Cyberloafing in the Workplace: A By-Product of Perceived Workplace Incivility and Perceived Workers’ Frustration
Chine Bernard C. Ph.D, Etodike, Chukwuemeka E & Joe-Akunne, Chiamaka O. Ph.D

INTRODUCTION
There is an increasing demand for organizational effectiveness across all sectors; this could be attributed to growing cost running organizations as typical in Nigeria like other developing countries. In the views of Gould-William [1], many employees in service organizations have found themselves in between this demand for effectiveness and the real circumstances of their work environments with a claim of unfavourable climate. However, it is becoming apparent to organizational owners, management, and workers that organizational events however it might be, have anticipated consequences especially regarding employee and job outcomes in the workplace [2]. For example, Radebe and Dhurup [3] opined that perceptions of organizational politics and frustration influence the occupational commitment of employees. Consequently, it is not surprising that cyber-loafing in the workplace as employee outcome is at an alarming increase among civil servants. The situation is worrisome as it has rendered service delivery inefficient and ineffective; thus, necessitating the interest of academia and practitioners in the search for causes and solution.

Cyber-loafing, also known as cyber-slacking is employee’s unofficial use of the internet, e-mail services and virtual game devices either self-improvised or provided by their employer during work hours [4]. Cyber-loafing include e-mailing jokes to friends, online shopping or game playing, downloading music, instant messaging (chatting on any of the instant message platforms like facebook, whatsapp, twitter, LinkedIn, Instagram, Badoo etc), posting to newsgroups, or surfing non-work-related internet sites [5].

Cyber-loafing is an important issue facing organizations as more cell phones and personal digital assistants (PDAs) are becoming more affordable to acquire and use than the computer for all level workers. There is fear among stakeholders that the behaviour (cyber-loafing) is a high-tech method for employees to shirk their job duties while appearing to be busy working [6]. This is because the attitude poses great danger to job, employee and organizational outcomes in...
most significant ways such as performance lapses and deadline failures as negative job outcomes [7]. Primarily, most workers who are victims of cyber-loafing spend a good number of productive man hours avoiding work in order to surf or loaf on the internet without executing officially the duties of their workplace and thereby disrupting normal organizational productivity flow [8]. The dangers it poses to productive outcomes created the need to understand organizational factors which may pre-dispose employees to cyber-loafing in the civil service in order to find management paradigms to discourage the behaviour.

Theoretically, cyber-loafing couldn’t have been unabated without organizational antecedents. There are a wide range of factors that could be responsible for its prevalence in the workplace such as: poor inter-personal relationship among workers and between employees and their supervisors, workplace incivility, organizational frustration among others [8]. Wagner, Barnes, Lim, and Ferris [9] contended that the presence of employee impediments is consequential of withdrawal behaviour of organizational members (a leading cause of to the cyber-loafing) who may be seen as factors that orchestrate perceived impediments. Breevaart and Bakker [10] justified the above assertion on the premise the member-member interaction and leader-member interaction of employees are becoming critical components of job outcomes, and in this sense could be responsible for employee’s withdrawal behaviour leading to cyber-loafing. Such consideration has been extended to the influence of perceived workplace incivility and perceived organizational frustration as climates which can orchestrate the cyber-loafing of employees.

**Problem Statement**

There is gap in empirical evidence which have attempted to provide data on the causes of cyber-loafing as a negative outcome orchestrated due to organizational climate which predispose employees to it. Many studies at best group-labeled such negative outcomes (such as counterproductive workplace behaviour and workplace deviance) without attempt to break them down into independent measuring aspects of behaviour witnessed in the workplace such as cyber-loafing. For instance, many studies such as Welbourne and Sarioł’s [11] investigated the conditions under which exposure to incivility at work was associated with engaging in counterproductive work behavior (CWB) without dimensions of such counterproductive workplace behaviour which include cyber-loafing. Other studies looked at the consequences of organizational climate from the perspective of job involvement of the employees without emphasizing the aspects of job involvement; for instance, Taştan and Davoudi’s [12] study validated the relationship between workplace incivility and employees' job involvement with moderating effect of collaborative climate. Studies like this one lacked the empiricism to provide information regarding the aspects of employee’s involvement in the workplace such as cyber-loafing which is a form of negative involvement to work.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

