National Research Journal of Human Resource Management
Volume No: 13, Issue No: 1, Year: 2026 (January-June)
PP: 9-20
ISSN: 2349-059X
Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal (IF: 7.25)
Journal Website www.nrjhrm.in

UNDER DIGITAL WATCH: VALIDATING A SCALE OF FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Mandeep Kaur

Research Scholar, Goswami Ganesh Dutta Sanatan Dharma College, Chandigarh

Monica Sachdeva

Associate Professor, Goswami Ganesh Dutta Sanatan Dharma College, Chandigarh

ABSTRACT

Electronic surveillance technologies have become increasingly prevalent in higher education institutions, yet empirically validated instruments for measuring faculty surveillance perceptions remain limited. This study presents a rigorous psychometric development and validation of the Electronic Surveillance Perception Scale (ESPS), 19-item instrument measuring faculty perceptions of electronic monitoring in academic environments. Following systematic scale development procedures encompassing a pilot study (n = 130) and main validation study (n = 520), exploratory factor analysis identified a robust four-factor structure: Perceived Surveillance Appropriateness (6 items, $\alpha = 0.872$), Perceived Invasion of Privacy (4 items, $\alpha = 0.883$), Perceived Surveillance Effectiveness (3 items, $\alpha = 0.887$), and Perceived Task Disruption (6 items, $\alpha = 0.905$) (Zweig & Webster, 2002; Samaranayake & Gamage, 2012). Confirmatory factor analysis with the main sample (n = 520) validated the hypothesized model with excellent fit indices ($\chi^2/df = 2.695$, RMSEA = 0.047, CFI = 0.963, TLI = 0.956) (Brown, 2015; Hu & Bentler, 1999). All factor loadings exceeded 0.50 (range: 0.571–0.970), with composite reliability values ranging from 0.856 to 0.886 (Raykov, 1997). Average Variance Extracted exceeded 0.50 for all dimensions, and discriminant validity was established with interconstruct correlations ranging from 0.176 to 0.487 (Chin, 1998). The validated ESPS provides educational researchers and administrators with a theoretically grounded, psychometrically sound instrument for assessing faculty surveillance perceptions in academic workplace environments.

Keywords: electronic surveillance, scale validation, higher education, faculty perceptions, factor analysis, psychometric measurement, workplace monitoring

1. INTRODUCTION

Electronic surveillance technologies have become ubiquitous in higher education institutions, with administrators implementing diverse monitoring systems including biometric attendance tracking, closed-circuit television (CCTV) monitoring, digital communication surveillance, and internet usage monitoring to enhance institutional accountability and security (Ball, 2010). Despite this proliferation, substantial gaps persist in the empirical literature regarding validated measurement instruments designed specifically to assess how faculty experience and interpret electronic monitoring systems within educational contexts (Jeske & Santuzzi, 2015).

The measurement challenge becomes particularly acute when considering that existing surveillance perception instruments often focus on singular dimensions or have been developed in organizational contexts substantially different from academic settings (Furnham & Swami, 2015). Higher education institutions operate within distinctive organizational cultures emphasizing faculty autonomy, intellectual freedom, and academic independence

ISSN: 2349-059X
Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal (IF: 7.25)
Journal Website www.nrjhrm.in

(Martin & Freeman, 2003). Electronic monitoring creates potential tensions with these fundamental academic values, yet these nuances are inadequately captured by generic workplace surveillance instruments (Jeske & Santuzzi, 2015).

1.1 Theoretical Foundations for Surveillance Perception

Stanton's (2000) seminal framework identifies four critical dimensions influencing employee responses to workplace monitoring: invasiveness, utility, fairness, and legitimacy. This comprehensive theoretical model emphasizes that surveillance perception operates across multiple psychological and organizational dimensions rather than representing a unidimensional construct (Stanton, 2000). Ball's (2010) analysis emphasizes relational and cultural dimensions of monitoring practices, highlighting how surveillance systems alter workplace dynamics and affect trust relationships between employees and management. These theoretical foundations suggest that surveillance perceptions are fundamentally multidimensional, requiring comprehensive measurement approaches that capture the complexity of employee responses (Zweig & Webster, 2002).

