



Journal of Recreation and Tourism Research

Journal home page: www.jrtr.org

ISSN:2148-5321

CYBERLOAFING AS A RECREATIONAL ACTIVITY AT DESK JOB WORKERS¹

Ümran YILDIZ^a 

Hüseyin GÜMÜŞ^b 

^aAfyon Kocatepe University, Physical education and sport school, Afyonkarahisar, Turkey

^bMersin University, Physical education and sport school, Mersin, Turkey (huseyinn.gumuss@gmail.com)

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received:

21.08.2017

Accepted:

02.12.2017

Anahtar Kelimeler:

Boş zaman
Rekreasyon
Sanal aylaklık
İnternet kullanımı

Keywords:

Leisure
Recreation
Cyberloafing
Internet usage

ÖZ

Masa başı çalışan bireylerde rekreasyon bir etkinlik olarak siber aylaklık davranışlarının incelenmesinin amaçlandığı bu çalışmada araştırmaya Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesinde görev yapan 436 akademik ve idari personel katılmıştır. Araştırmada veri toplama aracı olarak Akça (2013) tarafından hazırlanan “İnternet Kullanım Etkinlikleri Ölçeği” ve “İs Dışı İnternet Kullanım Gereççeleri Ölçeği” kullanılmıştır. Verilerin analizinde betimsel istatistiklerin yanı sıra ilişkisiz örneklem t-testi ve tek yönlü varyans analizi kullanılmıştır. Araştırmaya katılan bireylerin internet kullanım etkinliklerine ilişkin en yüksek ortalamaların “suiistimale acık internet kullanımı” faktöründe olduğu, iş dışı internet kullanımında ise çalışma grubunun is dışında interneti daha çok “araştırma” amaçlı kullandığı söylenebilir.

ABSTRACT

In this research, it was aimed to investigate the behaviours of cyberloafing as a recreational activity in desk job workers. 436 academic and administrative staff from Afyon Kocatepe University participated in the research. As a data collection tool, developed by Akca (2013) “Internet Usage Activities Scale” and “Reasons for Internet Usage apart from Work Scale” were used in the study. In the data analysis, in addition to descriptive statistics, Independent Samples T Test and One Way ANOVA were used. Regarding the internet usage of the participants, the highest mean value was found in the factor “internet usage open to abuse”. It can be said that the participants mostly used internet for “research” in the internet usage apart from their works.

***Sorumlu Yazar:** Hüseyin GÜMÜŞ

E posta: huseyinn.gumuss@gmail.com

¹ This research was supported by the TUBITAK 2209-A Project and presented as a oral presentation at 3rd International Conference on Social Sciences & Education Research on 27-29 April 2017 in Rome/ITALY.

INTRODUCTION

In today's world where intelligence technologies have been advancing very fast, computers and internet have produced some negative outcomes in addition to their benefits and convenience in numerous fields such as professional life and educational life. Workers tend to use internet provided by workplace for personal purposes during office hours and therefore, there are workforce losses (Akca, 2013). Internet access facilitates communication among workers as well as reduces unnecessary operations and stationary expenses, etc. Contrary to these advantages, however; computer and internet is increasingly misused at work.

Leisure was an "escape from the mechanized work process," but it was an escape whose content and form was so indelibly stamped by the exigencies of capitalist production that one's "experiences are inevitably after-images of the work process itself." "What happens at work, in the factory, or in the office can only be escaped from by approximation to it in one's leisure time." (Horkheimer and Adorno, 1999) These passages occurred in a more elaborated analysis of the so-called "culture industry," the name for which captured the philosophers' larger point that time spent away from labor was inextricably caught by the demands of mass production and mass consumption (Koshar, 2002).

On both sides of the Atlantic, this approach not only shaped much New Left thinking about late modern society, most notably in countercultural classics such as Herbert Marcuse's *One-Dimensional Man* and *Eros and Civilization*, but also later left its mark on the emergent field of "cultural studies." (During, 1993).

