

HRM and the smart and dark side of technology

Article

Accepted Version

Holland, P., Dowling, P. and Brewster, C. ORCID:
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5314-1518> (2022) HRM and the
smart and dark side of technology. Asia Pacific Journal of
Human Resources, 60 (1). pp. 62-78. ISSN 1744-7941 doi:
10.1111/1744-7941.12319 Available at
<https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/101308/>

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the
work. See [Guidance on citing](#).

To link to this article DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1744-7941.12319>

Publisher: Wiley

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law,
including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other
copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in
the [End User Agreement](#).

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

APJHR@60 - HRM & Technology

Peter Holland, Chris Brewster and Peter Dowling

Introduction

For this 60th anniversary of the *APJHR*, as with any major milestone, it is often a time to reflect on the previous decade and to suggest some of the changes that may occur in the next one. The last decade has seen some very substantial changes and disruption in employment and work. 2011-2020 was bookended by the stuttering recovery from the global financial crises (GFC) at one end and the emergence of the Covid-19 pandemic global recession at the other. In the midst of these major challenges the decade has also witnessed a quiet revolution with the emergence of smart technology impacting the time, place and space in which we work. The often-hailed ‘smart’ aspects of doing work with and through these technologies come bound up with another dimension, what can be described as the ‘dark’ side of this new world of work, associated with issues of invasion of privacy boundaries through intense levels of monitoring and surveillance and work intensification (Brewster & Holland, 2020; Holland & Bardoel, 2016). Perhaps even more fundamentally, these new technologies have facilitated the increasing separation of work and employment, typified by the emergence of the platform or ‘gig’ economy (Brewster & Holland, 2019).

Whilst it is beyond the scope of this article to explore all these issues in detail, we focus on how these changes have and will continue to impact the workplace and whether and how HRM will manage significant changes to its role in dealing with these emerging issues and the shifting boundaries of work. We explore changes to employee voice using social media; the emergence of cyber-vetting and the moral or ethical boundaries it challenges; the silent creep of technological surveillance and monitoring and the expanding use of biological and biometric testing in the workplace. The final sections explore the impact of the pandemic on work patterns through working from home (WFH); and, finally, we summarise the impact of the fourth industrial revolution (4IR) and the gig economy (CB), on work and employment.

The evolution of social media in work

Whilst social media as we know it emerged in the early years of this century, it was not until this last decade that its reach, impact and potential have been seen and exploited. Even mid-

decade there were still those arguing that the impact of social media was being underestimated:

If any company thinks that social media doesn't apply to them, they are seriously mistaken. We're in a digital revolution, digital technology is fundamentally changing the way we do business (Mennie, 2015. p.4)

The management of social media at work was initially developed from a defensive perspective by organisations, and by default the HRM function, through attempts to manage information and issues that had the potential to impact negatively on organisations. However, the realisation that in fact the very nature, immediacy and reach of social media can be used to enhance the organisations, has seen a rapid evolution in managing human resources issues through this medium. From a negative and defensive perspective, the HMV case in 2013 highlighted the potency of social media in relation to globalising local workplace issues: the company's social media site was taken over by disaffected workers who tweeted live from a HRM termination process, framing it as a 'mass execution' of loyal workers', claiming gross mismanagement and the use of unpaid illegal interns. Their tweet went to 70,000 followers who then re-tweeted them, before management regained control of their own social media account and deleted the messages. As Holmes (2013) noted, by the time HMV had regained control of the account the damage was done as the tweets had gone viral. The case illustrated the power and potency of social media around work issues (Miles & Mangold, 2014). Subsequent court cases have increasingly indicated that even posting about your work on personal sites with high privacy boundaries is no guarantee of not being sanctioned, or even dismissed, by your employer (Holland & Bardoel, 2016). However, that has not noticeably reduced the increasing volumes of information around work, with websites such as 'Glassdoor' dedicated to the topic, allowing employees and former employees to post reviews of their work experience.

Employers initially sought to create a defensive position, attempting to build controls and sanctions into the use of these media. However, as their use has developed, an increasing number of organisations have eschewed such negative approaches to social media and looked at the potential good social media can offer, not least to facilitating more effective and immediate communication channels at work (Holland, Cooper & Hecker, 2015). Led mainly by major US corporations such as IBM, HP, Deloitte and Microsoft, these organisations have set up internal social media systems with the aim of disseminating important organisational information as well as allowing employees to post on organisational issues. This allows

employees and management to engage critically on key and emerging employment issues – importantly, in real time (Evans, 2015).

