ONLINE SUPPLEMENT TO

PRIVACY AT WORK: A REVIEW AND A RESEARCH AGENDA FOR A

CONTESTED TERRAIN

In this *Online Supplement*, we provide additional details (beyond those in the main manuscript) in three areas: defining privacy (Section 1), review of empirical findings in organizational privacy research for two relationships that we identify in the stakeholders' privacy calculus model (Section 2), and discussion of legal issues in organizational privacy (Section 3). Table numbers below refer to those in this *Online Supplement.*

SECTION 1

PRIVACY: CONCEPTUALIZATIONS AND CONTEXTS

Privacy: Broader *Conceptualizations* from Law and Philosophy

What is privacy? Embedded in answering that question is a second one: why does privacy matter? Answers to this latter question reflect fundamentally different ways in which privacy is conceptualized. Conceptualizations reflect "an abstract mental picture" of privacy (Solove, 2002: 1095). We first consider conceptualizations from philosophy and law, which have influenced the prevailing *definitions in organizational research* that we delineate in the main manuscript.

Privacy can be considered as a person's moral or legal claim (right), or a person's physical or psychological state (condition), or a person's degree of control (control; Parker, 1974; Schoeman, 1984). When privacy is conceptualized as a right, it emphasizes people's claim to choose what information they wish to communicate to others, how that information will be obtained, and how it will be used (Westin, 1967; 2003). Claims that receive legitimacy, either through the law or through social norms, constitute a "right to privacy" (Westin, 2003). When

privacy is conceptualized as a physical or psychological state, it reflects the perception of "being-apart-from-others" (Weinstein, 1971). It is the "voluntary and temporary withdrawal of a person from the general society through physical or psychological means…" Westin, 1967: 5). When privacy is conceptualized as control, it is concerned with "control over who can sense us"; Parker, 1974: 281). It reflects the power people possess to oversee what information is collected or disseminated about themselves (Fried, 1970; Miller 1971). There are also other privacy conceptualizations. Solove (2002) summarized the legal and philosophical discourse on privacy by identifying six conceptions: a) the right to be let alone, b) limited access to the self, c) secrecy, d) control over personal information, e) personhood, and f) intimacy (for related discussions on the functions of privacy, see Westin, 1967; Marshall, 1974; and Pedersen, 1997). The merits of each of these conceptualizations of privacy, among others, remain a source of scholarly discontent across disciplines (for related discussions, see Bernstein, 2017; Parker, 1974; Gavison, 1980; Schoeman, 1984).

In the main manuscript, we discuss how defining privacy is relatively clearer when considering contextual norms (Nissenbaum, 2004), such as those that exist in the employment relationship. As such, we rely on the definition of organizational privacy offered by E. F. Stone and Stone (1990), which adheres to such contextual considerations. There are two notable aspects of the E. F. Stone and Stone (1990) definition of privacy. First, in terms of the conceptualizations of privacy discussed earlier, their definition considers privacy as a state and as control. E. F. Stone and Stone (1990) intentionally excluded privacy as a right from their definition: they viewed the issue of rights to fall within the legal domain. Second, the definition is pragmatic. That is, their definition aligns with Solove's (2002: 1128) view by eschewing "seeking to illuminate an abstract concept of privacy" and by "focus[ing] instead on understanding privacy in specific contexts."

Doing so helps wade through legal and philosophical debates on privacy. In particular, E. F. Stone and Stone's (1990) definition identifies three specific privacy contexts pertaining to employees: their information, their work environment, and their autonomy. We now draw on other disciplines to elaborate upon and to clarify the definitions for each of these three *privacy contexts*.

Related Definitions from Other Disciplines for the Privacy *Contexts*

In economics, *information privacy* is "the concealment of [personal] information" (Posner, 1981: 405). That is, informational privacy focuses on the deliberate and rational processes that underlie the protection and disclosure of personal data (Acquisti, Brandimarte, & Loewenstein, 2015). This simplifying viewpoint links the economics of privacy to the economics of information (Posner, 1978, 1981). In so doing, it explicitly conceptualizes privacy as a commodity that can be monetized and exchanged (Bennett, 1995). This conceptualization is also congruent with the spirit of Stone-Romero and Stone's (2007: 327) subsequent simplified definition of information privacy: "the ability of data subjects [employees and employers] to control information".

