

Analyzing the Relationship Between Organizational Justice and Cyberloafing: A Study in a Public University

Adnan AKIN¹
Esra ULUKÖK²
Tayfun ARAR³

Abstract

Technological developments bring many benefits and facileness to both private and business lives. By accelerating the businesses, organizations have become much more competitive. On the other hand they sometimes may suffer from the technology with the malevolently usage by the employees what is called as cyberloafing. Apart from other reasons to lead employees to this behavior, an unjust environment can cause cyberloafing to neutralize the situation. This research aims to investigate the relationship between four dimensioned organizational justice and cyberloafing on the administrative employees of a public university in Turkey. The results showed that there is not a significant relationship among the dimensions of organizational justice and cyberloafing.

Keywords: Cyberloafing, Organizational Justice, Public University

Introduction

Through the history, the ancestors of computers were just for simple calculations to make the life easier. By technological developments, they have penetrated all parts of people's lives from private life activities such as for social connections, entertainment and other personal issues to business life (Glassman et al., 2015, p. 170). Today's organizations need what computer and its potentials serve them to be faster and more effective in order to cope with the global challenges in business life (Huma et al., 2017, p. 97). In accessing to a branch over the other side of the world, providing service or a product to a customer regardless of the place, companies need to respond and make decisions faster than ever. To seize the era, in such an open business environment, they need to be in harmony with the most common and useful technological tool that is computer and the capabilities of it such as internet. As for every invention, there are also debates about this machines and what they have brought. Beside the many benefits of internet for the organization, at the other side of the medallion, there is a chance of employees' abusing of it. Instead of working, employees may spend their time on non-related activities with internet at workplace. There may be number of reasons for them to cyber loaf such as for reducing stress, for having fun to get far away from a monotony and maybe the perception of an unjust environment. Researches claim that organizations those are determined by their employees as unfair are places where work deviance behaviors such as violating norms, performing retaliatory behaviors and employee theft are more likely seen (Wolfe and Piquero, 2011, p. 336). One of those deviance behaviors is called as cyberloafing. When employees perceive that the outcomes, procedures or interpersonal attitudes and behaviors are unfair, to neutralize this situation they may choose the way of cyberloafing (Yıldız et al., 2015, p. 56).

Conceptual Framework

In this part, before explaining the rational relationship among organizational justice and cyberloafing via methodology, contextual definitions and explanations of these two terms will be clarified.

¹ Prof, Kirikkale University

² Research Assist, Kirikkale University

³ Research Assist, Kirikkale University

Organizational Justice

Justice is one of the core values in the organizations (Ghosh et al., 2014, p. 631). Gained to literature by Wendell and French in 1964, the term organizational justice generally refers to the way how employees perceive whether they are treated fairly at their workplaces as either the outcomes, the procedures or the interpersonal relations (Rupp et al., 2006, p. 538; Cropanzano et al., 2007, p. 34; Karriker and Williams, 2009, p. 114; Ghosh et al., 2014, p. 631).

The term is studied with different sub-names through the literature starting with one dimension and went up to four dimensions (Ghosh et al., 2014, p. 631). Those are distributive justice, procedural justice, interactive justice which are introduced in 10 years-gaps; but the division of interactive justice into two parts as interpersonal and informational took seven years. Distributive justice has been gained to literature by Adams in 1963 based on his equity theory which points that a person should receive an output as much as the inputs he contributes (Faldetta, 2016, p. 68). More developed version of this justice type, procedural justice has taken part in the literature by Thibaut and Walker in 1975, as the perceived justice of the procedures determining a specific outcome (Judge and Colquitt, 2004, p. 395). Then by Bies and Moag in 1986 introduced interactional justice which indicates the justice in treating each other (Wolfe and Piquero, 2011, p. 336). The third one is divided into two parts those are interpersonal justice which is about respect and sensitivity and informational justice that is about providing adequate justifications (Colquitt et al., 2001, p. 427; Karriker and Williams, 2009, p. 115; Crawshaw et al., 2013, p. 888). To sum up, for Cropanzano et al. (2007, p. 36), distributive justice's components are equity, equality and need; procedural justice's components are consistency, lack of bias, accuracy, correction, ethics and representation of all; interactional justice is constituted by interpersonal and informational justice. Some studies investigated the term with three sub factors and some did with four. There is not a consensus about the correct dimension number for this term (Alkhadher and Gadelrab, 2016, p. 337). Although these sub factors are related with each other (Ghosh et al., 2014, p. 628), they indicate differences on behalf of the effects on job attitudes (Karriker and Williams, 2009, p. 113; DeConinck, 2010, p. 1350). For example, distributive injustice is related with dissatisfaction for pay and promotion; procedural injustice is related with commitment and citizenship while interactional injustice is directly related with the supervisor.

