

Madison Epperson

Professor Ajunwa

Writing Seminar: Ethics and Technology

May 14, 2020

Final Paper

For this new generation of young adults, most people have been in contact with technology for as long as they can remember. But their aptitude to automation is in direct contrast with the experience of their grandparents, and even their parents, who still pull out old film to reminisce about childhood, and use physical contact books to get in touch with their friends. These differences perfectly exemplify a difference in social norms within different groups of people, that is to say that different groups are comfortable with, and have understandings of, different levels of technology. There are many reasons to object to or question the magnitude of workplace surveillance, however the social norms regarding technology have given a whole generation of people a relatively unconcerned view of it. The trouble with the growing use of workplace surveillance is that the lack of legal precedent leaves the matter of regulating this booming industry in the hands of employees- but because of social norms, the reaction to invasive employer activity widely differs. Employees are more likely to object on the basis of discomfort regarding social norms rather than cultural values. This is important because it reinforces the idea that social norms, not legal restrictions, are actually the biggest thing keeping employers in check. This begs the question, to what extent do social norms dictate corporate use of surveillance? And furthermore, are social norms enough to keep corporations in check, or is legal oversight desperately needed?

In order to best approach the issue, this paper analyzes the privacy paradox, the relationship between culture and privacy, and the differences in legal and social structures between countries, and social norms as a whole. Then, a two-part proposal is put forth to address the concerns: the first step uses a media approach to ignite widespread coordinated outrage with the current system, and the second uses the young and incoming workforce as a driving force for employers to take on change themselves. The research concludes that legal oversight for workplace surveillance is critical to the preservation of privacy in the workplace, as social norms not only will be an inadequate constraint for corporations, but if left unchecked, social norms and workplace surveillance will move in tandem, and eventually privacy will cease to exist.

An easy counter argument to this assertion would be to reference the difference between strong authoritarian states like China and strong democratic states like the United States and claim that there is an obvious difference between the workplace legal structures as a result of the different social norms, and therefore social norms are already doing a good enough job at keeping employers in check. The fundamental problem with this argument is that it is not dynamic. At the moment, yes, the different laws in different countries can largely be accounted for by social norms in the different areas, but that's not to say that that will stay that way for long, nor does it take into consideration the different types of exploitation in different places. Just because companies in democratic states have a harder time blatantly exploiting their workers doesn't mean they never do, it just means they do it differently than in authoritarian states. Consequently, the approach to regulating the different forms must be different as well.

The extent of legal oversight for workplace technology around the world is currently limited, and often not specific enough, to practical issues that constituents are facing in their workplaces, for the law to be effective. However, it is first important to address why technology

in the workplace is important, and therefore why companies must continue to update their workplace surveillance in order to be up to par. Larry Alton is a full-time freelance writer and business consultant with over seven years of experience. His 2016 article, *6 Signs You're Behind on the Workplace Norm*, Alton walks through all of the reasons why a company may not be up to date on their technology, and all the reasons why it is important to stay up to date.¹ He asserts that outdated technology is a reason that a company may be out of date, and goes on to explain that the dangers of outdated technology influence recruitment, employee retention, competitive vulnerability, and PR and customer perspectives.² Employers will have a hard time attracting and retaining employees with a seemingly out of date workplace. This is still a valid perspective on technology in the workplace, and companies often have this incentive to perpetuate more aggressive forms of technology. This race to the most technologically savvy, is precisely why legal oversight is necessary. Ifeoma Ajunwa and Jason Schultz, professors at Cornell University and New York University respectively, as well as Kate Crawford, a visiting professor at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, specifically look into the current legal structure regulating workplace surveillance, and where it falls short.³ The authors approach overall workplace surveillance by analyzing two of the main surveillance avenues employers take: productivity apps and worker wellness programs. Ajunwa, Crawford, and Schultz conclude that there is not enough legal protection in place to keep employers from exploiting their workforce, and propose three ways to approach closing this gap in the current legal literature: “(1) a comprehensive omnibus federal information privacy law, similar to approaches taken in the

¹ Larry Alton, *6 signs you're behind on workplace norm*, FORBES (November 7, 2016), www.forbes.com/sites/larryalton/2016/11/07/6-signs-youre-behind-on-new-workplace-norms/#60b332460cae.