In environmental psychology, *work environment privacy* (also sometimes referred to as space privacy or architectural privacy) is "the visual and acoustic isolation supplied by an environment" (Sundstrom, Burt, & Kamp, 1980: 102), although, as we discuss in the main manuscript, isolation associated with other senses (e.g., olfaction) is also sometimes invoked. That is, work environment privacy focuses on the actual physical environment of the office or the work space (Davis, Leach, & Clegg, 2011). More specifically, it reflects "employees' ability to control or regulate the boundary between self and others and, hence, others' access to self, and vice-versa" (Khazanchi, Sprinkle, Masterson, & Tong, 2018: 594).

In legal scholarship, *autonomy privacy* is "an individual's ability to make certain significant decisions without interference" (Kang, 1998: 1202); the "[protection of] a realm for expressing

one's self-identity or personhood through speech or activity" (DeCew, 1997: 77; also see Reiman, 1976, for a related philosophical view). In organizational research, such notions of autonomy privacy align with motivation research (e.g., self-determination theory, Gagné & Deci, 2005; job characteristics theory, Hackman & Oldham, 1980; demand-control-support model, Karasek, 1979). For instance, self-determination theory's consideration of autonomy ("Autonomy involves acting with a sense of volition and having the experience of choice"; Gagné & Deci, 2005: 333) reflects the legal and philosophical notions of autonomy privacy. In light of this voluminous existing literature, in both the main manuscript and this online supplement we consider autonomy privacy only to the extent that it directly informs information privacy and work environment privacy.

We include an illustrative set of definitions employed across primary studies in organizational research (see Table OS1 in this Online Supplement). We primarily include distinct definitions of information privacy and work environment privacy, but we also include a couple of definitions that encompass different privacy contexts in broader terms. In addition, we identify the primary privacy conceptualization reflected in the focal definition.

A quick glance at this table reveals that there are some common elements reflected across the different definitions. First, a majority of the definitions draw on the original ones put forth by a small set of scholars such as Westin (1967), Altman (1975), and E. F. Stone and Stone (1990). For this reason, and guided by Nissenbaum's (2004) and Solove's (2002) advice to focus on the context (here, the organizational context), we define information privacy and work environment privacy based on E. F. Stone and Stone's (1990) work. Second, the privacy definitions in organizational research primarily lean on the conceptualization of "privacy as control". This is not surprising. Conceptualizing privacy as control is relevant from an organizational standpoint. For

instance, considering privacy as control enables the introduction of appropriate governance mechanisms—a key responsibility for managers (Mintzberg, 1973)—to regulate privacy. In contrast, the conceptualization of "privacy as a state" primarily focuses on employees and their privacy perceptions. Thus, for instance, although Alge, Ballinger, Tangirala, and Oakley (2006) define information privacy primarily using the conceptualization of privacy as control (see Table OS1), their operationalization (through assessing employees' perceptions of information gathering control, information handling control, and perceived legitimacy) reflects the conceptualization of privacy as a state (Alge et al., 2006). This is consistent with Altman's (1975) view that even if employees provide a great deal of information (or permit its collection), they could still wish to experience a state of privacy.

SECTION 2

REVIEW OF EMPIRICAL FINDINGS IN ORGANIZATIONAL PRIVACY RESEARCH

As we discuss in the main manuscript, we first utilize the stakeholders' privacy calculus to review findings based on organizational research. We then evaluate this body of work by drawing on organizational research as well as research from other disciplines. In this Online Supplement, we discuss two sets of findings: the relationship between macrofactors and the organization's and employees' privacy calculus, and the relationship between the privacy contexts and employee cognitive-affective and behavioral outcomes. Findings related to the other relationships outlined in the stakeholders' privacy calculus model are outlined in the main manuscript.

Findings Related to Macrofactors, the Organization's Calculus, and Employees' Calculus

Summary of findings. We identified three macrofactors that will influence both the organization's and employees' privacy calculus: national culture, social norms, and the legal environment. National culture is "the collective programming of the human mind that distinguishes

the members of one [country or culture] from those of another" (Hofstede, 1980: 24). Social norms are social patterns that govern behavior of members of a particular group or society (Morris, Hong, Chiu, & Liu, 2015). The legal environment is the set of laws, regulations, statutes, and judicial decisions within a specific jurisdiction that pertain to privacy rights in the employment relationship (Budd, 2009; Edelman & Suchman, 1997).

