WORK (CYBER) BULLYİNG, POWER IMBALANCES AND VİCTİMİZATİON: A REVİEW ON PANOPTİC METAPHOR AND EMPLOYEE SURVEİLLANCE İN INDİAN WORKPLACES[1]

Dr. Jijo James Indiparambil
Sanjo College of Management and Advanced Studies (SCMAS)
Rajakkad, Kerala, India

Abstract

The dominant interpretation of electronic surveillance in the workplace focusing mainly on the invasion of privacy does not give sufficient explanation of its various and nuanced underpinnings and other adverse effects. Likewise, harassment or bullying in the workplace has been at the forefront of major concerns of organizations and employees for several decades and is currently more prevalent and opaque. Combining these two factors and through a methodical revisit of the metaphor of the Panopticon, this paper aims to examine its relevance for the analysis of modern electronic surveillance used in the workplace, and sparks discussion around the issue of workplace bullying and the consequent control mechanism, power imbalances and victimization, with a special focus and application on Indian scenario. This research exposes the unfair and unjustifiable victimization of workplace bullying by going beyond Foucault's concept of "disciplinary society," according to which persons are "normalized" by their categorical locations, as well as beyond Deleuze's argument of "society of control," where people are forced to live in circumscribed parameters. It is an exploratory research that follows an analytic research methodology of theoretical analysis (literature reviews) and critical discourse analysis. Persistent victimization is relayed as a co-existent phenomenon of workplace bullying.

Key words: Panopticon, employee surveillance, power control, power imbalances, workplace bullying, cyber bullying, employee victimization

Introduction

This is "the era of the great global optic" (Virilio 2002: 110) and digital persons. As societies, today, vehemently use the monitoring systems to control its citizens in every walk of life –workplaces, institutions, shopping markets, personal and occupational use of computers and internet, streets, vehicles, etc. – broadcasting the safety and security, individuals now crave to trace the surveillance tendencies of these disciplinarian societies. Workplace is a major locus of human life where monitoring and surveillance systems and mechanisms are extensively implemented establishing legal grounds for it. Analysing the modern tendencies of surveillance and the related power control, Michel Foucault used the metaphor of panopticon as a way to elucidate the inclination of disciplinary societies to subjugate its citizens. An orientation towards Foucault's understanding of discipline and the panopticon enables the theorization and the proper understanding of various nuances of workplace surveillance practices. Hence, this

---

[1] This study was presented at the TARAS SHEVCHENKO 6th INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS ON SOCIAL SCIENCES, April 4-5, 2021, Kyiv, Ukraine.

paper will discuss the metaphor of panopticon and the consequent workplace bullying and its subsequent control mechanism and power imbalances of contemporary workplace surveillance in India. It is an exploratory research that follows an analytic research methodology of theoretical analysis (literature reviews) and critical discourse analysis. It first argues and illustrates that Foucaultian thesis of power control must take into consideration the contemporary ever networked aspects of information and communication technologies in an attempt to explain the employee surveillance and its effects. The concepts of power control, workplace and cyber bullying and the consequent victimization are respectively analysed in the second and third phase of this research.

The Metaphor of Panopticon and the Derivation of Control Mechanism

The word panopticon derives from the Greek word *panoptes* meaning, "all seeing" (Briskin 1998). The English philosopher and social theorist Jeremy Bentham first proposed the metaphor of the panopticon in relation to watch and control the people in a prison. A panopticon, initially an architectural design, is a prison built so radially that a guard at a central position can see all the prisoners. This design allowed for the observation of a large number of prisoners from a central location without their knowledge of when and how often they were being watched. The aim of a panopticon is to sanction constant surveillance of all the inmates in a prison. Bentham emphasizes the totality of observation through this architectural form because he visualized and later observed that an unobserved space always encourages unregulated behaviour (Bentham 1962). Hence, he writes that "cells, communications, outlets, approaches, there ought not anywhere to be a single foot square, on which man or boy shall be able to plant himself – no not for a moment – under any assurance of not being observed. Leave but a single spot thus unguarded, that spot will be sure to be a lurking-place for the most reprobate of the prisoners, and the scene of all sorts of forbidden practices" (Bentham 1962, 86).

Michel Foucault uses this metaphor of the panopticon in his theory of surveillance (Foucault 1997). For, some of the frameworks that have emerged in tandem with electronic monitoring are, potentially and actually, linked to this paradigm. According to Foucault, "There is no need for arms, physical violence, material constraints. Just a gaze. An inspecting gaze, a gaze which each individual under its weight will end by interiorising to the point that he is his own overseer, each individual thus exercising this surveillance over, and against, himself. A superb formula: power exercised continuously and for what turns out to be a minimal cost" (Foucault, 1980: 155). Foucault, referring to the panopticon metaphor, tries to show how our contemporary society is structured as this kind of surveillance system. He states that we now live in the panoptic machine: "We are neither in the amphitheatre, nor on the stage, but in the panoptic machine, invested by its effects of power, which we bring to ourselves since we are part of its mechanism" (Foucault 1997, 217).And he calls it as assuring automatic functioning of power.

Using the metaphor of the panopticon to study any modern practices of monitoring and surveillance underlines the increased capabilities of modern observers or watchers to procure more power or domination over the observed or the watched (Manokha 2018). The capacity of intrusion and the consequent breaching of individual life is enhanced through the application

of the advanced surveillance technologies leading to establish power as domination. Researchers on the subject elucidates and illustrates this power control through various nuanced interpretations, such as the erected means of a structure of domination and controlling masses of people, and even the most efficient and totalitarian form of power that for a normal individual hardest to resist (Manokha 2018; Allmer 2012; Fiske 1999; Poster 1990). The current prominent surveillance researcher, David Lyon, who interprets the profiling and social sorting nature of surveillance also emphasise it as the coercive control of power (Lyon 2003). It points to the fact that in the modern scenario of the organizational workplace, communication technologies allow for an even greater monitoring of its employees without any overt signs of surveillance (D'Urso 2006). Since, in this situation, people cannot determine when they are being watched, they are forced to act as if they are constantly viewed and scrutinized.