The approach is based upon the long-recognised concept of the insight of the group over individual judgements, where the average response of the group is typically more accurate or reflective of a situation than any individual's estimates or beliefs (Mannes, Sol & Larrick, 2014). As such, through this 'wisdom of crowds' approach (Surowiecki, 2004), management has the capacity to capture employees' experience and opinions in real time potentially allowing for more effective and efficient decision-making as enhancing two-way communication (Holland, Coper & Hecker, 2019). However, there is a caveat here, one that is very relevant for the HRM specialists who would in theory manage such a system: if the system is perceived to be overly controlled and information too tightly managed by the employer, or if information is restricted, it is unlikely to be effective (Martin, Parry & Flowers, 2015). This is best illustrated in the work of Kougiannou and Mendonça (2021), who highlight the effective use of social media voice mechanisms by gig workers to mobilise and overcome employer silencing of their voices. As Kougiannou and Mendonça (2021) and Holland et al (2015) note, the role of technology can act as a facilitator or an inhibitor of voice - and of silence - and is an emerging issue.

In addition, and explored in the final section of this paper, there is a growing dislocation in the 'platform' economy between the workforce and (HRM) management in situations where algorithms increasingly manage the employment relationship. Barnes et al (2018), highlight the importance of these technology platforms across the advanced economies for trade unions, too, in the decline and potential regeneration of collective participation of the workforce through more immediate and effective voice as these social media platforms can bypass management and disseminate more relevant information and better representation of the views of their membership.

Cyber-vetting at the boundaries of employment

Smart technology has created a paradigm shift in the amount of information available about individuals and organisations. Harvesting such information can create or increase huge amounts of information - or misinformation - as well as traversing moral and ethical boundaries. This is particularly significant in the recruitment and selection process and in reputation management for both the organisation and the individual and this has become an

increasingly prominent issue, not least for HRM specialists to manage, particularly since, as with other issues discussed in this paper, the technological advances tend to lead the legal, ethical and managerial frameworks within which they operate.

From the employment perspective, the key issues are most likely to emerge around the boundaries of employment: that is, around the recruitment and selection process; and around termination. One key task for organisations, and hence for HRM specialists, is the selection of the best person–organisation fit. As well as traditional forms of information such as CVs and references, employers now have the potential to explore a candidate’s profile through the practices of ‘cyber-vetting’ (also known as social media screening). Taking the definitional approach, cyber-vetting is portrayed as a proactive process of gathering on-line information (Berkelaar, 2014). The catalyst for this information gathering is of course the internet and in particular social media websites. With an ever-increasing presence of individuals on-line, there are increased opportunities for information harvesting by the employer – by HRM specialists. Cyber-vetting by its probing nature tends to be ad hoc and covert and thus without the permission, knowledge and therefore consent of the applicant (Berkelaar & Buzzanell, 2014). The danger lies in being open to legal liabilities and ethical and moral ‘grey areas’ through the information acquired, which is often sourced through, and therefore dependent on algorithms: depending on how they are set up and how good they are, the information they collect may be accurate or it may be false, misleading or inaccurate. This has potential consequences for both the individual being vetted and the organisation using the data; in the first case in terms of their career, and in the second in terms of the accuracy of decision-making and the moral and ethical implications of making mistakes. Largely identical issues arise when social media is used to at the other boundary of employment, when it is ‘scraped’ for use in performance or disciplinary cases. Making use of social media by employers and employees is therefore a double-edged sword (Wheatcroft, 2016).

Social media and employment

Research (Holland & Jeske, 2020; Jeske & Schulz, 2021) has increasingly found that much of the information on social media and other websites is unreliable, incorrect, inaccurate or outdated. Whilst career websites - such as Linked In - may blur the boundaries of cyber-vetting, in that they are career dedicated websites, outside of these forums, a critical point is that much of this information is, at best, difficult to verify. In addition, there are ethical and moral concerns about seeking such information on these social media websites (as noted,

often without the knowledge or consent of the employee or potential employee) as the material is often linked to personal or lifestyle choices (Jeske & Shultz, 2016). As such, the Applicants or employees are unlikely to be aware of these issues or potential breaches of their privacy and therefore will have no opportunity for redress in the event of mistaken decisions. HRM specialists should be seeking only information relevant to the individual's role in the organisation, anything outside these boundaries that came to light can result in legal redress and employer brand damage (Holland & Jeske, 2021), but that is a hard line to draw. As far as possible, HRM specialists involved in cyber-vetting information gathering should be ethical, transparent and respectful (Jeske & Schultz, 2016; Holland & Jeske, 2020).

As we have said, the internet can be a double-edge sword of (mis)information and (in)accuracies, making employers vulnerable to brand and reputation damage. Review websites such as Glassdoor provide an insight into the experiences and feelings of people wanting to work in, working in or having worked in an organisation, thus enabling individuals outside the boundaries of the business to learn more about the culture of particular employers. Glassdoor alone holds 40 million reviews of approximately 700,000 organisations (Heath, 2018) - and it is growing.

Reviews on these sites capture the work experience within organisations and range across culture, communication and leadership. In some cases, people will air grievances that exist only in their mind – there is a dark side of personal grievances too – and it is difficult for any reader to be able to tease out how much truth there is any particular post. People might well assume, however, that a cluster of negative accounts indicates underling issues (Heath, 2018). In general, information about a potential employer is valuable and research by Ranosa (2018) found that those who use Glassdoor to undertake 'smart' research on their target organisation and got a job there had longer tenure with the organisation than those that did not use such websites.

