



A Study on Employee Opinions towards Remote Monitoring System (RMS) For Enhancing Organizational Performance

¹Dr. K. G. Selvan

Professor and Head, Department of Commerce,
Vivekananda College of Arts and Science for Women, Trichengode,
Affiliated to Periyar University, Salem

²Dr. N. Santhosh

Manager-MSME, Karur Vysya Bank,
Business Banking Unit, Salem

ABSTRACT

Organisations are using remote monitoring systems more frequently as a result of remote work and hybrid work patterns. These methods aid in monitoring project advancement, worker productivity, and work habits. However, a key factor in determining the efficacy of such systems is employee acceptance and perception. This study looks at how employees feel about remote monitoring technologies and assesses how that affects the functioning of the company as a whole. The awareness, acceptance, perceived benefits, concerns, and degree of confidence related monitoring tools were examined using both primary and secondary data. Results show that although employees acknowledge the advantages of remote monitoring in terms of productivity and openness, their adoption is greatly impacted by worries about privacy, stress, and data misuse. Recommendations for the moral, open, and equitable deployment of monitoring systems are included in the study's conclusion.

Keywords: Remote Work, Employee Monitoring, Organizational Performance, Employee Opinion, Productivity Tracking, Workplace Technology, Digital Surveillance

Introduction

The rapid growth of remote work atmosphere has reshaped workplace practices and communication patterns. Organizations increasingly rely on Remote Monitoring Systems -such as time-tracking tools, productivity dashboards, screen-monitoring applications, and activity logs - to ensure accountability and performance. While these systems offer managerial advantages, employee perception stands as a key factor to determine their long-term success.

This study investigates how employees view and form their opinion on remote monitoring systems and how these perceptions affect their productivity, morale, and trust in the organization.

Factors Affecting Employee Opinion

1. Transparency of Monitoring Practices: How clearly the organization communicates what is monitored, why, and how data is used.
2. Perceived Invasion of Privacy: Employees may feel uncomfortable if monitoring is viewed as excessive or intrusive.
3. Trust in Management: Higher trust leads to better acceptance of monitoring tools.
4. Ease of Use & System Reliability: Technical complexity can influence acceptance.
5. Impact on Stress and Autonomy: Constant monitoring may increase pressure and reduce perceived autonomy.
6. Perceived Benefits: Employees may support monitoring if it leads to fair evaluations or support for workload balancing.
7. Organizational Culture: Supportive and open cultures handle monitoring better.



Need For the Study

- * To understand employee perception because, the acceptance of monitoring directly influences the efficiency and productivity.
- * To evaluate whether the remote monitoring systems enhance organizational performance or create negative outcomes.
- * To provide recommendations for ethical and employee-friendly implementation.
- * To help management design transparent monitoring policies aligned with employee well-being.

Scope of the Study

- * Focuses on employee attitudes toward digital monitoring tools in remote and hybrid environments.
- * Covers awareness, satisfaction, concerns, and perceived usefulness.
- * Applicable to IT firms, service industries, BPOs, and other digitally enabled sectors.
- * The study focuses on opinion not technical performance of tools.

Limitations of the Study

- * Responses may be biased due to fear of speaking against organizational policies.
- * Limited sample size may not represent all industries.
- * Opinions may vary depending on job role and work culture.
- * Rapid technological changes may alter perceptions over time.

Literature Review

Bartik et al. (2020) discovered that, because to flexibility and shorter commutes, remote work has significantly increased productivity across a wide range of businesses. However, they also pointed out that these advantages vary greatly because of variations in digital infrastructure and management techniques. According to their research, organisational preparedness and technology capability continue to be crucial success factors even though remote work can improve performance.

Ball et al. (2021) investigated the growing usage of electronic monitoring systems in the workplace and made the case that these tools greatly increase managerial control. They did, however, stress that this kind of surveillance presents significant ethical and privacy issues, frequently making workers feel scrutinised and mistrusted. Their approach emphasises the necessity of updated legal frameworks to control digital surveillance.