**Perceived workplace incivility**

Perceived workplace incivility is a low-intensity disrespectful behaviour that does not have regards to the dignity and self-esteem of other individuals which runs contrary to expectations of the individual and workplace norms for mutual respect [13, 14]. Incivility is a social interaction that can be interpreted differently by the parties involved because the intent of the harm-doer is ambiguous in the eyes of the target, observers, or even the instigator [15, 14]. For example, an individual may perceive that his supervisor constantly cuts him off when he speaks at departmental meetings while the instigator may claim that any harm experienced was due to oversight or ignorance on his part; or the instigator may deny harmful intent by claiming that the target has misinterpreted the behavior or that the target is hypersensitive.

The circumstances as highlighted above are suggestive of justification for the instigator actions but are capable of instigating withdrawal behaviours as an avoidance mechanism. The reaction of the employee towards the perceived harms from the instigator is therefore preventive in approach but such solitary adaption to a large extent predisposes the employee to cyber-loafing in forms of social media chats, online networking or game playing with damning consequences such as low involvement, lack of team spirit and cooperation, lack of commitment, deadline failures and general ineffectiveness etc. This is due to the fact that behavior which a person may perceive as cold, brusque, or rude, may be viewed as ideal by another [15].

Incivility, wherever it is found can take escalating, spiraling, or cascading forms [16]. It can be a tit-for-tat exchange of behaviors of equal intensities (non-escalating, uncivil exchange) or it can escalate into a spiral of more aggressive behaviors with each exchange escalating spiral of incivility [17, 13]. Incivility may also be redirected towards a co-worker or subordinate (direct displacement of cascading pattern of incivility) when the victim does not dare to retaliate directly against the instigator. This often happens when the instigator is of higher status (i.e., one’s supervisor) than the victim. Although, the instigator of incivility can be at the same, higher, or lower level than the target, instigators of incivility are three times more likely to be of higher status than the target [16].

The manner and form in which incivility can occur is endless and this is particularly of concern to both management and organizational members. These forms appear to be explained by Spiral theory of...
incivility propounded by Andersson and Pearson [14]. More often, uncivil act is acknowledged and perceived as uncivil by an individual due to violated norms or unacceptable conducts [6] which are caused by victim’s reaction and desire for revenge triggered by negative effect, or a decision to depart from the organization, which could take place at any point throughout the spiral. Sadly, spiral effects of incivility can further reach epidemic proportions. Based upon the spiral theory of incivility, it can be concluded that incivility is a vicious cycle which can be triggered from a minor issue and escalate to severe coarseness. Incivility spirals may be discontinued by establishing a civil culture reconciliation, forgiveness and zero-tolerance climate towards incivility [7, 16, 15, 14].

Deductively, human conflicts caused by uncivil behaviours are the leading causes of lack of trust, loyalty, cooperation and teamwork which affect the productive processes of any organization and effectiveness. To a large extent, certain forms of incivility may not be tolerated by other employees in the workplace and this may be the common basis for organizational frustration and consequently loafing activities. There is observable relationship in literature that most forms of incivility frustrate organizational effort but have employee outcomes such as cyber-loafing as it threatens the goals of the employees.

Perceived Worker’s Frustration

Worker’s frustration are work circumstances either physically, environmentally, structurally, functionally and/or otherwise which prevent employees from attaining the stated goals of an organization and their individual goals [18]. Worker’s frustration are often referred to organizational frustration because they are induce by organizational or management policies or the organizational climate which they create [18]. In that sense, they are also be referred to as organizational constraint; something that inhibits the progress of the organization, the members of such organization or cause their goals and objectives not to be achieved. Eissa and Lester [19] asserted that the frustration of an employee much likely may influence his/her subordinates in a virtuous cycle. Organizational frustration has a negative impact on human organization. It can cause stress, helplessness, withdrawal behaviours leading to cyber-loafing and lack of commitment of the workforce.

