

Manuscript ID:
TIJCMBLIR-2025-020640

Volume: 2

Issue: 6

Month: December

Year: 2025

E-ISSN: 3065-9191

Submitted: 18 Nov. 2025

Revised: 29 Nov. 2025

Accepted: 17 Dec. 2025

Published: 31 Dec. 2025

Address for correspondence:
Saisheela Sudhir Mangaonkar
Assistant Professor, Department
of Commerce
Email: saisheelajade@gmail.com

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19177193

DOI Link:

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19177193>



Creative Commons (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0):

This is an open access journal, and articles are distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International Public License, which allows others to remix, tweak, and build upon the work noncommercially, as long as appropriate credit is given and the new creations are licensed under the identical terms.

Balancing Productivity and Employee Privacy: Ethical Challenges of Digital Surveillance in the IT Industry's Hybrid Work Model

Saisheela Sudhir Mangaonkar

Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce

Abstract

The increasing adoption of hybrid work models in the IT industry has transformed organizational structures, management practices, and employee experiences. While hybrid work offers flexibility and efficiency, it has also intensified the use of digital surveillance technologies aimed at monitoring employee productivity and behavior. These technologies, although beneficial for organizational control and performance measurement, raise profound ethical concerns related to employee privacy, autonomy, trust, and psychological well-being. This paper critically examines the ethical challenges of digital surveillance in hybrid IT workplaces by exploring the tension between productivity optimization and respect for employee privacy. Drawing on utilitarianism, deontological ethics, and virtue ethics, the study analyzes common surveillance practices and their implications for individuals and organizations. The paper further discusses organizational, psychological, and cultural consequences of surveillance and proposes ethical principles and governance strategies for responsible monitoring. The study concludes that ethical, transparent, and proportionate surveillance—combined with trust-based management—is essential for sustaining productivity and employee dignity in hybrid IT work environments.

Keywords: hybrid work, digital surveillance, employee privacy, IT industry, workplace ethics, productivity

Introduction

The nature of work has undergone a significant transformation over the past decade, with the IT industry at the forefront of this change. Advances in digital technologies, cloud computing, and collaboration tools have enabled organizations to move beyond traditional office-centric models toward more flexible hybrid work arrangements. Hybrid work models, which combine remote and in-office work, have become a defining feature of modern IT organizations (Allen et al., 2021). While these models offer benefits such as flexibility, reduced operational costs, and improved work-life balance, they also introduce new managerial and ethical challenges. One of the most prominent challenges associated with hybrid work is the growing reliance on digital surveillance technologies. In the absence of physical supervision, organizations increasingly deploy monitoring tools to track employee activity, productivity, communication, and performance. These tools promise greater visibility and data-driven decision-making, but they also raise concerns about excessive control, erosion of privacy, and the normalization of constant monitoring. The ethical dilemma at the heart of this issue lies in balancing organizational productivity goals with employees' right to privacy and dignity. While organizations have legitimate interests in ensuring efficiency, accountability, and security, employees have equally legitimate expectations of autonomy, trust, and respect—particularly when work takes place in personal spaces such as homes. This paper argues that uncritical adoption of digital surveillance risks undermining the very benefits hybrid work is meant to deliver. The purpose of this paper is to critically examine the ethical challenges of digital surveillance in the IT industry's hybrid work model. Specifically, it explores how surveillance practices affect employee privacy, psychological well-being, trust, and organizational culture, and how ethical frameworks can guide more responsible approaches. By integrating ethical theory with practical organizational concerns, this study contributes to ongoing debates about the future of work in technology-driven environments.

Hybrid Work Models in the IT Industry

1. Emergence and Growth of Hybrid Work

Hybrid work is not entirely new to the IT industry. Long before global disruptions accelerated remote work adoption, IT professionals frequently worked across distributed teams and flexible schedules.

How to Cite this Article:

Mangaonkar, S. S. (2025). Balancing Productivity and Employee Privacy: Ethical Challenges of Digital Surveillance in the IT Industry's Hybrid Work Model. *The International Journal of Commerce Management and Business Law in International Research*, 2(6), 194–197. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19177193>

However, the large-scale normalization of hybrid work represents a structural shift rather than a temporary adjustment. Organizations now intentionally design roles, workflows, and performance systems around hybrid arrangements (Messenger & Gschwind, 2016). The IT industry is particularly well-suited to hybrid work due to its reliance on digital outputs rather than physical presence. Software development, system maintenance, data analytics, and cybersecurity tasks can often be performed remotely with minimal disruption. As a result, hybrid work has become both a competitive advantage and an expectation among IT professionals.