Jeske and Santuzzi (2015) extend this theoretical understanding by documenting the psychological implications of different types of electronic performance monitoring, distinguishing between monitoring systems that track what employees do versus monitoring systems that track how employees do their work. Their research confirms that the dimensionality of surveillance perception varies depending on both the type of monitoring technology employed and the organizational context within which monitoring occurs (Jeske & Santuzzi, 2015).

1.2 Gap in Higher Education Surveillance Research

While surveillance perceptions have been examined in corporate and manufacturing contexts, the specific educational context presents distinctive characteristics requiring tailored measurement approaches (Furnham & Swami, 2015). Faculty within higher education settings operate with different expectations regarding autonomy, privacy, and professional judgment compared to employees in conventional organizational hierarchies (Martin & Freeman, 2003). The teaching and research functions central to academic work may be differentially affected by surveillance compared to production or service work contexts (Furnham & Swami, 2015).

Research addressing workplace surveillance in educational settings remains sparse, despite the increasing prevalence of electronic monitoring in colleges and universities (Jeske & Santuzzi, 2015). Furnham and Swami (2015) note that surveillance perception research has concentrated heavily on technology sector and industrial settings, with limited investigation of education-specific contexts. This research gap limits both theoretical understanding of surveillance impacts in academic environments and practical guidance for educational administrators implementing monitoring systems.

1.3 Research Objectives and Contributions

This research addresses critical measurement gaps by systematically developing and validating a context-specific instrument designed for higher education settings. The Electronic Surveillance Perception Scale provides educators and researchers with an empirically validated tool for assessing faculty surveillance perceptions, contributing to both surveillance theory advancement in educational contexts and evidence-based organizational decision-making regarding surveillance implementation (Ball, 2010; Samaranayake & Gamage, 2012).

ISSN: 2349-059X
Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal (IF: 7.25)
Journal Website www.nrjhrm.in

The primary objectives of this study are:

1. To adapt and culturally contextualize the Electronic Surveillance Perceptions Scale from Samaranayake and Gamage (2012) for application in Indian higher education contexts through systematic forward–backward translation and expert review procedures
2. To conduct comprehensive psychometric validation encompassing exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis with rigorous evaluation of scale dimensionality, reliability, and validity (Raykov, 1997)
3. To assess convergent and discriminant validity of identified dimensions through comprehensive validity testing procedures (Chin, 1998)
4. To provide educational researchers and administrators with an empirically validated, context-appropriate instrument for measuring faculty surveillance perceptions in academic workplace environments

2. SCALE DEVELOPMENT AND METHODOLOGY

2.1 Theoretical Framework and Scale Selection

The ESPS was adapted from Samaranayake and Gamage's (2012) Electronic Surveillance Perceptions Scale, originally developed for software professionals in Sri Lanka. The original instrument encompassed six theoretical dimensions: Perceived Level of Infringement (2 items), Perceived Relevance to Work (2 items), Perceived Rationale of Employer (2 items), Perceived Invasion of Privacy (4 items), Personal Judgment of Effectiveness (3 items), and Perceived Task Satisfaction (3 items) (Samaranayake & Gamage, 2012).

The selection of this instrument as a foundation was based on several theoretical considerations. First, the original scale represented a comprehensive multidimensional conceptualization of surveillance perception grounded in organizational psychology and surveillance studies literature (Samaranayake & Gamage, 2012). Second, the instrument had demonstrated acceptable psychometric properties in its original context, providing a reliable starting point for cultural adaptation (Samaranayake & Gamage, 2012). Third, the theoretical dimensions aligned with established surveillance perception frameworks, particularly Stanton's (2000) conceptualization of surveillance invasiveness, utility, fairness, and legitimacy.

2.2 Cultural and Contextual Adaptation Procedures

Following established protocols for cross-cultural scale adaptation, the instrument underwent systematic modification to enhance appropriateness for Indian higher education contexts (DeVellis and Thorpe, 2021). Adaptation procedures included:

Translation Protocol: Forward translation from English to Hindi was conducted by bilingual experts with fluency in both English academic terminology and Hindi equivalents. Independent back-translation to English was performed by translators naive to the original instrument, ensuring equivalence of meaning across translations (DeVellis and Thorpe, 2021).