In 21st century, majority of the work load may necessarily require internet access and internet use. Yet, some may also use internet for personal purposes at official and formal places such as workplace; which can be named as cyberloafing. Although there are many different definitions of cyberloafing, it is generally defined as using time unproductively (Ugrin, Pearson and Odom, 2007).

Anandarajan et al. (2004) classified personal internet use into four different groups in terms of organization and individuals:

Disruptive behaviors: They are considered by organizations as dangerous internet usage and generally include harmful dimensions of internet use. These may be termed as internet abuse. Entering adult websites, playing online games and downloading songs are some of the disruptive cyberloafing behaviors.

Recreational behaviors: They are related to leisure time and entertainment. Searching for recreational/entertaining or social/artistic activities on the internet or searching for shopping websites are some of the recreational cyberloafing behaviors.

Personal learning behaviors: Following news about organization, searching for educational opportunities, visiting webpages of professional organizations and reading actual events are some of the personal learning cyberloafing behaviors.

Ambiguous behaviors: This is the most ambiguous group. Joining discussions about organization in chat rooms, entering official websites and gaining knowledge about other organizations in chat rooms are some ambiguous cyberloafing behaviors.

It is known that first studies about the term cyberloafing were undertaken during 2000s in business (Stanton, 2002; Lim, 2002) and later in education (Galluch and Thatcher, 2006; Adams, 2006). As for studies in Turkish literature, it was noted that studies focused mainly on business (Van Doorn, 2011; Özkalp, Aydın and Tekeli, 2012; Kose, Oral and Turesin, 2012; Örucu and Yıldız, 2014) and education (Kalaycı, 2010; Kurt, 2011; Ergun, 2012).

In the study of Galluch and Thatcher (2007), it is emphasized that people use personal internet for shopping for family members and friends, communicating, paying bills and banking operations while they use company's internet access for such reasons as sharing information or a file with others in the organization, organizational management, etc.

The current study focused on examining cyberloafing behaviors of academic and administrative personnel employed at Afyon Kocatepe University.

METHOD

The population of the study was composed of a total of 2186 personnel; 1250 of whom were academic staff while 936 of them were administrative staff. 436 personnel who were randomly selected from the population were included in the study.

As data collection tool; a 32-item “Internet Usage Activities Scale-IUAS” designed by Akca (2013) by reviewing the relevant literature and a 13-item “Non-work related Internet Use Reasons Scale-NRIURS”. The scale items were designed in 5 point Likert type coding (1:Almost never, 5:Almost always). IUAS, having 4 factors, accounted for 66.76% of total variance and its Cronbach alpha coefficient was .84. NRIURS had 2 factor structure and its Cronbach alpha coefficient was .82.

The data were collected during office-hours during 2016-2017 academic year by three students who studied at school of physical education and sports and were trained about data collection methods. Before administering the forms, participants were informed that the study was about internet use, there were no right or wrong answers in the forms, questions should be answered accurately and data would not be disclosed. For the analyses of the data, Independent Samples T-Test was used depending on the number of the variable in order to test the difference between two variables while One-Way ANOVA was employed in order to test the difference between more than two variables. Findings obtained after analyses were presented in tables and discussed.

FINDINGS

Table 1. Demographic findings of the study group

VARIABLES		N	%
SEX	Male	305	70.0
	Female	131	30.0
POSITION	Academic	294	67.4
	Administrative	142	32.6
MARITAL STATUS	Married	324	74.3
	Single	112	25.7
EDUCATIONAL STATUS	University	152	34.9
	Master	284	65.1
AGE	≤35 years	170	39.0
	36-45 years	178	40.8
	≥46 years	88	20.2
INCOME STATUS	≤3000	64	14.7
	3001 - 5000	220	50.5
	5001 - 7000	54	12.4
	≥7000	98	22.5
DURATION OF INTERNET	< 1 hour	56	12.8
	1-3 hours	180	41.3
	> 3 hours	200	45.9
LENGTH OF SERVICE	< 6 years	114	26.1
	7-12 years	118	27.1
	13-18 years	84	19.3
	> 19 years	120	27.5
TOTAL		436	100

In Table 1; variables related to participants’ sex, position, marital status, educational status, age, income level, internet duration and length of service was examined.