In this regard, a proper orientation toward Foucault's understanding of discipline and the panopticon will perfect the theorization of contemporary workplace surveillance practices. According to Thomas McMullan, monitoring employee behaviours and electronic communications from a central location becomes panoptic (McMullan 2015). Foucault also uses this idea of central inspection in his theory. A central inspection is possible through present CCTV implementation. The workers don't know whether they are being watched. McMullan compares the contemporary notion of visuality (digital and data-driven) with that of central tower concept of panopticon and conveys that this is being co-opted for the same exercise of power without intimating when is being watched (McMullan 2015). Certain parallels can be triggered within the panopticon design and the monitored workplace, that "the employment of Panoptic-like surveillance as an attempt to subjugate employees to the power of management [... which] often instils a sense of powerlessness and fear among the observed" (D'Urso 2006, 288).Besides, from the perspective of the observer, the desired outcome permits easier control of the observed. This pattern prompts employees feel they are isolated and secluded in their own environment of communication and action.

Workplace surveillance makes the use of power almost instinctive where employees are controlled, categorised, disciplined and normalised through electronic and other such mechanisms without any particular reason (Koskela 2003).The panoptic structure exposes the helplessness of individuals in the face of the overwhelming force of institutions such as workplaces to establish the terms of life within their boundaries (Simon 2005). This panoptic effect is generated through a suspicion of being always surveilled even in its absence. The scholarship will assume this effect from various concept from the writings of Foucault, such as the 'power of the gaze' as the power of the observers or the 'power over', 'power as repression', etc. (Manokha 2018). Within the modern workplace, it also looks for the extent of employee visibility and employer invisibility through the implementation of technology and the quantity and permanence of records and their analysis through its performance. In this regard, as Foucault rightly observes, "surveillance is permanent in its effects even if it is discontinuous in its action" (Foucault 1991, 201) in the workplace.

Information technology, which is broadly used in any work context today, intrinsically turns out to be surveillance technology when it is used "as a tool not just for work but for establishing and enforcing a particular kind of power relationship and for producing desired effects" (Botan 1996, 299). As a result, in the workplace, the desirable freedom of the

employees is restricted, and strain and stress is placed on the relationship between the employer and the employee. The panoptic surveillance is said to enlarge the increased uncertainty and reduced workplace communication. Greg Elmer further illustrates, likewise, an all-seeing gaze of electronic and non-electronic technologies is marked in the workplaces, which is yet masked and therefore at once visible and invisible. This situation makes the observed at any time under the watchful eye of the electronic "tower" whereby the possibility of generating a self-imposed discipline often driven by the fear or the inability to see agents of authority (Elmer 2003). Elmer also conceptualizes the "multiple interactions between mobile subjects and geographically-dispersed technologies of surveillance" and the dangers attached, such as affecting the habit, corporal movement and the subject`s flows of everyday life (Elmer 2003). It is clear in this regard that the various and multi-faceted effects of surveillance always include both the desired or sought after and the unexpected or unwanted.

Workplace Bullying: A Conceptual Review

A general understanding of the nature and effects of workplace bullying will help the reader to relate this scenario with the surveillance practices. The concept of workplace bullying is used as a common synonym for all inappropriate workplace behaviours and relates to continuous and intentional and deliberate negative acts, often both psychological and physical in nature, directed towards an employee (Rai & Agarwal 2017; Samani & Singh 2012). Though researchers differentiate workplace bullying, an interpersonal mistreatment, with other forms of negative acts such as workplace aggression, incivility, harassment, social undermining, emotional abuse, etc., it encompasses all threats to personal standing (Rai & Agarwal 2017). Workplace bullying is systematically defined as "harassing, offending, socially excluding someone or negatively affecting someone's work tasks [… occurring] repeatedly and regularly and over a period of time [… and] is an escalating process in the course of which the person confronted ends up in an inferior position and becomes the target of systematic negative social acts" (Einarsen et al. 2011, 15). Three key distinguishing features of bullying identified here are persistency (repetitions), power disparities (power imbalance, submission), and hostility (systematic and planned negative acts). These explicit and identifiable behaviours, directed towards the other, are experienced in three broad categories, such as related to work (excessive monitoring, unreasonable workloads, unfair deadlines), person (humiliation, unreasonable criticism), and physical intimidating behaviours (insults, threats) and thus prevalent and ubiquitous in workplaces (Einarsen et al. 2009; 2003).

The verbal or physical harassment or emotional abuse or any other counterproductive behaviours in the workplace become unethical as these function against social rules that are universally accepted for humanities sustenance and development. Premilla D'Cruz and Ernesto Noronha (2016) describe varieties of workplace bullying relating to emotional abuse at work. They speak about a *compounded bullying* in connection with interpersonal bullying in relation to level and *dual locus bullying* in association with internal or external bullying in terms of location (D'Cruz and Noronha 2016a). However, it has to be noted that for many researchers, workplace bullying and its variants of emotional abuse and other harassment are considered acts of power with perpetrators and acts of powerlessness with the targets (Einarsen et al. 2011).

In this regard, a list of factors related to workplace bullying as identified by Einarsen et al. (2009) is given below (figure 1):

Work-related bullying	Person-related bullying
1. Someone withholding information that affects your performance.	1. Being humiliated or ridiculed in connection with your work.
2. Giving order to do work below your level of competence.	2. Having key areas of responsibility removed or replaced with more trivial or unpleasant tasks.
3. Having your opinions ignored.	3. Spreading of gossip and rumours about you and having allegations made against you.
4. Give tasks with unreasonable deadlines.	4. Being ignored or excluded or facing a hostile reaction when you approach.
5. Excessive monitoring of your work.	5. Having insulting or offensive remarks made about your person, attitudes or your private life.
6. Pressure not to claim something to which by right you are entitled (e.g. sick leave, holiday entitlement, and travel expenses).	6. Hints or signals from others that you should quit your job.
7. Causing to be exposed to an unmanageable workload.	7. Repeated reminders of or persistent criticism of your errors or mistakes.
Physically intimidating bullying	8. Practical jokes carried out by people you don't get along with.
1. Being shouted at or being the target of spontaneous anger.	9. Being the subject of excessive teasing and sarcasm.
2. Intimidating behaviours such as finger-pointing, invasion of personal space, shoving, blocking your way.	
3. Threats of violence or physical abuse or actual abuse.	