² Larry Alton, *6 signs you're behind on workplace norm*, FORBES (November 7, 2016), www.forbes.com/sites/larryalton/2016/11/07/6-signs-youre-behind-on-new-workplace-norms/#60b332460cae.

³ Ifeoma Ajunwa, Kate Crawford, and Jason Schultz, *Limitless Worker Surveillance*, 105 CAL. L. REV. 735, 101-142 (2017).

European union... (2) a narrower, sector-specific Employee Privacy Protection Act (EPPA), which would focus on prohibiting specific workplace surveillance practices that extend outside of work related locations or activities; and (3) an even narrower sector and sensitivity-specific Employee Health Information Privacy Act (EHIPA).⁴ The idea being that these would be strong steps towards creating an adequate legal foundation to protect all workers, which is the only sure way to make substantial change in this situation. These are important because they create a legal standard separate from the social norms present with any individual group or population of workers. The difficulty with leading change by way of legislation is that legislation is hard to pass.

One of the most difficult parts of creating legal change is finding ample support for the cause. In this case, a phenomenon called the “privacy paradox” prevents the general public from realizing any type of coordinated outrage about worker exploitation in the form of workplace surveillance. Patricia A. Norberg, Daniel R. Horne, and David A. Horne define the privacy paradox as a tendency for consumers to express their interest in, and demand for, privacy, but at the same time let those concerns have a seemingly small effect on their actual decisions.⁵ Their research dissects the difference between peoples’ actions and their intentions, and why this difference is so large specifically in the realm of privacy. The research concludes that consumers are more likely to trust the market norms than their own intuition, which leads them to leave their concerns on the wayside in order to not be left behind in the age of rapid technological advancements.⁶ In an age where everyone buys the newest device and downloads the most recent

⁴ Ifeoma Ajunwa, Kate Crawford, and Jason Schultz, *Limitless Worker Surveillance*, 105 CAL. L. REV. 735, 102 (2017).

⁵ Patricia A. Norberg, Daniel R. Horne, and David A. Horne, *The Privacy Paradox: Personal Information Disclosure Intentions versus Behaviors*, 41 THE JOURNAL OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS 100 (2007).

⁶ Patricia A. Norberg, Daniel R. Horne, and David A. Horne, *The Privacy Paradox: Personal Information Disclosure Intentions versus Behaviors*, 41 THE JOURNAL OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS 100 (2007).

software update, even though people seem to be more concerned with large corporations mining data, employers are actually more intrusive, and people are more accepting in that realm.⁷ Meera Jagannathan, a seasoned writer MarketWatch, interviews various experts in the legal and corporate sectors for their opinions about workplace surveillance, and collectively the experts assert that not only is there insufficient legal oversight to effectively counter this surge in surveillance, but also employees are not putting up enough of a fight to create pushback on these tendencies.⁸ Corporations are able to exploit consumers' tendency to go with the market, and continue to sell increasingly invasive technologies, and subsequently get the general population more comfortable with new levels of deteriorating privacy. Their ability to do this is only possible if people continue to choose not to care, so the best way to approach this problem would be to better understand the root of the issue.

The big question to answer is: why do people continue to buy devices that they know are spying on them? Rani Molla has a degree from Columbia Journalism School, and spends her time covering business and technology for Recode by Vox. In her article, Molla dissects why people continue to buy smart technology more, even as the magnitude of big data increases. She provides five explanations for why this is: people don't understand the extent of data smart devices are collecting, the tradeoffs are worth it, consumers don't have other options, people assume that the government is taking care of it, and people don't actually care that much about privacy.⁹ Her main conclusions lie in the fact that many people are simply choosing to surrender

⁷ Meera Jagannathan, *Your employer has more confidential data on you than Amazon, Apple, or Facebook*, MARKETWATCH (August 4, 2019), <https://www.marketwatch.com/story/your-employer-is-tracking-your-every-move-is-it-too-late-to-do-anything-about-it-2019-07-24>.

⁸ Meera Jagannathan, *Your employer has more confidential data on you than Amazon, Apple, or Facebook*, MARKETWATCH (August 4, 2019), <https://www.marketwatch.com/story/your-employer-is-tracking-your-every-move-is-it-too-late-to-do-anything-about-it-2019-07-24>.