Table 2. T-test results of IUAS scores according to position

Scale	Subscales	Position	n	\bar{x}	Ss	sd	t	p
IUAS	Recreational	Academic	294	2.48	.59	.03	-.91	.36
		Administrative	142	2.53	.56	.05		
	Disruptive	Academic	294	3.14	.51	.03	-.78	.43
		Administrative	142	3.19	.56	.05		
	Personal learning	Academic	294	2.18	.57	.03	-2.49	.01*
		Administrative	142	2.33	.59	.05		
	Ambiguous	Academic	294	2.71	.77	.04	1.06	.29
		Administrative	142	2.63	.73	.06		
NRIURS	Study	Academic	294	3.55	.73	.04	2.61	.01*
		Administrative	142	3.35	.74	.06		
	Entertainment	Academic	294	2.87	.66	.04	-.014	.98
		Administrative	142	2.87	.70	.06		

p<.05

When study groups' IUAS and non-work related internet use reasons were investigated in terms of position; it was noted that position created a significant difference in personal learning behaviors and study subscales. It was identified that average scores of administrative personnel were higher in personal learning while average scores of academic personnel were higher in study subscales than administrative personnel.

Table 3. T-test results of IUAS scores according to sex

Scale	Subscales	Sex	n	\bar{x}	ss	sd	t	p
IUAS	Recreational	Male	305	2.54	.59	.03	2.02	.02*
		Female	131	2.40	.56	.05		
	Disruptive	Male	305	3.15	.53	.03	-.02	.98
		Female	131	3.15	.51	.04		
	Personal learning	Male	305	2.27	.61	.03	2.45	.01*
		Female	131	2.13	.49	.04		
	Ambiguous	Male	305	2.76	.72	.04	3.27	.01*
		Female	131	2.49	.82	.07		
NRIURS	Study	Male	305	3.45	.76	.04	-1.44	.15
		Female	131	3.56	.66	.06		
	Entertainment	Male	305	2.89	.66	.04	.64	.52
		Female	131	2.84	.70	.06		

p<.05

When Table 3 was examined in terms of sex variable, it was found that sex variable produced a significant difference in recreational behaviors, personal learning behaviors and ambiguous behaviors. Average scores of

male participants were higher in recreational behaviors, personal learning behaviors and ambiguous behaviors than average scores of female participants.

Table 4. T-test results of IUAS scores according to marital status

Scale	Subscales	Marital status	n	\bar{x}	Ss	sd	t	p
IUAS	Recreational	Married	324	2.52	.59	.03	-.16	.10
		Single	112	2.42	.54	.05		
	Disruptive	Married	324	3.22	.53	.03	-.45	.01*
		Single	112	2.97	.47	.04		
	Personal learning	Married	324	2.24	.59	.03	-.91	.36
		Single	112	2.19	.53	.05		
Ambiguous	Married	324	2.74	.75	.04	-.27	.01*	
	Single	112	2.52	.75	.07			
NRIURS	Study	Married	324	3.47	.72	.04	-.67	.50
		Single	112	3.53	.78	.07		
	Entertainment	Married	324	2.84	.69	.04	-2.19	.02*
		Single	112	2.99	.59	.06		

p<.05

When scale scores of the study group were investigated, there were significant differences in disruptive behaviors, ambiguous behaviors and entertainment behaviors in terms of marital status. It was noted that married individuals demonstrated higher scores in disruptive behaviors and ambiguous behaviors while single individuals had higher scores in entertainment behaviors.