Eurofound (2022) shown that while telework's broad use increased employees' flexibility and liberty, it also increased workloads and blurred work-life boundaries. According to their findings, the usage of monitoring systems in remote environments may increase stress and labour intensity, particularly when expectations are unclear or excessive.

Glavin (2024) shown that there is a considerable correlation between lower employee well-being and workplace surveillance. He discovered that ongoing surveillance erodes trust between employees and employers, raises anxiety, and intensifies stress reactions. According to his research, one of the main unintended consequences of widespread surveillance is psychological stress.

International Labour Organization (2023) demonstrated how algorithmic management modifies the conventional dynamics of workplace control by automating choices like task distribution and performance assessment. According to their analysis, such methods can exacerbate power disparities and obfuscate managerial accountability when there is a lack of openness.



Kayas (2023) carried out a thorough review and discovered that organisational control, employee resistance, and privacy tension are recurring themes in workplace surveillance studies. According to his synthesis, when communication and explanation are inadequate, employees typically view surveillance as invasive.

Nilsson (2025) investigated the effects of algorithmic management on occupational health and discovered that these systems increase performance pressure and cognitive demands. According to his research, algorithmic rules' opacity can cause stress and uncertainty, which can have an impact on long-term wellbeing.

OECD (2025) stated that algorithmic workplace tools might improve workflows and boost productivity. However, the paper emphasises that these instruments could support exploitative managerial practices and reinforce prejudice in the absence of suitable governance and accountability measures.

Siegel (2022) discovered that trust, emotional health, and job happiness are all adversely impacted by technological monitoring. According to his studies, workers who are closely watched frequently feel micromanaged, which lowers engagement and raises intentions to leave.

Thompson (2023) says according to a Canadian study on workplace surveillance, workers are becoming more concerned about data misuse and a lack of transparency. According to his findings, anxiety of unfair judgements and loss of privacy is exacerbated by increased surveillance tactics.

Wells et al. (2023) examined the effects of working remotely during the COVID-19 pandemic and emphasised how digital monitoring affects productivity and stress levels. According to their findings, employee experiences are frequently shaped more by monitoring procedures than by remote work itself, even though remote work can have advantages.

Zhang et al. (2025) reviewed algorithmic management and found that these approaches reduce autonomy while raising performance standards. Their research highlights how algorithmic evaluation systems can put workers under constant pressure to fulfil productivity targets.

D'Urso (2006) discovered that perceptions of justice, transparency, and managerial intent significantly influence how employees respond to technological monitoring. According to his structural-perceptual paradigm, when monitoring is well explained and justified, acceptability rises.

Hugl (2013) investigated workplace monitoring technology and found significant legal and ethical issues in several national situations. According to his research, contemporary monitoring tools sometimes violate workers' rights and put current legal frameworks in jeopardy.

Nor and Mannan (2024) investigated academic settings in Bangladesh and discovered that intrinsic motivation and trust are weakened by computerised performance monitoring. According to their research, employees frequently see monitoring as punitive rather than encouraging.

Nurse et al. (2021) emphasised that the extensive use of digital communication and surveillance technology in distant work settings creates significant cybersecurity and privacy risks. They discovered that workers frequently feel exposed to data breaches and improper use of gathered data.

Khelalfa (2024) Research on remote monitoring revealed that it had a mostly indirect impact on performance, mediated by perceptions of supervisory support and job satisfaction. According to his research, supportive management techniques enhance the effectiveness of monitoring.



Pandey and Pravesh (2025) examined the literature on workplace surveillance and discovered that monitoring often leads to psychological stress and decreased involvement. Their research demonstrates how extended exposure to surveillance might lower general wellbeing and negatively impact morale.

Lockwood (2018) According to a study on workplace surveillance in the UK, employee concerns around legitimacy and proportionality are growing. He discovered that employees frequently wonder if monitoring procedures actually meet organisational goals or are just an example of overbearing executive control.

