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Abstract
Many workers are now monitored or tracked using electronic tools: organizations may read filter emails; block or monitor web activity; or use video or audio surveillance. Reactions to these practices vary widely; some people accept this as a necessary part of the modern workplace whereas others form extremely negative reactions. From past research we know that communication and control are key best practices to minimize these negative reactions. However even when organizations follow these design principles, some people will be more prone to react negatively. We investigated dispositional and situational factors that contribute to the acceptance of workplace electronic surveillance. After controlling for characteristics of the monitoring, legitimacy perceptions is predicted by low neuroticism and low trait reactance, whereas procedural justice is predicted by low conscientiousness, low neuroticism and high extraversion.
Personalities Predict Acceptance of Electronic Performance Monitoring at Work

The electronic monitoring of employees at work has become commonplace; today almost everyone is monitored in some way. According to a 2007 American Management Association (AMA) survey, 66% of organizations monitor internet usage, 45% track keystrokes/content/time spent on the computer, and 43% monitor email. With the increased accessibility of monitoring technology and the growing trend of remote work, many organizations are using electronic monitoring to observe employee performance and discourage workplace deviance.

Much of the research on electronic performance monitoring (EPM) has centered on employee reactions, as early studies found that it was associated with increased stress, decreased job satisfaction, reduced morale, increased organizational distrust, and increased turnover (Chalykoff & Kochan, 1989; Smith, Carayon, Sanders, Lim, & Le Grande, 1992; Westin, 1992). In addition, critics of EPM voice concerns that electronically observing employee activity violates individuals’ right to privacy (Miller & Weckert, 2000). According to some researchers, the key to minimizing these negative effects while harnessing the benefits of EPM such as increased performance (Griffith, 1993; Irving, Higgens, & Safayeni, 1986) is to design monitoring systems in ways that enhance employee attitudes toward the monitoring (Alder & Ambrose, 2005a; Alge, 2001; Ambrose, Alder, & Noel, 2000; Moorman & Wells, 2003; Stanton, 2000a). As such, much of the more recent research on EPM has focused on the characteristics of monitoring systems or policies that lead to positive perceptions of organizational justice.

For example, Stanton (2000b) found that monitoring consistency, knowledge of performance from monitoring, monitoring control, and monitoring justification predicted perceived fairness. This body of research suggests that characteristics of the system itself affect the perceived fairness of the EPM. Perceived fairness, in turn, has been shown to positively
relate to organizational citizenship behaviors (Moorman & Wells, 2003; Wells, Moorman, & Werner, 2007), performance (Alder & Ambrose, 2005a; McNall & Roch, 2009), satisfaction (Alder & Ambrose; McNall & Roch), organizational commitment (Wells et al., 2007), and negatively relate to counterproductive work behaviors (Henle, Kohut, & Booth, 2009).

Clearly, the characteristics of the monitoring system or policies themselves are worthy of study. However, we know relatively little about how characteristics of the individuals being monitored also affect monitoring outcomes. It is necessary to understand how individual characteristics influence monitoring acceptance, as any initiative designed to improve perceptions will be bounded by employees’ dispositions. Even when monitoring systems are designed to respect privacy and enhance perceptions of fairness, some employees may still have negative reactions that arise from personality differences. Zweig and Webster (2003) presented evidence to suggest that some personality traits may moderate the relationships between characteristics of the monitoring and attitudes toward the monitoring. Specifically, university students were given a vignette that described an awareness monitoring system. Instead of monitoring employee performance, this type of surveillance system would be used to facilitate communication among geographically dispersed employees by showing when each team members is available to communicate. For this particular monitoring system, employees would be able to actually see their colleagues via streaming video. Zweig and Webster used an experimental design to manipulate characteristics of this monitoring system described in the vignettes, and tested whether the relationship between monitoring characteristics and attitudes toward the monitoring depended on one’s personality. They found that the relationship between invasion of privacy and fairness was more strongly negative for introverted individuals compared to those that are more extraverted, which may suggest that introverts are more sensitive to
privacy invasion. In addition, the relationship between perceptions of fairness and attitudes toward the monitoring was more strongly positive for emotionally stable individuals than those who are more neurotic. This study is important in that it provides some evidence regarding how personality may affect perceptions of electronic monitoring, but the external validity of the study is limited in that participants were university students that were asked to imagine how they would respond to one specific type of monitoring. In addition, although it is interesting to test whether personality moderates relationships between monitoring characteristics and perceptions of the monitoring, it is also important to examine whether personality influences monitoring perceptions over and above characteristics of the monitoring.

