral sensors (which do not look at what we say, but how do we interact and with whom), which put us under constant constant surveillance, not the only one capable of exceeding and renew the criteria of our traditional measurement tools?

This is what the new measurement tools, such as sociometric badges, show us, show how much productivity is being reduced if we only try to maximize it. Rather than measuring only individual productivity, badges seek to measure cooperation, and thereby foster social interaction.

The example of the experience with the Bank of America call center shows that the productivist isolation of employees is counterproductive and that unstructured coffee breaks are introduced to improve exchanges between each (and hence the productivity) is much more efficient. If the excessive control tools explain that we need to be less monitored, time to exchange, time to think about our activity... certainly, their social acceptance is assured.

That's also what Google's Big Data tools for human resources use to refine its recruitment. Tools that have undermined the company's first hiring indicators, which are less and less interested in the agreed metrics of VCs, such as studies or expertise, in favor of the detection of the ability to 'adapt.

In the case of Tunisian companies, we see the reinforcement of the control devices of employees performance after the events of January 14, 2011; They have different security consequences on the national territory: decree of state of emergency followed by a new law of extension of this state, reinforcement of the safety of transport, industrial sites or water supply, reinforcement of the means of safety public. The reinforcement of behavior monitoring and device control system in Tunisian companies causes sources of stress in the workplace (Khanchel, 2019). With the advance of technology, surveillance tools are more and more invasive and powerful, but this practice is not new today! Long before the advent of the Internet, many pointing systems littered the walls of factories, and signage sheets were already circulating in the nineteenth century. Now, thanks to technology, the possibilities are immense and companies can closely monitor the comings and goings of their employees.

### *1.1 Pointing Systems*

Although they tend to disappear, it is still possible to find mechanical pointers in which employees insert a cardboard card at each arrival and departure. More modern and more widespread, the taggers process the information digitally at each passage under a portico, for example. But the real luxury products in this area are the fingerprint biometric pointers, which we had the opportunity to admire in most James Bond and which are becoming more and more corporate because they do not require any equipment additional.

The use of these machines has long been justified by the time savings they represent, especially in terms of human resources management. Legally, the company must ensure that the system is in no way falsifiable; the data provided by the clocking machine can not, moreover, not be used to punish or dismiss an employee too often late.

The company must ensure that the system is in no way falsifiable

For fingerprint biometric readers, the CNIL (National Commission for Information Technology and Freedom) is even stricter: their use is regulated to very specific issues, such as access to dangerous equipment or sensitive data. the company, or even the state. More anecdotally, Scandinavian and American companies have tested the principle of implanting an RFID chip under the skin, but this solution simply allows to get rid of the badge and offers little possibility of monitoring.

### *1.2 Video surveillance*

If companies decide to equip their offices and warehouses cameras, it is usually for reasons of safety : reducing theft and evidence collection in cases of crime from an employee or a third party. But before installing the cameras, the legislation indicates that the employer must consult upstream with its employees and its works council. An authorization from the prefect will be necessary if the workspaces are intended to be open to the public.

The installation of cameras in offices is therefore completely lawful, but the company must be able to justify this choice in case of control: sensitive documentation, dangerous equipment, cash, valuables, etc. Be careful though, cameras can not shoot anything. Apart from the cases mentioned above, an employee on his workstation can not be in the field of the camera, and the same applies to break zones, toilets and union premises. If, as an employee, you are in doubt, you can always contact the labor inspectorate to organize a check.

The company must be able to justify this choice in case of control.

### *1.3 Geolocation*

Geolocating a vehicle has many advantages for a company: this feature not only improves logistics but is also used for security and anti-theft issues. GPS plotters are usually installed in company owned vehicles; the employer has the obligation, as for the cameras, to inform the employees upstream. The use of geolocation must be justified to the CNIL, and the collection and processing of location data outside the working time of employees (breaks and weekends) are prohibited.