When considering privacy from a macro standpoint, the factors of national culture, social norms and a country's regulatory environment are intertwined. For instance, the enactment of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDRP) in the European Union (EU) provides employees with rights to be informed about how organizations process their personal data, to access their personal data, to ask for inaccuracies in their data to be corrected and for their data to be erased when no longer needed (i.e., the "right to be forgotten"), to restrict or block processing of personal data in specific cases, and to retrieve the data and send it to another organization ("data portability"; European Commission, 2018). In the United States, employees' data do not receive similar protections—there is no single comprehensive federal data-protection law (O'Connor, 2018). Employees' information privacy rights are diffused across several laws and statutes (Determann & Sprague, 2011; Thoren-Peden & Meyer, 2018). Furthermore, employees in organizations in the private sector do not possess privacy rights and levels of protection comparable to those employees working in organizations in the public sector (Wilborn, 1998). Overall, though, the body of work in organizational research that identifies the linkages between these macrofactors and the organization's or employee's privacy calculus is sparse. As such, the primary factor we consider below is national culture.

An information systems study (Milberg, Smith, & Burke, 2000) drew on a sample of internal auditors across 19 countries, and reported that Hofstede's (1980) cultural dimensions were related

to personal privacy concerns. Specifically, participants from cultures higher on individualism, power distance and masculinity, as well as those from cultures lower on uncertainty avoidance, had greater privacy concerns. However, organizational research on applicant reactions toward selection methods reports some differing findings for power distance. Power distance reflects the degree to which cultures are tolerant of unequal power structures (or status differences) within an organization (Hofstede, 1980), and so employees in high power distance cultures (compared to those in low power distance cultures) are likely to be less sensitive to requests for personal information during employee selection (see Daniels & Greguras, 2014). In accordance, Phillips and Gully (2002) observed that Singaporean (high power distance) participants did not weigh privacy considerations as highly as American (low power distance) participants did. Similarly, Snyder and Shahani (2012) reported that privacy considerations vis-à-vis selection methods were not at the forefront for Indian (high power distance) participants.

Comparisons across American and Belgian participants, however, revealed few differences (and more commonalities) regarding privacy concerns related to using internet-based selection systems or providing employment-related information via the internet (Harris, Van Hoye, & Lievens, 2003). Anderson and Witvliet (2008) observed similar trends in a six-country (France, Portugal, Singapore, Spain, The Netherlands and the United States) study: participants were uniformly concerned about privacy associated with different selection methods although there were a few (negligible) differences across countries. Overall, although there exist some cross-cultural differences in information privacy concerns, there is also evidence of commonalities across cultures—an aspect consistent with Westin's (1967) observations that people across cultures value privacy (see also, Newell, 1998; Francis & Francis, 2017).

As regards work environment privacy, in a qualitative study of American interns working in

Japanese organizations, Masumoto (2004) observed that, in the open layout of the Japanese workplaces (where cubicles or partitions are less common compared to workplaces in the U.S.), the American interns perceived a lack of privacy. Kaya and Weber (2003) report a similar finding from a non-work setting: space privacy concerns of American students living in dorms were greater than those of their Turkish counterparts. Overall, though, we identified few cross-cultural differences for both information and work environment privacy, and no clear pattern of findings. For instance, in the Masumoto (2004) study discussed above, American interns' privacy concerns dissipated after six months, and they appreciated the opportunity to establish supportive relationships with coworkers in the open office layout.

Assessment of empirical findings and connections to related work in other disciplines. In general, social norms, national culture, and legal environments appear to have some impact on employees' privacy but the evidence is limited. Furthermore, most studies in this area have focused more on how these macrofactors have influenced employees' privacy concerns than on employers' actions that are proximal triggers for such concerns. To that end, in a recent qualitative study, Leclerq-Vandelannoitte (2017: 147) observed that ubiquitous information technologies (e.g., smartphones and wifi-enabled laptops), which were meant to increase autonomy, flexibility and responsiveness, also created a norm of "continuous availability" such that French employees perceived "an obligation to remain reachable" even outside the office and official work hours. Thus, the introduction of technologies and policies by the employer resulted in subtle privacy intrusions that extended beyond the workplace. More broadly, the role of distributed work practices (e.g., telecommuting) and the blurring of boundaries between the professional and home domains, with the concomitant evolution of social norms that could influence privacy, is an area that warrants further investigation. Future research could therefore adopt a multilevel perspective

that includes the societal (or country) level, the organizational level, and the individual employee level, with societal level factors (both directly and via organizational level factors) exerting effects on the individual employee's privacy calculus as well as moderating its relationships with various behavioral and cognitive-affective outcomes (cf. Gelfand, Nishii, & Raver, 2006).

Another approach could involve a more nuanced way to study the influence of national culture. Rather than examining direct effects of culture on privacy, Ayoko and Härtel (2003) studied dynamics of cultural interactions within two large Australian organizations. They found that members of culturally heterogenous workgroups (based on country of origin or cultural backgrounds of group members) had different values and norms of interaction, which led to different interpretations of personal space and privacy invasion. Culture could thus elicit tensions between coworkers and between work groups (i.e., not just between employers and employees). Global teams, multicultural teams, and culturally diverse workforces are some settings where such tensions could potentially manifest.