⁹ Rani Molla, *People say they care about privacy but they continue to buy devices that can spy on them*, VOX (May 13, 2019), <https://www.vox.com/recode/2019/5/13/18547235/trust-smart-devices-privacy-security>.

to the realities of today's world, which gives companies free reign to proceed as they wish.¹⁰ For the most part, the tradeoffs are worth it because most users do not understand what privacy really means, and what the consequences are in its absence. In order to address this gap, Louis Menand examines legal examples relevant to the history of privacy, and how it came to be a controversial commodity in today's technological age.¹¹ Additionally, he empathizes with why technology users often end up complacent with the invasion of their privacy, and argues that the convenience of customization can push users to compromise privacy for a better experience.¹² Companies are able to sell their products by selling an essentially evolving lifestyle- changing only with technological innovation. This is a skill the companies have developed: market the technology to fit the glamour of innovation, and inevitably get consumers to willingly surrender their privacy- an asset, and a mode of leverage, that most don't know that they have.

It is imperative, then, to not only effectively convince others of the value of their privacy, but also to advocate for it. Fábio Esteves breaks down the importance of the right to privacy into two sections: ideological reasons, and practical reasons. Ideologically he claims that privacy is a right that people fought for, and that it is in everyone's interest to maintain their own privacy. On the other hand, he insists that there are practical reasons to care about one's privacy as well: any information can be twisted and weaponized, and it is never clear how it might affect a person in their future.¹³ There is, however, a fundamental problem with changing the mindsets of those ignoring the danger of a lack of privacy. In their research, Eszter Hargittai and Alice Marwick

¹⁰ Rani Molla, *People say they care about privacy but they continue to buy devices that can spy on them*, VOX (May 13, 2019), <https://www.vox.com/recode/2019/5/13/18547235/trust-smart-devices-privacy-security>.

¹¹ Louis Menand, *Why Do We Care So Much About Privacy?*, THE NEW YORKER (June 11, 2018), <https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2018/06/18/why-do-we-care-so-much-about-privacy>.

¹² Louis Menand, *Why Do We Care So Much About Privacy?*, THE NEW YORKER (June 11, 2018), <https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2018/06/18/why-do-we-care-so-much-about-privacy>.

¹³ Fábio Esteves, *"I have nothing to hide. Why should I care about my privacy?"*, MEDIUM (October 27, 2016), <https://medium.com/@FabioAEsteves/i-have-nothing-to-hide-why-should-i-care-about-my-privacy-f488281b8f1d>.

acknowledge the tendency that young adults have to advocate for their privacy while not changing their actions to protect their privacy, but argue that the lives of young adults are so ingrained in technology that most do not act simply because they do not feel that their actions would make a difference. They conclude that their actions, or lack thereof, are more likely a result of general cynicism about the realities of privacy in today's age, than lack of understanding of consequences or a choice to simply not care.¹⁴ In other words, it's a cultural mindset that has motivated their actions thus far. Groups of people are not acting in direct defiance of the protection of privacy, they are simply acting in tandem with cultural values and social norms representative of their group or generation.

The easiest way to see the effects of cultural differences is through borders. Different countries have different cultural values, and subsequently different legal priorities. André M. Everett, Yim-Yu Wong, and John Paynter are employees at the Universities of Otago, San Francisco State, and Auckland respectively. These researchers used email privacy to create a standard comparison of corporate privacy policies between countries. Almost all countries use email for personal and corporate reasons, but every country governs corporate access to personal and work emails differently.¹⁵ Not only does each country have different policies, but each country has individual reasons for why their policies make sense for them. The researchers conclude that although the issues of monitoring and surveillance continue to require more research, the main differences are held in the classification of moral rights, and how those conflict with the rights of a company, or the individual.¹⁶ On a similar level, Daniel Ornstein

¹⁴ Eszter Hargittai and Alice Marwick, "What Can I Really Do?" *Explaining the Privacy Paradox with Online Apathy*, 10 INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF COMMUNICATION 3737 (2016).

¹⁵ André M. Everett, Yim-Yu Wong, and John Paynter, *Balancing Employee and Employer Rights: An International Comparison of E-Mail Privacy in the Workplace*, 11 JOURNAL OF INDIVIDUAL EMPLOYMENT RIGHTS 291 (2004).

