

# Impact of Cyberloafing on the Workplace (A Case of Zenith Bank Nigeria Plc.)

Salami Luqman Adeniyi

*Department of Human Resource Management, Highstone International University California, USA*

Date of Submission: 25-01-2024

Date of Acceptance: 05-02-2024

## ABSTRACT

Cyberloafing is the employee use of Internet, provided by the organization, for non-work related activities during work hours in the workplace, this also includes use of mobile internet enabled devices such as smart phones and tablets. This phenomenon has become more prevalent with the ease of access to internet leading to loss of working hours and interference with organizational performance thereby creating concerns regarding employee productivity. It is counterproductive work behaviour as it undermines the goal and interest of the organization. Aside emailing and browsing, engaging in online social activities is one of the most common reasons for using the internet this is referred to as social cyberloafing. Social cyberloafing can be a source of social support. Research shows that benefits of social support are double barreled, firstly because employees with stronger social network exhibit better psychological and physical wellbeing and secondly employee with good social network are likely to cope positively with job stress. Thus social network acts as a buffer against stress. Although technological interventions have been proven to be effective, some employees perceived it as invasion to their privacy and this can have consequences on their behaviour. This research study attempts to examine the relationship between employee behaviour, stress, work facilitation/depletion and cyberloafing with focus on the impact in the workplace. It aims to contribute to the information system's body of knowledge. Discussions and implications for future research are provided.

**Keywords:** Cyberloafing, Organisational performance, employees' behaviour, Stress, social cyberloafing, employee productivity

## I. INTRODUCTION

Communication technology has broadened every part of our lives by influencing our social structures, personal actions, and cultural outcomes. Thanks to the advancement of communication

technologies, the internet is now a vital component of our workplaces. The Internet has made the workplace more flexible, liberated, and independent. ICT has fundamentally altered how people work across all sectors of the economy, boosting productivity and efficiency. Technology is, however, also fostering bad or unproductive conduct in humans (Anandarajan and Simmers, 2015). These days, we may access the internet on little computers called mobile devices in addition to using it at work. Therefore, the line separating appropriate from inappropriate internet use while delaying an employee's current work-related responsibilities is a problem in the modern era. When work is put off for personal projects, an employee's behavior deviates from normal production and highlights the difference between the quantity and quality of their output. Cyberloafing refers to the use of online resources for personal purposes (Lim 2022).

An employee's conduct deviates from usual production when work is postponed for personal pursuits, highlighting the gap between quantity and quality of their output. The majority of studies on cyberloafing focus on its negative effects on workers and organizations, but more recent studies have started looking into its potential positive effects. Some of these studies have found that cyberloafing positively influences employee behavior, indicating that it has both negative and positive effects in the workplace. It's interesting to note that people who have exhausted energy supplies are more prone to engage in CWBs (Banks, Whelpley, Oh, & Shin, 2012), which supports the idea that businesses should support staff in managing their resources to deal with stress.

There is empirical evidence that most employees engage in cyberloafing during the workplace, even if it is impossible to precisely measure the effect it has on firms (Andressen et al., 2014). The two types of cyberloafing that Blanchard and Henle (2018) identified are minor

and major cyberloafing. Sending and receiving emails, listening to the news, and viewing financial websites are all examples of minor Cyberloafing. Visits to adult websites, online conversations, blogging, music downloads, and gambling constitutes serious Cyberloafing. Due to the fact that online time is not used productively, Barlow et al. (2003) and Blau, Yang, and Ward-Cook (2016) elaborated the same unfavorable association of cyber laziness with task performance. According to Lim and Chen (2012), employees benefit from browsing activities while sending emails. In a fast-paced atmosphere with high work expectations, little to no work-life balance, and organizational pressure, it has become vital to examine employee attitudes regarding cyberloafing as a response to job stress and how it affects the workplace. Job stressors have been linked to decrements in job performance and increases in counter-productive work and strain (Gilboa, Shirom, Fried, & Cooper, 2008; Meier & Spector, 2013). Several researches have suggested that cyberloafing is a response to unfair treatment at work. They concur that cyberloafing is justifiable when workers put in extra effort to access the knowledge or resources they need to execute their jobs, put in unpaid overtime, or are required to finish excessive amounts of work (Lim, Teo, & Loo, 2022). Importantly, employees are less likely to use cyberloafing as a stress-reduction strategy when they perceive organizational implications, such as disciplinary action against it.

There are various reasons why workers engage in cyberloafing activities. Numerous studies have been undertaken to determine the causes of this behavior, and the results of these studies indicate that stress or pressure at work, including job ambiguity, role conflict, and role overload, can lead to employees engaging in cyberloafing activities. Employees who experience any kind of job stress will turn to cyberloafing to relieve their stress (Sawitria & Runing, 2012). Understanding what drives people to behave in this way can help firms create and implement effective intervention programs and policies to prevent or restrict its occurrence.

Cyberloafing is a dysfunctional deviant employee behaviour that has negative consequences for the organization, such as decrease in productivity, increased financial losses and exposure to liability risks, (Colin, 2020; Lichtash, 2004; Stewart, 2000; Verton, 2000). It threatens network security and strains organizational bandwidth by overloading it, (Oswald & Elliot Howard, 2003). Cyberloafing turns out to be a

counterproductive behavior when the employee intends to avoid work or to punish the organization by limiting their contribution. While the majority of internet users believe that tasks like checking the football results online or sending an email to a friend just take a few seconds and shouldn't be problematic in the grand scheme of things, these tasks frequently take hours and cause issues for the organization. Other words that characterize using the internet in the workplace ineffectively exist. Non-work-related computing (Lee et al., 2005), cyberslacking, cyberdeviance, online misuse, workplace internet leisure browsing, and junk computing are a few examples (Vitak et al, 2011).

Numerous viewpoints on the advantages and disadvantages of using a personal computer at work have been studied, according to those studies. Others place more emphasis on the positive effects, such as enhancing employees' creativity and learning capacity and acting as a mechanism for rest and recovery from the stress of work, while some believe it has negative effects on organizations in terms of productivity, legal compliance, and information security (Henle et al., 2019; Wagner et al., 2012). Cyberloafing can be viewed from this perspective as being similar to taking a traditional physical break from work, such as walking to the pantry to get coffee or simply taking a walk outside. Cyber loafing is expected to improve work performance by allowing employees to take a break from their duties.

The objective of this study is to evaluate and understand the impact of cyberloafing in the financial sector in a bid to improve organizational commitment and organizational performance. The specific objectives are to examine the relationship between job stress and cyberloafing; to examine the relationship between employee job satisfaction and cyberloafing and to examine the relationship between organizational justice and cyberloafing. Based on the specific objectives of this study some hypotheses are formulated to buttress the investigation, thus;

**H<sub>01</sub>:** There will be a significant relationship between job stress and cyberloafing in the organization

**H<sub>02</sub>:** There will be a significant relationship between job satisfaction and cyberloafing in an organization.