What these social media developments have initiated is a more proactive approach by organisations to managing their online presence and reputations (Acikgoz & Bergman, 2016; Breaugh, 2013; Mosley, 2015). Whichever way you look at it, online reputation management in the age of cyber-vetting and online review sites are becoming a challenge for many organisations, at the interface of attracting, recruiting and selection of new employees, and sometimes in control of current ones, and is increasingly an important area for HRM to manage (Biswas & Suar, 2016; Pabo-Nzaou, Lemieux, Beaupré, & Uwizeyemungu, 2016;

Russell & Brannan, 2016). Given the lack of guidance through legal frameworks, these challenges in cyber-vetting are significant concerns for all HRM professionals, especially in a globalised economy with an increasingly global workforce (Elefant, 2011).

Monitoring and surveillance at the centre of employment - smarter and darker?

Things are changing fast for those in work too. The significant advancement and ubiquitous nature of advanced smart technology in the last decade has created a substantial shift in the darker aspect of work such as in the intensity and invasiveness of electronic monitoring and surveillance available to management. As these advances increase, at a rapid rate, the legal framework has been unable to keep pace, leaving HRM specialists 'out on their own', building policies and practices in something of a vacuum. This section explores technological developments in (some might say invasion of) works and the attempts of the law to catch up.

Biological and biometric testing

Smart technology has increasingly made cost reductions in, and greater availability of biological and biometric testing. As increasing numbers of organisations access these techniques, with varying levels of HRM sophistication, the legal system has become a key battleground in adapting the boundaries of employment law to keep pace with the shifting boundaries of the technology. In this context, Australia has become somewhat of a leader in establishing a framework for managing these issues. Advances in new technologies have and continue to increase tension between and within the boundaries of the employment relationship around health and safety at work, employee rights and privacy rights. The tensions are creating an increasingly complex ethical minefield.

For example, whilst not a new form of monitoring, drug testing was once seen as only applicable for critical incident professions such as pilots or road haulage drivers or in heavy industries such as mining and steel works. These organisations were associated with critical incident management - and had the capacity and resources (including the ability within HRM) to undertake such monitoring. Such testing is now within the capabilities of most organisations. Drug-testing is predicated on creating a safe workplace from a human, economic and legal perspectives (French, Maclean, Sindelar & Fang, 2011; Gates, Grove & Copeland, 2013; Roche, Pidd & Kostadinov, 2016). Drug-testing is used to help negate the problems associated with substance abuse in the workplace (Ames & Bennet, 2011). However, the assumption that this is a straightforward relationship is over-simplified.

Research identifies that there are those who use illicit drugs outside the work environment and in ways that do not affect their work performance (Holland, 2016). From a legal perspective this is important since, whilst the duty of care is important, from an economic perspective, not every job has the potential to do harm. So, is mass testing and personal information gathering of white-collar workforce removed from critical incident environments really required? What implications does that have from the perspective of developing a trusting employment relationship – which some would argue is at the heart of good HRM.

In countries like the USA drug-testing is largely accepted by the public but it is frequently found to be major issue of contention in other countries such as Australia. In an analysis of high-profile cases employment cases on drug-testing at work Holland, Teicher and Pyman (2005) identified the importance of contextual elements that resulted in decisions being judged as either harsh nor unfair for both the employer and the employee. These decisions provided a framework in which HRM needed to manage drug-testing in businesses in Australia. However, after a decade, this argument was effectively overturned in the case of *Toms v Harbour City Ferries Pty Ltd FWC2327* (April 2014). A Sydney Harbour ferry captain returned a positive reading for marijuana, after an accident which was not his fault. Toms was dismissed for a serious breach of the Code of Conduct policy on zero tolerance of drugs and alcohol at work. Contextual evidence was provided that the marijuana was for pain relief on his day off, and he was not expecting to be called into work. The subsequent unfair dismissal proceedings centred on the legitimacy of zero-tolerance policies on drug and alcohol in the context of its influence on the accident, the effect on the captain and the impact on non-work activities. In an appeal after reinstatement due to these contextual factors, the full bench of the Work Commission held the dismissal was not harsh, unjust or unreasonable on the grounds that the mitigating factors noted were not grounds for non-compliance, with the Code of Conduct stating that ‘employees must not commence or continue work if they are affected by alcohol or other drugs’. The clear policy and guidelines on zero drug and alcohol tolerance at work, and the issues of public and employee safety and deliberate disobedience by a senior employee, were the key guiding points in the decision and the deputy president found that there was a valid reason for the dismissal of Mr Toms by Harbour City (FWCFB 6249). The significant aspect of this case was the focus on the employer’s policy above all contextual considerations. This is an important change in focus on drug and alcohol tolerance in the Australian workplace What this decision also signified is that employees’ behaviour outside work can be subject to employer discipline and even dismissal, where safety is a key

aspect of the role. This argument has been sustained in the case of CFMEU v Port Kembla Coal Terminal (PKCT) (2015) .