Expert Panel Review: A panel of five experts with expertise in surveillance research, organizational psychology, and higher education assessment reviewed all items for cultural appropriateness, linguistic clarity, and relevance to Indian educational contexts. The panel evaluated whether items accurately captured intended constructs while maintaining cultural

ISSN: 2349-059X
Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal (IF: 7.25)
Journal Website www.nrjhrm.in

sensitivity and avoiding language patterns unfamiliar to Indian college teachers (DeVellis and Thorpe, 2021).

Content Validity Assessment: Content validity was assessed using the Content Validity Ratio (CVR) index, with individual items requiring CVR > 0.62 to demonstrate adequate agreement among expert judges (DeVellis and Thorpe, 2021). This procedure ensured that retained items demonstrated sufficient expert consensus regarding appropriateness and relevance for the target population.

Modification of Context-Specific Terminology: References to information technology–specific terminology in the original instrument were systematically replaced with higher education–appropriate language. For example, original items referencing "software development tasks" were recontextualized to refer to "teaching and research activities" (Samaranayake & Gamage, 2012). This terminological adaptation maintained theoretical consistency while improving comprehensibility for academic audiences (DeVellis and Thorpe, 2021).

2.3 Pilot Study: Sample Characteristics and Procedures

A comprehensive pilot study was conducted with 130 college teachers from higher education institutions across North India (Chandigarh, Delhi, Haryana, and Punjab). Pilot sample demographics included:

Demographic Distribution:

- Gender: 80% female and 20% male
- Age: 21–30 years (11.5%), 31–40 years (46.9%), 41–50 years (28.5%), and ≥50 years (13.1%)
- Educational attainment: Doctoral degrees (64.6%), postgraduate qualifications (28.5%), and other credentials (7%)
- Work experience: 1–10 years (41.5%), 10–20 years (43.8%), and >20 years (14.6%)

All participants reported exposure to electronic surveillance measures in their workplace environments, including biometric attendance systems, CCTV monitoring, internet usage tracking, or digital communication monitoring.

Pilot Study Reliability Analysis: Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients for the pilot study revealed acceptable internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.84$) for the Electronic Surveillance Perceptions scale, indicating adequate item intercorrelation and suitability for proceeding to confirmatory validation procedures (Alder, 2001). These preliminary reliability estimates provided confidence in instrument performance before initiating full-scale validation with the main study sample.

2.4 Main Study: Sample and Data Collection

Main Study Sample: Data for primary validation analyses were collected from 520 college teachers across higher education institutions in North India. The main sample substantially exceeded the pilot study ($n = 130$), providing enhanced statistical power and generalizability for confirmatory factor analysis and validity assessment procedures (DeVellis and Thorpe, 2021).

Inclusion Criteria: Participants included full-time and part-time faculty members across various academic disciplines who met the following criteria: (1) current employment as a college teacher in designated geographic regions; (2) documented exposure to electronic

ISSN: 2349-059X
Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal (IF: 7.25)
Journal Website www.nrjhrm.in

surveillance systems in their workplace; (3) minimum six months employment experience in their current position; and (4) voluntary informed consent to participate (DeVellis and Thorpe, 2021).

Data Collection Procedures: Questionnaires were administered using mixed methods including both online survey platforms and in-person administration to maximize response rates and accommodate faculty scheduling flexibility. All participants received comprehensive information regarding study purpose, confidentiality measures, and voluntary participation, with informed consent obtained prior to questionnaire completion.

2.5 Psychometric Validation Procedures

Comprehensive psychometric validation encompassed two primary phases: exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) (Fabrigar et al., 1999; Raykov, 1997).