**H<sub>05</sub>:** There will be a significant relationship between organizational justice and cyberloafing in an organization.

This study will be of great assistance to the banking industry in addressing the issue of cyberloafing, and it will undoubtedly signal a pivotal moment in the drive to create a positive and long-lasting performance through the management and eventual eradication of cyberloafing in the banking industry. The study also hopes that its conclusions and suggestions will raise people's awareness of the issue; scholars and students of management will see the study as a valuable instrument and source for further investigation.

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

### 2.1 Conceptual review

Cyberloafing, or the usage of the Internet at work, is increasing daily, which has led to new productivity difficulties (Kim & Byrne, 2021). Cyberloafing, as defined by Whitty and Carr (2006), is the excessive use of the Internet for non-job-related purposes while at work. Because of this excessive use, there are now additional issues during working hours (Vitak et al., 2021), which results in billions of dollars in productivity losses (Blanchard & Henle, 2018; Lim, 2022). Researchers noted that productivity loss is not the only concern; cyberloafing also causes challenges with computer network security, legal complications, and a slowdown in data transmission throughout a company's computer network. Researchers have suggested that a deterrence strategy using acceptable use policies for Internet-based applications along with mechanisms designed to monitor employee Internet usage and detect unauthorized usage can be an effective way to reduce cyberloafing, which has become a pervasive issue for many organizations. Because there are new multimedia distractions for workers every day, according to Blanchard and Henle (2018), the issue of wasting work time by browsing the Internet for personal reasons will persist. It is important to investigate why people abuse the workplace internet and its effects on the organization.

#### Predictors of Cyberloafing

**Job Stress:** The pressure that an individual feels as a result of organizational and job-specific variables, such as demands and limits that have been imposed on them, is known as job stress (Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, & Rosenthal, 1964). Previous research demonstrates that workplace stress has a negative impact on workers' physical as well as emotional health. According to a study, stress at work has a negative impact on employees' physical

and mental health, which in turn affects their intention to quit and job performance (Hang-yue, Foley, & Loi, 2005). Role stresses can be broken down into three categories: role conflict, role ambiguity, and role overload.

Role overload is defined as an imbalance between the task needs and the time allotted for their completion as well as the resources that are available to meet those requirements (Rizzo, House, & Lirtzman, 1970). When an employee's work role is followed by more work, less time, tight deadlines, and less resources needed for the performance of duties, the tasks due, and the work role-related obligations, this problem of work overload arises.

Role ambiguity happens when someone is unsure of what is expected of them in their role within a company or organization (Rizzo, House, & Lirtzman, 1970). Investigating the amount of information offered to him or she in relation to his or her employment could help determine the degree of role ambiguity. Role ambiguity may be described as a lack of understanding necessary to meet organizational objectives (Luthans & Thomas, 1989). And this is a result of bad communication between managers and staff members, insufficient employee training, or confusing job expectations. Additionally, there is a significant correlation between cyberloafing and role ambiguity (Blanchard & Henle, 2008).

**Job Satisfaction:** One of the dimensions of an employee's working attitude, job satisfaction, has a substantial impact on cyberloafing in terms of employees' disengagement from certain areas of their work and desire to replace it with other activities. Emotions that produce happy sensations and satisfaction in workers at the conclusion of their workday are referred to as job satisfaction. Positive attitudes that people acquire toward their jobs lead to high levels of satisfaction; negative attitudes lead to low levels of contentment. Organizational factors influencing job satisfaction include working conditions, compensation, management, prospects for promotion, and relationships with co-workers and managers. A person's age, sex, marital status, level of education, occupation, seniority, IQ, personality, culture, and social surroundings are considered personal characteristics.

Physical characteristics of the job, qualification for the job, promotion, management style, control mechanism, trust, advancement, rivalry, communication, payment, working conditions, coworkers, and participation in

organizational environment and decisions are examples of organizational factors that affect job satisfaction. Cyberloafing has been found to be an emotional reaction to upsetting work experiences and feelings of dissatisfaction, which increases the likelihood that an employee may commit such wrongdoing. Lau, Au, and Ho (2023); Judge, Scott, and Illies (2016); and Liebmann et al. (2011). Less pleased workers are less dependable and accountable to the company, and they are more prone to engage in off-task behavior at work.

**Organizational Justice:** According to research, when employees feel there is less organizational fairness, they are more prone to cyberloaf (Blau, Yang, & Ward-Cook, 2016; de Lara, 2007; Lim, 2022). Employees who believed their employers to be unfair were more likely to participate in retaliatory behavior, such as cyberloafing, according to Skarlicki & Folger's (1997) research. The three types of justice distributive, procedural, and interactional—were all found to be negatively correlated with cyberloafing by Lim and Teo (2015), who examined the impact of these variables in predicting cyberloafing. According to research by Lim (2022), one way workers attempt to redress perceived injustice at work is by cyberloafing. When credit is not properly provided for a job well done, interpersonal mistreatment is one of the most prevalent felt forms of unfairness. In general, this relationship is such that if workers feel they are being treated unfairly by the company, they may become upset and inspired to retaliate by cyberloafing. Distributive, procedural, and interactional justice is the three main manifestations of organizational justice.

## 2.2 Theoretical Framework

### Theory of Organizational Justice

Distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice are the three subcategories of organizational justice. According to research, when employees feel there is less organizational fairness, they are more prone to cyberloaf (Blau, Yang, & Ward-Cook, 2006; de Lara, 2007; Lim, 2002). According to Folger (1997), workers who felt their employers treated them unfairly were more likely to participate in retaliatory behavior, such as cyberloafing. The three types of justice distributive, procedural, and interactional were all found to be negatively correlated with cyberloafing by Lim and Teo (2005), who examined the impact of these variables in predicting cyberloafing. According to research by Lim (2022), one way workers attempt to redress perceived

injustice at work is by cyberloafing. When credit is not properly provided for a job well done, interpersonal mistreatment is one of the most prevalent felt forms of unfairness. In general, this relationship is such that if workers feel they are being treated unfairly by the company, they may become upset and inspired to retaliate by cyberloafing. Distributive, procedural, and interactional justices are the three main manifestations of organizational justice.

Equitable justice Fairness connected to decision outcomes and resource distribution is how this is conceptualized. The results or resources provided may be physical (like pay) or intangible (like resources) (e.g., appraisal). When outcomes are thought to be applied equitably, distributive justice perceptions might be encouraged. The fairness of the procedures leading to results is referred to as procedural justice. Procedural justice is believed to be improved when people feel like they have a say in the process or when the process demonstrates traits like consistency, correctness, ethics, and impartiality. Interactional justice relates to how a person is treated as decisions are made, and it can be supported by giving reasons for choices and breaking bad news in a sensitive and respectful way. According to earlier research, interactional justice should be divided into two parts: Informational and interpersonal justice. Informational justice concerns the suitability of the explanations provided in terms of their timeliness, specificity, and truthfulness. Interpersonal justice refers to perceptions of respect and propriety in one's treatment and this reflects the extent to which people are treated with politeness, dignity, and respect by authorities and third parties involved in executing procedures or determining outcomes. This article concentrates on explanations given to individuals that provide details on the rationale behind why particular techniques were employed.