These cases illustrate the problems, issues and complexity surrounding the ongoing development and handling of drug testing policies and practices at work, as part of a wider health and safety process, as technology enables more organisations to undertake such testing. In addition, fundamental issues of privacy outside of work are now included. Significantly for HRM specialists is the need to understand these contested contours of the workplace and develop strategies that can deal with them.

Biometric monitoring and surveillance at work: the last frontier?

Similar to drug testing, the availability of genetic testing (available now on mail order for those wishing to explore their heritage) has also emerged as an ethical and legal workplace battlefield and therefore a contest terrain for HRM. Again, legal precedents are being set in Australia, as advances in smart technology become an enabler in the increase in intensity and invasiveness of mass monitoring and surveillance in the workplace, and this has been paralleled by advances at an individual level in terms of isolating and identifying the individual through a range of biometric and biological testing. Genetic testing involves the acquisition of a person's genetic or DNA information. Typical workplace features of biometric recognition technologies at work include iris, facial or fingerprint recognition, with a focus on increasing the reliability of identity authentication and/or verification linked to security, access control, theft prevention and attendance record-keeping (Carpenter et al., 2016). The unique nature of biometric traits is seen to enhance this accuracy as they are perceived as not easily replicable (Ball, 2010; Jackson, 2009; Nanavati et al., 2002; Rao, 2018).

The emerging issues for HRM are the management and use of this unique information, and employee privacy (Miller, 2017). In a world-leading case - *Jeremy Lee v Superior Wood Pty Ltd (2019)* - which again went to the Full Bench of the Australian Fair work Commission (FWC), an employee (Lee) was dismissed for refusing to sign-in using a biometric scanner which matched a digitized record of the fingerprint to the employee. There were damning findings of the coercive nature of the process leading to dismissal, of non-compliance with privacy and information regulations policy and, by default the information privacy of the employee. The dismissal was overturned on grounds of new contractual obligations by the full bench of the Fair work Commission (Holland & Tham, 2020) not on these privacy

breaches. What this case highlights is that the reduced cost of the relevant technologies is making them available to organisations with limited resources (including experience or capability) in their HRM department, meaning this will continue to provide a rich contested terrain for HRM to manage and the courts to monitor.

Commented [CB1]: I couldn't quite work this out: what was the verdict? Was he unfairly dismissed or not?

This may also be the case with the advancement of radio frequency identification (RFID) and Global Positioning Systems (GPS) devices. These were developed to track freight but can just as easily be used for the tracking of people; some firms, mainly in the USA, are trying to microchip their employees – in the same way that those employees do with their pets. This also raises ethical issues! As Barbelier (2018) points out, how reasonable it is for employers to require employees to provide biometric data or be tracked every hour of the day and night? Is that extending beyond the realm of reasonable management of work-related security or performance or is it just an invasion of informational privacy (Alder & Ambrose, 2005)? It is hardly conducive to the creation and sustenance of a culture of trust (Holland et al., 2016). The future advances of technology and its intersection with human biology will be one of the major frontiers of the employment relationship and a key one for human resource professionals to contend with over the next decade.

Working from home

Technology, then, is a significant driver of change in work and is going to become an increasingly important issue for HRM to manage, especially in relation to advances in (smart) information communication technologies (ICT). This is best exemplified by the impact of the global coronavirus (or COVID-19) pandemic. For many this might be described as a forced global social experiment – in making the ‘place’ of work incidental to the work itself and hugely expanding the phenomenon of ‘working from home’ (WFH), as governments across the world mandated the closure of physical worksites. The technology required had been available for many years, but the pandemic was a major accelerant. The irony is that the relatively seamless transition of millions of workers and managers *en masse* and instantly to the virtual workplace was that the levels of smart technology in the employees’ hands (smart phone and computers) and in the employers’ technology platforms, were already primed for WFH prior to the pandemic - but its use was almost non-existent. WFH has benefits for employers (in terms of a lower need for expensive office, factory and warehouse space) for employees (in terms of more control over their time and less commuting time) and for society

(in terms of less use of resources and less pollution moving people to and from work). But it was little used: we would argue that that is because employees like the social side of work and, crucially, employers did not trust people to work when they were not within immediate sight, or within potentially immediate sight, of a supervisor.

The pandemic forced the experiment. It can be seen as a catalyst breaking that distrust of allowing people to work out of sight – a hangover of 19th and 20th century management processes. However, the ingrained management culture of oversight soon became evident with the emergence IT software designed to track people working remotely. Euphemistically called ‘tattleware’, research by Allyn (2020) and Sparrow (2020) highlighted the monitoring of the employee’s computer mouse and keyboard movements, ‘TSheets’ on employee’s phones could observe their whereabouts during working hours, and ‘Time Doctor’ could download videos of the employees’ screens as they worked and enable the computer webcam to take pictures of the employee every 10 minutes, with the option to log workers out or send an email from their supervisor if they were perceived to be inactive for too long.