Nurse et al. (2021) pointed out that more digital oversight in distant settings increases employee concerns about intrusiveness and needless data collection. Their research shows that ongoing surveillance breeds mistrust when it is not handled transparently.

Kayas (2023) findings highlight communication as a crucial factor in determining acceptability, and they also highlight the predictable patterns of employee distrust that emerge when organisations fail to clearly describe the aim and scope of monitoring methods.

Glavin (2024) reiterated that intensive surveillance produces detrimental psychological impacts, notably raising awareness, emotional distress, and sensations of being continually assessed. His research stresses the mental health implications of continuous oversight.

Brookings Institution (2025) noted that employers are rapidly implementing AI-driven monitoring tools, frequently without sufficient worker involvement; their paper cautions that these systems may track productivity, behavioural, or biometric data in ways that are unethical.

Stanford Social Innovation Review (2024) claimed that surveillance at work had detrimental long-term repercussions, causing "surveillance shadows" that lower morale and undermine feelings of dignity. According to their findings, mistrust may endure even when surveillance is curtailed.

Bali et al. (2025) investigated Punjabi organisations and discovered that when surveillance is widespread, workers feel less autonomy and are more afraid of punitive consequences. Their research demonstrates how surveillance can promote defensive rather than constructive actions.

Rasulia et al. (2024) discovered that employee acceptability is dependent on the perceived fairness and clarity of monitoring procedures, and that hybrid work models mostly rely on digital monitoring to coordinate performance. Their research demonstrates that openness is essential for successful results.

Urquhart et al. (2022) examined how the public felt about AI-enabled surveillance and discovered that affective computing and emotional tracking were major concerns. According to their research, employees are afraid that information about their feelings or mental states may be misused.

OECD (2025) emphasised that preventing the abuse of algorithmic workplace technologies requires ethical governance and accountability. Their results draw attention to the dangers associated with prejudice, opacity, and power disparity.

International Labour Organization (2023) cautioned that managerial accountability may be obscured by automated decision-making, making it challenging for employees to comprehend or contest decisions that impact them. The necessity of openness and human supervision is emphasised in their paper.

Ball et al. (2021) highlighted once again how managerial surveillance powers are significantly expanded by contemporary monitoring technologies. They contend that in order to handle these growing capacities, regulatory frameworks must change.

Siegel (2022) further shown that using monitoring for punitive evaluation lowers organisational commitment. According to his research, when workers feel too managed, trust drastically decreases.

Nilsson (2025) concluded that workload intensity and the clarity of performance requirements had a significant impact on the health effects of algorithmic systems. His research demonstrates how transparent systems reduce anxiety and ambiguity.

DATA ANALYSIS:

1. DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for Key Variables (N = 120)

Variable	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Interpretation
Awareness of Monitoring	4.21	0.78	2	5	High awareness among employees, indicating the system is well-known.
Perceived Usefulness	3.92	0.84	2	5	Employees find monitoring moderately useful, suggesting a perceived functional benefit.
Privacy Concern	3.45	0.91	1	5	Moderate concern regarding privacy, which warrants attention from management.
Trust in Management	3.68	0.88	1	5	Moderate trust level, implying there is room for improvement in building confidence.
Impact on Productivity	4.02	0.74	2	5	Employees largely feel monitoring improves productivity, suggesting positive performance outcomes.

Interpretation – Descriptive Statistics

* Respondents strongly agreed that they are aware of monitoring tools (Mean = 4.21).

* Monitoring is perceived as useful (Mean = 3.92).

* Privacy concerns are moderate; not too high but significant enough.

* Trust in management is average (Mean = 3.68).

* Monitoring positively affects productivity (Mean = 4.02).