As such, we seek to extend our understanding of how both individual and situational factors influence perceptions of an EPM system. We focus on personality and trait reactance as key individual differences that relate to monitoring acceptance and contrast these variables with elements of information control and monitoring invasiveness, two important aspects of EPM that have been shown to predict reactions in past research. Given that increasing the acceptance and fairness of a monitoring system appears to be key in reducing negative reactions (Stanton, 2000a), the main dependent variables of interest include perceived legitimacy (extent to which the way an organization collects and handles personal information violates one’s expectations of what is reasonable, given the situation; Alge, Ballinger, Tangirala, & Oakley, 2006) and procedural justice (extent to which the processes of the monitoring are applied consistently, free from bias, accurate, ethical, and extent to which the affected individuals’ opinions are taken into account; Colquitt, 2001).

Monitoring System Characteristics
Given that electronic monitoring can be pervasive, occur without awareness, and record virtually every behavior (especially on the computer), concerns over the privacy of personal information are growing (Alge et al., 2006). Some EPM systems are perceived as more invasive than others and can be characterized according to how much information privacy is afforded to employees. One aspect of information privacy is *information gathering control*, which refers to the degree to which employees believe they have control over how their personal information is collected and stored (Alge et al., 2006). Another aspect, *information handling control*, concerns employees’ beliefs about how much control they have over the use and dissemination of personal information once it is collected. According to Alge (2001), control over personal information is important because it allows people to control their public persona at work. When privacy is invaded (i.e., when people lose this control), people are often forced to reveal things about themselves that they prefer to keep private, which can have negative outcomes for individuals. Moreover, because organizational procedures that symbolize employees’ value to the group are characterized by a high degree of procedural justice (e.g., Lind & Tyler, 1988), any procedures that come across as disrespectful or undermining employees’ social identities will lead to negative perceptions of legitimacy and justice (Alge, 2001).

**Hypothesis 1:** *Information gathering control (H1a) and information handling control (H1b) are associated with increased perceptions of legitimacy and procedural justice.*

Another important aspect of monitoring is the monitoring content. That is, what is actually being monitored can also vary across monitoring systems and affect perceptions of legitimacy and justice. Individuals may feel that only job-relevant behavior should be monitored at work. Thus, if the monitoring is not job-relevant, people may perceive a loss of control over their public image. Monitoring job-relevant behaviors (e.g., monitoring email, phone calls,
computer files), for example, is likely to feel very different than monitoring non-work behaviors (e.g., personal internet usage). The former is likely to feel more relevant to work and hence justified, whereas the other may feel more invasive due to the collection of personal information that employees wish to keep private. We refer to the first type of monitoring as *work-related monitoring* and the second type of monitoring as *personal monitoring*. Although work-related monitoring is not likely to trigger strong feelings of injustice or invasion of privacy, personal monitoring may.

*Hypothesis 2: Personal monitoring will be negatively related to perceptions of legitimacy and procedural justice, and this relationship will be more negative than the relationship with work-related monitoring.*

**Individual Differences**

Individual difference variables are most relevant when situations are ambiguous, whereas situational variables are most salient when the situation is well-defined (Barrick & Mount, 1993). Thus, in well-defined situations, contextual factors will account for the most variance in the dependent variables, whereas personality factors will account for the most variance when the situations are ambiguous. Because people often do not know exactly when they are being monitored, how their personal information will be used, whether their performance as assessed by the monitoring system is adequate, and the consequences of good or poor performance (Chen & Ross, 2007), the context of workplace monitoring is often ambiguous. Thus, we hypothesize that personality will be a significant predictor of the reactions to monitoring, even after controlling for monitoring characteristics. Thus, we are interested in examining how much additional variance in the outcomes can be explained by personality variables, after taking the characteristics of the EPM system into account. For the current study, we focus on the Big Five
Personality traits: extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness as well as trait reactance, an additional personality characteristic likely to be relevant to perceptions of privacy and injustice.