Before answering the question of why employees would like to have a justice at their organizations, it should be stated that some managers are confused about what their employees really want. They may not be sure that whether justice means favorability or not; assuming that justice for an employee should be resulted desirable (Cropanzano et al., 2007, p. 35). Sometimes unfavorable results could be accepted just as procedures are perceived as fair (Alkhadher and Gadelrab, 2016, p. 337). Just as other organizational issues, organizational justice has some positive and negative implications for employees. Their attitudes and behaviors such as commitment, overall performance, job satisfaction, loyalty and collective esteem (Roch and Shanock, 2006, p.300; Cropanzano et al., 2007, p. 39-40; Ghosh et al., 2014, p. 628; Alkhadher and Gadelrab, 2016, p. 337; George and Wallio, 2016, p. 113) are significantly affected by the degree of their organization's actions so as to determine whether management is objective and legitimate (Rupp et al., 2006, p. 538). A just environment is also playing a moderating factor for reducing stress by the creation of a feeling that makes employee work hard and comply with job demands (Proost et al., 2015, p. 489). Moreover the employee's organizational citizenship-feeling would get stronger (Chen and Jin, 2014, p. 302). When an organization is lack of a justice causes both psychological issues like stress (Judge and Colquitt, 2004, p. 395; Hannam and Narayan, 2015, p. 215), theft intention, anxiety and anger (Chih et al., 2017, p. 3) and physical issues such as sleep problems and absenteeism (Alkhadher and Gadelrab, 2016, p. 337). Another negative result of organizational injustice is its cause of workplace deviance behaviors (Wolfe and Piquero, 2011, p. 333; Faldetta, 2016, p. 67) such as cyberloafing (Lim et al., 2002; Lim, 2005; Restubog et al., 2011; Kaplan and Ögüt, 2012). For whole justice and injustice perceptions, it should be cleared that, the perception may depend on culture and from one person to another. Individual differences such as personalities, gender, and age and so on may affect the perception of justice (Hannam and Narayan, 2015, p. 215). According to (Faldetta, 2016, p. 69), individuals at workplace are divided into three parties as givers who are benevolent and do not care about justice; equity sensitives who admires balance; and takers who are the selfish ones. Considering rationally, while justice is "nothing" for the givers; for other two types, without justice they could indicate deviance behaviors. Organizational justice is also a cultural

issue (Enoksen and Sandal, 2015, p. 479-480) and as it is investigated in the literature the context is mostly studied in Western cultures, there is a doubtful gap of generalizing the results (Chen and Jin, 2014, p. 302).