In developing economies such as Nigeria, organizational decisions and policies (such as work processes and procedure, work load, shift work, overtime, annual leave) are usual owner oriented and in most cases are not in the interest of the employees. Many authors for instance: Osman, Othman, Rana, Solaiman and Lai [20]; Meier & Gross [16]; Kubey [21]; Kolawole, Igboanusi and Gwaison's [22] and [23] contended that organizational objectives and decisions which do not considerate the positions of the workers in most instances frustrate the goals of the employees. The dangers of working with a frustrated workforce is known with its attending negative consequence not limited to counterproductive workplace behaviour, organizational deviance, absenteeism, tardiness and general ineffectiveness etc [12]. Such decisions and policies among other effects seem to block the employees’ career paths. When the career paths of employees are blocked or threatened there is high tendency that unpalatable employee outcomes will ensue. Such negative employee antecedents may influence the job involvement of employees and might instigate withdrawal behaviours leading to cyber-loafing with its adversity to productive goals of the organization [12].

Some frustration cannot be avoided and thus, individuals who are prevented from getting to a certain point in life may become frustrated. This leads to tension, when it persists; when the frustration is not broken or reduced, the victim becomes troubled. The troubled individual could become aggressive; as well as may exhibit withdrawal behaviours such as cyber-loafing in order avoid the tension created or to break it. Two basic types of frustration are pertinent; these are environmental and personal frustration. Environmental frustration is when external factors frustrate the satisfaction of motives by making it different or impossible for a person to attain a goal [24]. On the other hand, personal frustration occurs as a result of one deficient in individual’s life or personality, for example looking for promotion, but cannot pass qualifying or promotion examination can be very frustrating. No organization can thrive with its members being frustrated because frustration has a negative impact on achievement motive both at individual or organizational level. Without proper examination of organizational factors which may lead to more workers engaging in the cyber-loafing behaviour, there may be no clue on how to curb the menace. It is based on this circumstance that perceived workplace incivility and organizational frustration were proposed as predictors of cyber-loafing in the workplace [7, 5].

Cyber-Loafing Behaviours in the workplace

Cyber-loafing may be regarded as the private use of the internet during work for non-work purposes. Generally referred to as Non-Work Related Computing (NWRC), cyber-loafing is an employee’s usage of organizational IP resources for personal purposes, not directly related to organizational goals [25].

Cyber-loafing is employee’s voluntary non-work related use of company provided email and Internet while working” [26]. The terms Non-Work Related Computing (NWRC), cyber-loafling, cyber-slacking and Personal Web Use (PWU) may all mean one and same implying authorized use of internet or computer services of the organization for personal uses not related to the aspects of performing job tasks of the
organization. Many authors opine that cyber-loafing behaviour is a workplace deviance [7]. There are two types of cyber-loafing: serious and minor. Serious cyber-loafing consists of online gambling and surfing adult-oriented websites. Minor cyber-loafing would be acts like sending personal email at work. A study done in 2008 by Blanchard and Henle, as cited by Zoghbi-Manriquez-de-Lara [7], suggests that minor cyberloafing is innocuous. However, both serious and minor loafing activities have negative impact on employees’ job outcomes [7].

Cyber-loafing Behaviours

Cyber-loafing is distinguished in four behaviours dimensions; these are derived from several literature fields. The four behaviours are: developmental, recovery, deviant and addictive behaviours.

- **Development behaviour** - which considers the process of cyber-loafing as a potentially source for learning. Cyber-loafing from this point of view of proving an increase in skill which could be used in future activities by employees to benefit both employee and organization [27].

- **Recovery behaviour** - which considers the health of the employee to word off frustration, stress or organizational threats to reduce discomfort and has positive effects on the employee and organization [7, 28].

- **Deviant behaviour** - which considers cyber-loafing as unwanted behaviour aimed against the organization. This behaviour clearly considers cyber-loafing as behaviour with negative consequences (e.g. decreased productivity) for organizations [29, 8].

- **Addiction behaviour** - which could be caused by engaging in cyberloafing as a habit and could result in problematic behaviour. The origin of addiction could lie in the history of an employee in terms of impulse control and addictive disorders [30] or could be caused as a way to respond to dissatisfaction or boredom [31].