### Theory of Interpersonal behaviour

Triandis established the Theory of Interpersonal Behavior (TIB) in 1977. According to Triandis, behavior in any circumstance is a function of the intention, habitual reactions, and situational limits and conditions. Along with cognitive considerations, social and affective aspects also have an impact on intention. According to Triandis' approach, one is neither totally automatic nor fully deliberative. One is neither wholly social nor fully autonomous. Moral convictions have an impact on behavior, but these influences are tempered by emotional needs and cognitive constraints. Norms, roles, and self-

concept are examples of social factors. The social codes that govern what should and shouldn't be done are known as norms. Roles are groups of behaviors that are seen to be suitable for people in specific positions within a group. The concept of oneself, the objectives that one should seek or reject, and the behaviors one engages in or abstains from are all referred to as one's self-concept. Triandis explicitly discusses the impact of affective elements on behavioral intentions. It is considered that emotional reactions to a decision are distinct from rational-instrumental assessments of its effects. These reactions can be both positive and negative, with varied degrees of intensity. Decision-making is more or less influenced by affect, which is controlled by behavioral instincts in reaction to certain circumstances. Individual involvement in cyberloafing if he or she has high intentions to do so as a result of environmental influence; in opposition, the level of cyberloafing behaviour decrease when more negative influences provided for instance monitoring the usage of internet from higher level.

### 2.3 Empirical Review

Cyberloafing results in the waste of time, which is an organization's most valuable resource. As a result, businesses should be concerned about productivity loss, legal consequences, and network outages. Research conducted on email usage by Macklem (2006) revealed that responding to emails consumes less energy than is needed for other office tasks and that emailing has a detrimental influence on employees' productivity. Minor Cyberloafing includes activities like sending and receiving emails, listening to the news, and visiting financial websites. Serious Cyberloafing includes activities including visiting adult websites, having online conversations, blogging, downloading music, and gambling. Barlow et al. (2023), Blau et al. (2006), and Jandaghi et al. (2015) elaborated the same detrimental association of cyber loafing with task performance since the time spent online is not utilised for productivity. Lim and Chen (2012) assert that workers benefit from browsing activities while they are emailing. Women transitioned to the workforce more slowly than men. In their study, employees used the internet for an average of 51 minutes every day at work. According to a 2006 article in Debt Cubed, there are 34 million employees in the US who engage in cyberloafing, which results in a weekly productivity loss of 200.6 million hours. According to research by Bock & Ho (2019) and Li & Chung (2016), email and chat require a lot of attention and are negatively

correlated with productivity. Cyberloafing is discussed by Weatherbee (2020) as an example of anti-organizational or deviant behavior. Organizational productivity is lowered as a result of this behavior.

Cyberloafing is a significant sign of workplace inefficiency. Additionally, he found that there is no link between poor communication and productivity at work, which shows that different online activities done at the office have different effects on output. Askew (2012) found that cyberloafing on computers differs from cyberloafing on mobile devices in terms of its relationship to employee pleasure. Mobile cyberloafing is inversely correlated with employee happiness. This implies that dissatisfied employees use their phones for pleasure and to get away from the stresses of the office. According to a Gouveia (2013) survey of 3200 American employees, 50% of them engage in daily Cyberloafing for more than two hours, which costs \$4500 per employee daily. In 2013, My Sammy, a software startup, described cyberloafing as a hidden epidemic that was hurting commercial productivity. They created software to track individual employee computer use. However, because the program may be used on PCs and personal smart phones for Cyberloafing, it is challenging for companies to determine the exact number of hours that employees put in. According to Corgnet et al. (2015), businesses should allow employees choose their own internet usage restrictions rather than imposing an autocratic policy on them. This will improve employee performance at work. Most workers in businesses Cyberloaf inadvertently in one way or another.

Olajide (2018) discovered in their research the relationship between informational and employee performance and came to the conclusion that as an employee's dependence on accessing the internet to look for information not related to his task during working hours increases, so does his or her performance. This conclusion is supported by (Askew, 2012), which also argued persuasively that employees who engage in informational searching are distracted by other websites, which impairs their performance. They came to the same conclusion that social loafing has a significant negative impact on employee performance. Facebook, Twitter, and other online social networking sites are frequently utilized at work and constitute deviant behaviour that has a negative impact on employee performance.

Additional research by Belanger and Van Slyke (2002), cyberloafing gives workers a break

from their jobs and improves their performance when they return to work after the break. By giving them a relaxing respite, it helps workers cope with the lengthy workdays. In occupations where employees are required to put in greater effort while having fewer employment resources, the level of weariness of employees can be minimized through recovery processes. Research by Askew (2012) and Kim, Triana, Chung, & Oh (2016), people who are less satisfied with their professions engage in cyberloafing activities more frequently to pass the time and avoid unpleasant sensations at work. Sao et al. discovered a favorable correlation between cyberloafing activities and behavioral characteristics (2020). They came to the conclusion that cyberloafing has a good effect on employees' behavior as shown by skill acquisition, relief from workplace stress, idea production, development of interest in one's job, and revitalization of attention span.

Cyberloafing, or utilizing websites for personal purposes while at work, has received more attention lately (Polito, 1997). In general, employers are concerned that such behavior could impair production and result in a loss of funds (Block, 2001; Greengard, 2000; Milss, 2001). Businesses have therefore tried to limit such Internet access at work by implementing special usage policies (Henle, Kohut, & Booth, 2019; Lara, Tacoronte, & Ding, 2006). In a recent randomized controlled trial, 96 undergraduate management students were randomly assigned to three different 10-minute rest conditions during a letter search task: a control condition involving another simple task; a rest condition where students could do whatever they pleased except for browsing the Web; and a Web-surfing condition. After the break, the students who were Web browsing fared the best.

The elements that affect attitudes toward and actual use of the Internet for personal purposes while at work are currently poorly understood. In a study involving 1,024 workers, it was discovered that Cyberloafing was positively correlated with male gender, educational attainment, and work autonomy but negatively correlated with age (Garrett & Danziger, 2008). Restubog et al. (2011) found that age was favorably correlated with Cyberloafing, self-control was negatively connected with Cyberloafing, and gender was irrelevant to Cyberloafing in a research of 310 employees at a university in the Philippines. Employees with high levels of self-control exhibited a larger negative association between perceived organizational justice and cyberloafing

than those with low levels of self-control. Cyberloafing was found to be favorably associated with male gender and racial minority, and adversely associated with age in the one study on this subject that we are aware of.