Table 5. ANOVA results of IUAS scores according to age groups

Scale	Subscales	Age groups	n	\bar{x}	Ss	sd	F	p
IUAS	Recreational	≤35 years	170	2.54	.62	.05	5.41	.005*
		36-45 years	178	2.52	.55	.04		
		≥46 years	88	2.31	.52	.05		
	Disruptive	≤35 years	170	3.12	.57	.04	1.06	.345
		36-45 years	178	3.20	.49	.04		
		≥46 years	88	3.14	.50	.05		
	Personal learning	≤35 years	170	2.29	.66	.05	4.82	.008*
		36-45 years	178	2.25	.53	.04		
		≥46 years	88	2.06	.46	.05		
Ambiguous	≤35 years	170	2.76	.76	.06	2.55	.079	
	36-45 years	178	2.68	.73	.05			
	≥46 years	88	2.53	.80	.08			
NRIURS	Study	≤35 years	170	3.49	.71	.05	.088	.915
		36-45 years	178	3.47	.74	.05		
		≥46 years	88	3.51	.79	.08		
	Entertainment	≤35 years	170	2.95	.73	.06	2.71	.067
		36-45 years	178	2.79	.59	.04		
		≥46 years	88	2.91	.69	.07		

p<.05

When Table 5 was examined, it was found that average scores of the participants differed significantly in terms of recreational behaviors and personal learning behaviors and the difference was caused by those aged ≥ 40.

When scale scores of the study group were investigated in terms of income level, it was found that there were significant differences in recreational behaviors and personal learning behaviors.

Table 6. ANOVA results of IUAS scores according to length of service

Scale	Subscales	Length of service	n	\bar{x}	Ss	sd	F	p
IUAS	Recreational	<6 years	114	2.54	.64	.06	3.01	.197
		7-12 years	118	2.55	.61	.06		
		13-18 years	84	2.47	.49	.05		
		>19 years	120	2.49	.53	.05		
	Disruptive	<6 years	114	3.08	.58	.05	1.09	.353
		7-12 years	118	3.19	.49	.04		
		13-18 years	84	3.18	.50	.05		
		>19 years	120	3.17	.53	.05		
	Personal learning	<6 years	114	2.33	.58	.05	4.94	.002*
		7-12 years	118	2.28	.65	.06		
		13-18 years	84	2.26	.56	.06		
		>19 years	120	2.06	.48	.04		
	Ambiguous	<6 years	114	2.73	.79	.07	.849	.468
		7-12 years	118	2.74	.69	.06		
		13-18 years	84	2.65	.76	.08		
		>19 years	120	2.60	.79	.07		
NRIURS	Study	<6 years	114	2.88	.60	.06	.164	.921
		7-12 years	118	2.87	.72	.07		
		13-18 years	84	2.91	.76	.08		
		>19 years	120	2.85	.63	.06		
	Entertainment	<6 years	114	3.39	.71	.07	1.07	.361
		7-12 years	118	3.55	.67	.06		
		13-18 years	84	3.52	.69	.07		
		>19 years	120	3.50	.85	.08		

p<.05

When scale scores of the study group were investigated in terms of length of service, a significant difference was found in personal learning behaviors. As length of service increased, average scores of personal learning behaviors decreased.

DISCUSSION AND RESULT

Non-work related usage of computers and smart phones, which are considered as an inseparable part of today's world and introduced for work related purposes, reduces work performance and work productivity considerably. In the current study in which office workers' cyberloafing behaviors were examined; a comparison was performed among academic and administrative personnel in terms of demographic variables. According to the findings, IUAS and non-work related internet use reasons were examined and it was identified that position created a significant difference in personal learning and study subscales. Average scores of administrative

personnel were higher in personal learning while academic personnel showed higher average scores in study subscale. For us, the fact that academic personnel must closely follow the changing, actual and updated studies related to their academic expertise may have played a role upon this result. Aytac et al. (2001) pointed out that academicians employed by universities carry out such responsibilities and duties as teaching students for future professions, undertaking scientific studies, producing knowledge and technology and introducing these knowledge and technology into humanity and society and spreading scientific thought in the society. Therefore, it was an expected outcome that academicians' non-work related internet use reasons were higher in study subscale as compared to administrative personnel. As for Internet usage activities among administrative personnel, they spend most of their time communicating official correspondence and following the changing legislations as a part of their tasks. Therefore, we are of the opinion that average scores of IUAS of administrative personnel were higher in personal learning than academic personnel. Örucü and Yıldız (2014) classified cyberloafing behaviors as minor cyberloafing and serious cyberloafing and indicated that academic personnel demonstrated more cyberloafing behaviors than administrative personnel did.

