CYBERLOAFING INCREASES OR DECREASES TASK PERFORMANCE AND PRODUCTIVITY- A REVIEW FROM EMERGING LITERATURE

*S.Aishwarya
**Dr. M. Ayisha Millath
*Phd Research Scholar (Full time), Alagappa Institute of Management, Alagappa university, Karaikudi
**Assistant Professor, Alagappa Institute of Management, Alagappa university, Karaikudi

Abstract:
This paper covers about cyberloafing and its predictable effects on organizational productivity. The intention of this research paper is to discuss whether employee job attitudes, organizational characteristics, attitudes towards cyberloafing and other non-Internet loafing behavior has the chance of affecting task performance of the employees. We discuss that the employee job attitudes of job involvement and intrinsic involvement are connected to cyberloafing. In addition, we discuss that organizational characteristics including the apparent cyberloafing of one's coworkers and managerial support for internet usage are related to cyberloafing. We also arrived some conclusions from previous researches that attitudes towards cyberloafing and the extent to which employees participate in non-Internet loafing behaviors (e.g., talking with coworkers, running personal works) will both be related to cyberloafing. In addition, this paper covers a general view on cyberloafing among the organizations and their support to use the internet facility for the knowledge gained workers in a modern work environment.
Keywords: cyberloafing,productivity, task performance, non-internet loafing.

Introduction:
Cyber loafing is a term used to define the activities of employees who use their Internet access at work for personal use whereas pretending to do genuine work. Cyber loafing is known from the term goldbricking, which originally referred to applying gold coating to a brick of useless metal. Today, both goldbricking and cyberloafing (cyberslacking and cyberbludging) are used to refer to this phenomenon. Companies which employ cyberloafers, predicted that productivityleads to inefficiency.Each year, cyberloafing can cost employers a great deal of money in lost productivity. To secure this practice, investigation software, sometimes used to monitor employees' online activities. Another approach is to install proxy servers to avert access to sites and services such as Instant Messenger, Internet Chat, Internet betting etc., Disciplinary measures and subsidized online access after business hours have also been used to decrease incidences of cyberloafing.
Some cyber loafing activities are:
- Browsing sports-related Web sites
- Shopping online for personal goods
- Checking non-work-related e-mail
- Browsing investment-related Web sites
- Browsing entertainment-related Web sites
- Playing online games
- Downloading non-work-related information
- Downloading online games
- Browsing general news Web sites

- Chatting in online chat rooms
- Chat with other people with instant messenger
- Posting messages on non-work-related items
- Using the Internet to gain additional income while at work
- Browsing non-work-related Web sites
- Using social media websites

Cyber loafing Literature Review:

- According to Kevin Landon Askew 2012, from his investigation, great care was taken to provide a description of cyber loafing that was accurate: Cyberloafing happens when a non- telecommuting employee uses any type of computer (e.g., desktop, cell-phone, tablet) at work for non-destructive activities that his/her primary supervisor would not consider job-related. Considerably, cyberloafing researchers have been much more slack in describing the boundaries of cyberloafing. The inaccuracy of working definitions in the literature might be due to the fact the cyberloafing as a phenomenon is instinctive, and therefore explanations only need to point to the concept that people already have in their minds. But the lack of precision is not acceptable because some significant decisions should be based on the definition of cyberloafing: what items to include in a scale and what participants should be included and excluded, for example. Although there is no evidence that this has harmed cyberloafing research, it has been a conceptual shortcoming of the literature. In addition to the lack of clarity on the definition of cyberloafing, organizational researchers have spent considerable period trying to elucidate how cyberloafing relates to other internet-mediated constructs, such cyber-bullying and cyber-aggression.
- Many cyberloafing researchers have tried to adapt Robinson and Bennett's (1995) Workplace Deviance Model – a typology of CWBs (Counter productive work behavior), which distinguishes CWBs along two dimensions: severity of the behavior and target (individuals vs. the organization). Consistent with Robinson and Bennett's (1995) distinction between minor and serious behaviors, at least three teams of researchers have tested and found support for a two factor model consisting of a cyberloafing factor and a serious computer-mediated factor (Askew, 2010a; Blanchard & Henle, 2008; Mastrangelo, Everton, & Jolton, 2006).
- Weatherbee's (2009) also used Robinson and Bennett's Workplace DevianceModel as the basis for explication of the relationships among cyber loafing and related constructs. Similar to the Robinson and Bennett model, Weatherbee's typology distinguishes behaviors along the severity and target (individual vs. organization) dimensions, creating four categories of behaviors. Weatherbee classified cyber loafing as a production-deviance behavior, a minor cyber-deviant behavior directed towards the organization, which is closely related to other constructs such as "surfing". Although Weatherbee's typology has not been empirically tested, it is consistent with empirical research in the cyber loafing literature (e.g., Askew, 2010a; Blanchard & Henle, 2008; Mastrangelo et al., 2006) and has a strong theoretical backing in the CWB literature (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). As such it is probably the best framework to date that relates cyber loafing to the other types of internet-mediated behaviors.