### III. RESEARCH METHODS

The research design used for this research work would be the cross-sectional survey design. The survey design method is adopted in this study due to its usefulness in the study of non-observable events such as opinions, attitudes, preferences and or dispositions.

The population of this study will be made up of the staff of Zenith Bank Nigeria Plc within Lagos state mainland which is a constituent made of both male and female respondents.

Sample size will consist of 200 respondents drawn from the employees of Zenith Bank within the mainland of Lagos State. The questionnaire will be taken by the researcher to the branches of Zenith Bank with offices within the mainland and shared by hand to the staff. The sampling technique is the random sampling.

A questionnaire was used as the primary data collecting technique to gather the significant data that required for this research's analysis. This questionnaire will include two components. Section A was designed to gather the respondents' biographical information, portion B of the questionnaire contains the applicable questionnaire items for the study variable.

The data obtained in the bio-data during the cause of this study would be analyzed using the frequency distribution showing percentage. The research questions would be analyzed descriptively using mean and standard deviation, frequency distribution and simple percentage where needed. The Pearson correlation formula would be used to test the hypotheses to establish a cause and effect relationship between the dependent and independent variables in each hypothesis.

### IV. DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

One hundred and nine (109) copies of the questionnaire were retrieved from the Staff of Zenith Bank Plc. in Lagos. Although the administration of the questionnaire required multiple trips to the bank's offices in Lagos to reach a 94% response rate from the respondents, the researcher forced the respondents to complete it immediately. As a result, the data analysis for this study is based on 109 total copies of the questionnaire that were correctly filled out and returned in Lagos.

**Analysis of Demographic Data**

The frequency distribution is used to evaluate the demographic data using

straightforward percentages (section A of the questionnaire). The following table includes presents the results(Questions 1 – 4):

**Table 4.1: Respondents Classified by Demographic Information (Questions 1 – 4)**

Sex		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	67	61.5	61.5	61.5
	Female	42	38.5	38.5	100.0
	Total	109	100.0	100.0	
Marital Status		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Single	21	19.3	19.3	19.3
	Married	50	45.9	45.9	65.1
	Divorced	38	34.9	34.9	100.0
	Total	109	100.0	100.0	
Age		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Below 20	17	15.6	15.6	15.6
	21 - 30 yrs	42	38.5	38.5	54.1
	31 - 40 yrs	22	20.2	20.2	74.3
	41 - 50yrs	12	11.0	11.0	85.3
	50 yrs and above	16	14.7	14.7	100.0
	Total	109	100.0	100.0	
Educational Qualification		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	WASC/GC E/NECO	27	24.8	24.8	24.8
	OND/NCE	28	25.7	25.7	50.5
	HND/B.Sc	19	17.4	17.4	67.9
	M.Sc/MBA	26	23.9	23.9	91.7
	Professional /others	9	8.3	8.3	100.0
	Total	109	100.0	100.0	

Source:Field Survey, 2024

The outcome of the study of the demographic data is shown in Table 4.1 above. According to analysis of the respondents' sex distribution, 61.5% of them were men and 38.5% were women. This suggests that the sample contains more male respondents than female respondents.

Additionally, the chart reveals that 19.3% of respondents were single, 45.9% of them were married, while other 34.9% of the respondents were divorced, widow/widower or separated. This result indicates that there are more married people in the sample.

According to the table, 15.6% of the respondents were under the age of 20, 38.5% were

between the ages of 21 and 30, 20.2% were between the ages of 31 and 40, 11.0% were between the ages of 41 and 50, and 14.7% were beyond the age of 50.

The table 4.1 further indicated that 24.8% of the respondents were holders of WASC/GCE/NECO, 25.7% of the respondents were NCE/OND holders, while 17.4% of the respondents hold HND/B.Sc/BA and 23.9% hold M.Sc/MA/MBA. Also 8.3% of the respondents hold professional qualifications.

When necessary, simple percentages, frequency distributions, means, and standard deviations were used to examine this section of the questionnaire.

**Analysis of Data Relating to cyberloafing in the organization**

The analysis of the means ( $\bar{x}$ ) were interpreted as follows:

<b>Code:</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>
Below 1.45	= Never
1.45 – 2.44	= Rarely
2.45 – 3.44	= Occasionally
3.45 – 4.44	= Frequently
4.45 and above	= Very frequently

**Table 4.2: Mean and Standard Deviation of the Respondents' views in the Questionnaire**

<b>Descriptive Statistics (Views)</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Maximum</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>
I browse sports related website	109	1.00	5.00	3.5046	1.39193
I shop online for personal goods	109	1.00	5.00	3.9083	1.23634
I check non work related email	109	1.00	5.00	4.0642	1.18067
I browse investment related websites	109	1.00	5.00	4.0183	1.13840
I receive non work related email	109	1.00	5.00	3.8624	1.25069
I browse entertainment related websites	109	1.00	5.00	3.5963	1.21807
I send non work related email	109	1.00	5.00	4.3211	.89112
I play online games	109	1.00	5.00	4.0000	1.09713
I download non work related information	109	1.00	5.00	4.4771	.83440
I browse general news website	109	1.00	5.00	3.6697	1.07199
I download online games	109	1.00	5.00	3.5596	1.21283
I participate in chat rooms	109	1.00	5.00	3.5138	1.24436
I post messages on non-work related item	109	1.00	5.00	3.3119	1.11137
I use the internet to gain additional income while at work	109	1.00	5.00	4.1468	1.18498
I chat with other people on instant messenger	109	1.00	5.00	3.6055	1.26943
I use the internet to book vacations and travels	109	1.00	5.00	4.0183	1.07136
I visit job hunting and employment related sites	109	1.00	5.00	3.4587	1.30194
I use the internet to read blogs	109	1.00	5.00	3.6055	1.26211
I download music	109	2.00	5.00	4.4679	.71452
I view sexually explicit websites	109	1.00	5.00	3.4587	1.33008
Valid N (listwise)	109				

Source:Field Survey, 2024

Table 4.2 shows that respondents regularly check non-work email, browse investment websites, receive non-work email, browse entertainment websites, send non-work email, play online games, browse general news websites, download games, engage in chat rooms, and use the internet to make money while at work, chat with other people on instant messenger, use the internet to book vacations and travels, visit job hunting and employment related sites, use the internet to read blogs, view sexually explicit websites. The respondents very frequently

download non work related information and also download music while they occasionally post messages on non-work related item, with means of 3.50, 3.90, 4.06, 4.01, 3.86, 3.59, 4.32, 4.00, 3.66, 3.55, 3.51, 4.14, 3.60, 4.01, 3.45, 3.60, 3.45, 4.47, 4.46, 3.31 and standard deviation of 1.99, 1.23, 1.18, 1.13, 1.25, 1.21, 0.89,1.09, 1.07, 1.21, 1.24, 1.18, 1.26, 1.07, 1.30, 1.26, 1.33, 0.83, 0.71 and 1.11 respectively.