Exploratory Factor Analysis Protocol:

Exploratory factor analysis employed Principal Component Analysis with Varimax rotation following established procedures (Fabrigar et al., 1999). Data suitability assessment included:

- Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy (> 0.60 threshold) (Kaiser, 1974)
- Bartlett's test of sphericity confirming factor analysis appropriateness ($p < 0.001$) (Kaiser, 1974)
- Communality evaluation assessing item variance explanation

Factor retention criteria employed multiple convergent indicators (Fabrigar et al., 1999):

- Eigenvalue thresholds (> 1.0) for initial factor identification
- Scree plot examination for optimal factor determination
- Theoretical coherence assessment evaluating whether extracted factors aligned with surveillance perception literature

Confirmatory Factor Analysis Protocol:

Confirmatory factor analysis employed AMOS software with maximum likelihood estimation to test hypothesized factor structures identified through exploratory analysis (Brown, 2015). Model fit assessment criteria included (DeVellis, 2017; Brown, 2015; Hu & Bentler, 1999):

- Chi-square/df ratio (values 1–3 indicating excellent fit, < 5 acceptable)
- Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA; < 0.06 good fit, < 0.08 acceptable)
- Comparative Fit Index (CFI; > 0.95 excellent, > 0.90 acceptable)
- Tucker–Lewis Index (TLI; > 0.95 excellent, > 0.90 acceptable)

Convergent and Discriminant Validity Assessment:

Convergent validity was assessed through factor loadings (> 0.50) and Average Variance Extracted (AVE > 0.50) (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988). Discriminant validity was evaluated using the criterion that square root of AVE for each factor should exceed interconstruct correlations (Chin, 1998). Composite Reliability values were calculated to assess internal consistency of scale dimensions (Raykov, 1997).

ISSN: 2349-059X
Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal (IF: 7.25)
Journal Website www.nrjhrm.in

3. RESULTS

3.1 Exploratory Factor Analysis Results

Data Suitability Assessment. The ESPS demonstrated excellent suitability for factor analysis with KMO = 0.857 (substantially exceeding the minimum threshold of 0.60) and Bartlett's test of Sphericity $\chi^2 = 3101.543$ ($df = 171$, $p < 0.001$) (Kaiser, 1974). These results confirmed the dataset's appropriateness for factor analysis.

Factor Structure and Variance Explanation. Exploratory factor analysis identified a robust four-factor structure explaining 70.459% of total variance (Hair et al., 2010). Four components demonstrated eigenvalues exceeding 1.0: Component 1 (37.246%), Component 2 (14.330%, cumulative 51.576%), Component 3 (10.485%, cumulative 62.061%), and Component 4 (8.398%, cumulative 70.459%). Communalities analysis demonstrated adequate factor explanation, with extraction values ranging from 0.538 (Discomfort with Constant Surveillance) to 0.889 (Perception of Monitoring as Unfair/Unethical) (Kline, 2016).

Rotated Factor Structure and Item Loadings. Varimax rotation with Kaiser normalization yielded a clear four-factor structure demonstrating minimal cross-loadings:

Factor 1: Perceived Task Disruption (6 items, α = 0.905). This dimension measured perceived negative impacts of surveillance on work performance and task complexity (Zweig & Webster, 2002). Factor loadings ranged from 0.654 to 0.956, including: Surveillance Hindering Job Performance (λ = 0.893), Task Complexity Due to Surveillance (λ = 0.840), and Surveillance as Task Burden (λ = 0.795). This factor reflects faculty concerns regarding surveillance interference with academic work efficiency and performance, representing a key concern in educational contexts where teaching and research quality depend on unobstructed professional judgment.

Factor 2: Perceived Surveillance Appropriateness (6 items, α = 0.872). This dimension captured cognitive judgments regarding surveillance reasonableness and organizational necessity, combining elements from the original infringement, relevance, and rationale dimensions (Zweig & Webster, 2002). Factor loadings ranged from 0.571 to 0.970, including: Lack of Understanding of Surveillance Purpose (λ = 0.900) and Unacceptability of Being Monitored (λ = 0.797). This factor represents faculty assessment of whether surveillance practices align with organizational mission and whether management has provided adequate justification for monitoring implementation.

Factor 3: Perceived Invasion of Privacy (4 items, α = 0.883). This dimension measured privacy concerns and ethical considerations related to electronic monitoring (Zweig & Webster, 2002). Factor loadings ranged from 0.737 to 0.967, including: Perception of Monitoring as Unfair/Unethical (λ = 0.869) and Privacy Concerns Affecting Well-being (λ = 0.852). This factor captures fundamental privacy concerns regarding surveillance intrusiveness and ethical implications of electronic monitoring systems.