As mentioned by Yellowlees and Marks [30] general internet addiction or severe cyber-loafing behaviours could develop severe work-related problems such deadline failure, security issues, lack of dedication and general production problems. More specifically, activities that cause problematic internet use are activities with social interaction [32, 30]. Furthermore, Stanton [33] and Yellowlees and Marks [30], opined that the consequences of cyber-loafing could be both employee and organizational orientated.

Based on the behavioural dimensions of cyber-loafing, it is pertinent that two behaviour dimensions (recovery and deviance) support the model of the current study. Cyber-loafing as a recovery behaviour is applicable in the context of unfavourable organizational climate which may be inhibitory to employee goals. This form of inhibition may be avoided or tend to be broken by cyber-loafing or cyber-slacking. The purpose and use of cyber-loafing as recovery behaviour is to reduce the tension caused by the inhibitory climate in the organization such as incivility or worker’s frustration. Equally, as organizational deviance, cyber-loafing may be targeted as retaliatory of behaviour by the employee to punish the organization or break even with unfavourable organizational climate. Leader-member instigated incivility may the employees (subordinates of the leader) response with cyber-loafing at the expense of organizational effectiveness. Also, cyber-loafing may be deviance oriented; as consequences of bad habit, employee aggression, employee’s sabotage of all forms.

**Theoretical Framework**

What were considered in the framework were social factors of the organization as an exchange arena and personal factors (reasons) which also initiate behaviour on individual level. Thus, two theories were adopted to underline the expected relationship among the variables of the study namely: social exchange theory by Blau [34] and theory of frustration by Amsel [1].

**Social Exchange Theory [34]**

Blau [34] in social exchange theory proposed that socio-psychological perspective processes of exchanges between parties allows the exchanging member to evaluate party’s treatment and thus react in reciprocity. The theory established that organizational events predict responses of members who are affects by such organizational events. Thus, if a member of the organization exhibits uncivil conduct the other parties whom those conducts are targeted at naturally will choose reciprocal actions which may include cyberloafing behaviours. The theory addresses both recovery and deviant basis for cyber-loafing behaviours in the organization. However, the theory may be limited in application because it does not establish personal or subjective employee’s for the prevalence of cyber-loafing activities.

Based on the limitations of social exchange theory, the study further supplements Frustration theory by Amsel [1] to explain subjective factors which influence cyber-loafing behaviour. According to Amsel’s [1] theory of frustration, frustration is a consequence of frustrating-motivational state which bears on the relationship between causes, their reinforcement and outcomes. The theory assumes that behaviour is motivated to avert a frustrative-state. Organizational impediments and incivility are likely causes to motivate employees’ behaviour inform of cyber-loafing aimed at averting the frustration. The value of this theory is that underline the personal factors which energize behaviour of employees in the organization.
In consideration of the above conceptual and theoretical reviews, and to provide management guidance in the instance of the prevalence of cyber-loafing in the organization and how it may be influenced by incivility and worker’s frustration, the following research questions are deemed pertinent to guide the study:

- Would perceive workplace incivility predict cyber-loafing among civil servants in Anambra State?
- Will Worker’s frustration predict cyber-loafing among civil servants in Anambra State?

**Hypotheses**

The following hypotheses were formulated to guide the study:

- Perceived workplace incivility will significantly and positively predict cyber-loafing among Anambra State civil servants.
- Organizational frustration will significantly and positively predict cyber-loafing among Anambra State civil servants.

**METHOD**

**Participants**

Three hundred and twenty-seven (327) public sector employees served as participants in the study. The study participants were drawn from employees of Anambra state civil service. The participants were 146 males and 181 females. The age of the participants ranged from 25 to 57 years, with a mean age of 41 years and standard deviation of 3.50yrs. The participants were selected through simple random sampling technique. Simple random sampling was used to select the participants from their respective ministries.