**Analysis of Job Stress**

Where appropriate, means, standard deviations, frequency distributions, and simple percentages

were used to evaluate this section of the questionnaire. The means (x) analysis was interpreted as follows:

<b>Code:</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>
Below 1.45	= Strongly Disagree
1.45 – 2.44	= Disagree
2.45 – 3.44	= Undecided
3.45 – 4.44	= Agree
4.45 and above	= Strongly Agree

**Table 4.3: Mean and Standard Deviation of the Respondents Views in the Questionnaire**

<b>Descriptive Statistics (Views)</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Maximum</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>
I have a lot of work and fear that very little time to do it.	109	1.00	5.00	3.4587	1.28763
I feel so burdened that even a day without work seems bad	109	1.00	5.00	4.5505	.83318
I feel that I never take a leave.	109	1.00	5.00	4.1468	1.11244
Many people at my office are tired of the company demand.	109	1.00	5.00	3.9908	1.10968
My job makes me nervous.	109	1.00	5.00	3.4679	1.01442
The effect of my job on me is too high.	109	1.00	5.00	3.4404	1.22044
Many a times, my job becomes a big burden.	109	1.00	5.00	3.2752	1.15367
Sometimes when I think about my job I get a tight feeling in my chest.	109	1.00	5.00	4.1560	1.04681
I feel bad when I take a leave.	109	1.00	5.00	4.0000	1.07152
I'm not able to satisfy the different demands of various peoples above me.	109	1.00	5.00	4.3394	.89464
I'm not able to satisfy the conflicting demands of my colleagues and juniors.	109	1.00	5.00	3.9541	1.12534
I'm not able to satisfy the demands of clients and others, because they are opposite to each other.	109	1.00	5.00	4.4679	.83410
The expectations of my seniors different from my juniors.	109	1.00	5.00	3.3303	1.36120
I am concerned about the different expectations of different peoples.	109	1.00	5.00	3.9266	1.32432
I am able to balance between time at work and time at other activities.	109	1.00	5.00	4.3945	.88211
I have difficulty balancing my work and other activities.	109	1.00	5.00	4.0367	1.12156
I feel that the job and other activities are currently balanced.	109	1.00	5.00	4.1468	1.11244
Overall, I believe that my work and other activities are balanced.	109	1.00	5.00	3.6881	1.35877
Valid N (listwise)	109				

Source:Field Survey, 2024

Table 4.3 reveals that respondents concurred that they have a lot of work and worry that there isn't enough time to complete it, feel as though they never take a vacation, and that many colleagues at their workplace are tired of the demands of the employer. They also concurred that their jobs make them anxious, that they occasionally experience tightness in the chest when thinking about their jobs, feel bad when they take vacations, and that they are unable to meet the demands of various parties. The respondents feel that their work and other activities are currently balanced overall, that they have trouble balancing their work and other activities, and that they are concerned about the various expectations of other people. They all firmly agreed that they are so overburdened by their work that even a day off seems unpleasant, and they successfully strike a balance between their work and other

commitments. The respondents weren't certain whether or not their employment has a significant negative impact on them, often turns into a heavy burden, and that their seniors have different expectations from them than do the juniors with means of 3.45, 4.14, 3.99, 3.46, 4.00, 4.33, 4.15, 3.95, 3.92, 4.39, 4.03, 4.14, 3.68, 4.55, 4.46, 3.44, 3.27, 3.33, and standard deviation of 1.28, 1.11, 1.10, 1.01, 1.22, 1.15, 1.04, 1.07, 0.89, 1.12, 1.36, 1.32, 1.12, 1.11, 1.35, 0.88, 0.83, 0.83

**Analysis of Employees Job Satisfaction**

Means, standard deviations, frequency distributions, and simple percentages were used as necessary for the analysis of this component of the questionnaire. The following was the interpretation of the mean analysis's (x) findings:

<b>Code:</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>
Below 1.45	= Strongly Disagree
1.45 – 2.44	= Disagree
2.45 – 3.44	= Undecided
3.45 – 4.44	= Agree
4.46 and above	= Strongly Agree

**Table 4.4: Means and Standard Deviations of the Respondents views in the Questionnaire (Questions 39-45)**

<b>Respondents View</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Maximum</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>
In general I am satisfied with this job	109	1.00	5.00	4.4679	.83410
I find that my opinions are respected at work	109	1.00	5.00	3.6422	1.08460
Most people on this job are very satisfied with it	109	1.00	5.00	3.4679	1.43739
I am satisfied with the recognition I get for the work I do	109	1.00	5.00	4.1468	1.11244
I am satisfied with the way my pay compares to that of similar job	109	1.00	5.00	3.6881	1.35877
I am satisfied with the personal relationship between my boss and his/her employees	109	1.00	5.00	3.6330	1.32400
I am satisfied with the way my boss handles employees	109	1.00	5.00	3.1835	1.43479
Valid N (listwise)	109				

Source: Field Survey, 2024

The results from Table 4.4 show that respondents strongly agreed with the statement that they are generally satisfied with their jobs, that employees' opinions are respected at work, that

most people are very satisfied with their jobs, that they are satisfied with the recognition they receive for their efforts, that they are satisfied with how their pay compares to that of similar jobs, and that

they are satisfied with the work environment with means of 4.46, 3.64, 3.46, 4.14, 3.68, 3.63, 3.18 and standard deviations of 0.83, 1.08, 1.43, 1.11, 1.35, 1.32 and 1.43, respectively.

In this section, means, standard deviations, frequency distributions, and straightforward percentages were used as necessary for the analysis of this component of the questionnaire. The following was the interpretation of the mean analysis's (x) findings:

**Analysis of Organizational Justice**

Code:	Interpretation
Below 1.45	= Strongly Disagree
1.45 – 2.44	= Disagree
2.45 – 3.44	= Undecided
3.45 – 4.44	= Agree
4.45 and above	= Strongly Agree