People high on extraversion are characterized as being talkative, energetic, and assertive (John & Srivastava, 1999). As briefly described above, there may be differences in how introverts and extroverts perceive intrusions of privacy (e.g., Zweig & Webster, 2003). Several other studies have supported this conclusion and have found that extraverts tend to be less concerned with privacy than introverts (Junglas et al., 2008; Pedersen, 1987; Stone, 1986). Therefore, we hypothesize that extraversion is positively associated with perceived legitimacy. Individuals that are more extraverted also tend to be more concerned with the perspectives and feelings of others, whereas introverts tend to be more attuned to their own feelings. If extraverted individuals are also more accommodating to the perspectives of their superiors, they may be more likely to accept managers’ justifications for electronic monitoring (Chen & Ross, 2007). Moreover, an important part of procedural justice is how much input one has or had during the process of implementing the monitoring system. Given that voicing opinions or concerns may require a certain level of assertiveness, we also hypothesize that extraversion is positively related to procedural justice.

Hypothesis 3: After accounting for the effects of monitoring characteristics, extraversion is associated with higher perceived legitimacy, and procedural justice.

People high in agreeableness are characterized as good-natured, cooperative, and trusting (John & Srivastava, 1999). Given the trusting, undemanding, and sympathetic aspects of agreeableness, we hypothesize that increased levels of this trait are also associated with increased EPM acceptance because agreeable individuals are motivated to be cooperative and maintain
harmony. Agreeable individuals have also been shown to be less concerned with privacy, potentially because of their more trusting nature (Judge et al., 2002; Junglas et al., 2008). As such, we hypothesize that agreeableness is positively associated with perceived legitimacy. Finally, agreeableness is also negatively related to equity sensitivity and positively related to procedural justice (Scott & Colquitt, 2007). Therefore, we hypothesize that agreeableness is positively associated with procedural justice.

**Hypothesis 4:** After accounting for the effects of monitoring characteristics, agreeableness is associated with higher perceived legitimacy, and procedural justice.

People high in conscientiousness are characterized as orderly, responsible, and dependable (John & Srivastava, 1999). We expect that a conscientious employee would not mind having their work activities electronically monitored because they are less likely to engage in workplace deviance in the first place (Colbert, Mount, Harter, Witt, & Barrick, 2004) and may value EPM as a more accurate assessment of their performance. However, it has also been suggested that more conscientious people are more protective of their privacy because they are concerned about what others will do with their personal information (Junglas et al., 2008). Therefore, we hypothesize that conscientiousness will be negatively related to perceived legitimacy.

**Hypothesis 5:** After accounting for the effects of monitoring characteristics, conscientiousness is associated with lower perceived legitimacy.

The theory regarding the relationship between conscientiousness and procedural justice is not well developed, and no relationship has been empirically supported (Colquitt, Scott, Judge, & Shaw, 2006). Thus, an exploratory approach will be taken to evaluate this relationship.
Research Question 1: Does conscientiousness explain variance in procedural justice, after controlling for monitoring characteristics?

People high on neuroticism are characterized as anxious, easily upset, and self-conscious (John & Srivastava, 1999). Because EPM is often stressful (Aiello & Kolb, 1995; Irving et al., 1986) and involves observing and recording individual behavior, it is likely that individuals high on neuroticism are more dissatisfied with monitoring systems in general, regardless of the system characteristics. Neurotic individuals tend to be more anxious and worrisome by nature, so it is also likely that they will worry more about the consequences of being electronically monitored. Therefore, we hypothesize that neuroticism is negatively associated with perceived legitimacy.

Considering that individuals high on neuroticism tend to be more discontented, irritable, and moody, it is also likely that they will be less satisfied with the monitoring system and see it as unfair. Moreover, because neurotic individuals tend to focus on the negative aspects of their environment, they may also be more likely to view EPM as biased, unethical, and threatening. Empirically, neuroticism has been found to be positively related to equity sensitivity and negatively relate to procedural justice. Thus, we hypothesize that neuroticism is negatively associated with procedural justice.

Hypothesis 6: After accounting for the effects of monitoring characteristics, neuroticism negatively predicts perceived legitimacy and procedural justice.