It is used for security and anti-theft issues

#### *Eavesdropping*

The same principles apply to listening to communications. If a company does not need the agreement of the employee to analyze his consumption with the operator, it must imperatively get his permission to install a system for listening to his conversations. However, this authorization is not enough, the employer must once again be able to justify the use of such a method. In France, using your professional line to make private calls is not punishable by law, as long as it does not become abusive.

Using your professional line to make private calls is not punishable by law, as long as it does not become abusive.

### *1.4 Surveillance software*

Keeping track of an employee's movements and physical actions is not the only dimension that technology has perfected. Nowadays, all the digital activity, including communications, that companies can control, including the use of the computer and the mobile phone, the activity on the Internet and the mobile applications, the exchanges of e-mails and SMS, as well as the extraction and import of data.

#### *Activity trackers*

Do not imagine that these practices are not widespread, on the contrary employee monitoring solutions are numerous and the companies that developed them well. Teramind, for example, offers software that can determine whether the "digital" behavior of an employee deviates from the rules previously reported by management. Thus, if he is too often on social networks while working in the accounting department, the software can highlight it. ActivTrak, free solution, quantifies the time spent by an employee on "**productive**" or "**non-productive**" sites. All information collected can be processed by a manager but also by algorithms, programmed to detect any anomaly. The most whimsical in this story is that most of these softwares - available on computer and mobile phone - are totally **invisible to the user**.

The employee's Internet connections during his working time are presumed to be of a professional nature; the employer therefore acts **legally** by using such solutions, even if it runs the risk of **losing the trust of its employees** irrevocably.

An employee may be dismissed for misconduct in case of misuse of the Internet. This is the reason why these solutions all help to block malicious or illegal content in order to automatically limit the non-professional uses of the equipment available.

Solutions to block malicious or illegal content to limit unprofessional uses

Reading e-mails, SMS and files

Legally, e-mails exchanged via a professional address and the files stored on the computers of the company are the property of the latter, just like SMS exchanged via a business phone. The use of **abusive language** in an exchange can therefore justify **serious misconduct** or even **dismissal**. Software has the ability to handle a tremendous amount of emails and, depending on the keywords used, to bring some to the direction. This practice allows the company, in case of prevention or following a particular event, to quickly identify the source of a problem. On the other hand, if the subject of the e-mail indicates the word "**personal**" or "**Confidential**", this right becomes void. It is for this reason that most companies stipulate in their internal regulations that personal-to-personal exchanges are strictly forbidden, in which case even the mentions mentioned above are considered to be useless.

Software has the ability to process e-mails and, depending on the keywords used, to bring some back to management.

### *1.5 Customer monitoring systems*

It has been 45 minutes now that you are waiting for the evening meal you ordered on your favorite delivery service. The little bike pictogram seems to have made a detour that was not planned, and you start to be annoyed. When the driver finally arrives, you thank him by catching the kraft paper bag but, once the door is closed, you open the application in question to express your dissatisfaction with the service. These scoring systems are becoming more common in the service environment and they are not inconsequential.

By asking customers directly about the quality of the work done by their employees, businesses kill two birds with one stone. On the one hand, users have the feeling of controlling their customer experience by regularly judging the services they received; on the other hand, the company benefits from an additional supervisor free of charge. If we take the example mentioned earlier, a late delivery man will be caught between **the GPS data** recorded by the application and the almost immediate feedback from the customer. The latter is then part of an **employee monitoring system**, democratized.

While the measure alienates us, is it possible that immoderation frees us? In any case, it is the hope on which its promoters base themselves. Can control and measurement become liberatory if controlled and measured objects change? At a time when indicators are so important, if installed, must we believe that only the excess will allow us to show their limits, and to change?

## **2. Literature Review**

Monitoring is a term applied to a variety of work practices using information and communication technologies to collect and analyze data on the performance of employees' work (Aiello & Panina 2005, Aiello & Svec 1993; Komaki, Zlotnick & Jensen, 1986, Niehoff & Moorman, 1993).

This definition considers monitoring as "continuous collection, analysis and management of information relating to work performance and use of equipment". The essence of monitoring through this definition is the power of data collection that technologies allow and no one cares about the use of these data base (Lakhoua & al., 2018).