**Table 4.5: Mean and Standard Deviation of the Respondents' views in the Questionnaire (Questions 69 - 88)**

Respondents View	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
I think that my work schedule is fair	109	1.00	5.00	3.4679	1.01442
I think that my level of pay is fair	109	1.00	5.00	3.4404	1.22044
I consider my workload to be fair	109	1.00	5.00	3.2752	1.15367
Over all the rewards I receive here are quite fair	109	1.00	5.00	4.1560	1.04681
I feel my job responsibilities are quite fair	109	1.00	5.00	4.0000	1.07152
Job decisions are made by my supervisor in an unbiased manner	109	1.00	5.00	4.3394	.89464
My supervisor makes sure that all employee concerns are heard before job decisions are made	109	1.00	5.00	3.9541	1.12534
To make formal job decisions, supervisor collects accurate and complete information	109	1.00	5.00	4.5505	.83318
My supervisor clarifies decisions and provide additional information when required by employees	109	1.00	5.00	3.2936	1.40964
All job decisions are applied consistently to all affected job employees	109	1.00	5.00	3.4587	1.31608
Employees are allowed to challenge or appeal job decisions made by my supervisor	109	1.00	5.00	3.6055	1.27670
When decisions are made about my job my supervisor treats me with kindness and consideration	109	1.00	5.00	3.4587	1.31608
When decisions are made about my job my supervisor treats me with respect and dignity	109	1.00	5.00	3.6055	1.27670
When decisions are made about my job my supervisor is sensitive to my own needs	109	2.00	5.00	4.4954	.67528
When decisions are made about my job my supervisor deals with me in truthful manner	109	1.00	5.00	3.4771	1.30239

When decisions are made about my job my supervisor shows concern for my right as an employee	109	1.00	5.00	3.3853	1.16196
When decisions are made about my job my supervisor discusses with me the implications of the decision	109	1.00	5.00	4.0275	1.15035
The supervisor offers adequate justification for decisions made about my job	109	1.00	5.00	4.3394	.89464
The supervisor explains very clearly any decision made about my job	109	1.00	5.00	3.9541	1.12534
When making decision the supervisor explains very clearly any decision made about my job	109	1.00	5.00	4.4679	.83410
Valid N (listwise)	109				

Source: Field Survey, 2024

Table 4.5 presents analysis of organizational justice which demonstrates that respondents agreed with the idea that their work schedule is reasonable, that overall, the benefits they receive are acceptable, and that their job requirements are reasonable. Their supervisor makes impartial job judgments; it is acknowledged that their supervisor ensures that all employee issues are heard before making official employment decisions; supervisor gathers accurate and comprehensive information. The respondents concurred with the following points: Employees have the right to challenge or appeal decisions made by their supervisor; when decisions are made about their jobs, their supervisor treats them with consideration; and all job decisions are applied consistently to all affected job employees; Their supervisor treats them with respect and decency when decisions are made about their employment, and they are dealt with honestly when decisions are made concerning their employment. The respondents also agreed with the ideas that when decisions are made concerning their jobs, their supervisor talks to them about the consequences of those decisions, provides enough reason for those decisions, and clearly explains any decisions made about their jobs. The respondents weren't sure whether they thought their wage was fair; They believe their workload is reasonable; they are divided on the idea that their supervisor clarifies decisions and provides additional information when requested by employees; they are also divided on the idea that when decisions are made regarding the job, their supervisor shows concern for their rights as an employee. However, the respondents strongly

agreed with the idea that when decisions are made regarding the job, their supervisor is sensitive to their own needs; and they strongly agreed that when making decisions, the decision-makers should take their own needs into consideration with means of 3.46, 4.15, 4.00, 4.33, 3.95, 3.45, 3.60, 3.45, 3.60, 3.47, 4.02, 4.33, 3.95, 3.44, 3.27, 3.29, 3.38, 4.55, 4.49, 4.46 and standard deviations of 1.01, 1.04, 1.07, 0.89, 1.12, 1.31, 1.27, 1.31, 1.27, 1.30, 1.15, 0.89, 1.12, 1.22, 1.15, 1.40, 1.16, 0.83, 0.67 and 0.83 respectively.

### TEST OF HYPOTHESES

The data must be subjected to a statistical test or mathematical analysis in order to derive the precise and trustworthy conclusions from the study of the data presented above. Pearson The statistical correlation tool was employed as a technique for testing hypotheses. To determine whether there is a relationship between the values that have been empirically obtained or whether they significantly deviate from those that would be anticipated under a particular set of theoretical assumptions, correlation analysis was utilized. The five presented hypotheses were examined using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 23.0.

#### 1.The relationship between job stress and Cyberloafing in the organization (Hypotheses I).

The alternative form of my hypothesis predicted that there would be a strong connection between workplace stress and cyberloafing. The statistical tool of Pearson Correlation was used to

test the hypothesis. The analysis's findings are displayed in table 4.8 below.

**Table 4.6: The summary of Correlation Coefficient between job stress and cyberloafing in the organization.**

		<b>Job Stress</b>	<b>Cyberloafing</b>
<b>Job Stress</b>	Pearson Correlation	1	-.046
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.633
	N	109	109
<b>Cyberloafing</b>	Pearson Correlation	-.046	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.633	
	N	109	109

\*.correlation is significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed)

A Pearson correlation was performed on Table 4.6 to ascertain the association between "Job stress" and "Cyber" inside the firm. The Pearson correlation coefficient,  $r$ , is observed to be  $-0.046$  and is statistically insignificant ( $p = -0.046 > 0.05$ ). In an organization, there is a direct, inverse relationship between "job stress" and "cyberloafing.", which is statistically none significant ( $r = -0.046$ ,  $n = 109$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ). As a result, we accept the null hypothesis and reject the alternative hypothesis. Therefore, there is no discernible link between job stress and cyberloafing within the organization. This

demonstrates that there is no causal link between workplace stress and cyberloafing in the company.

**2. The relationship between Job satisfaction and Cyberloafing in the organization (Hypothesis II).**

In its alternative version, hypothesis II predicted that job satisfaction and cyber-loafing in an organization would be significantly correlated. The statistical tool of Pearson Correlation was used to test the hypothesis. Below is a presentation of the analysis' findings.

**Table 4.7: The summary of Correlation Coefficient between job satisfaction and cyberloafing in the organization.**

		<b>Job Satisfaction</b>	<b>Cyberloafing</b>
<b>Job Satisfaction</b>	Pearson Correlation	1	-.155
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.107
	N	109	109
<b>Cyberloafing</b>	Pearson Correlation	-.155	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.107	
	N	109	109

\*.correlation is significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed)

A Pearson correlation was performed in Table 4.7 to ascertain the association between "Job Satisfaction" and "Cyberloafing." The Pearson correlation coefficient, or  $r$ , is observed to be  $-0.155$ , which is statistically unimportant ( $p = 0.107 > 0.005$ ). There was a significant, yet statistically non-significant, negative connection between "work satisfaction" and "cyberloafing" ( $r = -0.155$ ,  $n = 109$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ). In light of this, we accept the null hypothesis and disregard the alternative one. It is discovered that workplace cyberloafing has no discernible relationship to job satisfaction. According to this finding, there is no connection

between workplace cyberloafing and job happiness. Therefore, at a company, online laziness does not result in job happiness.

**3. The Relation between organizational justice and Cyber loafing in the Organisation**

An organization's organizational justice and cyber loafing will have a strong relationship, according to the alternate form of hypothesis V. The statistical tool of Pearson Correlation was used to test the hypothesis. Below is a presentation of the analysis' findings.