Cyberloafing

As being one of the work deviance behaviors (Lim, 2005, p. 208; Lim and Teo, 2005, p.1083; Lara et al., 2006, p. 450; Blanchard and Henle, 2008, p. 1070; Liberman et al., 2011, p. 2193; Restubog et al., 2011, p. 248; Lim and Chen, 2012, p. 343; Baturay and Toker, 2015, p. 358; Jandaghi et al., 2015, p. 335; Sheikh et al., 2015, p. 172; Yılmaz et al., 2015, p. 291; Aghaz and Sheikh, 2016, p. 52; Akbulut et al., 2017, p. 88), cyberloafing is defined in the literature mostly in a common way as employees' kind of behaviors at workplace related with the misusage of company's internet sources that is not close to work in supervisor's opinion; mostly for checking personal e-mail and surfing the Web (Lim et al., 2002, p. 67; Blanchard and Henle, 2008, p. 1068; Liberman et al., 2011, p. 2192; Jia et al., 2013, p. 358; Askew et al., 2014, p. 510; Baturay and Toker, 2015, p. 358; Jandaghi et al., 2015, p. 338; Aghaz and Sheikh, 2016, p. 52). Although in some studies it is witnessed that the sample is constituted by the students (Henle et al., 2009; Ugrin and Pearson, 2013; Baturay and Toker, 2015; Sheikh et al., 2015; Yılmaz et al., 2015; Akbulut et al., 2016), according to the notion in the common definitions the sample should involve "employees". In furtherance to this situation, rather than a student or an ordinary employee, cyberloafing is mostly experienced with knowledge workers (Glassman et al., 2015, p. 170; Yılmaz et al., 2015, p. 291; 5) or in knowledge based companies (Aghaz and Sheikh, 2016, p. 51).

The issue is first used by Tony Cummins in New York's daily news, 1995; gained to literature by Lim in 2002 (Jandaghi et al., 2015, p. 338) based on the classification made by Robinson and Benett in 1995 (Blanchard and Henle, 2008, p. 1070; Keklik et al., 2015, p. 130). They divided cyberloafing into two sub dimensions those are minor and serious. Following studies practiced the same classification (Lim and Teo, 2005; Blanchard and Henle, 2008, p. 1067; Sheikh et al., 2015, p. 173). While serious cyberloafing behaviors include online gambling and spending time on adult sites; minor ones are sending personal mails (Blanchard and Henle, 2008, p. 1067). According to Lim and Teo (2005, p. 1083) and Sheikh et al. (2015, p. 173), serious cyberloafing behaviors tend to be less implemented. Apart from this, there are other classifications such as slacking in the web and emailing (Lim, 2002) then as a third part interactive cyber loading is added by (Blao et al., 2013). Another classification by Ramayah (2010); it is personal communications, access to personal information, personal downloading and personal e-commerce. Most common cyberloafing behaviors at workplace are related with e-mailing with social environment, spending time on social sites and other entertainment sites, shopping online, banking operations, downloading software, looking for employment and instant messaging (Lim and Teo, 2005, p. 1086; Liberman et al., 2011, p. 2193; Ugrin and Pearson, 2013, p. 812; Askew et al., 2014, p. 510; Baturay and Toker, 2015, p. 358).

According to Lim et al. (2002, p. 66), Henle et al. (2009, p. 902), Baturay and Toker (2015, p. 358) and Sheikh et al. (2015, p. 172); cyberloafing is a "double-edged sword". Thanks to technological opportunities employees may either use internet as a necessity for company issues or as a pleasure for personal issues. It is the evident of the how quality the cyberloafing practiced by employee that it is hard to understand on which purpose he is using the internet (Askew et al., 2014, p. 510). Although the impact of internet on organizations still remain unexplored relatively (Liberman et al., 2011, p. 2192), it is obvious that companies have many benefits from the tool of era. By internet, costs are reduced, time required processes are shortened, productions and services provided are done much effectively (Lim, 2005, p. 207; Lim and Teo, 2005, p. 1081; Lara et al., 2006, p. 450). It also improved the communication in both qualitative and quantitative ways (Huma et al., 2017, p. 97). On the other hand, technology not used for its main purpose may causes inefficiencies in time and human resources usage (Kaplan and Ögüt, 2012, p. 2). By abusive usage of company internet sources, loss productivity may decrease and concerns for privacy may increase (Lim, 2005, p. 207). It also causes loss of intellectual property, increase security threats and appear lawsuits issues (Huma et al., 2017, p. 98). Besides, among stakeholders, organizational liability may be interrogated (Lim and Teo, 2005, p. 1082). The final negative result of uncontrolled usage of internet is cyberloafing (Yılmaz et al., 2015, p. 290). Cyberloafing is rather an important issue as being one of the most common time wasting behavior at common place (Askew et al., 2014, p. 510; Akbulut et al., 2016, p. 616). According to statistics, by the years 2000, 2003 and to present, due to the penetration of technology in daily life, employees use internet sources for non-work related purposes 56%, 59%