In this research, we will join the few authors who proposed to integrate a "reporting" process into the definition of monitoring (Nebeker & Tatum, 1993). However, we would like to point out that they do not clearly specify whether these reports are actually communicated to employees, ie if there is feedback from this collection of performance data. Thus, by integrating the feedback phase into the definition of performance monitoring, the latter would consist of setting standards/evaluation procedures, observing and collecting, through technologies, data on employee performance, analyzing them (evaluating employee performance) and implementing place adjustment actions (Lakhoua, 2013). It would therefore be a control exercised before the action, during the action and / or after the action (Bouquin, 1998).

Monitoring extends the logic of scientific management of work through control in two ways: by ensuring that workers operate in accordance with company rules and procedures and by providing useful information to reduce costs (Wood, 1998). It is thus a "mechanism whose purpose is to influence the behavior of the actors of the organization in the direction expected for the latter". If we refer to Langevin and Naro (2003), monitoring consists of a so-called "behavioral" approach to control. We join Merchant (1998) to emphasize that the problem of control in this approach is primarily that of controlling individuals (Khanchel & Ben Kahla, 2016).

### 3. Methodology

The problem selected by this paper consists in defining the sources of stress coming from the monitoring system and device control in Tunisian companies after the events of January 14, 2011. To answer this problematic, we chose the "Puzzle" method (Rouibah, 2002), for two reasons. The first is to help Tunisian companies create collective meaning. The second reason for this choice, is that previous work on this issue has always been of a quantitative nature. Indeed, the authors focused on one or two predefined sources of stress and tried to validate or invalidate hypotheses through quantitative data analysis following the administration of questionnaires or following an experiment to compare two work situations "under monitoring" and "without monitoring".

In order to better identify the different sources of stress from the behavior monitoring and device control system in Tunisian companies, we followed the next steps :

- Targeting which delimits the part of the external environment of the company on which the efforts of the previous day must be targeted.
- The targeting phase is also akin to defining the information needs and therefore the identification of the sources (formal and informal) to be scanned that could provide the targeted information.
- The hunt that consists of going to the front of the information and making them available in the company.
- Lift means when the tracker sends the collected information to the person responsible for storing it. The descent device requires that the tracker has a suitable hardware means to transmit the information, easy to access and use.
- Memorization which constitutes the intelligent storage to value and exploit the collected information. Intelligent storage allows the formatting of information and their classification in databases to be able to find them at any time ready to be used.
- Meaning-making, a crucial phase in the process of inductively processing and interpreting anticipatory intelligence, or creating meaningful connections between fragmented, ambiguous, and uncertain information in interactions with individual memories, and collective.
- Dissemination / Access, which consists in putting the information developed, resulting from meaning sessions, at the disposal of the authorized end-users, often operational managers.
- The Action that corresponds to the use of the information. If the latter are significant enough, they can be integrated into the decision-making process. If however, the processed information does not allow a clear enough vision, they can be completed by relaunching a new request for missing information (Khanchel & al., 2018).

### 4. Results

After defining in the first part the context of this research as well as the problem. We will present in a second part the prototype developed to answer this problem and we will describe the experimentation of this tool as part of a strategic intelligence project. We draw some recommendations from the conclusion.

#### 4.1 Sources of Stress Related to the Presence of Others

The presence of managers in the workplace makes it easy to access employee performance data at all times and therefore to monitor performance at all times. Thus the unpredictability of performance monitoring presents a main source of stress. Supervisors can listen to employees at any time, which is true to the principle of behavioral control.

The presence of others can be likened to a stimulus and a source of stress because of the uncertainty associated with social stimuli. In addition, this stimulus encourages employees to increase their efforts and improve their performance even if they do not have a great capacity to control their work pace. Indeed, the criteria set for performance monitoring are very difficult to achieve, especially since in this business it is very difficult to control the pace of work. The latter largely depends on the interaction with customers and the pace of the conversation.

We find that the presence of others is stressful because it also represents an unconditional stimulus, a source of potential evaluation. Especially since this potential evaluation is unpredictable and may be a source of injustice.