¹⁶ André M. Everett, Yim-Yu Wong, and John Paynter, *Balancing Employee and Employer Rights: An International Comparison of E-Mail Privacy in the Workplace*, 11 JOURNAL OF INDIVIDUAL EMPLOYMENT RIGHTS 291 (2004).

analyses social media use around the world, and then breaks down how each individual country approaches workplace monitoring of social media legally. He lays out an in-depth analysis of three sensitive topics: employment law issues regarding social media, freedom of speech online, and steps organizations are taking to address social media in the workplace. Ornstein proceeds to detail the current legal practices regarding social media in the workplace for eight different major countries, and analyses how they are similar as well as different.¹⁷ The legal practices in each country directly reflect the social norms and cultural values that the population of said country tend to uphold. Each country is tolerant or intolerant of certain levels of privacy, technology, and social constructs. Legislation is clearly constructed, as well as voted on, by each individual population, and therefore the population create legislation that they deem is important and or representative of their own values.

Although it may be difficult to imagine how these cultural differences reflect concrete law practices in real life, there are countries with extreme views, in comparison to the United States, that make it easier to see the stark differences. Tiffani Li analyzed Chinese workplace law and cultural privacy norms to articulate not only how this reality is realized for them, but also how it can affect other countries over time.¹⁸ Li focuses her article on the importance of understanding cultural norms in the face of technological globalization. She argues that expectations of privacy are products of cultural norms, and if differences are ignored, the cultural norms of one country can infiltrate those of another. As a result of globalization, something becoming normal in one country can eventually affect what is considered normal on a global scale, and furthermore may affect policy in individual countries across the world. Additionally,

¹⁷ Daniel Ornstein, *Social Media Usage in the Workplace Around the World- Developing Law and Practices*, 13 BUSINESS LAW INTERNATIONAL 195 (2012).

¹⁸ Tiffany Li, *China's influence on digital privacy could be global*, THE WASHINGTON POST (August 7, 2018), <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/theworldpost/wp/2018/08/07/china-privacy/>.

Li proposes that cultural norms can be changed by way of legal action, forcing people to adjust their expectations over time.¹⁹ That is to say, that if a country were able to pass legislation that is different from the social and cultural norms of that country, the social and cultural norms of that country will eventually be affected by the legislative change. Because people, in most places, must follow the law, the law can become a way of life. A population will have to adhere to the legal practices that govern them, and as a result, depending on the nature of the legislation itself, the way one lives their life might have to change substantially. As time goes on, those adjustments become natural, and a population has effectively changed its norms.

Once cultural differences have been established as explanations for legal differences, the best way to approach the legal issue is to fully understand specifically how culture and privacy interact, so that those differences can be accounted for when legal experts move to fill the gap. The work of Daria Panina and John R. Aiello focuses on the prevalence of multinational corporations (MNCs), and how technologies within MNCs will begin to face difficulties as they encounter cultural differences as a result of globalization. They assert that national culture will influence how employees view fairness and how much they are willing to accept practices that are imposed upon them.²⁰ G. Stoney Alder, on the other hand, analyzes the reaction to employee monitoring in different places. In his research, Alder argues that different cultures react differently to electronic performance monitoring, and that bureaucratic cultures will respond more favorably to monitoring than supportive cultures.²¹ Alder concedes that there are both positive and negative effects of workplace performance monitoring, but suggests that there is a

¹⁹ Tiffany Li, *China's influence on digital privacy could be global*, THE WASHINGTON POST (August 7, 2018), <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/theworldpost/wp/2018/08/07/china-privacy/>.

²⁰ Daria Panina and John R. Aiello, *Acceptance of electronic monitoring and its consequences in different cultural contexts: A conceptual model*, 11 JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL MANAGEMENT 269 (2005).

²¹ G. Stoney Alder, *Employee reactions to electronic performance monitoring: A consequence of organizational culture*, 12 THE JOURNAL OF HIGH TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT RESEARCH 323 (2001).

more substantial reason that workers may react differently to performance monitoring than just chance or preferences. He concludes by asserting that employee reactions differ based on an organization's individual culture, therefore implying that culture is an important factor in how tolerant, or intolerant, a person may be to workplace surveillance.²² Environment, as well as the influence of others can have a large impact on the tolerance of technology that one may or may not be comfortable with.