Figure 1 – factor structure of workplace bullying

Rai and Agarwal discuss these three categories in detail and further subcategorise them. The work-related bullying into attack through work roles and tasks, misuse of power, occupational devaluation, and professional discredit, and then illustrate the issues related to these factors (Rai & Agarwal 2017). Then, they elaborate on person-related bullying consisting the elements of belittlement and humiliation, devaluing the person, and finally the concept of favouritism with further explanation on unfair and partial treatment and domination (Rai & Agarwal 2017). All these factors and features prove that the bullying in the workplace causes employees feel constantly and persistently subjected to negative behaviours at the hands of others. In this way, researchers are of the opinion that bullying is related to a host of negative attitudes and behaviours in the workplace (Rai & Agarwal 2018). Any unfavourable workplace incidents engender strong negative feelings among employees affecting adversely their attitudes and behaviours in relation to work. Likewise, it is clear that persistency and power disparities are the key features of negative activities in an organization that make them within the category of workplace bullying. Therefore, workplace bullying has very detrimental effects on the contemporary work-life, placing serious implications on employees themselves and on organizations and on society.

The reaction and the response of the employees, who are affected with the adverse workplace situations, vary in multiple situations. Researchers (Rai & Agarwal 2018; Park & Ono 2016; Kwan et al. 2016; Einarsen et al. 2016; Giorgi et al. 2015) examine three possible ways of employee response to the workplace bullying, such as: (1) to withhold discretionary behaviours (not showing creativity and workplace engagement); (2) to depict dissatisfying

behaviours and attitudes (job dissatisfaction, job quit); and (3) to engage in revenge and retaliatory behaviours (workplace deviance and neglect). Rai and Agarwal point out the increased turnover intentions, decreased form of both in-role behaviours such as commitment and loyalty and extra-role behaviours like that of added dedication to complete the task with perfection (Rai & Agarwal 2019). They observed, "work-related stressors (like workplace bullying) can drain employees' essential psychological resources and trigger a resource conservation motive wherein employees adopt defensive postures to protect against further losses" (Rai & Agarwal 2019, 212). A set of passive coping strategies (silence and feedback avoidance) are also observed (Rai & Agarwal 2018; Xu et al. 2015) recently from the part of employees who do not wish to make it public due to the fear punishment such as of holding the promotion un-necessarily and of losing job.

Surveillance, Power Control and the Workplace Bullying in India

India being the largest democratic country in the world and second to China in terms of population with 1.1 billion citizens emerges today as a major global power. The workforce of India today is close to half a billion people, second only to China and three times the size of the United States. Though India is predominantly a rural, agro-based country with about two thirds of its population based in villages, we witness a rural transformation led by the green revolution of the late sixties and the white revolution of late seventies (Raghavan, Vaithianthan & Murali 2015). The next phase of rural transformation is by a 'Knowledge Revolution' facilitated by Information and Communication Technology (ICT). In fact, ICT has brought commendable revolution in India so far, and it has reduced intermediation in business and society, provided solutions across sectors and is increasingly becoming an important tool for national development. Likewise, India has emerged as an important venue for the services sector including financial accounting, call centres, and business process outsourcing and has become the leading country for offshore outsourcing. Around one-third of the global workforce employed in top IT companies has bases in India – a sign that this country is virtually turning into the global IT headquarters (Dwivedi, Kaushik & Luxmi 2014; Majumdar 2012). The rapid and exciting growth of ICT in Indian organizational workplace appropriates the study of how it addresses the needs of the employees and what are the challenges that it brings forward.

The current expected and experienced rapid growth of ICT in the Indian organizational workplace entails an extensive use of electronic surveillance means and practices and it in turn causes for individual and social impacts in both ways – good or bad. It requires, therefore, a critical exploration. Thus, it is both appropriate and essential to investigate how it addresses the needs of the employees and the challenges it brings forward. An emergent body of research and scholarship, both quantitative and qualitative inquiries and analysis have explored several aspects of workplace behaviours in Indian organizations.The socio-cultural issues of any given period is an important aspect for predicting the level of incidence and other happenings in any country. The Indian society or culture is observed simultaneously as individualistic and collectivistic along with its relational orientations at both individual and societal levels and, given its hierarchical and patriarchal nature of this society, is linked to the issue of power in every walks of life (D'Cruz & Rayner 2012; Kakar & Kakar, 2007) including lifestyles and occupations. Workplace bullying has been recognized as serious physiological, psychosocial,

emotional, intellectual, and occupational hazard faced in the current work situation. This research primarily observes the connection between the surveillance processes in the organization and the workplace bullying.

According to Babu P. Remesh, technologically enabled mechanisms of surveillance and employee monitoring in India generally allow organizations to obtain the objectives of performance maximization, cost minimization, standardization and increased profitability (Remesh 2008). Organizations acquire these objectives through the process of rationalization and quality check. Researching and understanding the multifaceted effects and impacts of electronic surveillance in the Indian workplace, Ramesh compares the degree of surveillance at work with the situation of 19th century prisons or Roman slave ships (Ramesh 2004). For, when employees become subjects of incessant monitoring and recording of all workplace interactions and behaviours, they get the feeling of being constantly observed and scrutinized, and this turns out to be a psychological torture for many (Remesh 2008). To the same angle, the above mentioned Foucaultian concept of 'panoptic gaze' in relation to workplace surveillance brings further implications of an institutionalized acceptance of various management prerogatives, which often become imposed control system and its inevitable extension (Bain & Taylor 2000). It also intensifies the labour processes to the extent to become heavier than the usual for employees and goes beyond the limit of any disciplinary control. Thus the work processes and behaviours that are closely monitored emerge to be in conflict with the Indian work culture based on openness, individual initiative, loyalty, trust and informality, and causes for unequal power relationships, such as bestowing power on the monitoring agent over the monitored (Richards 2013; Upadhya & Vasavi 2006).