Findings Related to Privacy Contexts and Employee Outcomes

Information privacy and employee outcomes: Summary of findings. In terms of cognitive-affective outcomes, a key correlate of perceptions of invasion of privacy is procedural justice (i.e., employees' perceptions regarding the fairness of how employment-related decisions are made; Colquitt, Greenberg, & Zapata-Phelan, 2005). Although these two constructs are moderately negatively correlated, they are distinct (Alge, 2001; Eddy, Stone, & Stone-Romero, 1999). When employees (or applicants) perceive the selection (e.g., Bauer et al., 2006; Stoughton, Thompson, & Meade, 2015) or monitoring (McNall & Stanton, 2011; Posey, Bennett, Roberts, & Lowry, 2011; Zweig & Webster, 2002) process to be invasive, they consider it to be procedurally unfair. Other cognitive-affective outcomes that are negatively related to perceptions of invasion of

privacy are job satisfaction (Mossholder, Giles, & Wesolowski, 1991), organizational trust and organizational commitment (Chory, Vela, & Avtgis, 2016), and satisfaction with the organization's human resources system (Lukaszewski, Stone, & Stone-Romero, 2008). In terms of performance outcomes, Alge and colleagues (2006) observed that information privacy (with three subdimensions of perceived legitimacy, information gathering control, and information handling control) was positively related to citizenship behavior directed at individuals within the organization (OCB-I) as well as the organization itself (OCB-O).

Information privacy and employee outcomes: Assessment of empirical findings and connections to related work in other disciplines. Overall, there is limited research that considers the effects of information privacy on employee outcomes. In this domain, most studies have focused on justice perceptions, and to some extent on other cognitive-affective outcomes. Few studies have examined the relationship between information privacy and performance or other work behaviors. Beyond the organizational literature, communications research has identified specific behaviors that employees enact if they perceive privacy invasion: specifically, employees with lower status (subordinates) are more likely to initiate actions (i.e., change the topic, or directly confront the violator by communicating their dislike of the invasive behavior) compared to those with higher status (supervisors; Le Poire, Burgoon & Parrott, 1992). Furthermore, information systems research suggests that perceptions beyond invasiveness are rising to the fore. For instance, Choi, Park and Jung (2018) introduced the notion of "privacy fatigue" (i.e., repeated consumer data breaches result in people feeling drained when considering online privacy) and observed that, compared to privacy concerns, privacy fatigue was associated with greater disclosure of personal information and disengagement from coping behaviors toward data breaches. This finding suggests that perceptions of too much invasiveness over too long a period of time could result in

a reaction similar to "learned helplessness" (Carlson & Kacmar, 1994), which manifests as privacy fatigue. On that note, identifying functional ways to equip employees to cope with perceptions of invasiveness would be helpful.

Work environment privacy and employee outcomes: Summary of findings. In terms of cognitive-affective outcomes, a generally consistent finding is that employees report higher satisfaction with their workspace if it is a private one (Fischer, Tarquinio, and Vischer, 2004; Oldham and Rotchford, 1983; Sundstrom et al., 1980). This is especially so for employees higher in the organization's hierarchy (e.g., managers compared to clerical workers; Carlopio & Gardner, 1995; Sundstrom, Herbert, & Brown, 1982). Furthermore, if employees' work environment affords greater privacy (personal space, acoustic), they also report higher overall job satisfaction (Lee & Brand, 2005; Zalesny & Farace, 1987; Varjo, Hongisto, Haapakangas, Maula, Koskela, & Hyönä, 2015), lower emotional exhaustion (Laurence, Fried & Slowik, 2013), and lower fatigue (Aries, Veitch, & Newsham, 2010).

In terms of performance outcomes, lower work environment privacy results in distractions in one's work environment and is associated with lower job performance (McElroy & Morrow, 2010; Varjo et al., 2015). Establishing zones of privacy could result in higher performance (Bernstein, 2012). In that vein, in a study of Korean employees' privacy beliefs, Keem (2017) observed that those employees who believed that they controlled others' access to them had higher psychological empowerment, and, in turn, creative performance. In a related finding, Dutch employees reported that the quality of their physical work environment (which included aspects of whether employees perceived personal space, acoustic, and olfactory privacy) was associated positively with creative performance (Dul, Ceylan, & Jaspers, 2011).