Mark Srite and Elena Karahanna take the analysis a step further, and lay out what specifically about different places makes them react to privacy concerns differently. In their research, Srite and Karahanna investigate which tactic is a better way to predict individual technology acceptance: national cultural values, or local social norms.²³ They specifically looked at masculinity versus femininity, individualism versus collectivism, power distance, and uncertainty avoidance when they analyzed technology acceptance. Srite and Karahanna concluded that social norms are stronger indicators of technology acceptance than cultural values, and that masculinity/femininity differences did account for differences in the relationship between perceived usefulness and behavioral intention, as well as perceived ease of use and behavioral intention.²⁴ Social norms can be clearly identified as substantially different depending on the demographic they have been adopted in, so analyzing the different groups can provide insight into how social norms work in a more practical sense. This is significant because it complicates the legislative matter. It is much easier to create legislation for an entire population than it is to either create different legislation for different sectors of a population, or to create

²² G. Stoney Alder, *Employee reactions to electronic performance monitoring: A consequence of organizational culture*, 12 THE JOURNAL OF HIGH TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT RESEARCH 323 (2001).

²³ Mark Srite and Elena Karahanna, *The Role of Espoused National Cultural Values in Technology Acceptance*, 30 MIS QUARTERLY 679 (2006).

²⁴ Mark Srite and Elena Karahanna, *The Role of Espoused National Cultural Values in Technology Acceptance*, 30 MIS QUARTERLY 679 (2006).

relatively adaptable legislation for multiple groups of people within a population. Social norms are different within age groups, parts of the country, economic status, and even industry. Analyzing and understanding these different sectors are imperative to the process of working out an eventual solution.

The effect of social norms is easily displayed in the differences between age groups in the acceptance or rejection of advancing technology. In their research, Michael G. Morris and Viswanath Venkatesh use employee age to further explore how and why employees may react differently to workplace technologies. They found that younger workers' usage depended more on attitude towards the technology, while older workers' behaviors relied more on subjective norms.²⁵ This is important because as workplace demographics change to a younger population, employers will have to adjust their usage of employee technology to effectively manage and appease the new, and younger, working class.²⁶ What is more concerning, is that not only will this new generation will likely be more comfortable with invasive technology than the last, but they will also expect companies to be equipped with top of the line innovation, and therefore be aiding the process of the elimination of privacy. As this young group ages, there are concerning patterns in how their aptitude for technology translates to the workplace. Tam Harbert discovers that not only are employees often unconcerned with most of how they are being surveilled, but also that as technology is getting more invasive, employees are getting more comfortable with its reaches. He breaks down the article into different sections regarding employee trust in employers, the challenges of privacy law, and employee comfort in various situations, and concludes that people have become accustomed to forfeiting their privacy in many other

²⁵ Michael G. Morris and Viswanath Venkatesh, *Age Differences in Technology Adoption Decisions: Implications for a Changing Workforce*, 53 PERSONNEL PSYCHOLOGY 375 (2000).

²⁶ Michael G. Morris and Viswanath Venkatesh, *Age Differences in Technology Adoption Decisions: Implications for a Changing Workforce*, 53 PERSONNEL PSYCHOLOGY 375 (2000).

environments, so it is hard to justify putting a hard line here.²⁷ The transition between social technology and professional technology can be almost non-existent, and the fact that social technology has become so invasive only further perpetuates the reaches of professional technology. And as both become more advanced, there is less and less of a difference between them. The only thing impeding the reach of technology becomes people's own comfort- often reflected in the social norms they take part in.

Social norms clearly have a substantial influence on the realities of surveillance implementation in different areas, but it is crucial to understand how, and to what extent, in order to fully understand what is legally necessary moving forward. It is becoming increasingly clear that there are many problems with privacy in the workplace, and workplace surveillance technologies around the world, but without an honest assessment of how social pressures influence employee tolerance, there will be no way to effectively combat invasive technology before it is too late. Although there is plenty of research about the concept of a privacy paradox, and the fact that it exists, little is said about how this directly impacts a population's tolerance for workplace surveillance. It is still unclear how different one age group is from the next, and whether or not this new group of young adults will use their affinity for technology to confront employers, or take the surveillance as a yet another normalcy in everyday life. Furthermore, there is little being done to understand the true consequences of that reality if the latter occurs. Are social norms helping or hurting, and can a population change their social norms quickly enough to make change, or does the legal system have a responsibility to step in? The only way to persuade the new generation of workers to fight for the protection of their privacy would be to

²⁷ Tam Harbert, *Watching the Workers*, THE SOCIETY FOR HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT (SHRM) (March 16, 2019), <https://www.shrm.org/hr-today/news/all-things-work/pages/watching-the-workers.aspx>.

provide clear consequences for if no action is taken. No group of people is really effectively mobilized without fear, and as of right now there is no fear.