Perspectives and Antecedents

The most common perspective on cyberloafing is that it is a type of break, onedone using a computer (e.g., Blanchard & Henle, 2008; Blau et al., 2004; Lim & Teo, 2005). From this

break analogy, researchers have drawn different conclusions regarding the implications. Some researchers have cited prevalence rates and concluded that cyberloafing is reducing productivity (e.g., Malachowski, 2005; Stewart, 2000). Other researchers have concluded that cyberloafing can provide a respite, boosting productivity and employee satisfaction (Belanger & Van Slyke, 2002; Block, 2001). Researchers typically haven't tested these predictions, instead focusing on descriptive issues like the prevalence, dimensionality, and antecedents of cyber loafing (Weatherbee, 2009).

Cyberloafing and Task Performance
Although the antecedents of cyberloafing have been studied frequently, much less research has been conducted on the consequences of cyberloafing. This is surprising since the consequences of cyberloafing are an important reason to study cyberloafing. The construct of task performance is a particular concern here, since cyberloafing could potentially have very negative effects on productivity. Even though there has been a dearth of empirical research on how cyberloafing influences task performance, there has been much speculation in the literature, and this has led to four competing perspectives.

- Firstly, the perception is that cyberloafing results in lower task performance through lost work time (Barlaw, Bean, & Hott, 2003; Foster, 2001). In this perspective, time spent cyberloafing is time that would have been spent working and any loss of work time is expected to translate into lost productivity (Barlaw et al., 2003; Foster, 2001). If this perspective is correct, one should expect a negative relationship between cyberloafing and task performance.

- Secondly, related perception is that certain types of cyberloafing behaviors are either harmful or more harmful than other cyberloafing behaviors to productivity. Lim and Chen (2009) have taken the perspective that social behaviors are more harmful to productivity because the relationship-building nature of these activities requires more energy, time, and cognitive resources. Lim and Chen (2009) argue that these demands make it harder for an employee to switch back to work-related tasks compared to non-social behaviors such as browsing the web. Blau and his colleagues (2004) made a similar argument for interactive behaviors, which includes social behaviors and online games. If these perspectives are true, we should observe interactive and social behaviors to have negative associations with task performance. Moreover, these behaviors should more strongly relate to lower task performance than behaviors such as web-browsing. A third perspective is much more positive in regards to the influence of cyberloafing.

- Thirdly, the perception is that cyberloafing can provide a respite from work, boosting productivity once the employee returns from work (Belanger & Van Slyke, 2002, Block, 2001). The boost is assumed to be substantial enough to overcome any loss in productivity incurred during the cyberloafing session itself (Mirchandani & Motwani, 2003). The mechanism for this effect is one of recovery: cognitive resources are drained during work-related tasks and engaging in cyberloafing recovers these resources allowing the employee to become more productive. Researchers who take this perspective (Belanger & Van Slyke, 2002, Block, 2001) rely on the break literature and Baumeister's Ego Depletion Model to support their predictions. If this perspective is correct, there should be a positive relationship between cyberloafing and task performance. Moreover, the amount of cyberloafing one does in short breaks should be associated with increases in productivity.

- Fourthly, the perception of cyberloafing is that it does not influence task performance, or it only influences task performance in extreme cases (Blanchard & Henle, 2008). According to this perspective, people have a certain amount of work to get done and

they cyberloaf when they have the time. This view does not suggest that everyone is equally productive; it suggests that each employee has a certain standard of work they aspire to, and they put enough work in to obtain that standard and cyberloaf with some of the leftover time. If this perspective is correct, then there should be no relationship or a small relationship between cyberloafing and task performance. Moreover, if it is also the case that cyberloafing is only harmful if done in excess, then frequent long durations of cyberloafing should negatively predict task performance.