In another finding of the study, sex variable was investigated and no significant difference was found in non-work related internet use reasons. This finding may be suggesting that non-work related internet use reasons did not differ in terms of sex variable. Although there were studies that reported that sex variable did not create any significant difference in cyberloafing behaviors (Ünal and Tekin, 2015; Restubog et al., 2011; Stanton, 2002; Ugrin et al., 2007); it was found that in internet use activities; average scores of male personnel were higher in recreation, personal learning and ambiguous behaviors than female personnel.

Another factor that affected cyberloafing behaviors was marital status. When the effect of marital status upon internet use activities were investigated, findings demonstrated that married participants' scores of disruptive behaviors and ambiguous behaviors were higher than single participants; which made us conclude that married participants may have had needs that are more different in their lives as compared to single participants. As a result, that internet and computer are effective instruments in meeting these needs may explain cyberloafing behaviors as effective variable in terms of marital status. As for non-work related internet use reasons; average scale scores of single participants were higher than married participants. The study of Örucü and Yıldız (2014) argued that single individuals perform activities such as joining social websites, visiting online societies, watching videos for entertainment purposes more than married individuals. It may be suggested that single individuals use cyber-society more often than married individuals due to similar reasons.

In another finding of the study, no significant difference was found in non-work related internet use reasons in terms of age variable but there were significant differences in recreational and personal learning behaviors. According to findings obtained, as age of the participants increased, their cyberloafing behaviors in recreation and personal learning decreased. In other words; it may be suggested that young participants were engaged with cyberloafing behaviors more than the middle aged and older participants. Many studies that examined the correlation between age and cyberloafing concurred with the current study (Kose et al., 2012; Vitak et al., 2011; Phillips and Reddie, 2007; Ugrin et al., 2007; Mastrangelo et al. 2006; Matanda et al. 2004; Atkin et al., 1998; Kraut et al., 1998).

The findings obtained revealed that length of service was an effective variable upon cyberloafing behaviors. As length of service increased, average scores in personal learning of internet use activities scale decreased and it may be concluded that there was an inverse proportion between length of service and personal-learning-motivated-cyberloafing behaviors. In other words, personnel with lower length of service demonstrated more personal-learning-motivated-cyberloafing behaviors than those with higher length of service.

As a result; it was identified that variables of position, sex, marital status, age groups, income level and length of service affected internet use activities of academic and administrative personnel while position and marital status affected non-work related internet use. It was found that the highest average scores of internet use activities were obtained in "disruptive internet use", "ambiguous internet use" and "recreational internet use" and "personal-learning-motivated-internet use"; respectively. As for non-work related internet use, it may be argued that the study group used internet for "study" purposes. Also it is suggested that the subsequent studies should be applied to larger groups with different sample groups.