**Instrument**

Instruments for the data collection are;
- Incivility scale developed by O’Reilly [35]; organizational frustration scale developed by Spector [18], validated in Nigeria by Dieke [36] and cyber-loafing questionnaire by Li and Chung [37]. Incivility Scale by O’Reilly [35] is a 30-item scale which is a revised version of the previous 42-item scale by the same author. It contains subscales that measure different types of uncivil behaviours in order of severity. The items are rated on a 5-point response format of strongly disagree = 1 to strongly agree = 5. Sample items include “Put you down or look down on you” Made derogatory remark about you”. All items are direct item scores. O’Reilly [35] obtained an alpha coefficient of .76. Validity/reliability – In order to ascertain the validity of incivility scale, incivility scale was correlated with 24-item Bennett and Robinson’s [38] workplace deviance scale during the pilot study. Validity analysis revealed a correlation of r = .62 between the scale confirming that the scale is valid. Also, Cronbach’s alpha reliability analysis was carried out during the pilot study to ascertain the reliability of the instrument in the current study. The result of the reliability analysis revealed a coefficients of α = .73.

Organization Frustration Scale was developed by Spector [18] to measure worker’s frustration. It is a 29-item questionnaire structured in the Likert format. It is designed to assess the frustration level of the individual perceive co-worker’s act of aggression, time wasting, sabotage and unreasonable demand to the self. Spector [18], reported a reliability alpha of .88, and a construct validity coefficient of 0.59, by correlating organizational frustration (OF) with the reactions to the construct. Sample items include: “say something derogatory about your boss to other people”. The concurrent validity of the scale is 0.098. The scoring are direct and reverse score. Items, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 12 were reversing (score) items, while the rest items were directly scored. The highest score is 6, that is, agree completely coded (6), agree pretty much is coded (5), agree slightly coded (4), disagree slightly coded (3), disagree pretty much coded (2) and disagree completely coded (1). The Nigerian norms or mean scores are the basis for interpreting the scores of the subjects. Scores higher than the norms indicate high levels of organizational frustration while scores lower than the norms indicate the absence of frustration. Validity/reliability – In order to ascertain the validity of organizational frustration scale, the scale was correlated with organizational justice scale by Neihoff and Mormman [38] during the pilot study. Validity analysis revealed a correlation of r = -.67 between the scale confirming that the scale is valid. Also, Cronbach’s alpha reliability analysis was carried out during the pilot study to ascertain the reliability of the instrument in the current study. The result of the reliability analysis revealed a coefficients of α = .76.

Cyber-loafing questionnaire is a 24-item questionnaire developed by Li and Chung [37]. The author reported an internal consistency of .77 for the general cyber-loafing scale and .85 and .68 for activity and behaviour subscales. Sample items include: “I use the Internet during work for private purposes to extend my social network”, “I use the Internet during work for private purposes to search information”, “I use the Internet during work for private purposes to play a game online”, “I use the Internet during work for private purposes to buy goods”. Each of the four activities is represented by three items on a five-point scale ranging from (1) “Almost” Never” to (5) “Always”. This scale consisted of three items per behaviour on a five-point scale ranging from (1) “Almost Never” to (5) “Almost Always”. For its use in this study, a pilot study was carried out to ascertain its reliability and the result of the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient confirmed that the instrument is reliable at .79.
Procedure

The study started with a pilot study to ensure the instruments for the study are reliable measures of the constructs. Consequently, responses of 51 participants who are civil servants from Anambra State civil service were elicited with the help of research assistants. The choice of using state employees is because the sample has similar characteristics with those of the main study. The researchers visited the secretariat during the official break time (1-2 pm) and gave the questionnaire to participants who were willing to be part of the study having introduced themselves as researchers carrying out an inquiry. The questionnaire was prepared in a booklet and was hand-distributed to the participants. The participants were given both oral and written instructions on how they may fill in the items in the questionnaire. The participants were assured of the confidentiality of their responses as there is no right or wrong answers, since the inquiry is only for an academic purpose. After filling their responses to the item questions which took each of the respondents about 19 minutes, the researchers together with the research assistants collected back the filled questionnaire from the respondents. Fifty-seven (57) questionnaire booklets were distributed but only fifty-three (53) were collected back while 51 was valid. After collecting the filled questionnaire, they were sorted and only the valid ones were coded in excel spr.