It is generally observed and researched that societies ranking high in power distance and power control, establishing more hierarchical nature of governance, and hence low in uncertainty avoidance and interactional nature of authority will be more prone to workplace bullying (Akella 2016). Workplace bullying is one form of this power-related workplace management behaviour, which is said to be a destructive form of leadership by many researchers (Ray & Agarwal 2018; Schyns & Schilling 2013; Einarsen et al. 2007), and which found to be widely prevalent in many of the organizational workplaces, has far-reaching impacts on employees and organizations. The unequal power relation that emerged due to the persistent surveillance and rigid controlling in the Indian socio-cultural context contributes toward an increased workplace bullying (D'Cruz & Rayner 2012). Adapting from Stale Einarsen et al., workplace bullying is defined by Premilla D'Cruz as "subtle and/or obvious negative behaviours embodying aggression, hostility, intimidation, and harm, characterized by repetition and persistence, displayed by an individual and/or group and directed towards another individual and/or group at work in the context of an existing or evolving unequal power relationship" (D'Cruz 2012; Einarsen et al. 2011).

The growing and excessive monitoring of work is an example for bullying in the Indian workplaces. For, involving an abuse or misuse of power, as we have previously discussed, this particular act namely workplace bullying in Indian organizational workplace context refers to a repeated and unreasonable act directed towards employees and which intimidates, degrades, offends or humiliates them (D'Cruz & Rayner 2012; D'Cruz 2012). The hierarchical nature of the Indian society, reflected in the organizational workplace and its management models,

predominantly tries to link to the issues of the exercise of power domination in the surveillance process. Thus, workplace bullying through excessive monitoring in India isolates or stigmatizes individual employees who experience severe adverse effects of this phenomenon, which brings forth unwarranted criticism, indifferent treatment via exclusion and social isolation, and high stress and consequent increase in psycho-physical problems, and invariably affects the employees' well-being. There are multiple and wide range of employee outcomes related to this power-related bullying in India, meticulously observed by the researchers (Ray & Agarwal 2018; Nielsen & Einarsen 2012; Samnani & Singh 2012), which could be detailed as, but not limited to, the high-mounted quitting and accelerated intention to quit, augmented job dissatisfaction and absenteeism, low organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behaviours, and depression and other psychosomatic disturbances and complaints.

The rigid and panoptical systems and techniques of monitoring fasten the individual employee sturdily to the machine (Upadhya & Vasavi 2006). For example, the closed-circuit video cameras fixed within and around the work-floor and work-premises bring further panoptical capacity, which is even continued and fostered by the centralized computer systems, that enable to map the entire activities of the employee (Upadhya & Vasavi 2006). It leads to lesser task performance in complex situations and further impediments in working relationships. As Monica T. Whitty reports, the presence of the other – the social presence – often impairs the performance on difficult task and provides deleterious effects on employees leading to greater stress and poor satisfaction (Whitty 2004). It makes employees feel insecure and causes a dent in their morale and thus a gradual decline in the quality and duration of relationship. Likewise, along with disrupting employees' "right to work at their own pace, [surveillance] guided by their own moral compass, [...] fosters mistrust" (Iyer 2012) and becomes detrimental to productivity and overall performance of organizations. Some studies reveal that the decrease in monitoring causes to reduce the quit-rates in the organizations – high monitoring leads to high quit rates (Batt, et al 2005). That means, extensive and repetitive monitoring along with high performance targets is said to have increased the attrition rates in the Indian organizational workplace (Deery, Nath & Walsh 2013).

Several other researchers observe in the same way that surveillance leads to high stress, towering depression, and emotional exhaustion and burnout (Batt, et al 2005; Holman 2004). For instance, Daria Panina opines that in any general context, "electronic monitoring is an intrusion into worker privacy, represents a lack of trust toward employees, and often leads to excessive control and work pacing by management" (Panina2009). All those globally experienced impacts of employee monitoring such as loss of self-esteem, low and disproportionate fair-process, increasing voyeurism, ferreting out whistleblowers, and detrimental effect on productivity, etc. (Kesan 2002), are in equal regard experiences in the Indian organizational workplace as well. For, surveillance becomes detrimental to the normal expectations and concerns of an Indian employee concerning work, namely, freedom in job, creative performance, trust from employer and colleague, commitment, importance of data security, efficiency in work, and understanding and appreciation, etc. For, extensive monitoring reinforces the employees to work in a stereotypical way – like a robotic image or in a mechanized form – who are, as George Ritzer and Craig D. Liar present, overly regimented,

dependent and overwhelmed by this practice of control, and thus becomes devoid of any autonomy and fails to bring their 'selves' to work (Ritzer & Liar 2009).

The virtual possibility and actual usage of data collected through monitoring to intimidate and punish employees rather than help them improve is quite common in India. In this context, workers individually and collectively demonstrate their capacity to resist this increasing control of electronic panopticon through the available ways (Ellway 2013; Bain & Taylor2000). Quoting Alan McKinlay and Phil Taylor, argues Benjamin P.W. Ellway that the worker resistance has been a 'daily reality' operating at different "levels of consciousness, effectiveness and strength across a workplace and over time" (Ellway 2013; McKinlay & Taylor 1996). Similarly, few researches such as Ellway and David Knights and Darben McCabe admit the risk of individualistic and fragmentary nature of resistance by which workers seek spaces for escape (Ellway 2013; Knights & McCabe 1998). However, as the increasing experience of high degree of monitoring and the extensive use of electronic-technology-aided control mechanisms in the Indian workplaces (Remesh 2008), it is also necessary to look into the current practices of cyber bullying of Indian workplaces that has sever consequent impacts on employees and these, along with the challenges, will be illustrated in the following section.

The Cyber Bullying and Victimization in India

The concept of cyber bullying comes generally under the purview of cyber-abuse. Cyber bullying is commonly and largely viewed as "inappropriate, unwanted social exchange behaviors initiated by a perpetrator via online or wireless communication technology and devices" (Piotrowski 2012, 45). It is a contact through electronic means, generally continuous, intentional and aggressive, directed towards someone who is not in a position to defend. These are problems arising out of the vulnerability and easy access of virtual cyberspace without any limitation. Cyber bullying, according to researchers, "differs from traditional bullying in offering potential anonymity to the bully and difficulty in identifying the victim. This combined with the obvious lack of monitoring and regulation in cyberspace makes the issue more intricate and strenuous to address" (Rao, Bansal &Chandran 2018).The permanency of computer-based messages, difficulty in identifying the misbehaviours, the omnipresent capacity of data due to the ubiquity of internet-linked devices and technologies, etc. increase the persisting nature of cyber bullying. The continuing effect of cyber bullying is marked by boundarylessness and the apparent anonymity, i.e., its range is not defined by, or limited to, any type of horizontal/vertical or external/internal boundaries imposed by a predefined structure, and this realm of digital capturing of bullying is retained, restored, and can have wide broadcast (D'Cruz 2016). The danger of cyber bullying is linked also to its all-pervasive nature and the hasty capacity to go viral.