Factor 4: Perceived Surveillance Effectiveness (3 items, α = 0.887). This dimension evaluated faculty beliefs about surveillance utility and legitimacy for organizational purposes (Zweig & Webster, 2002). Factor loadings ranged from 0.735 to 0.955, including: Acceptance of Monitoring Due to Lack of Trust (λ = 0.918) and Legitimacy of Employer Monitoring (λ = 0.867). This factor reflects faculty judgments regarding whether surveillance systems achieve intended organizational objectives and the appropriateness of monitoring for institutional purposes.

ISSN: 2349-059X
Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal (IF: 7.25)
Journal Website www.nrjhrm.in

3.2 Factor Structure Transformation: Original Six-Factor to Final Four-Factor Model

The transformation from the original six-factor model to the final four-factor structure represents significant theoretical insight regarding how surveillance perception reorganizes in different organizational contexts (Zweig & Webster, 2002). Specifically:

- The original three dimensions of "Perceived Infringement," "Perceived Relevance to Work," and "Perceived Rationale of Employer" merged into a single "Perceived Surveillance Appropriateness" factor in the empirically derived model (Zweig & Webster, 2002)
- The original "Perceived Task Satisfaction" dimension was reconceptualized as "Perceived Task Disruption," reflecting faculty emphasis on surveillance's negative impacts on work efficiency rather than positive contribution to job satisfaction (Zweig & Webster, 2002)

This reconceptualization reflects distinctive features of academic work environments and suggests fundamental differences between educational and corporate contexts in how surveillance impacts are conceptualized and experienced by employees (Zweig & Webster, 2002).

3.3 Confirmatory Factor Analysis Results

Model Fit Assessment. Confirmatory factor analysis of the hypothesized four-factor model demonstrated excellent fit. Chi-square goodness-of-fit test yielded χ^2 (144) = 388.144 (p < 0.001), with CMIN/DF = 2.695 (less than 3, indicating acceptable fit) (Brown, 2015). Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) = 0.047 remained within the acceptable range of ≤0.05, indicating minimal discrepancy between hypothesized and observed covariance matrices (Hu & Bentler, 1999).

Absolute fit indices demonstrated strong model adequacy: Goodness of Fit Index (GFI) = 0.928 and Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index (AGFI) = 0.906, both exceeding the 0.90 threshold (Hu & Bentler, 1999). Incremental fit indices revealed Comparative Fit Index (CFI) = 0.963 and Tucker–Lewis Index (TLI) = 0.956, substantially exceeding the 0.90 criterion, indicating that the hypothesized model represents a substantial improvement over a null baseline model (Brown, 2015). Parsimonious fit indices (PGFI = 0.704, PNFI = 0.793) demonstrated adequate model parsimony.

Convergent Validity Assessment. All 19 scale items demonstrated standardized factor loadings exceeding 0.50 (range: 0.571–0.970), with critical ratios greater than 1.96 and p-values < 0.001, confirming significant item–construct correlations (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). This comprehensive pattern of strong factor loadings provides strong evidence of convergent validity, indicating that all items effectively measure their intended underlying constructs (Fornell & Larcker, 1981).

Average Variance Extracted for all dimensions exceeded 0.50: Perceived Surveillance Appropriateness (AVE = 0.507), Perceived Task Disruption (AVE = 0.567), Perceived Invasion of Privacy (AVE = 0.635), and Perceived Surveillance Effectiveness (AVE = 0.671), demonstrating strong convergent validity and confirming that more variance in items is explained by their underlying factors than by measurement error (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988).

Discriminant Validity Assessment. Square root of Average Variance Extracted for each dimension exceeded correlations with all other dimensions: Perceived Surveillance Appropriateness (√AVE = 0.712), Perceived Task Disruption (√AVE = 0.753), Perceived

ISSN: 2349-059X
Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal (IF: 7.25)
Journal Website www.nrjhrm.in

Invasion of Privacy (√AVE = 0.797), and Perceived Surveillance Effectiveness (√AVE = 0.819) (Chin, 1998). Interconstruct correlations ranged from 0.176 to 0.487, all substantially below the √AVE values, confirming adequate discriminant validity and demonstrating that the four factors represent meaningfully distinct constructs rather than redundant measures (Chin, 1998).