In main study, having ensured the validity and reliability of the instruments during the pilot study, the researchers advanced to the main study with the aid of the instruments as statistical tools. The participants of the main study were employees of from Anambra civil service at the State secretariat Awka. The researchers used simple random sampling (ballot technique) to select ministries (ministries used in the pilot study were systematically exclude to avoid test repeatability bias). Accidental sampling technique was deployed to select the participants from the ministries. The researchers after selecting ministries approached those in charge in those ministries, for permission to carry out the study with their staff. The researchers introduced themselves researchers carrying out an inquiry. The researchers visited the Secretariat for data collects on three occasions during the fieldwork. During the visitations, responses of three hundred and twenty-seven (327) participants were elicited for the study. The respondents were informed that the research is inquiry as there are no right and wrong answers. On the whole, a total of 350 questionnaires were administered while 337 (96.2% return rate) were collected back. Only 327 (97%) questionnaires were correctly filled and were used for analysis in the study. In addition to the items, demographic variables such as gender, age, marital status, educational background were included in the instrument used in order to obtain the characteristics of the population. All the raw data obtained from the field exercise were transferred to SPSS statistical tool for analyses.

Design and Statistics

This study being a survey study adopted predictive design and multiple regression analysis was adopted as the appropriate statistical tool to analyze the data obtained from the field study. All statistical analyses were managed with Statistical Package for Social Sciences SPSS version 20.00.

RESULT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table-1: Shows descriptive statistics, mean, standard deviations and number of participants for the variables of the study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variable</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace incivility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker’s frustration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyber-loafing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table-2: Summary table of multiple regression analysis for predictive effects of perceived workplace incivility and worker’s frustration on cyber-loafing Coefficients (a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Cyber-loafing

Summary of Statistical Findings

The result from the multiple regression table above (table 2) confirmed that that perceived workplace incivility positively and significantly predicted cyber-loafing among civil servants at α = .40, p < .05 (n=327). Also, worker’s frustration positively significantly predicted cyber-loafing among civil servants at α = .54, p < .05 (n=327). From the findings above, the
regression result produced positive relationship implying that as the predictor variables (perceived workplace incivility and worker’s frustration) increases, the dependent variable (cyber-loafing) also increases and vice-versa. The findings imply that with more incivility and workers’ frustration, there is more cyber-loafing behaviour.

**Discussion of Findings**

This study examined perceived workplace incivility and worker’s frustration as predictors of cyber-loafing of employees of Anambra State civil service. Two hypotheses were tested to ascertain their predictive influence of independent variables and the result confirmed that both perceived workplace incivility and worker’s frustration significantly and positively predicted cyber-loafing of employees of Anambra State civil service.

The positive and significant predictive influence of workplace incivility on cyber-loafing is supported by findings of the study done by Welbourne and Sariol [11] which investigated the conditions under which exposure to incivility at work was associated with engaging in counterproductive work behavior. Like in their study, which cyber-loafing activities is a form of counterproductive workplace behaviour. The findings of Welbourne and Sariol’s study highlighted that certain work conditions can increase employees’ susceptibility to negative employee outcomes such as cyber-loafing. Also, the finding is supported by the evidence provided by Taştan and Davoudi’s [12] study which validated the relationship between the experience of workplace incivility and employees' job involvement and the moderating effect of collaborative climate on the relationship between these two constructs. The result showed that employees' job involvement was significantly reduced by the experienced workplace incivility which is a form of withdrawal behaviour (negative employee outcome) with withdrawal behaviours being the leading signs of cyber-loafing in organizational setting. Both empirical findings were supported by Social exchange theory by Blau [34] which see cyber-loafing as the as consequence of human interaction emanating from the incivility of members.

Worker’s frustration was also confirmed as significant predictor of cyber-loafing among Anambra state civil servant. The finding was supported by Mohadese and Rahbar’s [39] investigation on the effect of worker’s cynicism on deviant behaviors of employees which found significant and positive relationship between the worker’s cynicism and deviant behaviors of employees. Worker’s cynicism is a form of worker’s frustration which may lead to arbitrary exploitation of organizational resources including the internet facilities as a form of recovery and deviance from impediments in the paths of the employees. Also, Lewandowski’s [12] study examined the organizational factors that contribute to workers’ frustration with their work situation. The findings indicate that factors most directly affecting clients were predictive of frustration, rather than factors that may indirectly support service quality or factors impacting workers’ professional autonomy. A sense of powerlessness and isolation (politics or Machiavellian traits) was also predictive of frustration, suggesting that participants viewed workplace problems as a private rather than an organizational concern and react individually to them. In the views of the author, it is possible that subjective human factors owing to individual differences which facilitate the interpretation of human interaction in the workplace are also factors which characterize the perception frustration also influence worker’s reaction towards it. Amsel’s [1] theory made a case for understanding frustration as individual’s frustrating motivational state which bears a regular relationship to reinforcement (with the reinforcement being employee’s negative outcome perultimately). The theory further maintains that frustration at first state is aversive and impedes progress; although it may be energizing as self-motivations.