The present cyber-bullying, new form of above discussed workplace bullying, is one of the major issues an employee faces in the environment of monitoring and information tracking. Cyber-bullying is defined as "the use of information technology to harm or harass the people in a deliberate, repeated, and hostile manner" (Feinberg & Robey 2009). It generally involves sending or posting harmful or cruel text and/or images using the internet or other digital communication devices, such as cell phones. It may occur on personal websites or may be

transmitted via e-mail, social networking sites, chat rooms, message boards, instant messaging, or cell phones (Feinberg & Robey 2009). It is also defined as a "wilful and repeated harm inflicted through the use of computers, cell phones, and other electronic devices" (Hinduja & Patchin 2010). Employees may be threatened in multiple ways by cyber-bullying. For instance, in online fights using electronic messages with angry and vulgar language (flaming), in being made the subject of gossip or rumours meant to damage his or her reputation or friendships (denigration), in having her secrets or embarrassing information or images put online (outing), etc. These are highly reported problems in the workplace today (Siegle 2010). They become a great threat to employees when all their activities and information is electronically monitored either with or without their proper consent.

That further shows, cyber bullying, as generally described, is "being cruel to others" by engaging them aggressively with any harmful materials using internet or other computer/technologies (Siegle 2010). Cyber harassment - sending repeatedly nasty, malicious, offensive, and insulting messages - can be one of the leading forms of cyber bullying. Likewise, any repeated intense-harassment and defamation including threats or creating significant fear become part of this process, and is known as cyber-stacking (Siegle 2010). Premilla D'Cruz illustrates two types of bullying in the workplaces: (1) personal bullying - consisting behaviours of "making insulting remarks, excessive teasing, spreading gossip or rumours, persistent criticism, playing practical jokes, and intimidation; and (2) work-related bullying - consisting giving unreasonable deadlines or unmanageable workloads, excessive monitoring of work and assigning meaningless tasks or even on tasks (D'Cruz 2012). It shows that the excessive monitoring itself is a sort of bullying that causes unnecessary stress in the workplaces. She continues to observe that: Though these behaviours may be relatively common in workplaces, when frequently and continually directed towards the same individual and/or group of individuals with increasing intensity, they undermine, demoralize and humiliate the latter, draining his/her/their coping resources and resulting in his/her/their stigmatization and victimization (D'Cruz 2012, xv).

It is true with the electronic surveillance used in the organizational workplaces "where one party systematically targets another party and exhibits repeated and persistent aggressive and hostile behaviours towards the latter leading to his/her/their victimization" (D'Cruz 2012, xvi).Hence, cyber bullying can systematically be termed as a 'digital victimization' and is a wilful harm inflected through technology leading to physical, behavioural and functional ramifications (Hinduja & Patchin 2010). We also experience here an illegitimate use of power from the side of the authority or in other words power imbalances between employers/managers and employees. In this sense, some peculiar and atypical characteristics of workplace bullying are "target orientation, persistence (including frequency and duration), escalation, harm, power disparity, and intent" (D'Cruz 2012, xvii).Along with countersigning the dysfunctional and counterproductive behaviours in the workplace, cyber bullying arouses as a more crippling and devastating problem for workers. That means in Indian organizational workplaces, employees experience singling out or stigmatization because of this deeply target oriented surveillance practices. For instance, here, an employee ends up in an inferior position and becomes the target of social offense and exclusion.

This shows that the cyber bullying, which is directed towards the persons who are unable to defend or who are not in a position to guard himself/herself because of his/her position – lower in rank – in an organization, makes that person victimized. Victimization is the result of unequal power distribution or power distance that forms a managerial tactic where the one who is in power could influence, win, or gain an advantage over the lower placed employee (Akella 2016; Hutchinson et al. 2010). In general, by creating newer structures of relationships and power distances to implement further managerial strategies ensure and promote additional effective subordination of the workers. Such control techniques of cyber bullying by becoming over time more indirect, hegemonic, and insidious, minimize the labour resistance and create added victimization of employees. The consequent notion of workers being treated like machines resamples the concept of 'direct control' illustrated by Friedmann before several decades, which witnessed the ignorance of the subjectivity of the workers (Friedmann 1977). This type of "totalizing work environments," as described by Crowley (2014), where coercion and power "undermined norms of justice and civility, and employee abuse, humiliation and dehumanization, was permitted by the management" (Akella 2016), makes a worker victimized in every pace or his/her work-life.

Workplace bullying or the cyber bullying is the prominent example that shows the surveillance can corrupt. A study on Indian workplace context conducted by Premilla D'Cruz and Ernesto Noronha show that employers team leaders or even colleagues use various and multiple forms of technological devices to harass workers (D'Cruz & Noronha 2013). They continue to observe that the employers monitor workers continuously from their desks, and then, as we have mentioned above, use instant text messaging, email, cell phone calls, computer software alerts, etc., to constantly and persistently send continues flow of questions and comments, often in the form of warnings or threats on performance to the worker – a trend of Cyber bullying at work (D'Cruz & Noronha 2013; Poster 2015). In their study, D'Cruz and Noronha found many cases of managers and other authorities having acquired personal information of employees, contact employee families outside of work, threaten to post collected data on social media websites or making it known to other actual and potential employers, which can even lead to physical threats of workers' bodies (D'Cruz & Noronha 2013). In the same manner, Winifred R. Poster in his research on Indian call centres indicates how the targets of electronic and other monitoring are extending way beyond workers' physical movements, and into their inner cores – their emotional states, and features of their identities (Poster 2007). More in these two categories – bodily and emotional threats - will be discussed in the next chapter.