Reliability Assessment. Composite Reliability values demonstrated strong internal consistency: Perceived Surveillance Appropriateness (CR = 0.856), Perceived Task Disruption (CR = 0.886), Perceived Invasion of Privacy (CR = 0.873), and Perceived Surveillance Effectiveness (CR = 0.858), all exceeding the 0.70 threshold and indicating acceptable to excellent reliability (Raykov, 1997). Cronbach's alpha coefficients (range: 0.872–0.905) confirmed these reliability estimates. The overall scale demonstrated excellent reliability (Cronbach's α = 0.892, CR = 0.869, AVE = 0.595), indicating strong internal consistency across all items (Raykov, 1997).

Psychometric Summary Table:

Dimensions	Items	Cronbach's α	CR	AVE
Perceived Surveillance Appropriateness	6	0.872	0.856	0.507
Perceived Task Disruption	6	0.905	0.886	0.567
Perceived Invasion of Privacy	4	0.883	0.873	0.635
Perceived Surveillance Effectiveness	3	0.887	0.858	0.671
Overall ESPS	**19**	**0.892**	**0.869**	**0.595**

Table 1: Reliability and Validity Coefficients for the Electronic Surveillance Perception Scale (*n* = 520)

4. DISCUSSION

4.1 Theoretical Contributions

This research advances surveillance theory through empirical identification and validation of a four-dimensional structure for electronic surveillance perceptions in higher education contexts, providing strong support for multidimensional theoretical frameworks (Zweig & Webster, 2002; Stanton, 2000). The empirically derived dimensions align with established conceptual frameworks, particularly Stanton's (2000) four-dimensional surveillance perception model, while extending theoretical understanding through rigorous psychometric validation in academic settings.

The transformation from the original six-factor to four-factor structure represents a significant theoretical contribution, demonstrating how surveillance perceptions reorganize in different organizational and cultural contexts (Zweig & Webster, 2002). The merging of infringement, relevance, and rationale dimensions into "Perceived Surveillance Appropriateness" suggests faculty tend to holistically evaluate surveillance systems based on overall reasonableness rather than treating these as separate concerns (Zweig & Webster, 2002). This finding has important implications for surveillance policy communication and management in educational institutions, suggesting that management efforts should address overall surveillance justification and transparency rather than attempting to persuade faculty regarding isolated technical aspects of monitoring systems.

ISSN: 2349-059X
Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal (IF: 7.25)
Journal Website www.nrjhrm.in

The reconceptualization of "Task Satisfaction" as "Task Disruption" represents a fundamental theoretical shift, indicating that surveillance impact in educational contexts is perceived primarily through its interference with professional autonomy and teaching effectiveness rather than its contribution to job satisfaction (Zweig & Webster, 2002). This finding reflects distinctive features of academic work environments where faculty autonomy constitutes a core professional value (Martin & Freeman, 2003). Faculty are likely to perceive surveillance through a lens of task hindrance rather than task facilitation, contrasting with employment contexts where efficiency improvements from monitoring might be more apparent (Zweig & Webster, 2002; Stanton, 2000).

4.2 Methodological Contributions

This research demonstrates that rigorous psychometric validation in educational contexts yields meaningful measurement instruments distinct from generic workplace instruments (Creswell, 2017). The systematic two-phase validation approach combining exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis with a comprehensive main study sample (n = 520) provides a replicable methodological template for future educational measurement research (DeVellis and Thorpe, 2021). The successful cross-cultural adaptation from a Sri Lankan information technology context to Indian higher education settings illustrates the feasibility of instrument adaptation across diverse cultural and organizational contexts when proper validation procedures are employed (Chin, 1998; DeVellis and Thorpe, 2021).

The use of both exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis with distinct sample sizes (pilot n = 130, main n = 520) represents best practices in scale validation, ensuring that factor structure identification and hypothesis testing rely on appropriate analytical approaches (DeVellis and Thorpe, 2021). The substantial main study sample size (n = 520) provides enhanced statistical power for confirmatory analyses and increases generalizability of findings to broader college teacher populations in similar geographic and cultural contexts (DeVellis and Thorpe, 2021).