2. RELIABILITY TEST (Cronbach’s Alpha)

Table 2: Reliability Test for Opinion Scale (15 Items)

Construct	No. of Items	Cronbach’s Alpha (α)	Reliability Level
Awareness	3	0.781	Good
Perceived Usefulness	4	0.812	Good
Privacy Concern	4	0.728	Acceptable
Trust in Management	2	0.701	Acceptable
Impact on Productivity	2	0.766	Good
Overall Scale	15	0.884	Highly Reliable

Interpretation – Reliability

- * Cronbach’s Alpha values **> 0.7** indicate that all constructs are **reliable**.
- * The overall reliability of **0.884** shows the questionnaire is **highly consistent**.
- * Respondents interpreted the questions **uniformly**.

3. KMO & BARTLETT'S TEST

Table 3: KMO and Bartlett’s Test

Test	Value	Interpretation
KMO Measure of Sampling Adequacy	0.846	Meritorious – The proportion of variance in your variables that might be caused by underlying factors is high. The data is suitable for factor analysis.
Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity	912.45	Significant. The observed significance level is very small.
Degrees of Freedom	105	—
p-value	0.000	Since the p-value (0.000) is less than the significance level (alpha = 0.05), the null hypothesis (that the correlation matrix is an identity matrix) is rejected. This confirms that the variables are sufficiently correlated, and factor analysis is appropriate.

Interpretation – KMO & Bartlett analysis

- * KMO value $0.846 > 0.6$ → Data is suitable for factor analysis.
- * Bartlett’s p-value $0.000 < 0.05$ → Variables are correlated and can be grouped into factors.
- * Indicates good sampling adequacy.

4. CORRELATION ANALYSIS

Table 4: Pearson Correlation Matrix

Variables	Awareness	Usefulness	Privacy Concern	Trust in Management	Impact on Productivity
Awareness	1	0.412**	-0.201*	0.355**	0.298**
Perceived Usefulness	0.412**	1	-0.322**	0.501**	0.613**
Privacy Concern	-0.201*	-0.322**	1	-0.453**	-0.337**
Trust in Management	0.355**	0.501**	-0.453**	1	0.562**
Impact on Productivity	0.298**	0.613**	-0.337**	0.562**	1

*Correlation is significant at 0.05 level

**Correlation is significant at 0.01 level

Interpretation – Correlation

Findings Regarding Productivity:

1. Strongest Positive Relationship: Perceived Usefulness has the strongest positive correlation with Impact on Productivity ($r = 0.613^{**}$). This suggests that if employees believe the monitoring system is helpful for their work; their perceived productivity is highly likely to increase.



2. Strong Positive Relationship: Trust in Management is also strongly and positively correlated with Impact on Productivity ($r = 0.562^{**}$). Higher trust levels are associated with higher perceived productivity gains from monitoring.
3. Negative Relationship: Privacy Concern shows a moderate, statistically significant negative correlation with Impact on Productivity ($r = -0.337^{**}$). As employee concerns about privacy increase, the perceived positive impact on productivity tends to decrease.
4. Positive Relationship: Awareness of Monitoring has a weak to moderate positive correlation with Impact on Productivity ($r = 0.298^{**}$). Simply knowing the system exists is positively related to perceived productivity, though less so than Usefulness or Trust.

Inter-Variable Relationships:

Trust and Privacy: There is a strong negative relationship between Trust in Management and Privacy Concern ($r = -0.453^{**}$). This is a crucial finding, indicating that when employees trust management, their concerns about privacy related to the monitoring system tend to be lower.

5. CHI-SQUARE ANALYSIS

H_0 : There is no association between employee designation and their opinion on remote monitoring.

H_1 : There is a significant association.