The irregularity and unpredictability of performance appraisal is an objective in it self for companies to prevent employees from changing their behavior during performance monitoring. However, this irregularity makes it possible to distinguish behaviors that are not representative of the usual behaviors of employees.

We are seeing stressors perception difference inherent in monitoring performance induced by the level of employee experience. The performance monitoring is perceived differently by beginners and experienced, those who master their tasks well and those who master them less.

Knowing that employees do not necessarily receive training before they start work, they learn "on the job". The fact of evaluating them on a skill that they are not supposed to have and that they will develop as they go along does not seem to be sensible and appreciated. In other words, this criterion is significant with the progress of work in the company and not early in the career.

At the beginning of a career, employees rarely have confidence in themselves and the need to be supported is apparently very important. Some of them take the initiative and ask their own sandstone to be listened to assess their own shortcomings and find solutions.

Some people find reassurance that they know they are being listened to and that at any time the manager who listens to them can intervene and help them manage a situation that is difficult to manage.

Thus, monitoring is perceived as a source of stress at the beginning of a career if it makes it possible to evaluate performance not acquired by employees. However, if monitoring leads to advice to improve the performance and work of employees, it will be seen as a means of learning and not a source of stress. This difference in perception depends essentially on the intervention of the manager during the monitoring feedback phase and the use he makes of data collected in the workplace.

The collection of data is mainly done by supervisors or in-house managers known by employees but also by customers for whom the call center exempts the administration of a workshop, the marketing of a product, the taking meeting with customers... etc.

Being listened to by someone outside the company can also be stressful for employees. Even with the knowledge of being listened to by the "Customer" for example, employees are more stressed than usual. May be for fear of the unknown "The customer", its reactions or following a safe-estimate of the power of the customer. For their part, they justify this fear by a fear that the client is not aware of the difficulty of their job and does not take into account these difficulties when assessing the work they do.

Thus, the presence of others can be seen as a conditional and unconditional stimulus. The constant, evaluative presence of managers is an important source of stress. In addition, the evaluative function of monitoring seems to be the most worrying function of employees. This constitutes an important source of injustice due to the irregularity of the data collection, the lack of mastery of the job of the employees or the inconsistency between the evaluation criteria and the degree of expertise of the employees. At the beginning of the career, monitoring is better perceived if its role is to help employees learn their job and overcome their difficulties. It is only after a certain experience that monitoring is appreciated for its behavioral control function that stimulates employees and pushes them to make more effort.

#### *4.2 Sources of Stress Related to the Presence of Technologies*

The effect of social facilitations must occur when the observer or audience is not physically present or visible (Bond & Titus, 1983). The presence of technology must therefore be seen as an invisible presence to monitor the work of employees and replace the physical presence of managers with a much more persistent and penetrating virtual presence.

Contrary to what some writers think, employees are more stressed in the presence of device control. The only technologies cited as sources of stress are video surveillance and recording conversations. These have in common the continuous presence in the workplace as a main feature and the constant access to performance data of workers.

The employees reject the "video" tool in the case of largely companies studied because this tool not only to collect information about the performance but also behaviors that are not linked to productivity. Employees are convinced that the performance can be measured by listening to conversations. Thus, monitoring system does not concretely contribute anything to the evaluation of the performance criteria. This tool does not make it possible to evaluate the performance of the employees but makes it possible to evaluate other behaviors of the employees such as the way they hold themselves, the clothes worn, the gestures... etc, which constitutes a source of stress.

The second tool contested by employees is the recording of telephone conversations. Although opinions are mixed on this tool, it seems interesting to us to retain the stressful effect of the latter. Being registered is one way of controlling employee behavior and performance, but this control can be done in the short term or in the long term after the action. Employees fear a feedback too far in time compared to the action, which does not allow them to know the why of this evaluation and to lose any weapon of defense since they do not remember this action.

Thus, the reluctance of employees towards registration is not based on the type of evaluation criteria applicable, such as video surveillance, but especially the time of the consequent feedback. In a completely contradictory way, some employees consider this tool as proof of performance. By recording telephone conversations can ask to check their performance in the case of an unfair evaluation by a manager.