In the same way, a study conducted by Abihijeet Singh Tomar et al. from the Management Development Institute, Gurgaon, India shows that monitoring does affect the employees by way of limiting productivity and efficiency and reducing commitment and trust towards organization and thus "find it harsh enough to leave the organization for the breach of privacy at workplace due to monitoring" (Tomar et al. 2013, 18). Likewise, systems of surveillance track employees' positions in time and space and expose employees who are 'working hard' and those who are 'not pulling their weight' (Sewell & Barker 2006). Here, the individuals may come to be seen differently by themselves and by others. Moreover, "if employees realize that their actions and communications are monitored, then their creative

behaviour may be reduced if they are worried about monitoring and judgement" (Ball 2010, 93).Though few researchers have observed that "the effect of being victimized can create in targets a need to protect their self-image by working harder and longer and by strengthening their self-respect through any means available to them" (Vega & Comer 2005,106), the escalated form of victimization leads to further stressful consequences.

Conclusion

The Foucaultian thesis of power control and power distance backgrounds one of the contemporary ever networked aspects of information and communication technologies and the consequent employee surveillance, excess of which produces unexpected adverse implications. Surveillance and power imbalances create workplace bullying and this pattern negatively correlates with job satisfaction, work engagements, etc. It goes against the positive fulfilling of the Job and dedicated work-related state of mind. Workplace or cyber bullying is more likely to result in intense emotional and behavioural reactions like disappointment, frustration, anger and resentment, towards the work. Moreover, people who are the targets of bullying also experience a wide range of said adverse effects such as, stress, helplessness, lack of confidence, psychosomatic traumas and symptoms, low morale and productivity, job-dissatisfaction, increased sense of vulnerability, etc. A worker experience bullying when he/she becomes the target of unreasonable and repeated actions that creates a risk to health and safety. This research exposes the unfair and unjustifiable victimization of workplace bullying by going beyond Foucault's concept of "disciplinary society," according to which persons are "normalized" by their categorical locations, as well as beyond Deleuze's argument of "society of control," where people are forced to live in circumscribed parameters.

The target victimization is the result or end-product of this practice, which along with the experience of humiliation, intimidation or threatening, leads, in turn, to increased absenteeism and turnover. A persistent victimization of the target is said to be a co-existent phenomenon of workplace and/or cyber bullying. The exercise of coercive power distance and control victimizes the subject with various abuses and makes the target defenseless with limited or no resources to resist and perpetrator aims here to control and intimidate the victim and make them voiceless in a professional relationship. It goes against the employment relationship with fairness, respect and dignity in professional or/and social interactions that directly or indirectly linked to the workplace bullying. The supervisory mistreatment and exploitation, through uncontrolled workplace surveillance, therefore, can be considered as a salient workplace event that is likely to produce undesirable outcomes. The research also elucidates the necessity of clarifying precisely the workplace bullying behaviours in organizations and initiating prevention programs with the adequate intervention of both employers and employees.

References

Agarwal, Upasana A. and Arpana Rai. 2017. Exploring Bullying Among Indian Managers: A Grounded Theory Approach. *Journal of Asia Business Studies* 6 (3): 247-273.

Akella, Devi. 2016. Workplace Bullying: Not a Manager's Right? *SAGE Open* (January-March): 1-10.

Allmer, Thomas. 2012. *Towards a Critical Theory of Surveillance in Informational Capitalism*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Bain, Peter and Phil Taylor. 2000. Entrapped by the 'Electronic Panopticon'? Worker Resistance in the Call Centre. *New Technology, Work, and Employment* 15 (1): 2-18.

Ball, Kirstie. 2010. Workplace Surveillance: An Overview. *Labor History* 51 (1): 87-106.

Batt, Rosemary, Virginia Doellgast and Hyunji Kwon. 2005. Service Management and Employment Systems in U.S. and Indian Call Centers. *CAHRS Working Paper Series Center for Advanced Human Resource Studies*. Cornell University ILR School.

Bentham, Jeremy. 1962. *The Works of Jeremy Bentham.* New York: Russell & Russell.

Botan, Carl and Mihaela Vorvoreanu. 2005. What Do Employees Think about Electronic Surveillance at Work? In *Electronic Monitoring in the Workplace: Controversies and Solutions*, ed. John Weckert, 123-144. Hershey: Idea Group Publishing.

Botan, Carl. 1996. Communication Work and Electronic Surveillance: A Model for Predicting Panoptic Effects. *Communication Monographs* 63 (4): 293-313.

Briskin, Alan. 1998. Stirring of Soul in the Workplace. Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Crowley, M. 2014. Class, Control, and Relational Indignity: Labor Process Foundations for Workplace Humiliation, Conflict and Shame. *The American Behavioral Scientist*58 (3): 418-434.

D'Cruz, P. 2016. Cyberbullying at Work: Experiences of Indian Employees. In Virtual Workers and the Global Labour Market: Dynamics of Virtual Work, ed. Webster J., Randle K. 239-259. Palgrave Macmillan, London.

D'Cruz, P. and Charlotte. Rayner. 2012. Bullying in the Indian Workplace: A Study of the ITES-BPO Sector. *Economic and Industrial Democracy* 34 (4): 597-619.

D'Cruz, P. and E. Noronha. 2017. Workplace Cyberbullying. In *The New DigitalWorkplace: How New Technologies Revolutionize Work*, ed. K. Briken, et al. 112-131. Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke.

D'Cruz, Premilla and Charlotte Rayner. 20125. Bullying in the Indian Workplace: A Study of the ITES-BPO Sector. *Economic and Industrial Democracy* 34 (4): 597-619.

D'Cruz, Premilla and Ernesto Noronha. 2013. Navigating the Extended Reach: Target Experiences of Cyberbullying at Work. *Information and Organization* 23 (4): 324-343.

D'Cruz, Premilla. 2012. *Workplace Bullying in India*. New Delhi: Routledge.

D'Cruz, Premilla. and Ernesto Noronha. 2016a. Organizational Governance: A Promising Solution for Varieties of Workplace Bullying. *Research on Emotions in Organizations* 12: 409-444.

D'Urso, Scott C. 2006. Who's Watching Us at Work? Toward a Structural-Perceptual Model of Electronic Monitoring and Surveillance in Organizations. *Communication Theory* 16(3): 281-303.