Work environment privacy and employee outcomes: Assessment of empirical findings

and connections to related work in other disciplines. In contrast to the paucity of research on information privacy and employee outcomes, there is a larger body of research on work environment privacy and employee outcomes. The pattern of findings indicates that perceptions of lower work environment privacy lead to adverse cognitive-affective and performance outcomes. However, more research is essential to understand the reasons underlying such adverse reactions. Some potential mechanisms could be perceptions of crowding (Oldham & Rotchford, 1983) and psychological ownership (i.e., perceptions of possession of, and being deeply connected with, their workspace; Pierce, Kostova, & Dirks, 2001). Furthermore, as noted in the main manuscript, the broader literature on office layouts is more equivocal regarding their effects on employees' outcomes (see Elsbach & Pratt, 2007). For this reason, understanding boundary conditions of the work environment privacy – employee outcomes relationship will be helpful. In that vein, Laurence and colleagues (2013) found that personalization (a type of territorial behavior where employees intentionally decorate or modify their workspace as an affirmation of their identity; Brown, Lawrence, & Robinson, 2005) buffered the effects of work environment privacy on employees' emotional exhaustion. Other types of territorial behavior, particularly control-oriented marking (e.g., creating borders around one's workspace; Brown, 2009), can also be examined as potential moderators.

Finally, understanding the ways employees cope with the lack of privacy is a relatively unexplored area that requires further understanding. To assess whether interventions during the lunch break decreased work-related strain, call center agents were assigned to two conditions: a) a muscle relaxation exercise in a "silent room" that provided visual, acoustic, and personal space privacy, and, b) spending time in the organization's staff room and interacting with "self-chosen colleagues" that provided affiliation benefits (Krajewski, Wieland & Sauerland, 2010). Following

a six-month trial, only the relaxation exercise in the silent room significantly reduced post-lunchtime and afternoon strain. In a similar vein, in a qualitative study of four technology and telecommunications organizations, Cameron and Webster (2005) observed that employees were using Instant Messaging (IM) to have private conversations with colleagues and managers, especially in open-office environments where they felt face-to-face or telephone interactions could be easily overheard by coworkers. A newer study by Bernstein and Turban (2018) found much the same: a transition to open-plan offices led to a decline of about 70% in face-to-face interaction with an accompanying increase in electronic communication (IM and email). Identifying other coping strategies that employees adopt along with specific coping-facilitative organizational interventions (e.g., mindfulness; Glomb, Duffy, Bono, & Yang, 2011) could provide helpful guidance.

SECTION 3

LEGAL ISSUES IN ORGANIZATIONAL PRIVACY

As we discuss in the main manuscript, employees and employers have notable contests in the legal arena. For a set of contemporary legal cases in several illustrative countries, please see *Austin v. Honeywell Ltd.* (2013; Australia), *Communications, Energy and Paperworkers Union of Canada, Local 30 v. Irving Pulp & Paper Ltd.* (2013; Canada), *Toh See Wei v Teddric Jon Mohr & Anor* (2017; Malaysia), *National Union of Metalworkers of South Africa and other v Rafee NO and others* (2017; South Africa), *WM Morrison Supermarkers plc v. Various Claimants* (2018; United Kingdom), *Barbulescu v. Romania* (2017; Council of Europe), and *City of Ontario, California, et al. v. Quon et al.* (2010; United States).

Concomitantly, privacy-related regulation is evolving. The EU's GDPR is an important development that has notable implications for employers and employees. The European

Commission (2018) highlights that employers within the EU need to set up clear procedures around collection, processing, use, storage and transfer of personal data, and establish appropriate consent for doing so; "blanket consent" clauses are no longer allowed (Sanders, 2018).

In terms of employees, the European Commission (2018) highlights the GDPR applies to employees working in the EU at the time of processing of their personal data; employees have the right to know how their data are processed (right to be informed), to access the data, to ask for errors to be corrected and data to be removed when no longer needed or when processing is illegal (right to be forgotten), to curb processing of data in specific instances, to retrieve data and send to another organization (data portability), and to request that decisions made via computers or automated data processing be made by "natural persons" instead, and to dispute such decisions. With the enactment of the GDPR, multinationals with EU operations may need to consider aligning privacy policies globally, especially with the stringent limitations to cross-border data transfer. In turn, this may impact the implementation of Big Data analytics and other Artificial Intelligence functions that rely on massive data collection and usage.

Other than the GDPR, there are several notable regulatory changes across the world. These include Brazil's General Data Privacy Law (approved in 2018, expected to be effective in 2020), Canada's Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act (2000), China's Social Credit System (expected to be fully operational in 2020) and Personal Information Security Specification (2018), India's Personal Data Protection Bill (2018), and Singapore's Personal Data Protection Act (2012). These legal trends suggest that privacy challenges will continue to echo in the legal arena.