Thus, the presence considered to be a source of stress for monitoring system is mainly the constant presence. Any punctual monitoring is much more accepted by employees. The presence for the electronic monitoring is realized through the device control but also through the presence of the managers. Employees have more fears and apprehension about the presence of control for recording or listening. Similarly, the presence in the context of electronic monitoring is considered a conditional stimulus source of stress depending on the use made by managers to data collected via technologies.

#### *4.3 Sources of Stress Related to the Use of Technologies*

The technologies do not seem to scare provided employees but rather the use made of the data collected represents a major source of stress. Indeed, during the monitoring the data collection is followed by the return of the managers, and the latter seems to be much more stressful than the actual collection. Managers use the gravity penalty system as a way of managing human resources.

However, even though their threats are not really credible, they are creators of stress. The threats essentially concern two elements: possible sanctions such as gravities, warnings, etc., or loss of work.

With regard to the attitudes of managers during the data collection phase, some react against the results simultaneously. In fact, managers have overall objectives to be achieved per workday. These results obviously depend on the performance of employees. Failure to master these individual performances creates tension and stress that lasts all day long until these results are achieved.

However, if the manager does not handle stress, it communicates to employees and becomes a source of stress in turn. In other words, instead of motivating his staff to move forward as quickly and efficiently as possible, he will stress them and paralyze some of their actions.

Knowing that the behavior of managers is very important for employees and the working environment, certain attitudes adopted by the latter are not only stressful but pacemakers of irritation and aggression among employees. In fact, shouting, insulting or humiliating employees and disrespecting them creates a very stressful atmosphere and undermines their concentration. The employees tell us that when the manager shouts or threatens them, the desire to work and the motivation in silk diminish.

Feedback is a key phase of the behavioral control represented by performance monitoring. This phase differs from the first two phases of monitoring by direct contact of employees with their results. This contact can take several forms: a feedback from the supervisor, a public display of results, an individual display of results after access to a software analysis results. Each of these forms of feedback can be stressful for employees.

Feedback most frequently used in the workplace, direct feedback from managers. Direct feedback is used to analyze the results of employees in their presence and to provide them with methods and tools to adjust their behavior and performance in order to improve them. This direct feedback can be based on data collected directly by the manager through the observation of employee behaviors, data collected through a software census of the results or finally data collected through recording or video surveillance technologies.

The difference between a source of stress feedback and a non-stressful feedback is not about how to collect performance data, but about how to conduct the feedback by the manager. In some cases, the feedback takes place under very stressful conditions. Indeed, the manager details the results of the employee by sending him either sanctions or abusive remarks. As a result, no explanation is sent to the employee to improve his performance. In this case, the objective of the monitoring is transformed into a sanction objective.

We also add that monitoring can be a source of evaluation and selection of employees based on their performance. In other words, monitoring can be a way of eliminating people who are not teleworkers. Thus, this feedback phase can be stressful for those who are not average in terms of performance: they feel threatened to lose their job.

The second form of feedback is the public display of the results. This feedback helps to compare the results achieved by the employees as well as a ranking of the latter according to their results. Displaying a ranking of the results favors the motivation of high-performing employees and the stress of lower-performing employees.

Indeed, the high-performing employee will have a satisfaction of his need of esteem and will be motivated to protect his position among the best, while the less efficient employees will find themselves at the bottom of the ranking and



can act in two ways: either they will do their best to regain the top of the rankings, either they will feel depreciated and lose hope of improvement. In both cases, displaying the results is an important source of stress.

Thus, monitoring is a source of stress in itself for teleoperators. Nevertheless, it must be stressed that monitoring is stressful especially for teleoperators at the beginning of their careers who do not yet master their profession or teleoperators who do not really perform at the level of their tasks. The employees least affected by the stress caused by the monitoring are of course efficient and master their trades and above all they have confidence in their performance.