- Fifthly, non-internet loafing also taking a part of suffering individual performance and organizational productivity. Sometimes the managers support the workers for internet based loafing but not for just chatting with co-workers, wasting time by doing non-job related works etc., social loafing means a person applying less work to attain a goal when they work in a groupthan when they work individually. This is understood as one of the key reasons,groups are occasionally less productive than the combined performance of their members working as individuals, but should be notable from the unintentional coordination problems that groups sometimes experience.

Organizational productivity

Organizational productivity is described by a range of factors, it can be evaluated quantitatively, and sometimes require a qualitative or analytical approach. When evaluating productivity, it is essential to fully comprehend each of the vital drivers that influence productivity. In addition to evaluating each driver individually, it is necessary to determine how well these drivers work together and function as complete. Changes to one driver might have an effect on others. Effective Assessment includes understanding how each driver contributes to productivity.

Goals & Objectives: What we are trying to achieve, both short and long term.

Strategy: How do we plan to assign resources (men, tasks, systems, etc.) to attain our objectives.

Process: The most effective ways of working.

Structure: Roles, responsibilities, reporting relationships, placement arewell-matched with strategy and objectives should be monitored.

Staffing: The requisite backgrounds, skills and experiences of the people needed to do the job.

Controls & Reporting: The proper tools and metrics in place to track, manage and measure performance against objectives

Planning & Programs: Internal and external collaborative planning processes associated with business objectives and enablerapidity to market and ROI on Sales and Marketing investments

Motivation & Incentives: Financial and non-financial incentives appropriatelystrengthen objectives achievement.

Training & Development: Programs in place which link to business objectives, develop essential competencies and increase labor value.

Systems & Tools: The right tools to upkeep the plans and objectives, expedite decision making and facilitate organization efficiency and effectiveness.

Communications: Well-organized and operative communications that we want our internal and external audiences to know, understand and do, to simplify business objective achievement.

Culture: Fundamental values, beliefs and philosophies that shape, build or influence the ways of   working.

The capacity ofteamwork is always important for productivity. At the beginning years of the

corporate network, email and video conferencing provided productivity gains and lowered costs. Newer mobile collaboration tools make it much easier for geographically detached employees to work together. Tablets, smartphones and laptops connect users with colleagues anywhere, at any time. The new technic of BYOD (bring your own device) trend makes employees more productive. Because employees are working on devices that they own and are used to, they are likely to use them more often. The devices are mobile by definition, if an employee is taking notes in a meeting, reviewing documents in a commute or preparing the next day agenda while watching television, he can complete more in a way that does not impact his personal time as knowingly as it would if he had to work from a desktop computer.Simultaneously continuous connectivity and the growth of social networking have made it easier and more alluring for employees to waste time on the job. To prevent online time-wasting called cyber slacking, few organizations observe employees or limit the sites they can access from the corporate network.

Email processing consumes a substantial portion of many employees' time, estimated to be about 30 percent of a lot of knowledge workers' jobs more if email is not efficiently handled. Effective email management practices can lessen email's negative impact on productivity. Such practicesinclude limiting the number of email processing sessions each day and limiting the amount of time spent per session. Some organizations limit the hours during which email is accessible on the corporate network. By the research undergone by Gloria Mark at the University of California at Irvine, on average, employees are interrupted every 3 minutes and that it takes 23 minutes after even a very brief interruption to return to the original task. Interruption science explores the effect of disruptions on productivity.Employee productivity is one component of IT productivity, the relationship between an organization's technology investments and its corresponding efficient return on investment (ROI).