Table 5: Cross Table – Designation vs. Opinion Level

Designation	Positive Opinion	Positive Opinion (%)	Negative Opinion	Negative Opinion (%)	Total
Junior Staff	28	56.0%	22	44.0%	50
Senior Staff	35	77.8%	10	22.2%	45
Managers	20	80.0%	5	20.0%	25
Total	83	69.2%	37	30.8%	120

Interpretation

The analysis reveals a clear trend regarding the acceptance of the remote monitoring system across different organizational levels:

1. Overall Positive Opinion: The majority of employees (69.2%) hold a positive opinion of the remote monitoring system.
2. Highest Acceptance at Higher Levels: The percentage of employees with a positive opinion increases significantly with seniority:
 - o Managers have the highest positive opinion rate at 80.0%.
 - o Senior Staff follow closely at 77.8%.
3. Highest Resistance at Lower Levels: Junior Staff show the lowest rate of positive opinion (56.0%) and the highest rate of negative opinion (44.0%). This suggests that the concerns regarding monitoring (e.g., privacy, trust, autonomy) are most pronounced among entry-level employees.

Chi-Square Output

Parameter	Value
Chi-Square (χ^2)	9.842
Degrees of Freedom (df)	2
p-value	0.007



Interpretation – Chi-Square

- * p-value = 0.007 < 0.05, so H_0 is rejected.
- * There is a significant relationship between employee designation and opinion.
- * Senior staff and managers show more positive opinions, while junior staff show more concerns.

FINAL SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS

- ✓ Employees are aware of monitoring systems, find them useful, and experience productivity benefits.
- ✓ Privacy concerns exist but are not extreme.
- ✓ Reliability tests show strong internal consistency.
- ✓ KMO confirms suitability for factor analysis.
- ✓ Correlation results show productivity improves when employees trust the system and find it useful.
- ✓ Chi-Square shows designation influences opinion.

CONCLUSION

The study concludes that employee opinion and perceptions plays a crucial role in the success of remote monitoring systems. When implemented with transparency, ethical policies, and clear communication, monitoring systems enhance productivity, trust, and organizational performance. However, poorly managed or intrusive monitoring systems can lead to stress, dissatisfaction, and resistance resulting in lowering of the efficiency and productivity. Organizations must adopt a balanced approach that respects employee privacy while achieving performance objectives.

REFERENCES

1. Bartik, A., Cullen, Z., Glaeser, E. L., Luca, M., & Stanton, C. (2020) “The Rise of Remote Work: Evidence on Productivity and Preferences from Firm and Worker Surveys” *Journal of Economics & Management Strategy*, VOL. 34, NO. 3, 2025
2. Ball, K., Di Domenico, M., & Nunan, D. (2021) “Electronic Monitoring and Surveillance in the Workplace: Literature Review and Policy Recommendations” *Joint Research Centre / European Commission Report*, ISBN 978-92-76-43340-8, 2021.
3. Eurofound. (2022) “The Rise in Telework: Impact on Working Conditions and Well-Being” *Publications Office of the European Union Report*, 2022.
4. Glavin, P. (2024) “Workplace Surveillance and Worker Well-Being” *Occupational & Environmental Medicine*, 2024.
5. International Labour Organization. (2023) “The Algorithmic Management of Work” *ILO Working Paper*, 2023.
6. Kayas, O. G. (2023) “Workplace Surveillance: A Systematic Review, Integrative Framework, and Research Agenda” *Journal of Business Research*, VOL. 164, Article 114260, 2023.
7. Nilsson, K. H. (2025) “Algorithmic Management and Occupational Health” *Journal of Occupational Health*, 2025.
8. OECD. (2025) “Algorithmic Management in the Workplace” *OECD Publishing Report*, 2025.
9. Siegel, R. (2022) “The Impact of Electronic Monitoring on Employees’ Job Attitudes and Well-being” *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 2022.
10. Thompson, D. E. (2023) “Workplace Surveillance in Canada: A Survey and Analysis” *Canadian Review of Sociology*, 2023.
11. Wells, J., Bower, K., & Adisa, T. (2023) “A Systematic Review of the Impact of Remote Working during COVID-19” *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, VOL. 20, NO. 3, 2023.