REFERENCES

Anderson, N., & Witvliet, C. 2008. Fairness reactions to personnel selection methods: An international comparison between the Netherlands, the United States, France, Spain, Portugal, and Singapore. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 16: 1-13.

Aries, M. B., Veitch, J. A., & Newsham, G. R. 2010. Windows, view, and office characteristics predict physical and psychological discomfort. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 30: 533-541.

Austin v. Honeywell Ltd [2013] FCCA 662

Ayoko, O. B., & Härtel, C. 2003. The role of space as both a conflict trigger and a conflict control mechanism in culturally heterogeneous workgroups. *Applied Psychology,* 52: 383-412.

Barbulescu v. Romania App. No. 61496/08 ECtHR (ECtHR, 5 September 2017)

Bennett, C. J. 1995. *The Political Economy of Privacy: A Review of the Literature.* Hackensack, NJ: Center for Social and Legal Research.

Bernstein, E. S. 2012. The transparency paradox: A role for privacy in organizational learning and operational control. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 57: 181-216.

Bernstein, E. S., & Turban, S. 2018. The impact of the 'open' workspace on human collaboration. In press at *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences,* 373(1753): 20170239.

Brown, G. 2009. Claiming a corner at work: Measuring employee territoriality in their workspaces. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 29: 44-52.

Brown, G., Lawrence, T. B., & Robinson, S. L. 2005. Territoriality in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 30: 577-594.

Budd, J. W. 2009. *Labor relations: Striking a balance:* 71-73. Boston: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.

Cameron, A. F., & Webster, J. 2005. Unintended consequences of emerging communication technologies: Instant Messaging in the workplace. *Computers in Human Behavior,* 21: 85-103.

Carlopio, J., & Gardner, D. 1995. Perceptions of work and workplace: Mediators of the relationship between job level and employee reactions. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology,* 68: 321-326.

Choi, H., Park, J., & Jung, Y. 2018. The role of privacy fatigue in online privacy behavior. *Computers in Human Behavior,* 81: 42-51.

Chory, R. M., Vela, L. E., & Avtgis, T. A. 2016. Organizational surveillance of computer-mediated workplace communication: Employee privacy concerns and responses. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal,* 28: 23-43.

City of Ontario, California et al. v. Quon et al. 130 S. Ct. 2619 (2010)

Colquitt, J. A., Greenberg, J., & Zapata-Phelan, C. P. (2005). What is organizational justice? An historical overview of the field. In J. Greenberg, J., & J. A. Colquitt (Eds.), (2013). Handbook of organizational justice (pp. 3-56). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Daniels, M. A., & Greguras, G. J. 2014. Exploring the nature of power distance: Implications for micro-and macro-level theories, processes, and outcomes. *Journal of Management*, 40: 1202-1229.

Davis, M. C., Leach, D. J., & Clegg, C. W. 2011. The physical environment of the office: Contemporary and emerging issues. In G.P. Hodgkinson & J.K. Ford (Eds.), *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology:* 193-235. Chichester, UK: Wiley.

DeCew, J. W. 1997. *In pursuit of privacy: Law, ethics, and the rise of technology.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Determann, L., & Sprague, R. 2011. Intrusive monitoring: Employee privacy expectations are reasonable in Europe, destroyed in the United States. *Berkeley Technology Law Journal,* 26: 979-1036.

Edelman, L. B., & Suchman, M. C. 1997. The legal environments of organizations. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 23: 479-515.

Fried, C. 1970. *An anatomy of values.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Glomb, T. M., Duffy, M. K., Bono, J. E., & Yang, T. 2011. Mindfulness at work. In A. Joshi, H. Liao, & J. J. Martocchio (Eds.), *Research in personnel and human resources management,* 30: 115-157. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. 1980. *Work redesign.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Harris, M. M., Van Hoye, G., & Lievens, F. 2003. Privacy and attitudes towards Internet-based selection systems: A cross-cultural comparison. *International Journal of Selection & Assessment*, 11: 230-236.

Communications, Energy and Paperworkers Union of Canada, Local 30 v. Irving Pulp & Paper Ltd. (2013), 2 SCR 458

Johnson, C. A. 1974. Privacy as personal control. In D. H. Carson (Ed.), *Man-environment interactions: evaluations and applications:* 83-100. Washington D.C.: Environmental Design Research.