2. Managerial Control in Hybrid Contexts

Despite its advantages, hybrid work challenges traditional management practices rooted in visibility and direct supervision. Managers accustomed to monitoring effort through presence may struggle to assess performance in distributed settings. This perceived loss of control has fueled interest in digital surveillance tools as substitutes for physical oversight.

From a managerial perspective, surveillance appears to offer reassurance: it provides quantifiable metrics, real-time monitoring, and performance dashboards. However, this shift from trust-based to data-driven control raises ethical concerns about power imbalances, consent, and the treatment of employees as monitored subjects rather than autonomous professionals.

Digital Surveillance in Hybrid IT Workplaces

1. Forms of Digital Surveillance

Digital surveillance in hybrid IT workplaces encompasses a wide range of technologies and practices. Common tools include time-tracking software that records login durations, application usage monitors, keystroke and mouse activity trackers, screenshot capture tools, and AI-based productivity analytics. Communication platforms may also be monitored to assess responsiveness or collaboration patterns.

These technologies vary in intrusiveness. Some focus on output-based metrics, such as task completion and project milestones, while others monitor behavior continuously. The ethical implications intensify as surveillance becomes more granular, persistent, and opaque.

2. Organizational Justifications

Organizations justify surveillance practices on several grounds. Productivity measurement is often cited as the primary rationale, particularly in hybrid settings where outcomes may be less visible. Surveillance is also used for cybersecurity, regulatory compliance, and protection of intellectual property. In high-risk IT environments, monitoring can serve legitimate security functions.

However, ethical concerns arise when surveillance exceeds what is necessary for these purposes or when it is implemented without transparency and employee involvement. Surveillance that prioritizes control over trust can shift organizational culture toward suspicion and fear.

Ethical Frameworks for Analyzing Surveillance

1. Utilitarian Ethics

Utilitarianism evaluates actions based on their consequences, aiming to maximize overall well-being. From this perspective, workplace surveillance may be justified if it leads to higher productivity, organizational success, and job security for the majority (Mill, 1863). However, utilitarian analysis must also account for negative consequences such as stress, anxiety, and diminished morale.

In hybrid IT workplaces, the utilitarian calculus becomes complex. Productivity gains achieved through surveillance may be offset by long-term harm to employee well-being and retention. If surveillance undermines trust and creativity—key drivers of innovation in IT—the overall utility may decrease rather than increase.

2. Deontological Ethics

Deontological ethics emphasizes moral duties and rights rather than outcomes. From this perspective, employees possess inherent rights to privacy, dignity, and informed consent (Kant, 1785/1993). Surveillance that violates these rights is ethically unacceptable regardless of its productivity benefits.

In hybrid work contexts, deontological concerns are heightened because monitoring often extends into private spaces. Employees may feel compelled to accept surveillance due to power imbalances, raising questions about the validity of consent.

3. Virtue Ethics

Virtue ethics focuses on moral character and organizational culture. Ethical organizations cultivate trust, fairness, and respect rather than relying solely on control mechanisms (Aristotle, trans. 2009). Excessive surveillance may signal a lack of trust and undermine virtuous relationships between employers and employees.

From a virtue ethics perspective, ethical surveillance should support—not replace—human judgment, communication, and mutual accountability.

Impact of Surveillance on Employees

1. Privacy and Boundary Erosion

Hybrid work blurs the boundary between professional and personal life. Surveillance technologies that track activity within home environments risk eroding personal privacy. Employees may feel that their private spaces are being colonized by organizational control, leading to discomfort and resistance.

This erosion of boundaries challenges traditional notions of workplace ethics and necessitates greater sensitivity in surveillance design and implementation.

2. Psychological Well-Being and Stress

Continuous monitoring can create a sense of constant evaluation, leading to heightened stress and performance anxiety. Employees may engage in performative productivity—appearing busy rather than working effectively. Over time, this pressure can contribute to burnout, reduced job satisfaction, and mental health challenges.

In creative and knowledge-intensive IT roles, such stress can be particularly detrimental, as innovation

thrives on psychological safety rather than constant oversight.

3. Trust and Organizational Commitment

Trust is a foundational element of successful hybrid work. Surveillance-heavy environments risk signaling distrust, which can weaken employee commitment and loyalty. When employees perceive monitoring as unfair or invasive, they may disengage or seek employment elsewhere.

Ironically, surveillance intended to enhance productivity may ultimately undermine it by damaging motivation and collaboration.

Organizational Implications of Surveillance

1. Potential Benefits

When implemented ethically, surveillance can offer legitimate organizational benefits. Data-driven insights can improve workflow efficiency, identify training needs, and support fair performance evaluation. Transparent monitoring aligned with clear objectives can enhance accountability without compromising dignity.