It was estimated that by the end of 2020, one estimate was of up to 80% of organisations using some form of electronic surveillance to monitor remote working (Gartner cited in Martin, 2020). The emerge of remote working supported by technology, did not create trust in the workforce (Holland & Bardoel, 2016).

In the circumstances of the pandemic, remote working almost invariably meant working from home, where most people believe privacy should be at its strongest (Holland & Brewster, 2021; Holland & Tham, 2020). This ‘invasion’ of the home highlights the pressure of being electronically monitored and overseen by your boss and identifies the contentious issues of boundaries when it comes to the concept of moral and ethical privacy for the employee (Determann & Sprague, 2011; Sewell, 2021; Sewell & Barker, 2006; Tham & Holland, 2020).

Many argue that individuals have a need and expectation for privacy, which includes their home, and allows boundaries on how much of oneself is revealed to the employer (Fairweather, 1999; Petronio et al, 1998). Issues created by intense and relentless electronic monitoring and surveillance are exacerbated when the workplace is also the home (Holland & Brewster, 2021; Wheatley, 2021). Is management able to increase or decrease the level of trust needed in the employment relationship? Moving from a panopticon to a participatory model of management and leadership may be a particularly difficult change for some

managers to adjust to in the ‘new normal’. The sting in the tail for this increased intense electronic monitoring and surveillance is that it could result not only in a lack of trust but also in decreased mental health of the workforce (Holland & Brewster, 2021), which manifests itself in lower productivity and increased turnover (Martin, Wellon & Grimmer, 2016) and damage to employer brand reputation (Holland & Jeske, 2019).

A central issue emerging out of the pandemic for those WFH is the evidence that these were seen as a positive change and smart aspects of the ‘new normal’ in work practices are likely to remain (Liveris, 2020; Farrer, 2020) with hybrid work practices of traditional and virtual work becoming the normal. This new paradigm is likely to set new tests and agenda’s for HRM professional from issues of health and safety to isolation and team management. WFH seems to have negative implications for those who are already disadvantaged at work, particularly women with young children (Myers, et al. 2020. Del Boca, Oggero, Profeta & Rossi, 2020. Myers, et al. 2020) and of course the levels of monitoring and surveillance versus the levels of trust (Martin et al, 2016). HRM will be at the centre of these new challenges.

The changes in context

We should see these changes in their context. We are part of the *fourth industrial revolution* (Schwarb, 2016), the expansion of robotisation and artificial intelligence into every walk of life. It is, like the previous industrial revolutions, a stuttering and patchy process, with different incarnations and different implications in different places, but the overall trend is clear. Work is changing to accommodate what the technology can do better and/or cheaper than human beings. As in the previous revolutions some kinds of work are being eliminated and some created – but in this case, the work that is being created will be performed by robots and artificial intelligence (AI), rather than human beings. “The single most important challenge facing humanity today is how to understand and shape the new technology revolution” according to Klaus Schwab (2016), the founder of the World Economic Forum.

All of the changes we have discussed so far are dependent on these new technologies. Arguably, things like are progressing at speeds faster than predicted or often understood (Prassl, 2018). There will not, of course, be any ‘straight-line’ trajectory of change. But the threat of robotization and AI has led and will lead to an intensification of the ever-present search for cheaper ways to get work done. This will put on further pressure to move people out

of employment and to get them to provide the work in some form of the gig economy, it will exacerbate the possibilities of degrading work and it will, as we have seen, increase the control options for managers.

What is the role of HRM in this process? We would argue that if HRM specialists (and scholars) continue to focus on employment, rather than work, then their constituency and their influence will continue to decline; if they continue to focus on reducing labour costs to ensure that people can 'beat the machines' they will continue their shameful oversight of the increasingly stretched reward systems; and if they continue just to try to manage people to meet their employer's strategic targets, then they will continue to accept an 'amoral' approach to their work. If, on the other hand, they begin to see their task as encompassing all the ways in which work can get done (Brewster & Holland, 2019), and see their role as balancing the interests of all their stakeholders (Beer, Boselie & Brewster, 2015), then HRM can play a crucial role in the near future in the development of work and of society.

Conclusion: looking to the future

The dark side of recent developments has been a reinforcing of a work environment where extensive and ever-intensifying electronic monitoring and surveillance create a climate of oppression and control, and where isolation and lack of trust become sources of alienation (Holland & Tham, 2020). In such circumstances how can HRM work on the development and maintenance of a committed hybrid workforce? As Lepak and Snell (2008) note, human resource management systems need to reflect an environment characterised by continuous change and increased competition, but the direction of that change is always in contention.