4.3 Practical Applications and Implications

The validated ESPS enables educational administrators to systematically assess faculty surveillance perceptions prior to surveillance system implementation or following modifications to monitoring practices (Alder, 2001). Pre-implementation assessment provides empirical baseline data for understanding faculty concerns and identifying areas requiring enhanced communication or policy modification before system deployment (Alder, 2001).

The four-dimensional structure provides actionable guidance for organizational communication strategies. Effective surveillance communication should address multiple distinct concerns: appropriateness justification (providing clear rationale and transparency), privacy protection assurance (demonstrating surveillance necessity and limitations), effectiveness explanation (articulating how surveillance supports institutional objectives), and task facilitation demonstration (minimizing surveillance disruption of core academic work) (Zweig & Webster, 2002; Alder, 2001).

The ESPS's robust psychometric properties position it as a reliable instrument for organizational evaluation and longitudinal research (Rich et al., 2010). Educational institutions can employ the scale to: track surveillance perception trajectories following system implementation, evaluate transparency initiative effectiveness, identify institutional factors moderating faculty responses to monitoring systems, and support evidence-based decision-making regarding surveillance technology adoption (Rich et al., 2010).

ISSN: 2349-059X
Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal (IF: 7.25)
Journal Website www.nrjhrm.in

4.4 Limitations and Future Research Directions

Sample Characteristics Limitations: This study focused on college teachers in North India, potentially limiting cross-cultural generalizability. While the regional sample provides contextual authenticity for Indian educational settings, future research should validate the ESPS in diverse geographic regions, other nations, and alternative educational levels (secondary education, university settings) to establish cross-cultural validity and extend applicability (Stanton, 2000).

Gender Skewing: The pilot study sample included 80% female teachers, which may not reflect gender distribution across all higher education institutions. Future research should examine whether surveillance perceptions vary systematically by gender and whether gender differences emerge in larger, more gender-balanced samples (Stanton, 2000).

Longitudinal Investigations: This study employed cross-sectional design, providing snapshot assessment of surveillance perceptions at a single time point. Longitudinal research examining surveillance perception trajectories following system implementation would illuminate whether concerns stabilize or intensify over time, providing valuable data for predicting long-term surveillance impacts on faculty well-being and organizational functioning (Stanton, 2000).

Relationship to Organizational Outcomes: Structural equation modeling investigating relationships between ESPS dimensions and organizational outcomes including job satisfaction, organizational commitment, employee engagement, and occupational stress would extend theoretical understanding of surveillance–employee dynamics in academic settings (Stanton, 2000; Rich et al., 2010).

Institutional Context Factors: Future research should investigate moderating institutional variables including surveillance transparency practices, faculty participation in surveillance policy development, and institutional culture dimensions to identify factors that influence whether surveillance generates faculty acceptance or resistance (Alder, 2001).

4.5 Practical Recommendations for Educational Administrators

Based on the four-factor structure identified through this research, educational administrators implementing or modifying surveillance systems should consider:

1. **Establishing Clear Surveillance Rationale:** Develop comprehensive communication explaining surveillance necessity, scope, and intended benefits for institutional functioning. This addresses the Perceived Surveillance Appropriateness dimension and provides faculty understanding of management rationale (Zweig & Webster, 2002; Alder, 2001).
2. **Implementing Privacy Protections:** Establish clear policies regarding data access, storage, and use limitations. Communicate how surveillance data will be protected and demonstrate that monitoring is proportional to stated institutional objectives. This addresses the Perceived Invasion of Privacy dimension (Zweig & Webster, 2002; Alder, 2001).
3. **Demonstrating Surveillance Effectiveness:** Provide periodic reports documenting how surveillance contributes to institutional objectives, security enhancements, or legitimate administrative needs. This addresses the Perceived Surveillance Effectiveness dimension (Zweig & Webster, 2002; Alder, 2001).
4. **Minimizing Task Disruption:** Design surveillance systems to minimize interference with core academic work while addressing legitimate institutional concerns. Consider

ISSN: 2349-059X
Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal (IF: 7.25)
Journal Website www.nrjhrm.in

faculty workflow and teaching/research processes in system design. This addresses the Perceived Task Disruption dimension (Zweig & Webster, 2002; Alder, 2001).