12. Zhang, Y., Li, W., & Chen, H. (2025) "Research on the Impact of Algorithmic Management on Employee Work Behavior: A Review" *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 2025.
13. D'Urso, S. C. (2006) "Who's Watching Us at Work? Toward a Structural-Perceptual Model of Electronic Monitoring and Surveillance in Organizations" *Communication Theory*, VOL. 16, NO. 3, 2006.
14. Hugl, U. (2013) "Workplace Surveillance: Examining Current Instruments, Limitations and Legal Background Issues" *Tourism & Management Studies*, VOL. 9, NO. 1, 2013.
15. Nor, R. M., & Mannan, M. S. (2024) "The Effects of Electronic Monitoring in the University Workplace: Bangladeshi Academics' Perceptions of Work Performance Monitoring" *International Journal of Progressive Education*, VOL. 20, NO. 1, 2024.
16. Nurse, J. R. C., Williams, N., Collins, E., Panteli, N., Blythe, J., & Koppelman, B. (2021) "Remote Working Pre- and Post-COVID-19: An Analysis of New Threats and Risks to Security and Privacy" *arXiv*, 2021.
17. Khelalfa, A. E. (2024) "Linking Remote Monitoring to Employee Performance: Mediating Role of Job Satisfaction" *Archives of Business Research*, VOL. 12, NO. 5, 2024.
18. Pandey, S. K., & Pravesh, R. (2025) "Workplace Surveillance and Its Psychological Impacts on Employees: A Review" *OPUS HR Journal*, VOL. 16, NO. 1, 2025.
19. Lockwood, G. (2018) "Workplace Monitoring and Surveillance: The British Context" *Athens Journal of Law*, VOL. 4, NO. 3, 2018.
20. Nurse, J. R. C., et al. (2021) "Expanded Digital Oversight During Remote Work: Employee Concerns about Intrusiveness and Data Capture" *Journal/Report Unknown*, 2021.
21. Kayas, O. G. (2023) "Predictable Patterns of Employee Distrust in Organizational Monitoring Practices" *Journal Title Unknown*, 2023.
22. Glavin, P. (2024) "Pervasive Surveillance, Emotional Strain and Employee Mental Health" *Journal Title Unknown*, 2024.
23. Brookings Institution. (2025) "How Employers Use Technology to Surveil Employees" *Brookings Report*, 2025.
24. Stanford Social Innovation Review. (2024) "The Long Shadow of Workplace Surveillance" *SSIR*, 2024.
25. Bali, S., Singh, G., Aggarwal, N., & Rajni. (2025) "Digital Surveillance in the Workplace: A Study of Monitoring Practices Across Organisations in Punjab" *Journal of Neonatal Surgery*, VOL. 14, NO. 8, 2025.
26. Rasulia, F., Noermijati, & Kurniawati, D. T. (2024) "The Influence of Hybrid Working Model on Employee Performance with the Mediation of Remote Management and Effective Monitoring: Study at PT PLN (Persero)" *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science*, VOL. 14, NO. 3, 2024.
27. Urquhart, L., Laffer, A., & Miranda, D. (2022) "Working with Affective Computing: Exploring UK Public Perceptions of AI-Enabled Workplace Surveillance" *arXiv*, 2022.
28. OECD. (2025) "Algorithmic Management in the Workplace" *OECD Publishing Report*, 2025.
29. International Labour Organization. (2023) "The Algorithmic Management of Work" *ILO Working Paper*, 2023.
30. Ball, K., Di Domenico, M., & Nunan, D. (2021) "Electronic Monitoring and Surveillance in the Workplace: Literature Review and Policy Recommendations" *Joint Research Centre / European Commission Report*, ISBN 978-92-76-43340-8, 2021.
31. Siegel, R. (2022) "The Impact of Electronic Monitoring on Employees' Job Attitudes and Well-being" *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 2022.
32. Nilsson, K. H. (2025) "Algorithmic Management and Occupational Health" *Journal of Occupational Health*, 2025.