Deery, Stephen, Vandana Nath and Janet Walsh. 2013. Why do Off-Shored Indian Call Centre Workers Want to Leave Their Jobs? *New Technology, Work and Empowerment* 28 (3): 212-226.

Dwivedi, Sulakshna, Sanjay Kaushik and Luxmi. 2014. Impact of Organizational Culture on Commitment of Employees: An Empirical Study of BPO Sector in India. *Vikalapa* 39 (3): 77-92.

Einarsen, S., A. Skogstad, E. Rørvik, A.B. Lande and M.B. Nielsen. 2016. Climate for Conflict Management, Exposure to Workplace Bullying and Work Engagement: A Moderated Mediation Analysis. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management* 29 (3): 549-570.

Einarsen, S., H. Hoel and C. Cooper. 2003. *Bullying and Emotional Abuse in the Workplace: International Perspectives in Research and Practice*. Boca Raton: CRC Press.

Einarsen, S., H. Hoel, and G. Notelaers. 2009. Measuring Exposure to Bullying and Harassment at Work: Validity, Factor Structure and Psychometric Properties of the Negative Acts Questionnaire Revised. *Work & Stress* 23 (1): 24-44.

Einarsen, S., M.S. Aasland and A. Skogstad. 2007. Destructive Leadership Behaviour: A Definition and Conceptual Model. *The Leadership Quarterly* 18 (3): 207-216.

Einarsen, Stale, Helge Hoel, Dieter Zapf, and Cary L. Cooper. 2011. The Concept of Bullying and Harassment at Work: The European Tradition. In *Bullying and Harassment in the Workplace: Developments in Theory, Research, and Practice*, 2nd ed., eds. Stale Einarsen, Helge Hoel, Dieter Zapf, and Cary L. Cooper. 3-28. London: Taylor & Francis.

Einarsen, Stale, Helge Hoel,, Dieter Zapf, and Carry L. Cooper. 2011. The Concept of Bullying and Harassment at Work: The European Tradition. In *Bullying and Harassment in the Workplace: Developments in Theory, Research, and Practice*, ed. Stale Einarsen, Helge Hoel, Dieter Zapf, and Carry L. Cooper. 3-39. Boca Raton: CRC Press.

Ellway, Benjamin P.W. 2013. Making It Personal in a Call Centre: Electronic Peer Surveillance. *New Technology, Work and Employment* 28 (1): 37-50.

Elmer, Greg. 2003. A Diagram of Panoptic Surveillance. *New Media & Society* 5 (2): 231-247.

Feinberg, Ted and Nicole Robey. 2009. Cyber-bullying: Intervention and Prevention Strategies. National Association of School Psychologists (NASP), http://www.nasponline.org/resources/bullying/Cyberbullying.pdf [accessed December 28, 2020].

Fiske, John. 1999. *Media Matters: Race and Gender in U.S. Politics*. Minneapolis, MN University of Minnesota Press.

Foucault, Michel. 1980. The Eye of Power. In *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977 by Michel Foucault*, ed. C. Gordon. 146-165. Sussex: Harvester Press.

Foucault, Michel.1991. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison.* trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Penguin Books, 1991), 201. This work was first published in 1975 as *Surveiller et punir: Naissance de la prison* by Éditions Gallimard. This translation was first published by Allen Lane in 1977.

Foucault, Michel. 1997. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage Books.

Friedmann, A. 1977. *Industry and labor*. London, England: Macmillan.

Giorgi, G., J.M. Leon-Perez and A. Arenas. 2015. Are Bullying Behaviors Tolerated in Some Cultures? Evidence for a Curvilinear Relationship between Workplace Bullying and Job Satisfaction among Italian Workers. *Journal of Business Ethics* 131 (1): 227-237.

Hinduja, Sameer and Justine Patchin. 2010. Cyber-bullying. Cyberbullying Research Center.
http://www.cyberbullying.us/Cyberbullying_Identification_Prevention_Response_Fact_Sheet.pdf [accessed December 8, 2018].

Holman, David. 2004. Employee Well-Being in Call Centres. In *Call Centres and Human Resource Management*, eds. Stephen Deery and Nick Kinnie. 223-244. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Hutchinson, M., M. H. Vickers, D. Jackson, and L. Wilkes. 2010. Bullying as Circuits of Power: An Australian Nursing Perspective. *Administrative Theory & Praxis* 32 (1): 25-47.

Iyer, Priya. 2012. Electronic Surveillance of Employees – Pros and Cons. *Human Resources*, http://www.supportbiz.com/articles/human-resources/electronic-surveillance-employees-%E2%80%93-pros-and-cons.html [accessed December 19, 2020].

Kakar, S. and K. Kakar. 2007. *The Indians*. New Delhi: Penguin.

Kesan, Jay P. 2002. Cyber-Working or Cyber-Shirking? A First Principles Examination of Electronic Privacy in the Workplace. *Florida Law Review* 54: 290-332.

Koskela, Hille. 2003. 'Cam Era' - The Contemporary Urban Panopticon. Surveillance & Society 1 (3): 292-313.

Kwan, S.S.M., M.R. Tuckey, and M.F. Dollard. 2016. The Role of the Psychosocial Safety Climate in Coping with Workplace Bullying: A Grounded Theory and Sequential Tree Analysis. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* 25 (1): 133-148.

Lyon, David. 2003. *Surveillance as Social Sorting: Privacy, Risk, and Digital Discrimination*. New York, Routledge.

Majumdar, Sumit Kumar. 2012. *India's Late, Late Industrial Revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Manokha, Ivan. 2018. Surveillance, Panopticism, and Self-Discipline in the Digital Age. *Surveillance & Society* 16 (2): 219-237.

McKinlay, Alan and Phil Taylor. 1996. Commitment and Conflict: Worker Resistance to HRM in the Microelectronics Industry. In *The Handbook of Human Resource Management*, 2nd ed., ed. B. Towers. Oxford: Blackwell.

McMullan, Thomas. 2015. "What Does The Panopticon Mean In The Age Of Digital Surveillance? The Guardian, July 23, 2015, https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2015/jul/23/panopticon-digital-surveillance-jeremy-bentham. Accessed December 20, 2020.

Nielsen, M.B. and Stale Einarsen. 2012. Outcomes of Exposure to Workplace Bullying: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Work & Stress* 26 (4): 309-332.