and 2.5 hours per day relatively (Blanchard and Henle, 2008, p. 1068). According to Lim and Teo (2005, p. 1082); Liberman et al. (2011, p. 2192) and Jia et al., (2013, p. 358), 90% of the employees surf the Web for entertainment through working time. According to statistics, in Turkey usage of internet at workplace is at 36% (Yıldız et al., 2015, p. 55). Because of cyberloafing, employee productivity falls from 30% to 40% and even two decades ago it cost US businesses \$5.3 billion (Lara et al., 2006, p. 451). Today this number increased up to approximately \$183 billion worldwide (Jandaghi et al., 2015, p. 337). Besides, cyberloafing may cause employee dissatisfaction and increase turnover (Sheikh et al., 2015, p. 173). It also has a considerable effect on job burnout (Aghaz and Sheikh, 2016, p. 51). Furthermore employees can lose their job as statistics say 20% to 30% of companies fired those cyberloafing employees (Blanchard and Henle, 2008, p. 1068). Harms for the organizations are information theft, destroying brand images, loyalty and general trust of stakeholders (Jandaghi et al., 2015, p. 336). Because of the possibility of hacking issues, it leaves employers vulnerable to different kind of lawsuits (Liberman et al., 2011, p. 2192; Baturay and Toker, 2015, p. 359). On the other hand some researchers consider this issue as beneficial (Akbulut et al., 2016, p. 616). According to Lim and Chen (2012, p. 343) and Ugrin and Pearson (2013, p. 812) some cyberloafing may be useful for healing against stress and monotony. It can be restorative and entertaining for spiritual environment of the employee (Akbulut et al., 2017, p. 87). During non-work related activities on internet, cyberloafing behaviors can become a useful artificial teacher with a high speed communication and access of information through source and users (Keklik et al., 2015, p. 130). By this speed, employees can finish their tasks more effectively and more punctually (Glassman et al., 2015, p. 170). Positive or negative, with an endured discussions on literature, it can be said that, up to one point cyberloafing could be beneficial; but after that threshold it has significant negative outcomes for both employee and the employer. But the employer would not take the risk. Thus for preventing cyberloafing, in the literature there are some suggestions existing. Employers generally take two forms of precautions to cyberloafing as either tolerate up to a point or using organizational policies (Lara et al., 2009, p. 451). But this allowance to be tolerated could be abused (Glassman et al., 2015, p. 170). While some companies prohibit the usage of internet (Yılmaz et al., 2015, p. 291); some develop “effective” organizational policies (Lim and Teo, 2005, p. 1082; Henle et al., 2009, p. 902). But it is clearly understood that implementing internet using policies, punishment for specific websites or monitoring employees have not solved the problem so far (Huma et al., 2017, p. 98). Because a strict policies about usage of internet can affect job satisfaction and fairness negatively while making it harder to retain talented employees (Askew et al., 2014, p. 510). Thus as Henle et al.’ study (2009, p. 903), an effective solution should be non-intrusive for the ones who are acquiesce for the policies and more direct for rebels. Instead of searching for ways to obstacle the internet usage by ignoring the today’s business life and employees’ needs, it should be researched that why employees do cyberloafing so as to create a balance between needs of organization and employees (Askew et al., 2014, p. 510). There are mainly reasons why employees use their time at work for non-work related purposes. By a lack of self-control, as a tool for reducing stress and increasing job satisfaction, when accepted as a cultural norm of the organization, as the age is relatively younger, high standard education with a high status earning a good salary (Baturay and Toker, 2015, p. 359), perceived organizational unfairness, boredom and technological characteristics (Jia et al., 2013, p. 358; Yılmaz et al., 2015, p. 290) lead employees do cyberloafing. Jandaghi et al. (2015, p. 340-343) divide the antecedents of cyberloafing into three main categories as organizational factors those are policies and justice (Askew et al., 2014, p. 510; Akbulut et al., 2017, p. 88); work factors those are job demands and role conflict; personal factors which are personality traits and locus of control (Blanchard and Henle, 2008, p. 1071; Baturay and Toker, 2015, p. 359). Furthermore according to Soh et al. (2017, p. 1) by technological developments and intense work load, an employee who cannot provide his work-life balance needs to work at home; at the same time it would be so natural to spend time on non-work related issues at workplace.