## 5. Conclusion

The results confirm that employees express more fear and apprehension about the presence of managers than technologies, recording tools or listening in the workplace. Similarly, the presence in the context of electronic monitoring is considered a source of conditional stress stimulation based on the use made by managers of data collected through technologies. In addition, employees under supervision are much more subject to stress, anxiety and depression than those who are entitled to a certain degree of freedom, and their productivity will necessarily be degraded. As long as companies have the ability to justify the use of a surveillance system and warn their employees, then everything is possible. Nevertheless, an employer must not give in to paranoia if he does not wish to seriously degrade the atmosphere and productivity in his offices. The dimension of trust takes here all its magnitude, so that the rules of safety are respected without being forced to appeal to Big Brother. Therefore, the ideal for Tunisian managers is to achieve self-control reflexes within their teams. Those who see the benefits of this climate of trust will recall the order of those who could make their existence by abuse.

## 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. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1993.tb01102.x>
- Aiello J. R. (1993). Computer-based work monitoring: Electronic surveillance and its effects. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 23, 499-507. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1993.tb01100.x>
- Aiello J. R., & Kolb, K. J. (1997). Computer based performance monitoring and productivity in a multiple task environment. *Journal of Business & Psychology*, 12(2), 189-204. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1025022202211>
- Aiello J.R., Panina Daria. (2005). Acceptance of electronic monitoring and its consequences in different cultural contexts: a conceptual model. *Journal of International Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intman.2005.03.009>
- Amick B. C. & Smith M. J. (1992), Stress, Computer-based work monitoring and measurement systems: a conceptual overview. *Applied Ergonomics*, 23, 6-16. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-6870\(92\)90005-G](https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-6870(92)90005-G)
- Avero P., & Calvo M. G. (1999). Emotional reactivity to social-evaluative stress: Gender differences in response systems concordance. *Personality & Individual Differences*, 27, 155-170. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869\(98\)00229-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(98)00229-3)
- Bell, P. A., & Yee, L. A. (1989). Skill level and audience effects on performance of a karate Drill. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 129, 191-200. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.1989.9711720>
- Bond, C. F., & Titus, L. J. (1983). Social facilitation: A meta-analysis of 241 studies. *Psychological Bulletin*, 94, 265-292. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.94.2.265>
- Bouquin, H. (1998), Le contrôle de gestion, PUF, collection gestion.
- Burns, J. W. (1995), Interactive effects of traits, states, and gender on cardiovascular reactivity during different situations, *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 18, 279-303. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01857874>
- Cacioppo J. T., Rourke P. A., Marshall-Goodell B. S., Tassinary L. G., & Baron, R. S. (1990), Rudimentary physiological effects of mere observation. *Psychophysiology*, 27, 177-186. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8986.1990.tb00368.x>
- Cohen J. L. (1979). Social facilitation: Increased evaluation apprehension through permanency of record. *Motivation and Emotion*, 3, 19-33. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00994158>
- Cohen J. L. (1980), Social facilitation: Audience versus evaluation apprehension effects. *Motivation and Emotion*, 4, 21-34. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00995927>