Task Performance

Task Performanceis a working process which occurs when an assigned person (or a workgroup of persons) effectuates a task's plan: this refers to a manner in which they realize the work which was projected for a task. Since there is a task attributed with the main elements of its plan (the task goals, a plan of actions to reach these goals reasonably, and certain success measures to appraise effectiveness of these efforts) it is time to appoint the right performers who are able to undertake the practical work. Success of task performance (proper accomplishment of the practical work) is based upon the following matters (they are necessary for performers to be effective in their actions):

- Specification of task actions (a plan on how to complete this task in the best possible way)
- Specification of task constraints (requirements on duration, quality and budget of the task)
- Specification of results (what outputs are expected from completion of this work)
- Specification of roles (duties essential to every person at the task performance site)

CONCLUSION

Which of the four perspectives does the literature support? The most support can be found for the respite perspective. In a laboratory study done at the University of Copenhagen, two groups of participants were made to perform a simple task: watch a video with people passing a ball and count the number of passes (Surowiecki, 2011). Before the task, one of the groups was told that a funny video was available and was allowed to click and watch the 10-minute video; the other group was told that a funny video was available but was not allowed to click and watch the video. Consistent with Baumeister's idea of ego depletion (Baumeister et al., 1998), the group that watched the funny video – and therefore did not have to inhibit the

desire to watch the video – had significantly better performance than the group that did have to inhibit watching the funny video. Lim and her colleagues found similar results with another laboratory study (Lim et al., in press). The laboratory studies conducted by Lim and others are interesting and provide some evidence for the respite perspective. However, whether or not this effect found in the lab is present and dominant in organizations is an open question. What are missing from the literature at the moment are studies looking at the relationship between cyberloafing and task performance in actual organizations. A descriptive analysis of how cyberloafing relates to task performance in organizations would allow researchers to determine which one of the four perspectives best describes how cyberloafing operates in the real world. It would also help answer the question of what are implications of the cyberloafing being widespread. Each perception should give a different pattern of answers to these questions. If the first perception is correct, then there should be a negative bivariate relationship between cyberloafing and task performance, negative relationships between social and interactive cyberloafing and task performance but no differential relationships with task performance between social/interactive items and web-browsing and short and long break frequencies should both be significant predictors of task performance. By examining the answers to the research questions using data from actual organizations, we can see which perspective is the most reasonable. This will be a significant step towards understanding how cyberloafing influences task performance in actual organizations.

REFERENCE

1) Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2003). The past, present and future of workplacedeviance research. In J. Greenberg (Ed.), Organizational behavior: The state of the science (2nd ed., pp. 247–281). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

2) Askew, K. (2010a). An empirical comparison of different cyberloafing typologies. Posterpresented at SIOP. Atlanta, GA.

3) Askew, K. (2010b). Testing the plausibility of a series of causal minor cyberloafingmodels (Unpublished master's thesis). University of South Florida, Tampa, FL.

4) Askew, K., Coovert, M. D., Taing, M. U., Ilie, A., & Bauer, J. (2012, April). Work environment factors and cyberloafing: A follow-up to Askew. Poster presented at SIOP, San Diego, CA.

5) Askew, K., Coovert, M. D., Vandello, J. A., Taing, M. U., & Bauer, J. A. (2011). Work environment factors predict cyberloafing. Poster presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Psychological Science. Washington D.C.

6) Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2003). The past, present and future of workplace deviance research. In J. Greenberg (Ed.), Organizational behavior: The state of the science (2nd ed., pp. 247–281). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

7) Blanchard, A. L., & Henle, C. A. (2008). Correlates of different forms of cyberloafing:

8) The role of norms and external locus of control. Computers in Human Behavior, 24(3), 1067-1084.

9) Blau, G., Yang, Y., & Ward-Cook, K. (2004). Testing a Measure of Cyberloafing.Journal of Allied Health, 35(1), 9-17.

10) 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.

11) Lim, V. K. G., & Chen, D. J. Q. (2009). Cyberloafing at the workplace: Gain or drain on work? Behaviour & Information Technology, 25(1), 1-11.

12) 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(8), 1081-1093.

13) Lim, V. K. G., Teo, T. S. H., & Loo, G. L. (2002). How do I loaf here? Let me count the ways. Communications of the ACM, 45(1), 66-70.

14) Baumeister, R. F., Bratslavsky, E., Muraven, M., & Tice, D. M. (1998). Ego depletion: Is the active self a limited resource? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74(5), 1252.

15) Belanger, F., & Van Slyke, C. (2002). Abuse or learning? Communications of the ACM,45(1), 64-65.

16) Mirchandani, D., & Motwani, J. (2003). Reducing Internet abuse in the workplace.Advanced Management Journal, 68(1), 22-26.

17) Kevin Landon Askew (2012). The relationship between cyber loafing and task performance and an examination of the theory of planned behavior as a model of cyberloafing University of South Florida, 12-30