Literature Review

Organizational justice has gained importance in the literature (Colquitt et al., 2001, p. 425; Roch and Shanock, 2006, p. 299; Ghosh et al., 2014, p. 628), for some researches the attractiveness of the issue lasts for decades (Rupp et al., 2006, p. 538), for some during the first 65 years of 20th century (Faldetta, 2016, p. 68), for some since millennium (Enoksen and Sandal, 2015, p. 479) and for some through last 30 years (Colquitt, 2001, p. 386; Crow et al., 2011, p. 403). In literature review, it is obvious that the majority of the researches study this context as a cause; and most of them investigated the relationship between justice and commitment (Crow et al., 2012; Ohana, 2014; Bebenroth and Thiele, 2016; Lashari et al., 2016; Rahman et al., 2016; Chih et al., 2017; Jiang et al., 2017). All of those studies found a positive relationship between two terms. Apart from them, Wolfe and

Piquero resulted that the less organizational justice exists, the more intention employees have misconduct behaviors. In 2014, Ghosh et al. found a positive relationship between justice and employee engagement. Proost et al. (2015) said, justice strengthens the role of job control as a buffer for high job demands. While Fu and Lihua (2012) claim that justice affect perceived organizational support positively, as the encouraging this study, Faldetta (2016) found that organizational justice leads to organizational caring. George and Wallio (2017) also claimed that there is a negative direct relationship between justice and turnover intentions. There are also studies those handle justice term as the result. Hannam and Narayan (2015) found that intrinsically motivated employees view organizations as fairer and justice mediates the relationship among motivation and creativity. Enoksen and Sandal (2015)'s result indicate that power and tradition contribute to explain variance in justice.