- Criddle W. D. (1971). The physical presence of other individuals as a factor in social facilitation. *Psychonomic Science*, 22, 229-230. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03332585>
- Grant, R. A., & Higgins, C. A. (1991), The impact of computerized performance monitoring on service work: Testing a causal model. *Information Systems Research*, 2(2), 116-142. <https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.2.2.116>
- Guerin B. & Innes J. M. (1982), Social facilitation and social monitoring: A new look at Zajonc's mere presence hypothesis. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 21, 7-18. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8309.1982.tb00506.x>
- Hartley T. R., Ginsburg G. P., & Heffner K. (1999), Self-preservation and cardiovascular reactivity. *International Journal of Psychophysiology*, 32(1), 75-88. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-8760\(99\)00003-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-8760(99)00003-3)
- 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, P.143-157. <https://doi.org/10.1006/ijhc.1997.0167>
- Irving R. H., Higgins C. A., & Safayeni F. R. (1986), Computerized performance monitoring systems: use and abuse. *Communications of the ACM*, 29, 794-801. <https://doi.org/10.1145/6424.6430>
- Komaki J. L. (1986), Toward effective supervision: an operant analysis and comparison of managers at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 270-279. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.2.270>
- Khanchel, H. (2019), Stress in the Workplace: Causes, Effects & How to Cope. *Journal of Business Administration Research*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.5430/jbar.v8n1p52>
- Khanchel H., Lakhoua M.A. & Ben Kahla K. (2018), Operation of the Information Monitoring System for the Optimization of the Processing Time and the Dissemination of Financial Data. *Journal of Business and Management Research*, 5(4). <https://doi.org/10.5430/bmr.v7n3p1>
- Khanchel H. and Ben Kahla K. (2016), Impact of the Work Flexibility on Organization. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Developmen*, 5(4).
- Lakhoua M.N., (2013), "Systemic analysis of an industrial system: case study of a grain silo". *Arabian Journal for Science and Engineering*, 38, 2013, pp.1243-1254. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13369-012-0357-4>
- Lakhoua M.N, J. Ben Salem, L. El Amraoui, (2018), The Need for System Analysis based on Two Structured Analysis Methods SADT and SA/RT. *Acta Technica Corviniensis. Bulletin of Engineering, Fascicule 1*, 2018.
- MacCracken M. J. & Stadulis R. E. (1985), Social facilitation of young children's dynamic balance performance. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 7, 150-165. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsp.7.2.150>
- Merchant K. A. (1998). *Modern management control systems Upper Saddle River*. N.J: Prentice Hall.
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1993.tb01101.x>
- Niehoff, B. P., & Moorman, R. H. (1993), Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behaviour. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36, 527-556. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256591>
- Platania J., & Moran G. P. (2001), Social facilitation as a function of mere presence of Others. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 141, 190-197. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224540109600546>
- Rouibah, K., & Ould-Ali, S. (2002) - Puzzle: a concept and prototype for linking business intelligence to business strategy. *Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, 11 (2002), 133-152. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0963-8687\(02\)00005-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0963-8687(02)00005-7)
- Revelle, W., & Loftus, D. A. (1992). The implications of arousal effects for the study of affect and memory , In S.-A. Christianson (Ed.), *The handbook of emotion and memory: Research and theory* (pp. 113-149). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Rogers K. J. S., Smith M. J., & Stainfort P. C. (1990), Electronic performance monitoring, job design and psychological stress. *Proceeding of the Human Factors Society*, 34, 854-858. <https://doi.org/10.1177/154193129003401206>

- Smith M.J., Carayon P., Sanders K.L., Lim S-Y., & Legrande, D. (1992), Employee stress and health complaints in jobs with and without electronic performance monitoring. *Applied Ergonomics*, 23, p.17-28. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-6870\(92\)90006-H](https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-6870(92)90006-H)
- Snydersmith M. A., & Cacioppo J. T. (1992), Parsing complex social factors to determine component effects: I. Autonomic activity and reactivity as a function of human association. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 11, 263-278. <https://doi.org/10.1521/jscp.1992.11.3.263>
- Stanton J. M., & Barnes-Farrell, J. L. (1996), Effects of computer monitoring on personal control, satisfaction and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 738- 745. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.81.6.738>
- Stanton J. M., Shreya T. M. Sarkar-Barney. (2003), A detailed analysis of task performance with and without computer monitoring. *International Journal of Human Computer Interaction*, 16(2), 345-366. [https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327590IJHC1602\\_11](https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327590IJHC1602_11)
- Westin, A. (1986). *Privacy an quality of work-life issues in employee monitoring* (NTIS PB88-156851). National Technical Information Service, Washington, DC, dans Shleifer
- L. M., & Shell R. L. (1992), A review and reappraisal of electronic performance monitoring, performance standards and stress allowances. *Applied Ergonomics*, 23, 1, p. 49-53. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-6870\(92\)90010-S](https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-6870(92)90010-S)
- Wood A. M. (1998), Omniscient organisations and bodily observations: electronic surveillance in the workplace. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 18, 5/6, 136-174. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01443339810788407>
- Zajonc, R. B. (1965). Social facilitation. *Science*, 149, p. 269-274. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.149.3681.269>