**Table 4.8: Product Moment Correlation Coefficient of between organizational justice and cyber loafing in an organization.**

		Organisational Justice	Cyber Loafing
<b>Organisational Justice</b>	Pearson Correlation	1	-.048
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.623
	N	109	109
<b>Cyber Loafing</b>	Pearson Correlation	-.048	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.623	
	N	109	109

\*.correlation is significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed)

A Pearson product-moment correlation was performed in Table 4.8 to ascertain the association between "organizational justice" and "cyber loafing." The results of the analysis show that the Pearson correlation coefficient,  $r$ , is  $-0.048$ , which is statistically unimportant ( $p.623 > 0.005$ ). Organizational justice and cyber loafing had a negative connection that was statistically insignificant ( $r = -0.048$ ,  $n = 109$ ,  $p > 0.005$ ). We accept the alternative hypothesis and reject null hypothesis. The result confirms that there is a non-significant relationship between 'organizational justice' and 'cyber loafing' in the organisation.

## V. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The findings of the study confirmed that employees' job makes them nervous yet they feel bad when they leave and they are able to balance time at work with time on other activities. It was found that Job Satisfaction has no significant relationship with Cyberloafing. This means cyberloafing does not translate into Job Satisfaction in the organization. Based on the findings of this study, respondents agreed they are satisfied with their job and the recognition they get for their input and the way their boss handles employees. A non-significant relationship was found between Organizational Justice and Cyberloafing in the organization. This implies that employees agreed that their work schedule is fair and their rewards and job responsibilities are quite fair.

The following conclusions are drawn from the results of the testing of the major hypotheses of the study: Cyberloafing and job stress have no meaningful correlation. Job satisfaction and Cyberloaf do not significantly correlate. The correlation between Job Workload and Cyberloafing is negligible. Cyberloafing and intrinsic job involvement do not significantly correlate. Cyberloafing and Organizational Justice do not significantly interact.

This study shows that the employees in banking sector, using Zenith Bank as a case study, are not likely to engage in cyberloafing because they are satisfied with their jobs and identify with the organization. When employees identify with their organization and understand their responsibilities, less incidents of cyberloafing are witnessed in the organization.

With the increased usage of internet, it has become more difficult for employees to not engage in one form of cyberloafing or another. With high expectations on employee productivity with minimal timeframe, cyberloafing proves to be a form of recovery from job stress and heavy workload. Ivarsson and Larsson (2011) contend that most people cannot maintain their recuperation in the time that they spend away from work, adjusting to the demands of the workplace in terms of its physical, intellectual, social, emotional, spiritual, and artistic requirements.

This study recommends that employers should create a fair work environment with adequate job workload to curb the prevalence of cyberloafing. Employees should be given a stipulated time to 'loaf' be it cyber or social to prevent burnout and mental fog.

## REFERENCES

- [1]. Anandarajan, M. & Claire, A. S. (2015). Developing Human Capital through Personal Web Use in the Workplace: Mapping Employee Perceptions. Communications of the Association for Information Systems. 15. 776-791.
- [2]. Andressen, C., Torsheim, T., & Pallesen, S. (2014). Predictors of use of social network at work: A specific type of cyberloafing. Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 19, 906- 921.
- [3]. Askew, K. L. (2012). The Relationship between Cyberloafing and Task

- Performance and an Examination of the Theory of Planned Behaviour as a Model of Cyberloafing. University of South Florida, Department of Psychology, Graduate Theses.
- [4]. Banks, G. C., Whelpley, C. E., Oh, I. S., & Shin, K. (2012). (How) are emotionally exhausted employees harmful? *International Journal of Stress Management*, 19(3), 198-216.
- [5]. Barlow, J., Bean, L. A., & Hott, D. D. (2023). Employee “spy” software: Should you use it? *Journal of Corporate Accounting & Finance*, 14 (4), 7-12.
- [6]. Blanchard, A. L., & Henle, C. A. (2018). Correlates of Different Forms of Cyberloafing: The Role of Norms and External Locus of Control. *Computers in Human Behaviour*, 24, 1067-1084. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2007.03.008>
- [7]. Blau, Gary & Yang, Yang & Ward-Cook, Kory. (2016) Testing a measure of cyberloafing. *Journal of Applied Health*. 35. 9-17.
- [8]. Block, W. (2001). Cyberslacking, business ethics and managerial economics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 33, 225–231.
- [9]. Bock, Gee-Woo & Ho, Swee. (2019). Non-work related computing (NWRC). *Communications of the ACM*. 52. 124-128. [10.1145/1498765.1498799](https://doi.org/10.1145/1498765.1498799).
- [10]. Colin, M. (2020). Workers, surf at your own risk. *Business Week*, 3685, 105–106.
- [11]. Corgnet, B., Gonzales, R., & McCarter, M.W. (2015). The role of the decision-making process on cooperation in a workgroup social dilemma: An examination of cyberloafing. *Games* 6(4) 588–603.
- [12]. Greengard, S. (2000). The high cost of cyberslacking. *Workforce*, 79, 22–24.
- [13]. Gilboa, S., Shirom, A., Fried, Y., & Cooper, C. (2018). A meta-analysis of work demand stressors and job performance: examining main and moderating effects. *Personnel Psychology*, 61(2), 227-271.
- [14]. Griffiths, M.D. (1996). Internet addiction: An issue for clinical psychology? *Clinical Psychology Forum*. 97, 32-36.
- [15]. Guthrie, R. & Gray, P. (1996), “Junk computing: is it bad for an organization?”. *Information Systems*.
- [16]. Hardy, H. E. (2003). Internet, history and development of. *Encyclopaedia of International Media and Communications*, Volume 2.
- [17]. Henle, C. A., & Blanchard, A. (2016). Cyberloafing as a coping method: Relationship between work stressors, company sanctions and cyberloafing.
- [18]. Henle, C. A., & Blanchard, A. L. (2008). The interaction of work stressors and organizational sanctions on cyberloafing. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 383-400.
- [19]. Henle, C. A., Kohut, G., & Booth, R., (2019). Designing electronic use policies to enhance employee perceptions of fairness and to reduce cyberloafing: An empirical test of justice theory. *Computers in Human Behaviour*, 25, 902-910.
- [20]. Hurrell Jr, J. J., Nelson, D. L., & Simmons, B. L. (1998). Measuring job stressors and strains: where we have been, where we are, and where we need to go. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 3(4), 368-389.
- [21]. Jandaghi, G., Alvani, S. M., Matin, H. Z., & Kozekanan, S. F. (2015). Cyberloafing management in organizations. *Iranian Journal of Management Studies*, 8, 335-349.
- [22]. Judge, T. A., Scott, A. B., & Ilies, R. (2016). Hostility, job attitude and workplace deviance: Test of a multilevel model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(1), 126-138.
- [23]. Kahn, R. L., Wolfe, D. M., Quinn, R. P. & Snoek, J. D. (1964). *Organizational Stress: Studies in Role Conflict and Ambiguity*. New York.
- [24]. Katz, J. E., (2004). *Telephone International Encyclopaedia of Social Behavioural Sciences*.
- [25]. Ketchen, D. J., Craighead, C. W., & Buckley, M. R., (2008). Time bandits: how they are created, why they are tolerated and what can be done about them. *Business horizons*, 51, 111-150.
- [26]. Kim, S. J., & Byrne, S. (2021). Conceptualizing personal web usage in work contexts: A preliminary framework. *Computers in Human Behaviour*, 27(6), 2271-2283.
- [27]. Kim, Kwanghyun & Triana, María & Chung, Kwiyoung & Oh, Nahyun. (2015). When Do Employees Cyberloaf? An