In the literature, it is obvious that the studies about cyberloafing or cyber slacking are mostly made in the Western countries (Lara et al., 2006; Blanchard and Henle, 2008; Henle et al., 2009; Liberman et al., 2011; Jia et al., 2013; Ugrin and Pearson, 2013; Askew et al., 2014; Glassman et al., 2015;). There are also studies made in Eastern countries (Lim et al., 2002; Kim and Teo, 2005; Lim, 2005; Restubog et al., 2011; Lim and Chen, 2012; Jandaghi et al., 2015; Sheikh et al., 2015; Aghaz and Sheikh, 2016; Huma et al., 2017), but majority of those are developed countries; socially, economically and technologically. As a developing country in Turkey there are other studies related with cyberloafing (Baturay and Toker, 2015; Keklik et al., 2015; Akbulut et al., 2016; Yılmaz et al., 2015; Akbulut et al., 2017). Studies related with cyberloafing in the literature could be divided into three main categories. First category includes the researches about the antecedents of cyberloafing. For this purpose Blanchard and Henle (2008) found out belief in chance and norms are the major antecedents. Later Sheikh et al. (2015) claimed that the main factors resulting in cyberloafing are behavioral attitudes and subjective norms. Liberman et al. (2011) found that job attitudes and non-work domain affect this context positively while job involvement affect it negatively. Soh et al. (2017) determined the same reason-factor that is non-work domain in their study. For the same aim, in Huma et al. (2017)'s study, results showed that habit, intention and social influences are causing cyberloafing. In Jia et al.'s study (2013) found that extroversion affect cyberloafing positively, presence of internet usage policy and perceived work meaningfulness on cyberloafing affect it negatively. The differences are arose probably from the different samples and different countries. Due to the development levels of different countries, including technology, the antecedents may show variety. In the second category, studies are interested in the results or the effects of cyberloafing. Lim and Chen (2012) claimed that while browsing activities those are "serious cyberloafing behaviors" affect emotions positively, emailing do it in a negative way. Aghaz and Sheikh (2016) found that cyberloafing affects employees' job burnout intentions. Despite of these negative effects, Keklik et al. (2015) found out that cyberloafing affects organizational learning positively. In the last category, studies are related with how to intervene this behavior type. Lara et al. (2006) claimed that coercive and formal punishment which is a general illusion considered as "right" by managers increases cyberloafing. As against to this study, Ugrin and Person (2013) point that deterrence is good for stopping cyberloafing activities. Extended version of that study, Glassman et al. (2015) found out that in addition to blocking, employee empowerment and attention resource replenishment would be better to stop cyberloafing.

The relationship between organizational justice and cyberloafing has been studied beforehand. Lim et al. (2002) examined this relationship in Singapore with 188 employees and found out that organizational justice negatively affect cyberloafing. They also pointed that employees use cyberloafing to neutralize the stressful situations. In 2005, Lim made a similar study about the possible effect of organizational justice on cyberloafing and found out the same results (Lim, 2005). For same purpose, Kaplan and Ögüt (2012) with 1424 university hospital employees in Turkey found out the existence of negative relationship among organizational justice types and unimportant cyberloafing activities. They also resulted as positive relation between procedural and interactive justice with important cyberloafing activities. Another result they have found in that study is distributive justice impacts negatively both important and unimportant cyberloafing activities. Yıldız et al. (2015) could not find a significant relationship between these two issues. Their sample is constituted by 151 administrative and academic staff of a university in Turkey. In Philippines with 252 administrative personnel of a university, Restubog et al. (2011) examined the role of self-control in the relationship between the two topics and found that organizational justice negatively affect cyberloafing and self-control mediates this relationship. Henle et al. (2009) measured the justice on applying politics for stopping cyberloafing activities in U.S. both with employees and undergraduate students and found that justice politics application decrease these kind of deviant behaviors. In rationally thinking one of the reasons of negative relationship existence between organizational justice and cyberloafing could be arose from stress. Proost et al. (2015, p.489) says that organizational injustice increases

stress and Lim and Chen (2012, p. 343) and Ugrin and Pearson (2013, p. 812) say that cyberloafing activities are good at reducing stress.

In this study it is aimed to analyze a relationship between organizational justice and cyberloafing of an administrative staff in a public university in a developing country as Turkey. Although in the literature review about organizational justice and cyberloafing, there are some studies investigating the possible relationship and effect of these topics, this study is differentiated by both the sample and the method. As mentioned above, organizational justice could be differentiated from cultural and individual perspectives. Thus there is non-study in literature that is investigating this relationship with this sample in a developing Eastern country. In this study to explain more variance (Colquitt, 2001, p. 386; Alkhadher and Gadelrab, 2016, p. 337), four-factor form of organizational justice scale is used instead of three factor form which is majorly used.