Before moving forward, it is first important to address the nature of the people that need to be affected in this process, and how they operate. The lives of almost everyone living in the developed world is dictated by technology. From babies to adults, social activity and entertainment in particular is saturated with technology. The foundations of communication have been revolutionized by technological innovation, and at this point it would be almost impossible to be a functioning member of society without the use of it. As a result of this abundance of technology, many people conduct their social interactions, and even their political interactions online. The general public is heavily influenced by social media, news media, and influencers that they respect. People create change and social pressure from social media posts and online petitions. Recently, two men were arrested in Georgia after social media outrage sparked as a result of a lack of action from a local police department regarding the murder of an innocent man.²⁸ The murder had been committed earlier, but it wasn't until widespread social unrest was brought about by the story circulating on social media that the men that committed the crime were arrested. Even though the digital media is not tangible, it can create and motivate tangible change. On the other hand, the evolution of technology has become a luxury. Everyone wants the new device, the new software, the new game, which makes technological innovation a sought-after commodity. This means that to regulate technology, one would have to take a step back, separate the piece of technology from the glamour, and think critically about the capacity and

²⁸ Sabrina Siddiqui, *Two Men Arrested and Charged in Killing of Ahmaud Arbery in Georgia*, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL (May 8, 2020), <https://www.wsj.com/articles/video-sparks-calls-for-arrests-in-shooting-of-black-man-in-georgia-11588880193>.

capability of each new innovation. That is difficult to do, especially when many people don't see a need to think twice about it at all.

In order to effectively create change in this situation, the two-part proposal is put forth to address these concerns: the first step is to use a media approach to ignite widespread coordinated outrage with the current system. With this population of people, the best way to reach them is through media. The challenge would be to present this data in a way that is short, intriguing, and attention grabbing. Attempting to advertise and bring attention to a problem with technology that people are so fond of will not be easy, because people tend to only see what they want to see. In order to combat this issue, one would have to pitch the problem as separate from the technology they are most fond of. Keeping social media and the loss of privacy through owning devices separate from workplace technology allows people to give the issue a chance. It is important to eliminate the possibility of the public dismissing this out of hand because they don't see a problem with their phone or their computer. The other issue is the movement would have to launch at the same time that an important piece of legislation regarding privacy in the workplace is gaining traction. People need to feel a sense of urgency in order to act, otherwise there is no pull to the cause. The most effective way to approach it would be to pass around a daunting and unfair story about someone being mistreated, and give the solution. Call senators, sign petitions, educate oneself, all of which are important calls to action, and they are imperative to getting people's attention. And the only way to pass controversial legislation is to get people's attention.

The second step uses the young and incoming workforce as a driving force for employers to take on change themselves. Employers need employees, there is no getting around that. As previously discussed, social norms often differ based on generation, so as this new, technologically savvy generation enters the workforce, they have the power to enter with

demands. A similar parallel is the move to socially responsible businesses. Young people recently chose to change how they shopped, where they worked, and who they interacted with based on whether or not a company was socially responsible. Although it did not necessarily expand to every aspect of their lives, it certainly changed how many companies operate. The same idea is used here. The new generation can choose to be interested in only technologically fair companies. Ones that choose to not participate in invasive technology within their own corporations, which will make it beneficial for companies themselves to follow suit. In order to attract new, young, and intelligent recruits would be to conduct their business in a technologically ethical way, and the young people, newly educated by the social media campaign, will be educated enough on the subject to pick the companies they apply for wisely.