- Interactionist Perspective Examining Personality, Justice, and Empowerment. *Human Resource Management*. 10.1002/hrm.21699.
- [28]. Lau, V. C. S., Au, W. T., & Ho, J. M. C. (2023). A qualitative and quantitative review of antecedents of counterproductive behaviour in organizations. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 18(1), 73–99.
- [29]. Lee, R. T., & Ashforth, B. E. (1996). A meta-analytic examination of the correlates of the three dimensions of job burnout. *Journal of applied Psychology*, 81, 123-133.
- [30]. Li, S. M., & Chung, T. M. (2006). Internet function and Internet addictive behaviour. *Computers in Human Behaviour*, 22(6), 1067 – 1077.
- [31]. Licktash, A. E. (2004). Inappropriate use of email and internet in the workplace. *The arbitration picture. Dispute Resolution Journal*, 59, 26-26.
- [32]. Liebermann Benjamin, Gwendolyn Seidman, Katelyn Y. A., McKenna and Laura E. Buffardi. (2011). Employee job attitudes and organizational characters as predictors of cyberloafing: *Computers in Human Behaviour*, 27, 2192-2199.
- [33]. Lim, V. K. G. (2022). The IT way of loafing on the job: Cyberloafing, neutralizing and organizational justice. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 23, 675 -694.
- [34]. Lim, V. K. G., & Chen, D. J. Q. (2012). Cyberloafing at the workplace: Gain or drain on work? *Behaviour and Information Technology*, 31 (4), 343-345.
- [35]. Lim, V. K. G., & Teo, T. S. H., Loo, G. L. (2022). How do I loaf here? Let me count the ways. *Communications of the ACM*, 45 (1), 66-70.
- [36]. Lim, V. K. G., & Teo, T. S. H. (2005). Prevalence, perceived seriousness, justification and regulation of cyberloafing in Singapore: An exploratory study. *Information & Management*, 42, 1081–1103.
- [37]. Luthans, F., & Thomas, L. T. (1989). The relationship between age and job satisfaction: curvilinear results from an empirical study – A research note. *Personnel Review*, 18 (1), 23-26
- [38]. Macklem K (2016). You got too much mail. *Macleans*, 119 (5): 20 – 22.
- [39]. Martin, L. E., Brock, M. E. B., Buckley, M. R., & Ketchen, D. J. (2010). Time Banditry: Examining the purloining of time in organizations. *Human Resource Management Review*, 20 (1), 26-34.
- [40]. Meier, L. L., & Spector, P. E. (2013). Reciprocal effects of work stressors and counterproductive work behaviour: A five-wave longitudinal study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98, 529- 539
- [41]. Mills, J. E., Hu, B., Beldona, S., & Clay, J. (2001). Cyberslacking! A wired-workplace liability issue. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 42, 34–47.
- [42]. Naughton, K., Raymond, J., & Shulman, K. (1999). Cyberslacking. *Newsweek*, 134, 62–65.
- [43]. Olajide, O., Abdu, M., & Bawa Abdulqadir, A. (2018). Effect of Cyberloafing on Employee Performance Among Deposit Money Banks in Kaduna Metropolis. *Management and Social Sciences (OJAMSS)*, 3(1), 2276–9013.
- [44]. Oswald, B., Elliot – Howard, F., & Austin, S. F., (2003). Cyberslacking – Legal and ethical issues facing IT managers. Paper presented at the annual conference of the International association for computer information systems, Las Vegas, NV.
- [45]. Polito, A. (1997). Cyberloafing can be curbed. *Workforce*, 76, 18.
- [46]. Reinecke, L. (2009). Games at work: The recreational use of computer games during working hours. *Cyber psychology & Behaviour*, 12(4), 461-465.
- [47]. Restubog, S. L. D., Garcia, P., Toledano, L. S., Amarnani, R. K., Tolentino, L. R., & Tang, R. L. (2011). Yielding to (cyber)-temptation: Exploring the buffering role of self-control in the relationship between organizational justice and cyberloafing behaviour in the workplace. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 45, 247–251.
- [48]. Rizzo, House, & Lirtzman. (1970). Role conflict and ambiguity in complex organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 15, 50-63.
- [49]. Robinson & Bennett, R., (1995). A typology of deviance workplace behaviours: A multi-dimensional scaling study. *Academy of management Journal*, 38, 555-572.
- [50]. Sao, R., Chandak, S., Patel, B., & Bhadade, P. (2020). Cyberloafing:



- Effects on Employee Job Performance and Behaviour. *International Journal of Recent Technology and Engineering*, 8(5), 1509–1515.
- [51]. Sawitria & Ruining, H. S. (2012). Role of internet experience in moderating influence of work stressor on cyberloafing. *Procedia – Social and behavioural sciences*, 57, 320-324.
- [52]. Skarlicki, D.P. and Folger, R. (1997) Retaliation in the Workplace: The Roles of Distributive, Procedural, and Interactional Justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 434-443.
- [53]. Steger M. F., Dik B. J., & Duffy R. D. (2012). Measuring meaningful work: the work and meaning inventory (WAMI). *Journal of career assessment*, 20, 322-337.
- [54]. Stewart, F. (2010). Internet acceptable use policies: Navigating the management, legal, and technical issues. *Security Management*, 9, 46–52.
- [55]. Stoddart, S. R. (2006). The impact of cyberloafing and mindfulness on employee burnout. Wayne State University
- [56]. Teo, T. S. H., & Choo, W. Y. (2001). Assessing the impact of using the Internet for competitive intelligence. *Information and Management*, 39, 67–83.
- [57]. Vitak, J., Grouse, J., & La Rose, R. (2021). Personal internet use at work: Understanding cyberslacking. *Computers in human behaviour*, 27 (5), 1751-1759.
- [58]. Weatherbee, Terrance. (2010). Counterproductive use of technology at work: Information & communications technologies and cyber-deviancy. *Human Resource Management Review*, 20.35-44.