Kang, J. 1998. Information privacy in cyberspace transactions. *Stanford Law Review,* 50: 1193-1294.

Karasek, R. A. 1979. Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: Implications for job design. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 24: 285-308.

Kaya, N., & Weber, M. J. 2003. Cross-cultural differences in the perception of crowding and privacy regulation: American and Turkish students. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 23: 301-309.

Keem, S. J. 2017. *Controlling my boundaries: Explaining how and when workplace privacy promotes creative performance.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Georgia Institute of Technology.

Krajewski, J., Wieland, R., & Sauerland, M. 2010. Regulating strain states by using the recovery potential of lunch breaks. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 15: 131-139.

Kupritz, V. W. 1998. Privacy in the work place: The impact of building design. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 18: 341-356.

Laurence, G. A., Fried, Y., & Slowik, L. H. 2013. My space: A moderated mediation model of the effect of architectural and experienced privacy and workspace personalization on emotional exhaustion at work. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 36: 144-152.

Le Poire, B. A., Burgoon, J. K., & Parrott, R. 1992. Status and privacy restoring communication in the workplace. *Journal of Applied Communication Research,* 20: 419-436.

Leclercq-Vandelannoitte, A. 2017. An ethical perspective on emerging forms of ubiquitous IT-based control. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 142: 139-154.

Lee, S. Y., & Brand, J. L. 2005. Effects of control over office workspace on perceptions of the work environment and work outcomes. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 25: 323-333.

Lukaszewski, K. M., Stone, D. L., & Stone-Romero, E. F. 2008. The effects of the ability to choose the type of human resources system on perceptions of invasion of privacy and system satisfaction. *Journal of Business and Psychology,* 23: 73-86.

Margulis, S. T. 1977. Conceptions of privacy: Current status and next steps. *Journal of Social Issues,* 33: 5-21.

Marshall, N. J. 1974. Dimensions of privacy preferences. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 9: 255-271.

Masumoto, T. 2004. Learning to 'DoTime' in Japan: A study of US interns in Japanese organizations. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 4: 19-37.

McElroy, J. C., & Morrow, P. C. 2010. Employee reactions to office redesign: A naturally occurring quasi-field experiment in a multi-generational setting. *Human Relations,* 63: 609-636.

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.

Milberg, S. J., Smith, H. J., & Burke, S. J. 2000. Information privacy: Corporate management and national regulation. *Organization Science*, 11: 35-57.

Miller, A. R. 1971. *The assault on privacy: Computers, data banks, and dossiers.* Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Mintzberg, H. 1973. *The nature of managerial work*. New York: Harper and Row.

Morris, M. W., Hong, Y. Y., Chiu, C. Y., & Liu, Z. 2015. Normology: Integrating insights about social norms to understand cultural dynamics. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 129: 1-13.

National Union of Metalworkers of South Africa and other v Rafee NO and others (2017) JOL 37705 (LC).

Newell, P. B. 1998. A cross-cultural comparison of privacy definitions and functions: A systems approach. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 18: 357-371.

O'Connor, N. 2018. Reforming the U.S. approach to data protection and privacy. *Council on Foreign Relations, January 30.* Retrieved from https://www.cfr.org/report/reforming-us-approach-data-protection

Parker, R. B. 1974. A definition of privacy. *Rutgers Law Review,* 27: 275-296.

Pedersen, D. M. 1997. Psychological functions of privacy. *Journal Of Environmental Psychology*, 17: 147-156.

Persson, A.J. & Hansson, S.O. 2003. Privacy at work – Ethical criteria. *Journal of Business Ethics,* 42: 59-70.

Phillips, J. M., & Gully, S. M. 2002. Fairness reactions to personnel selection techniques in Singapore and the United States. *International Journal of Human Resource Management,* 13: 1186-1205.

Pierce, J. L., Kostova, T., & Dirks, K. T. 2001. Toward a theory of psychological ownership in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 26: 298-310.

Posey, C., Bennett, B., Roberts, T., & Lowry, P. B. 2011. When computer monitoring backfires: Invasion of privacy and organizational injustice as precursors to computer abuse. *Journal of Information System Security*, 7: 24-47.

Posner, R. A. 1978. The right of privacy. *Georgia Law Review,* 12: 393-422.

Posner, R. A. 1981. The economics of privacy. *American Economic Review,* 71: 405-409.

Rapoport, A. 1972. *Some perspectives on human use and organization of space.* Paper presented at the Australian Association of Social Anthropologists, Melbourne, Australia.

Reiman, J.H. 1976. Privacy, intimacy, and personhood. *Philosophy and Public Affairs,* 6: 26-44.