The central question emerging out of the pandemic concerns direction: will work patterns and practices developed during the pandemic continue as governments around the world begin to get a grip of the contagion, vaccination programmes begin to be effective, and people are allowed to go back to their traditional working patterns and workplaces? The initial consensus suggests that the work experiences of the 'new normal' are likely to continue in one form or another (Liveris, 2020; Farrer, 2020). People may, for example, go back to the workplace for just one or two days each week. This is going to require some practical changes (eg commuters' season tickets may have to be more flexible), some changes in workplaces (perhaps smaller office buildings and more 'hot-desking'), some changes in the surrounding support services (eg there may be less need for the sandwich shops and quick-

service restaurants that served the big city offices), maybe even some changes to family life and socialising. But there will also need to be some changes to HRM policies and practices.

So, in re-adjusting to the post-pandemic world what issues are likely to enhance or constrain the development of the new workplace? Clearly, the nature of how work will be organised and arranged is a critical issue. These may well be the defining HRM issues of the next decade and the defining point of the transformation in creating what is increasingly being called the 'new normal'. To what extent can the balance between WFH and attendance at the workplace be left to individual employees and to what extent will attendance at the workplace be required at certain times or on certain days. How is the balance between allowing individuals to work at home and the need for teamwork and 'freewheeling' creativity to be maintained? What will be the relationship between work and employment in the business of the future? What is HRM's role in the relationship with people who are being managed by an algorithm? What can HRM specialists do to overcome the pressures to increase and worsen the differences between advantaged workers and disadvantaged workers?

There are, we hope it is clear, big questions here and substantial issues for HRM departments. This is particularly the case when we think that until very recently HRM departments were focused almost exclusively on employment, rather than work, and on the workplace, rather than on hybrid forms of working. There is a requirement here for us all to learn well and to learn quickly.

References

- Allyn, B. (2020). Your boss is watching you: Work from home boom leads to more surveillance. *NPR.org*, May 13.
- Holland, P. & Brewster, C. (2021). Redesigning work as a response to the global pandemic: possibilities and pitfalls. In D. Wheatley, S. Buglass and I. Hardill (ed). *Remote Work and Worker Well-Being in the Post-COVID-19 Era: Impacts, Challenges, and Opportunities*. IGI Global. Penn. USA, pp.104-121.
- Sparrow, J. (2020). Working from home has a long history – be careful what you wish for not wanting to go back to the office. *The Guardian online*, May 26.
- Determann, L. and Sprague, R. (2011). Intrusive monitoring: employee privacy expectations are reasonable in Europe, destroyed in the United States. *Berkeley Technology Law*: 26, 979-1036.

- Sewell, G. & Barker, J.R. (2006). Coercion versus care: using irony to make sense of organizational surveillance. *Academy of Management Review*, 31(4): 934-961.
- Petronio, S. (2002). *Boundary of Privacy: Dialectics of Disclosure*, New York: NY, SUNY Press.
- Petronio, S., Ellemers, N., Giles, H. & Gallois, C. (1998). (Mis)communicating across boundaries. *Communication Research*, 61:101-113.
- Farrer, L. (2020). The new normal isn't remote work. It's better. *Forbes.com*. May 12.
- Lepak, D. P., & Snell, S. A. (2008). Employment subsystems and the 'HR architecture'. In P. Boxall, J. Purcell, & P. M. Wright (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of human resource management*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Liveris, C. (2020). We proved we can work from home. Why do we need to go back to the office? *WA Today*. May 16.
- Holland, P. & Brewster, C. (Eds.). 2020. *Contemporary Work and the Future of Employment in Developed Countries*. London & New York: Routledge
- Holland, P. & Jeske, D. (2017). The changing role of social media at work – implications for recruitment and selection. In T. Bonadrouk, H. Ruel and E. Parry, *Electronic HRM in the Smart Era*. London, Routledge.
- Holland, P. & Tham, T.L. (2019). Working under electronic monitoring and surveillance. In P. Holland, P. & C. Brewster (eds), *Contemporary Work and the Future of Employment in Developed Societies* (eds). Routledge. UK.
- Holland, P. & Tham, T.L. (2020) Workplace biometrics: protecting employee privacy one fingerprint at a time. *Economic and Industrial Democracy* [oi.org/10.1177/0143831X20917453](https://doi.org/10.1177/0143831X20917453)
- Lacey, A., Lester, K., Cartwright-Hatton, S. & Banerjee, R. (2020). *Coronavirus (COVID-19): Relationship, Emotional Well Being and Family Adjustment Study*. University of Sussex.
- Margulis, S. (2003). On the status and contribution of Westin's and Altman's theories of privacy. *Social Issues*, 59(2): 411-429.
- Morrison, S. (2020). Just because you are working from home doesn't mean your boss isn't watching. *Recode*. April 2.
- Sewell, G. & Barker, J.R. (2006). Coercion versus care: using irony to make sense of organizational surveillance. *Academy of Management Review*, 31(4): 934-961.
- Wheatley, D. (2012). Good to be home? Time use and satisfaction levels among home-based teleworkers. *New Technology Work and Employment* 27(3): 224-241.
- Wheatley, D. (2020). Changing places of work. In Holland, P. & Brewster, C. (Eds.) *Contemporary Work: The Future of Employment in Developed Countries*. London, Routledge. UK. pp.115-134.