5. CONCLUSION

This research successfully developed and validated a comprehensive, psychometrically sound measurement instrument for assessing electronic surveillance perceptions in higher education contexts. The comprehensive validation process involving both pilot study (n = 130) and main validation study (n = 520) resulted in the Electronic Surveillance Perception Scale demonstrating strong psychometric properties across all validity and reliability indicators (Brown, 2015; Chin, 1998; Raykov, 1997).

The four-dimensional ESPS provides strong empirical support for multidimensional theoretical frameworks, challenging unidimensional conceptualizations of workplace monitoring perceptions (Zweig & Webster, 2002; Stanton, 2000). The validated instrument addresses critical gaps in surveillance research methodology while providing educational administrators with evidence-based assessment tools for organizational decision-making (Ball, 2010; Alder, 2001; Rich et al., 2010).

The Electronic Surveillance Perception Scale contributes both to advancing surveillance theory in educational contexts and to supporting evidence-based organizational decision-making regarding surveillance implementation and management in academic institutions (Alder, 2001; Rich et al., 2010). As electronic surveillance technologies continue to proliferate in higher education settings, these validated measurement tools enable systematic, rigorous investigation of surveillance impacts on faculty perceptions and well-being in educational settings (Ball, 2010; Rich et al., 2010). The instrument is now available for educational researchers and administrators conducting surveillance perception research or implementing surveillance systems in college and university contexts.

REFERENCES

1. Alder, G. S. (2001). Employee reactions to electronic performance monitoring: A consequence of organizational culture. *The journal of high technology management research*, *12*(2), 323-342.
2. Alder, G. S., & Ambrose, M. L. (2005). An examination of the effect of computerized performance monitoring feedback on monitoring fairness, performance, and satisfaction. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *97*(2), 161-177.
3. Anderson, J. C., & Gerbing, D. W. (1988). Structural equation modeling in practice: A review and recommended two-step approach. *Psychological bulletin*, *103*(3), 411.
4. Ball, K. (2010). Workplace surveillance: An overview. *Labor History*, *51*(1), 87-106.
5. Brown, T. A. (2015). *Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research*. Guilford publications.
6. Chin, W. W. (1998). The partial least squares approach to structural equation modeling. In *Modern methods for business research* (pp. 295-336). Psychology Press.
7. Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage publications.
8. DeVellis, R. F., & Thorpe, C. T. (2021). *Scale development: Theory and applications*. Sage publications.

ISSN: 2349-059X
Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal (IF: 7.25)
Journal Website www.nrjhrm.in

9. Fabrigar, L. R., Wegener, D. T., MacCallum, R. C., & Strahan, E. J. (1999). Evaluating the use of exploratory factor analysis in psychological research. *Psychological methods*, *4*(3), 272.
10. Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of marketing research*, *18*(1), 39-50.
11. Furnham, A., & Swami, V. (2015). An Investigation of Attitudes toward Surveillance at Work and Its Correlates. Psychology, 6, 1668-1675.
12. Hair Jr, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). Multivariate data analysis. In *Multivariate data analysis* (pp. 785-785).
13. Hu, L. T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural equation modeling: a multidisciplinary journal*, *6*(1), 1-55.
14. 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.
15. Kaiser, H. F. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *psychometrika*, *39*(1), 31-36.
16. Kline, R. B. (2016). Principles and practice of structural equation modeling.
17. Martin, K., & Freeman, R. E. (2003). Some problems with employee monitoring. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *43*(4), 353-361.
18. Raykov, T. (1997). Estimation of composite reliability for congeneric measures. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, *21*(2), 173-184.
19. Rich, B. L., Lepine, J. A., & Crawford, E. R. (2010). Job engagement: Antecedents and effects on job performance. *Academy of management journal*, *53*(3), 617-635.
20. Samaranayake, V., & Gamage, C. (2012). Employee perception towards electronic monitoring at work place and its impact on job satisfaction of software professionals in Sri Lanka. *Telematics and Informatics*, *29*(2), 233-244.
21. Stanton, J. M. (2000). Reactions to employee performance monitoring: Framework, review, and research directions. *Human Performance*, *13*(1), 85-113.
22. Zweig, D., & Webster, J. (2002). Where is the line between benign and invasive? An examination of psychological barriers to the acceptance of awareness monitoring systems. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, *23*(5), 605-633.