There are no a priori predictions concerning the relationships between openness to experience (described as being intellectual, imaginative, and independent-minded; John & Srivastava, 1999) and reactions to monitoring given the lack of theoretical rationale and empirical support (Colquitt et al., 2006) for the relationships among these constructs. Rather, an exploratory approach will be taken.
Research Question 2: Does openness to experience explain variance in perceived legitimacy or procedural justice, after controlling for monitoring characteristics?

Psychological reactance refers to the motivation people experience when their personal freedoms are threatened or taken away. This motivational drive is directed towards restoring these threatened freedoms and is often accompanied by feelings of anger, hostility and aggression (Brehm & Brehm, 1981). Just as people can differ in terms of their tendency to experience anger across situations (i.e., trait anger), so can people vary according to the extent to which they experience psychological reactance across situations (i.e., trait reactance). One reason why people may be higher on trait reactance is because (1) they may be more sensitive to threats to their freedom, and/or (2) may be more likely to perceive that they have more personal freedoms. Thus, reactant individuals may be more likely to interpret monitoring systems as a threat to their personal freedoms (i.e., as an invasion of privacy), because they may be more sensitive to threats to their privacy and/or may be more likely to perceive privacy as a personal freedom. As such, it is likely that compared to people with low levels of trait reactance, those high on trait reactance would have more negative reactions to EPM regardless of the system’s characteristics. We hypothesize that trait reactance is negatively associated with perceived legitimacy and procedural justice.

Hypothesis 7: After accounting for the effects of monitoring characteristics, trait reactance is associated with lower perceived legitimacy and procedural justice.

A summary of the hypotheses is presented in Table 3.

Method

Participants
Participants were recruited through Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk; Amazon Web Services, 2005-2011), an online marketplace that allows researchers to post studies for participants to complete in return for a monetary incentive. In a comparison of MTurk and a traditional psychology subject pool, Behrend, Sharek, Meade, and Wiebe (2011) found that MTurk users tend to be more diverse in terms of age, race/ethnicity, education experience, and work experience and that their data was of similar quality. Thus, this study will help extend the external validity of Zweig and Webster (2011)’s findings by studying a more diverse sample of working adults.

After removing cases due to non-employment status, failing both “attention check” items, and missing data on more than 5% of the scales, our sample consisted of 298 MTurk participants. The average age of the participants was 32.09 years old (SD = 10.10) and the sample included 50.3% women. The participants were mostly Caucasian/White (58.9%) or Asian (26.1%), with a smaller percentage indicating they were African American (6.8%), Hispanic/Latino (3.7%), or multiple ethnicities (1.7%). The remainder of the participants (3.1%) did not identify their race or ethnicity. All participants were employed either full-time (68.8%) or part-time (31.2%). Participants were given a $1.00 incentive for their participation.

Procedure

An advertisement for the study was posted on MTurk in order to recruit participants. Those who agreed to participate were given a link to the online survey. First, participants were asked to think about their organization’s monitoring systems. For several types of monitoring, they rated (a) whether their organization performs this type of monitoring, (b) whether the information is used for employee development or for administrative purposes. Next,
the participants were asked to respond to several attitudinal and behavioral scales. Finally, the participants entered a completion code in MTurk in order to receive compensation.

Measures

*Personal and work-related monitoring* were measured using items adapted from AMA’s (2007) electronic monitoring and surveillance survey. We conducted a principal components analysis with oblique rotation and found strong empirical and conceptual support for two components: work-related monitoring (e.g., monitoring email, phone calls, voicemail messages, keystrokes, time spent on activities, computer files, breach of confidentiality, policy violations, and inappropriate language; 14 items; $\alpha = .87$) and personal monitoring (e.g., monitoring and blocking access to instant messaging, blogs, game, shopping/auction, entertainment, social networking, and adult sites; 17 items; $\alpha = .93$). One item (“Use video surveillance”) was removed due to weak loadings (< .22) on both dimensions.

*Information Gathering Control* was measured with Alge et al.’s (2006) scale (e.g., *I determine the types of information that my organization can store about me*; 4 items; $\alpha = .89$).

*Information Handling Control* was measured with Alge et al.’s (2006) scale (e.g., *I control how my personal information is used by my organization*; 4 items; $\alpha = .89$). An exploratory factor analysis suggested that this scale is distinct from information gathering control and that the two scales are only moderately correlated ($r = .61$).