References

- Acikgoz, Y. & Bergman, S. M. (2016). Social media and employee recruitment: Chasing the runaway bandwagon. In B. R. Landers & G. B. Schmidt (Eds), *Social Media in*

Employee Selection and Recruitment. Theory, Practice, and Current Challenges (pp. 175–195). New York, NY: Springer International Publishing.

- Alder, S. & Ambrose, M. (2005) Toward understanding fairness judgements associated with computer performance monitoring: An integration of the feedback, justice, and monitoring research. *Human Resource Management Review*, 15: 43–67.
- Barbeler, D. (2018). Turn on, tune in, drop out. *HRMonthly*, June:12-17.
- Barnes, A., Balnave, N. & Holland, P. (2018) ‘Utterly disgraceful’: social media and the workplace. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 77 (3):492-499.
- Beer, M., Boselie, P., & Brewster, C. 2015. Back to the future: Implications for the field of HRM of the multi-stakeholder perspective proposed 30 years ago. *Human Resource Management*, 54(3): 427-438
- Berkelaar, B. & Buzzanel, P. (2014). Cybervetting, person-environment fit, and personnel selection: employers’ surveillance and sensemaking of job applicants’ online information. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 42(4), 456-476.
- Berkelaar, B. (2014). Cybervetting, online information and personnel selection: Employers: New transparency expectations and the emergence of digital social contracts. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 28(4), 479–506.
- Biswas, M. K., & Suar, D. (2016). Antecedents and consequences of employer branding. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 136, 57–72.
- Breaugh, J. A. (2013). Employee recruitment. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 64 (January), 389-416.
- Brewster, C. & Holland, P. (2019). Work or employment in the 21st Century: IT’s impact on the employment relationship. In A. Wilkinson and M. Barry. *The Research Agenda for the Future of Work*. Edward Elgar. UK, pp.19-32.
- Brewster, C., & Holland, P. 2019. Work or employment in the 21st Century: IT’s impact on the employment relationship. In A. Wilkinson, & M. Barry (Eds.), *The Research Agenda for the Future of Work*: Edward Elgar.
- Carpenter, D., McLeod, A., Hicks, C. & Maasberg, M. (2016). Privacy and Biometrics: an empirical examination of employee concerns. *Information Systems Frontiers*, 20(1): 91-1
- Chiang, J. K.-H. & Suen, H.-Y. (2015). Self-presentation and hiring recommendations in online communities: Lessons from LinkedIn. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 48(2015), 516-524.
- Del Boca, D., Oggero, N., Profeta, P., & Rossi, M. (2020). Women’s and men’s work, housework and childcare, before and during COVID-19. *Review of Economics of the Household*, 18(4): 1001-1017.
- Elefant, C. (2011). The ‘power’ of social media: Legal issues and best practices for utilities engaging social media. *Energy Law Journal*, 32, 1–56.
- Elving, J. L., Westhoff, J. J. C., Meeusen, K., & Schoonderbeek, J.-W. (2012). The war for talent? The relevance of employer branding in job advertisements for becoming an employer of choice. *Journal of Brand Management*, 20, 355–373.
- Evans, T. (2015) Bad mouth. *HR Monthly*, August, 26-29