Panina, Daria. 2009. Electronic Monitoring in the Workplace. In *Encyclopedia of Human Resources Information Systems: Challenges in e-HRM*, eds. Teresa Torres-Coronas and Mario Arias-Oliva. Hershey, NY: Information Science Reference.

Park, J.H. and M. Ono. 2016. Effects of Workplace Bullying on Work Engagement and Health: the Mediating Role of Job Insecurity. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management* 28 (22): 1-24.

Piotrowski, Chris. 2012. From Workplace Bullying to Cyber Bullying: The Enigma of E-Harassment in Modern Organizations. *Organization Development Journal* 30 (4): 44-53.

Poster, Mark. 1990. *The Mode of Information: Poststructuralism and Social Context*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Poster, Winifred R. 2007. Who's on the Line? Indian Call Centre Agents Pose as Americans for U.S.-Outsourced Firms. *Industrial Relations* 46 (2): 271-304.

Poster, Winifred R. 2015. Socially Benevolent Workplace Surveillance?" *Work in Progress: Sociology on the Economy, Work and Inequality,* April 30 https://workinprogress.oowsection.org/2015/04/30/socially-benevolent-workplace-surveillance/ [accessed November 10, 2020].

Raghavan, P.V., R. Vaithianthan, and V.S. Murali. 2015. *General Economics for the CA Common Proficiency Test*, 2nd ed. Chandigarh: Pearson.

Rai, Aparna and Upasana A. Agarwal. 2017. Exploring the Process of Workplace Bullying in Indian Organizations. *South Asian Journal of Business Studies* 6 (3): 247-273.

Rai, Aparna and Upasana A. Agarwal. 2017. Exploring the Process of Workplace Bullying and Psychometric Properties of Negative Acts Questionnaire-Revised (NAQ-R) in Indian Organizations. *Journal of Indian Business Research* 9 (3): 229-247.

Rai, Arpana and Upasana A. Agarwal. 2018. Workplace Bullying and Employee Silence: A Moderated Mediation Model of Psychological Contract Violation and Workplace Friendship. *Personnel Review* 47 (1): 226-256.

Rai, Arpana and Upasana A. Agarwal. 2019. Linking Workplace Bullying and EVLN Outcomes Role of Psychological Contract Violation and Workplace Friendship. *International Journal of Manpower* 40 (2): 211-227.

Rai, Arpana and Upasna Agarwal. 2018. Impact of Workplace Bullying on Employee Outcomes: A Study of Indian Managerial Employees. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management* 67 (7): 1147-1170.

Ramesh, Babu P. 2004. 'Cyber Coolies' in BPO: Insecurities and Vulnerabilities of Non-Standard Work. *Economic and Political Weekly* 39 (5): 492-497.

Rao, T.S. Sathyanarazana, Deepali Bansal and Suhas Chandran. 2018. Cyberbullying: A Virtual Offense with Real Consequences. *Indian Journal of Psychiatry* 60 (1): 147-218.

Remesh, Babu P. 2008. Work Organization, Control and 'Empowerment': Managing the Contradictions of Call Centre Work. In *In an Outpost of the Global Economy: Work and Workers in India's Information Technology Industry*, eds. Carol Upadhya and A.R. Vasavi. London: Routledge.

Richards, Neil M. 2013. The Dangers of Surveillance. *Harvard Law Review* 126: 1934-1965.

Ritzer, George and Craig D. Liar. 209. The Globalization of Nothing and the Outsourcing of Service Work. In *Service Work: Critical Perspectives*, eds. Marek Korczynski and Cameron Lynne MacDonald. 31-52. New York: Routledge.

Samnani, A.-K. and P. Singh. 2012. 20 Years of Workplace Bullying Research: A Review of The Antecedents and Consequences of Bullying in the Workplace. *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 17 (6): 581-589.

Schyns, B. and J. Schilling. 2013. How Bad are the Effects of Bad Leaders? A Meta-Analysis of Destructive Leadership and Its Outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly* 24 (1): 138-158.

Sewell, Graham and James R. Barker. 2006. Coercion versus Care: Using Irony to Make Sense of Organizational Surveillance. *The Academy of Management Review* 31 (4): 934-961.

Siegle, Del. 2010. Cyberbullying and Sexting: Technology Abuses of the 21st Century. *Gifted Child Today* 33 (2): 14-16, 65.

Simon, Bart. 2005. The Return of Panopticism: Supervision, Subjection and the New Surveillance. *Surveillance & Society* 3(1): 1-20.

Smith, Peter K., Christina Del Barrio and Robert S. Tokunaga. 2013. Definitions of Bullying and Cyberbullying: How Useful Are the Terms? In *Principles of Cyberbullying Research: Definitions, Measures, and Methodology*, ed. Sheri Bauman, Donna Cross, Jenny Walker. 26-40. New York/Londres: Routledge.

Tomar, Abihijeet Singh *et al*. 2013. Workplace Monitoring in India. *RM Project: MDI Gurgaon*.

Upadhya, Carol and A.R. Vasavi. 2006. Work, Culture and Sociality in the Indian IT Industry: A Sociological Study. *Final Report to the Indo-Dutch Program for Alternatives in Development*. Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore.

Vega, G., and D. Comer. 2005. Sticks and Stones May Break You Bones, but Words can Break Your Spirit: Bullying in the Workplace. *Journal of Business Ethics* 58 (1-3): 101-109.

Virilio, Paul. 2002. The Visual Crash. In *CTRL [SPACE]: Rhetorics of Surveillance from Bentham to Big Brother*, ed. ThomasY. Levin, Ursula Frohne and Peter Weibel. 108-113. ZKM Centre for Art and Media: Karlsruhe.

Whitty, Monica T. 2004. Should Filtering Software be Utilized in the Workplace? Australian Employees' Attitudes towards Internet Usage and Surveillance of the Internet in the Workplace. *Surveillance and Society* 2 (1): 39-54.

Xu, A.J., R. Loi and L.W. Lam. 2015. The Bad Boss Takes It All: How Abusive Supervision and Leader-Member Exchange Interact to Influence Employee Silence. *The Leadership Quarterly* 26 (5): 763-774.