*Personality* was measured using John & Srivastava’s (1999) Big 5 personality scales: extraversion (e.g., *Is talkative*; 8 items; $\alpha = .85$), agreeableness (e.g., *Is helpful and unselfish with others*; 9 items; $\alpha = .80$), conscientiousness (e.g., *Does a thorough job*; 9 items; $\alpha = .81$), openness
(e.g., *Is original, comes up with new ideas*; 10 items; \( \alpha = .83 \)), and neuroticism (e.g., *Is depressed, blue*; 8 items; \( \alpha = .69 \)).

**Trait Reactance** was measured using a shortened version of Hong and Page’s (1989) scale (e.g., *I resist the attempts of others to influence me*; 6 items, \( \alpha = .85 \)). Brown, Finney, and France (2011) recommended using a subset of the items because the original is best represented by a bifactor model that includes a unidimensional *trait reactance* factor and several specific factors that are really method effects. An exploratory factor analysis suggested that the shortened scale is unidimensional, as intended. Sample items include

*Perceived Legitimacy* was measured using Alge et al.’s (2006) scale (e.g., *I have little reason to be concerned about my privacy here in my organization*; 5 items; \( \alpha = .87 \)).

*Procedural Justice* was measured with Colquitt’s (2001) scale (e.g., *Have those procedures been free of bias*?; 7 items; \( \alpha = .86 \)).

**Results**

Descriptive statistics and the regression analysis results appear in Tables 1 and 2, respectively. The results indicated that the monitoring characteristics accounted for a significant amount of variability in perceived legitimacy \( (R^2 = .28) \) and procedural justice \( (R^2 = .36; \) Table 2). Table 3 summarizes our hypotheses and whether they were supported.

Hypotheses 1a is partially supported. Information gathering control is positively related to perceived legitimacy, but a positive relationship was not supported with procedural justice. Hypothesis 1b, on the other hand, is fully supported. Information handling control is positively associated with both perceived legitimacy and procedural justice. Thus, while both are important for perceptions of privacy (i.e., legitimacy), only information handling control contributes to perceptions of procedural justice. Hypothesis 2, that personal monitoring would be more
negatively related to perceptions of the monitoring than work-related monitoring, was not supported. In fact, an unexpected result was found: whereas personal monitoring was unrelated to either dependent variable, work-related monitoring had a strong negative relationship with perceived legitimacy, and was unrelated to procedural justice. This suggests that monitoring work-related communication and documents may be more invasive than monitoring personal internet usage, a finding we did not expect. To summarize, perceived legitimacy is best predicted by increased information gathering and handling control, as well as decreased work-related monitoring. Procedural justice is only predicted by increased information handling control.

A second analysis was conducted to evaluate whether personality traits predict perceived legitimacy and procedural justice over and above the monitoring characteristics (see Tables 2 and 3). The six personality traits accounted for a significant proportion of the variance in each of the dependent variables after controlling for the effects of the monitoring characteristics, fully supporting Hypothesis 3 ($\Delta R^2 = .046$ for both outcomes). In terms of the hypothesis about the relationship with each personality trait with legitimacy perceptions and procedural justice, the support is mixed. Hypothesis 7 was fully supported: neuroticism was negatively related to both perceived legitimacy and procedural justice. In addition, Hypotheses 4 and 8 were both partially supported. As expected, extraversion had a positive relationship with procedural justice, but was unrelated to perceived legitimacy. Trait reactance, on the other hand, negatively predicted perceived legitimacy, but did not predict procedural justice. The rest of the hypotheses and research questions had nil results: agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness were not significantly related to either dependent variable.

Thus, the results suggest that personality does account for a significant amount of variance in perceptions of the monitoring after controlling for characteristics of the system.
Specifically, perceived legitimacy is associated with decreased neuroticism and trait reactance, and procedural justice is predicted by decreased conscientiousness and neuroticism, and increased extraversion, after controlling for information control and monitoring content.