**Implications of the Study**

The findings obtained in the current study as human behavioural attitudes in the workplace have implicated a number of organizational outcomes to the detriment of the organizational wellbeing. Workplace incivility not implies negative employee outcomes, but also affects the socialization process and human interaction in the workplace with the possible loss of workplace solidarity, cooperation and teamwork. The extent to which this is affected, implicates the commitment of employees and general organizational effectiveness. Cyber-loafing is at the expenses of the organization in terms of insecurity and internal/external threats.

**Limitation of the Study**

Socio-economic factors are known to be behaviour moderators, and this may influence the addiction and use of the internet the internet in the workplace. Employees who are from low socio-economic background might for non-work reasons decide to take advantage of their workplace if they have free internet services for work purposes than employees from high socio-economic background. There is also possibility that surfing the internet at the level of addiction may border on personality factors such as lack of self-control and bad habit. There is expectation that these factors have capacity to influence employees differently than the result obtained from the current study. As a survey studies, there is also fear that participants’ bias may have influenced the final outcome of the current study.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

There is need to assess if the same antecedents of cyber-loafing behaviour in public sector will also
elicited the same influence in the private sector in order to establish this a behavioural attitude in the workplace among Nigerians. This will increase the generalizability of the findings. There is also need to ascertain the effects of specific factors in the organizational climate such as demographic differences and the organization type.

Suggestions for Further Studies

No clear distinction was made on the source of internet facilities whether it is self-improvised through mobile phones and other personal digital devices of the employees or with the organization provided internet service and computer. Future studies should be able to ascertain this in order to decipher the level of addiction or deviance which may be associated with individual employees. There is need for a new model to find out if the relationship between the independent variables the dependent variable can be mediated in the presence of higher pay satisfaction. Consequently, it is recommended the design should also focus on the possibility that the interaction effects among other organizational antecedents may likely influence the result of the current study.

CONCLUSION

This study examined perceived workplace incivility and workers frustration as predictors of cyberloafing among Anambra State civil servants. Given the importance of employees in the workplace especially how they motivate organizational and job outcomes; this study conceptualized workers’ uncivil behaviour and worker’s frustration as leading factors in employees’ withdrawal behaviours especially cyberloafing. Based on the above, extensive literature review was made along with theories underpinning the influences of workplace incivility and worker’s frustration on cyberloafing behaviours. Using appropriate design and statistics, data was gathered analyzed indicated that both perceived workplace incivility and workers’ frustration significantly and positively predicted cyberloafing among Anambra State civil servants. The findings have both academic and pragmatic implications which are support by theoretical and empirical literature and certain limitation may reduce its generalizability as behavioural attitudes in Nigerian public work organizations.
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**Appendix II**

### Statistical Analysis

**Regression Analysis**

**Descriptive statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workplace incivility</td>
<td>67.644</td>
<td>2.2500</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational frustration</td>
<td>118.410</td>
<td>1.1450</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyber-loafing</td>
<td>88.205</td>
<td>3.1624</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coefficients (a)
### Variables Entered/Removed (b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Variables Entered</th>
<th>Variables Removed</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Perceived workplace incivility (a),</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational frustration (b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a All requested variables entered.

b Dependent Variable: Cyber-loafing

### Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.832(a)</td>
<td>.613</td>
<td>.610</td>
<td>3.73906</td>
<td>.613</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), Perceived workplace incivility (a), Organizational frustration

### ANOVA (b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>6434.962</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3217.481</td>
<td>230.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>2852.033</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>13.981</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9286.995</td>
<td>327</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Perceived workplace incivility (a), Organizational frustration)
b Dependent Variable: Cyber-loafing