2. Ethical, Legal, and Reputational Risks

Unethical surveillance exposes organizations to reputational damage, legal disputes, and employee backlash. In the IT industry, where talent is highly mobile, perceived privacy violations can significantly harm employer branding and retention.

Organizations must therefore consider not only immediate productivity gains but also long-term ethical and strategic consequences.

Legal and Regulatory Context

While this paper focuses on ethics, legal frameworks increasingly shape surveillance practices. Data protection principles such as transparency, purpose limitation, and data minimization reflect ethical values embedded in regulation. Ethical organizations often go beyond minimum legal compliance to uphold employee trust and social responsibility.

Ethical Guidelines for Digital Surveillance

1. Principles for Responsible Surveillance

Ethical surveillance in hybrid IT workplaces should be guided by the following principles:

- **Transparency:** Clear communication about what is monitored and why
- **Proportionality:** Avoiding excessive or unnecessary monitoring
- **Employee Participation:** Involving employees in policy development
- **Purpose Limitation:** Restricting data use to defined objectives
- **Accountability:** Establishing oversight and review mechanisms

2. Trust-Based Alternatives

Organizations can complement limited surveillance with outcome-based performance metrics, regular feedback, and strong communication. Trust-based management fosters autonomy while maintaining accountability.

Discussion

The ethical challenges of digital surveillance reflect broader tensions between control and autonomy in

modern organizations. The IT industry, as both a developer and user of surveillance technologies, carries a unique ethical responsibility. Balancing productivity and privacy require thoughtful integration of ethical principles into organizational practice.

Conclusion

Hybrid work has reshaped the IT industry, offering flexibility while intensifying ethical challenges related to digital surveillance. This paper has demonstrated that while surveillance can support productivity, it poses significant risks to employee privacy, well-being, and trust when implemented unethically. By adopting transparent, proportional, and participatory approaches, organizations can balance productivity objectives with respect for employee dignity. Ethical surveillance is not merely a compliance issue but a strategic imperative for the future of hybrid work.

Acknowledgment

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to everyone who supported and guided me throughout the completion of this research on “Balancing Productivity and Employee Privacy: Ethical Challenges of Digital Surveillance in the IT Industry’s Hybrid Work Model.”

Financial support and sponsorship

Nil.

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

References

1. Allen, T. D., Golden, T. D., & Shockley, K. M. (2021). How effective is telecommuting? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(6), 1525–1543.
2. Aristotle. (2009). *Nicomachean ethics* (W. D. Ross, Trans.). Oxford University Press.
3. Kant, I. (1993). *Groundwork of the metaphysics of morals* (J. W. Ellington, Trans.). Hackett Publishing. (Original work published 1785)
4. Messenger, J. C., & Gschwind, L. (2016). Three generations of telework. *New Technology, Work and Employment*, 31(3), 195–208.
5. Mill, J. S. (1863). *Utilitarianism*. Parker, Son, and Bourn.
6. Bhawe, D. P., Teo, L. H., & Dalal, R. S. (2020). Privacy at work: A review and research agenda for a contested terrain. *Journal of Management*, 46(1), 127–164. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206319878254>
7. Ball, K. (2010). Workplace surveillance: An overview. *Labor History*, 51(1), 87–106. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00236561003654776>
8. Bélanger, F., & Crossler, R. E. (2011). Privacy in the digital age: A review of information privacy research in information systems. *MIS Quarterly*, 35(4), 1017–1041.
9. D’Cruz, P., & Noronha, E. (2016). Positives outweighing negatives: The experiences of Indian employees under electronic surveillance. *Human Relations*, 69(2), 329–353.
10. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726715589848>

11. Jeske, D., & Santuzzi, A. M. (2015). Monitoring what and how: Psychological implications of electronic performance monitoring. *New Technology, Work and Employment*, 30(1), 62–78.
12. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ntwe.12039>
13. Martin, K., & Freeman, R. E. (2004). The separation of technology and ethics in business ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 53(4), 353–364.
<https://doi.org/10.1023/B:BUSI.0000043496.96235.29>
14. Moore, P., Upchurch, M., & Whittaker, X. (2018). Humans and machines at work: Monitoring, surveillance and automation in contemporary capitalism. *Palgrave Macmillan*.
15. Parent-Rochelleau, X., & Parker, S. K. (2022). Algorithms as work designers: How algorithmic management influences the design of jobs. *Human Resource Management Review*, 32(2), 100838.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2021.100838>
16. Stanton, J. M., & Weiss, E. M. (2000). Electronic monitoring in their own words: An exploratory study of employees' experiences with new types of surveillance. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 16(4), 423–440.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0747-5632\(00\)00018-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0747-5632(00)00018-6)
17. Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. PublicAffairs.