Discussion

Although the monitoring characteristics explained a large percentage of variance in perceived legitimacy and procedural justice, personality was able to explain an additional amount of variance in both variables as well. These findings suggest that considering individual differences is important when trying to understand or predict employee reactions to monitoring. These results suggest that regardless of certain characteristics of the monitoring system, some people (e.g., those that are more neurotic, trait reactant, conscientious, or introverted) will tend to respond more negatively than others because of their disposition. Thus, the benefits of a well-designed monitoring system are limited by employees’ dispositions.

These results have important implications for both theory and practice. In terms of theoretical contribution, this study advances our understanding of how individual differences and monitoring characteristics affect employee reactions to monitoring from an organizational justice and privacy framework. Specifically, extraversion, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and trait reactance appear to be important individual difference variables that in part, explain people’s reactions to EPM. In addition, this study provides additional evidence for the importance of information control and monitoring content. Interestingly, monitoring employees’ work-related behavior and communication is perceived as less legitimate (i.e., as an invasion of privacy) than monitoring personal internet usage. Perhaps employees expect that deviant behaviors (e.g., personal internet usage) will be monitored, whereas monitoring employees’ time and communication feels to invasive and controlling.
From a practical perspective, our study shows affording employees control over how their information is collected and handled leads to more favorable perceptions of the EPM system. Constantly monitoring employees’ behavior and communication may lead to decreased perceptions of legitimacy, however monitoring personal internet usage appears to have no negative effects. That said, although it is beneficial to design an EPM system according to best practices, it is important to realize that individual’s reactions to EPM are also driven by their personal dispositions. As a result, it is important for managers to recognize that some people will inevitably be negatively affected by electronic monitoring. The current study helps shed light on what characteristics might lead to non-acceptance so that managers can (1) have realistic expectations for the effectiveness of incorporating different monitoring system designs (e.g., increased control), and (2) identify employees most likely to react negatively.

Although these results have both theoretical and practical implications for organizations using EPM, they must be weighed against the limitations of our study. The data collected were all self-report, including the measures of monitoring characteristics. It is likely that some participants were not sure how they are monitored at work, and thus their responses may not accurately reflect the actual practices of their employers. Nonetheless, it is what employees are aware of that drives their perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors, and thus, we believe measuring how employees believe they are being monitored is of greater interest. Another potential limitation is that we used a convenience sample recruited on Mechanical Turk and were not able to verify participants’ employment status. However, using this sample allowed for the inclusion of employees from many organizations and ensured variation in the electronic monitoring characteristics. Despite these limitations, these results suggest that extraversion, trait reactance,
conscientiousness, and neuroticism are important individual differences that need to be considered when predicting employee reactions to monitoring systems.
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Table 1. Inter-Scale Correlations and Scale Reliabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Info Gathering Control</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>(.89)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Info Handling Control</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>(.89)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Work-related Monitoring</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>(.87)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Personal Monitoring</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>(.93)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Extraversion</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Agreeableness</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>(.80)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Conscientiousness</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>(.81)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Neuroticism</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>-.53**</td>
<td>-.53**</td>
<td>(.69)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Openness to Experience</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>(.83)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Trait Reactance</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>-.39**</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>(.85)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Perceived Legitimacy</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>-.41**</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>(.87)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Procedural Justice</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>(.86)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=298. *p<.05. **p<.01
Table 2. Results from Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Perceived Legitimacy</th>
<th>Procedural Justice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>R²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info Gather Control</td>
<td>0.14*</td>
<td>0.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info Handling Control</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-Related</td>
<td>-0.40**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info Gather Control</td>
<td>0.14*</td>
<td>0.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info Handling Control</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-Related</td>
<td>-0.37**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>-0.15*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Reactance</td>
<td>-0.14*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. β is the standardized regression coefficient. *p < .05. **p < .01.
Table 3. Hypotheses and Summary of Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Perceived Legitimacy</th>
<th>Procedural Justice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hypothesis</td>
<td>Supported?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 1a: Information Gathering Control</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 1b: Information Handling Control</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 2: Personal Monitoring vs. work-related monitoring</td>
<td>$\beta_{\text{personal}} &lt; \beta_{\text{work-related}} &lt; 0$</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 3: Personality vs. monitoring characteristics</td>
<td>$\Delta R^2 &gt; 0$</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 4: Extraversion</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 5: Agreeableness</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 6: Conscientiousness</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 7: Neuroticism</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 8: Trait Reactance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>