REFERENCES

- Adams, D. (2006). Wireless laptops in the classroom (and the Susame Street syndrome). *Communication of the ACM*, 49(9), 25-27. doi: 10.1145/1151030.1151049
- Akca, A. (2013). Analysis of non-work related internet usage (cyberloafing) behaviours of school principals. Master Thesis., Yıldız Technical University, İstanbul.
- Anandarajan, M., Devine, P. & Simmers, C.A. (2004). A multidimensional scaling approach to personal web usage in the workplace, 61-79, inside personal web usage in the workplace: a guide to effective human resources management (editor: M. Anandarajan and C. Simmers), Information Science Publishing.
- Atkin, D., Jeffres, L. & Neuendorf, K. (1998). Understanding internet adoption as telecommunications behavior. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 42(4):475-490.
- Demir, Ö. & Seferođlu, SS. (2016). The investigation of the relationship of cyber bullying with cyber loafing, internet addiction, information literacy and various other variables. *Online Journal of Technology Addiction & Cyberbullying*, 3(1), 1-26.
- Ergün, E., & Altun, A. (2012). The student's perspective of cyberloafing and its causes. *Eđitim Teknolojisi Kuram ve Uygulama*, 2(1), 36-53.
- Galluch, P. S., & Thatcher, J. B. (2006, Kasım). Slacking and the internet in the classroom: A preliminary investigation. *Proceedings of the fifth annual workshop on HCI research in MSI*, Milwaukee, Wisconsin
- Kalaycı, E. (2010). The investigation of relationship between cyberloafing and self-regulated learning strategies among undergraduate students. Master thesis, Hacettepe University, Ankara.
- Köse, S., Oral, L. & TÜresin, H. (2012). Social facilitation concept in business life and it's relationship with cyberloafing: a research on research assistants. *Sosyal ve Beřeri Bilimler Dergisi*, 4(1):287-295.
- Kosher R. (2002). Histories of Leisure. Newyork: Oxford International Publishers.
- Kraut, R., Patterson, M., Lundmark, V., Kiesler, S., Mukopadhyay, T. & Scherlis, W. (1998). Internet Paradox: A Social Technology That Reduces Social Involvement and Psychological Well Being?. *American Psychologist*, 53(9):1017-1031.
- Kurt, M. (2011). Contrastive study of cyberloafing behaviours. Fırat University 5th International Computer & Instructional Technologies Symposium, September 22-24, Elazıđ.
- Lim, V.K.G. (2002). The IT Way of Loafing on the Job: Cyberloafing, Neutralizing and Organizational Justice. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(5):675- 694.
- Mastrangelo, P.M., Everton, W. & Jolton, J.A. (2006). Personal Use of Work Computers: Distraction versus Destruction. *CyberPsychology & Behavior*, 9(6):730-741.
- Matanda, M., Jenvey, V.B. & Phillips, J.G. (2004). Internet Usage in Adulthood: Loneliness, Computer Anxiety and Education. *Behavior Change*, 21(2):103-114.
- Max Horkheimer and Theodor W. Adorno, *Dialectic of Enlightenment* (New York: Continuum, 1999), p. 137.
- Örücü, E., & Yıldız, H. (2014). The Personal Internet and Technology Usage at the Workplace: Cyberslacking. *Ege Akademik Bakis*, 14(1), 99.
- Özkalp, E., Aydın, U. & Tekeli, S. (2012). Deviant Organizational Behavior and a New Case in Working Life: Cyberloafing and Its Effects on Business Relations. *Çimento İşveren Sendikası Dergisi*, 26(2):18-33.
- Phillips, J.G. & Reddie, L. (2007). Decisional Style and Self-Reported Email Use in the Workplace. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 23(5):2414-2428.
- Restubog, S.L.D., Garcia, P.R.J.M., 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 Behavior in the Workplace. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 45(2):247-251.

- During S. S. (1993). *The Cultural Studies Reader* (London and New York: Routledge, 1993), pp. 31–2.
- Stanton, J.M. (2002). Company Profile of the Frequent Internet User. *Communications of the ACM*, 45(1):55-59.
- Ugrin, J.C., Pearson, J.M., & Odom, M.D. (2008). Profiling cyber-slackers in the workplace: Demographic, cultural, and workplace factors. *Journal of Internet Commerce*, 6(3), 75-89.
- Ünal, Ö.F., & Tekdemir, S. (2015). Cyberloafing: an empirical research on a public institution. *Süleyman Demirel University the journal of faculty of economics and administrative sciences*, 20(2).
- Van Doorn, O.N. (2011). Cyberloafing: A multi–dimensional construct placed in a theoretical framework. master thesis. Eindhoven University of Technology, Department Industrial Engineering and Innovation Sciences.
- Vitak, J., Crouse, J. & LaRose, R. (2011). Personal internet use at work: understanding cyberslacking. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 27(5): 1751-1759.