The research concludes that legal oversight for workplace surveillance is critical to the preservation of privacy in the workplace, as social norms not only will be an inadequate constraint for corporations, but if left unchecked, social norms and workplace surveillance will move in tandem, and eventually privacy will cease to exist. It is imperative that this new generation does not allow society to take it that far. Privacy is a tool, a luxury, and a form of leverage. In its absence, individuals are left at the mercy of those that can collect data. Because big corporations and people with a lot of money don't want legislation to regulate it, it will be harder to pass. Coordinated public outrage and the use of media and one's own purchasing power is the only thing that can push legislators in the other direction. Individuals that try to make change are usually unsuccessful on their own, but if one utilizes the tools of technology, one can motivate an entire population, and create real change.

Works Cited

- André M. Everett, Yim-Yu Wong, and John Paynter, *Balancing Employee and Employer Rights: An International Comparison of E-Mail Privacy in the Workplace*, 11 JOURNAL OF INDIVIDUAL EMPLOYMENT RIGHTS 291 (2004).
- Daniel Ornstein, *Social Media Usage in the Workplace Around the World- Developing Law and Practices*, 13 BUSINESS LAW INTERNATIONAL 195 (2012).
- Daria Panina and John R. Aiello, *Acceptance of electronic monitoring and its consequences in different cultural contexts: A conceptual model*, 11 JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL MANAGEMENT 269 (2005).
- Eszter Hargittai and Alice Marwick, *“What Can I Really Do?” Explaining the Privacy Paradox with Online Apathy*, 10 INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF COMMUNICATION 3737 (2016).
- Fábio Esteves, *“I have nothing to hide. Why should I care about my privacy?”*, MEDIUM (October 27, 2016), <https://medium.com/@FabioAEsteves/i-have-nothing-to-hide-why-should-i-care-about-my-privacy-f488281b8f1d>.
- G. Stoney Alder, *Employee reactions to electronic performance monitoring: A consequence of organizational culture*, 12 THE JOURNAL OF HIGH TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT RESEARCH 323 (2001).
- Ifeoma Ajunwa, Kate Crawford, and Jason Schultz, *Limitless Worker Surveillance*, 105 CAL. L. REV. 735 (2017).
- Larry Alton, *6 Signs you're behind on workplace norm*, FORBES (November 7, 2016), <https://www.forbes.com/sites/larryalton/2016/11/07/6-signs-youre-behind-on-new-workplace-norms/#60b332460cae>.
- Louis Menand, *Why Do We Care So Much About Privacy?*, THE NEW YORKER (June 11, 2018), <https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2018/06/18/why-do-we-care-so-much-about-privacy>.
- Mark Srite and Elena Karahanna, *The Role of Espoused National Cultural Values in Technology Acceptance*, 30 MIS QUARTERLY 679 (2006).
- Meera Jagannathan, *Your employer has more confidential data on you than Amazon, Apple, or Facebook*, MARKETWATCH (August 4, 2019), <https://www.marketwatch.com/story/your-employer-is-tracking-your-every-move-is-it-too-late-to-do-anything-about-it-2019-07-24>.
- Michael G. Morris and Viswanath Venkatesh, *Age Differences in Technology Adoption Decisions: Implications for a Changing Workforce*, 53 PERSONNEL PSYCHOLOGY 375 (2000).

Patricia A. Norberg, Daniel R. Horne, and David A. Horne, *The Privacy Paradox: Personal Information Disclosure Intentions versus Behaviors*, 41 THE JOURNAL OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS 100 (2007).

Rani Molla, *People say they care about privacy but they continue to buy devices that can spy on them*, VOX (May 13, 2019), <https://www.vox.com/recode/2019/5/13/18547235/trust-smart-devices-privacy-security>.

Sabrina Siddiqui, *Two Men Arrested and Charged in Killing of Ahmaud Arbery in Georgia*, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL (May 8, 2020), <https://www.wsj.com/articles/video-sparks-calls-for-arrests-in-shooting-of-black-man-in-georgia-11588880193>.

Tam Harbert, *Watching the Workers*, THE SOCIETY FOR HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT (SHRM) (March 16, 2019), <https://www.shrm.org/hr-today/news/all-things-work/pages/watching-the-workers.aspx>.

Tiffany Li, *China's influence on digital privacy could be global*, THE WASHINGTON POST (August 7, 2018), <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/theworldpost/wp/2018/08/07/china-privacy/>.