- Fairweather, N. (1999). Surveillance in employment – the case of teleworking. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 22(2):39-49.
- French, M., Maclean, J., Sindelar, J., & Fang, H. (2011). The morning after: Alcohol misuse and employment problems. *Applied Economics*, 43(21), 2705-2720.
- Gates, P., Grove, R., & Copeland, J. (2013). Impact of substance use on the Australian workforce, *Journal of Addiction and Prevention*, 1(2), 1-9.
- Heath, N. (2018). Seek and you shall find. *HRMonthly*, August, pp. 24–27.
- Holland, P. & Bardoel, A. (2016). Exploring the Smart and Dark side of Work in an Electronic Era. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 27(21): 2579-2581.
- Holland, P. & Jeske, D. (2017). The changing role of social media at work: Implications for recruitment and selection. In T. Bondarouk, H. Ruel & E. Parry (Eds), *Electronic HRM in the smart era* (Ch. 11, pg. 287-309). Book series The Changing Context of Managing People. London: Emerald Publishing.
- Holland, P. (2016). Drug testing in Australia: Still a contested terrain. *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 58(5), 688-696.
- Holland, P. J., Pyman, A. & Teicher, J. (2005). Negotiating the contested terrain of drug testing in the Australian workplace, *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 47(3), 326-338.
- Holland, P., & Jeske, D. (2017). The changing role of social media at work: Implications for recruitment and selection. In T. Bondarouk, H. Ruel & E. Parry (Eds), *Electronic HRM in the smart era* (Ch. 11, pg. 287-309). Book series The Changing Context of Managing People. London: Emerald Publishing.
- Holland, P., Cooper, B. & Hecker, R. (2015). Electronic monitoring and surveillance in the workplace: the effects on trust in management, and the moderating role of occupational type. *Personnel Review*, 44(1): 1-27.
- Holland, P., Cooper, B., Hecker, R. (2016) Use of social media at work: a new form of employee voice? *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 27(21): 2621-2634
- Holmes, P. (2013) Inside HMV's twitter disaster: What went wrong (and how to keep your company safe). www.LikedIn.com/pulse, February 14
- Jackson, L. (2009). Biometric technology: The future of identity assurance and authentication in the lodging industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 21(7): 892-905.
- Jeske, D. & Shultz, K.S. (2016). Using social media content for screening in recruitment and selection: pros and cons. *Work, Employment & Society*, 30, 535–546.
- Kougiannou, N. & Mendonça, P. (2021). Breaking the managerial silencing of worker voice in platform capitalism: the rise of a food courier network. *British Journal of Management*, DOI: 10.1111/1467-8551.12505.
- Lee J v Superior Wood Pty Ltd t./a Superior Wood, (FWC 95), January 2019.
- Lee J v Superior Wood Pty Ltd T/A Superior Wood, (FWC 4762), November 2018.
- Lee J v Superior Wood Pty Ltd, (FWCFB 2946), May 2019.
- Mannes, A., Soll J, & Larrick, R. (2014). The wisdom of select crowds. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 107(2):276-299

- Martin, A. J., Wellen, J. M., & Grimmer, M. R. (2016). An eye on your work: How empowerment affects the relationship between electronic surveillance and counterproductive work behaviours. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 27(21), 2635-2651.
- Martin, G., Parry, E., Flowers, P. (2015) Do social media enhance constructive employee voice all the time or just some of the time? *Human Resource Management Journal*, 25(4): 541-562
- Melanthiou, Y., Pavlou, F. & Constantinou, E. (2015). The use of social network sites as an e-recruitment tool. *Journal of Transnational Management*, 20, 31–49.
- Mennie, P. (2015). *Social Media, Risk and Governance*. UK: Hogan Page.
- Miles S, Mangold G (2014) Employee voice: Untapped resource or social media time bomb? *Business Horizons*, 57:401-411
- Mosley, R.W. (2015, May 11). CEOs need to pay attention to employer branding. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/2015/05/ceos-need-to-pay-attention-to-employer-branding>. Accessed 22 July 2018.
- Myers, K. R., Tham, W. Y., Yin, Y., Cohodes, N., Thursby, J. G., Thursby, M. C., Schiffer, P., Walsh, J. T., Lakhani, K. R., & Wang, D. (2020). Unequal effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on scientists. *Nature human behaviour*, 4(9): 880-883.
- Nanavati, S., Thieme, M. & Nanavati, R. (2002). *Biometrics: Identity verification in a Networked World*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc
- Pabo-Nzaou, P., Lemieux, N., Beaupré, D., & Uwizeyemungu, S. (2016). Critical challenges associated with the adoption of social media: A Delphi of a panel of Canadian human resources managers. *Journal of Business Research*, 69, 4011–4019.
- Prassl, J. (2018). *Humans as a Service*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ranosa (2018, August 21). How to use Glassdoor reviews to your advantage. *HRD Tech Newsletter*. Retrieved from <https://www.hrtechnologynews.com/news/talent-acquisition/how-to-use-glassdoor-reviews-to-your-advantage/109325>. Accessed July 22, 2018.
- Rao, U. (2018). Biometric bodies, or how to make electronic fingerprinting work in India. *Body and Society*, 24(3), 68-94.
- Roche, A., Pidd, K., & Kostadinov, V. (2016). Alcohol- and drug-related absenteeism: A costly problem. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health*, 40(3), 236-238.
- Roth, P. L., Bobko, P., van Iddekinge, C. H. & Thatcher, J. B. (2016). Social media in employee-selection-related decisions: A research agenda for uncharted territory. *Journal of Management*, 42, 269–298.
- Russell, S. & Brannan, M. J. (2016). ‘Getting the right people on the bus’: Recruitment, selection and integration for the branded organization. *European Management Journal*, 34, 114–124.
- Schwarb, K. (2016). *The Fourth Industrial Revolution*. Switzerland: World Economic Forum.
- Slovensky, R. & Ross, W. H. (2012). Should human resource managers use social media to screen job applicants? Managerial and legal issues in the USA. *Info*, 14, 55–69.
- Surowiecki, J. (2004). *The Wisdom of Crowds*. Anchor Books, New York

Wheatcroft, J. (2016). Risks and rewards in the world of social media. *Human Resource Management International Digest*, 24(5), 16–18.