Sanders, A. 2018. The GDPR – What does it mean for employers?. *Global Workplace Insider, May 25.* Retrieved from https://www.globalworkplaceinsider.com/2018/05/the-gdpr-what-does-it-mean-for-employers/

Shils, E. B. 1966. Privacy: Its constitution and vicissitudes. *Law and Contemporary Problems,* 31: 281-306.

Smith, H. J. 1993. Privacy policies and practices: Inside the organizational maze. *Communications of the ACM*, 36(12): 104-122.

Snyder, J. L., & Shahani, D. C. 2012. Fairness reactions to personnel selection methods: A look at professionals in Mumbai, India. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment,* 20: 297-307.

Sundstrom, E., Herbert, R. K., & Brown, D. W. 1982. Privacy and communication in an open-plan office: A case study. *Environment and Behavior*, 14: 379-392.

Thoren-Peden, D. & Meyer, C. 2018. USA: Data protection 2018. *International Comparative Legal Guides, June 12.* Retrieved from https://iclg.com/practice-areas/data-protection-laws-and-regulations/usa

Toh See Wei v Teddric Jon Mohr & Anor [2017] 11 MLJ 67.

Varjo, J., Hongisto, V., Haapakangas, A., Maula, H., Koskela, H., & Hyönä, J. 2015. Simultaneous effects of irrelevant speech, temperature and ventilation rate on performance and satisfaction in open-plan offices. *Journal of Environmental Psychology,* 44: 16-33.

Weinstein, M. A. 1971. The uses of privacy in the good life. In J. R. Pennock & J.W. Chapman (Eds.), *Privacy and Personality:* 88-104. New York: Routledge.

Westin, A. F. 2003. Social and political dimensions of privacy. *Journal of Social Issues,* 59: 431-453.

Wilborn, S. 1998. Revisiting the public/private distinction: Employee monitoring in the workplace. *Georgia Law Review,* 32: 825 – 888.

WM Morrison Supermarkets plc v. Various Claimants [2018] EWCA Civ 2339.

Table OS1

Privacy at Work: Conceptualizations, Contexts, and Definitions

Privacy Definitions from Organizational Research	Privacy Conceptualization as Defined[a]	Privacy Context Emphasized	Original Author(s) of the Definition
"…individual control over disclosure of personal information" (Tolchinsky, McCuddy, Adams, Ganster, Woodman, & Fromkin, 1981: 309).	Privacy as control	Information	Johnson (1974); Shils (1966); Westin (1967)
"…the ability (i.e., capacity) of the individual to control personally (vis-à-vis other individuals, groups, organizations, etc.) information about one's self" (Stone, Gueutal, Gardner, & McClure, 1983: 460).	Privacy as control	Information	Altman (1975), Margulis (1977), Westin (1967)
"…entails the degree of control that an organization affords its employees over practices relating to collection, storage, dissemination, and use of their personal information (including their actions and behaviors) and *the extent that such practices are perceived as legitimate*" (Alge et al., 2006: 222; emphasis added).	The definition primarily focuses on privacy as control. The latter portion of the definition (italicized) considers privacy as a right.	Information	Westin (1967), Westin (2003)
"a condition of limited access to identifiable information about individuals" (Milberg et al., 2000: 35).	Privacy as a state	Information	Smith (1993)
"…extent to which people can control the release and dissemination of personal information" (Zweig & Webster, 2002: 607).	Privacy as control	Information	Stone and Stone (1990)
"…the degree to which the employee experienced his or her workspace as private (i.e., being able to control the interaction of others)" (Oldham & Rotchford, 1983: 549)	Privacy as control	Work environment	Rapoport (1972)
"…the regulation of interaction between the self, others, or environmental stimuli" (Ayoko & Härtel, 2003: 388).	Privacy as control	Work environment	Kupritz (1998)
"…degree of individual control over space and over one's accessibility to others" (Fischer et al., 2004: 136)	Privacy as control	Work environment	Altman (1975)
"[People have] privacy to the extent that others have limited access to information about [them], limited access to the intimacies of [their] life, or limited access to [their] thoughts or [their] body'" (Persson & Hanson, 2003: 61).[b]	Privacy as control	Multiple contexts	Schoeman (1984)

Note: [a] In organizational research, privacy is defined largely based on the conceptualization of "privacy as control"; it is operationalized, however, by eliciting employees' privacy perceptions, which reflects the conceptualization of "privacy as a state".

[b]We made a slight modification to the definition provided by Persson and Hanson (2003), and by extension to that provided by Schoeman (1984), to make it gender neutral.