Methodology

In this research it is aimed to analyze whether there is a relationship among each dimension of cyberloafing those are minor and serious cyberloafing behaviors and each dimension of organizational justice which are procedural, distributive, interpersonal and informational justice through administrative staff of a public university. The sample of this study is constituted by n=120 personnel from chancery, two faculties, diaconate and an institute. The sample is determined by convenience sampling method. Survey data are collected by questionnaire. For this purpose the following hypotheses are established:

H1: There is a statistically significant relationship between procedural justice and serious cyberloafing behavior.

H2: There is a statistically significant relationship between distributive justice and serious cyberloafing behavior.

H3: There is a statistically significant relationship between interpersonal justice and serious cyberloafing behavior.

H4: There is a statistically significant relationship between informational justice and serious cyberloafing behavior.

H5: There is a statistically significant relationship between procedural justice and minor cyberloafing behavior.

H6: There is a statistically significant relationship between distributive justice and minor cyberloafing behavior.

H7: There is a statistically significant relationship between interpersonal justice and minor cyberloafing behavior.

H8: There is a statistically significant relationship between informational justice and minor cyberloafing behavior.

To measure cyberloafing variable, the scale developed by Örucü and Yıldız (2004, p. 104) has been used. In this 14 items involving scale, while first 8 items measure the serious cyberloafing behaviors, last 6 items measure the minor cyberloafing. For organizational justice variable, the scale developed by Colquitt (2001, p.389) and translated into Turkish by Özmen et al. (2007, p. 26) has been used. In this scale, first 7 items are related with procedural, 8-11 items are about distributive, 12-15 are interpersonal and 16-20 items are related with informational justice.

Results

The respond rate of survey is 54% by n=65 while the number of valid questionnaires are n=62. The following tables are analyze results.

Table 1. Demographics of Participants

		N	%		N	%
Gender	Female	21	33.9			
				Less than 1 year	3	4.8

Marital Status	Male	41	66.1	Working Period	1-5 years	12	19.4
	Single	15	24.2		6-10 years	10	16.1
	Married	47	75.8		11-15 years	9	14.5
					16-20 years	9	14,5
			21-25 years		13	21	
Age	25 and less	6	9.7	Education Level	Elementary School	5	8.1
	26-34	11	17.7		High School	10	16.1
	35-44	20	32.3		University	44	71
	45-54	22	35.5		Master	3	4.8
	55 and more	3	4.8				

When the demographics of participants are investigated, results showed that 33.9% are females and 66.1% are males. 24.2% of participants are single and 75.8% are married. In terms of age distribution, 35.5% of participants are constituting the major part as 45-54 age group. 4.8% of staff work for less than a year; 19.4% work for 1-5 years; 16.1% work for 6-10 years; 14.5% work for 11-15 years and 16-20 years and finally 21% work for 21-25 years. For education level analyzing, it is seen that 71% of participants are graduated from university.

Table 2. Reliability Analyze

Dimensions of Variables	Cronbach Alpha	N
Procedural Justice	.63	62
Distributive Justice	.63	62
Interpersonal Justice	.60	62
Informational Justice	.59	62
Serious Cyberloafing	.64	62
Minor Cyberloafing	.66	62

In reliability analyze, alpha values (r) are found related with the sub-dimensions as serious cyberloafing (.64), minor cyberloafing (.66), procedural justice and distributive justice (.63), interpersonal justice (.60) and informational justice (.59). Results showed that the alpha values are reliable and acceptable.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics of Variables

Dimensions	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Serious Cyberloafing	62	2.04	.60
Minor Cyberloafing	62	2.78	.96

Procedural Justice	62	3.01	.74
Distributive Justice	62	3.25	.88
Interpersonal Justice	62	3.98	.80
Informational Justice	62	3.88	.92

When the average scores of the variables used in the research are examined it has been observed that employees are more likely to conduct minor cyberloafing behaviors such as visiting news websites, and banking transactions sites on the internet than to have serious cyberloafing behaviors in their institutions. In addition, when the average of organizational justice sub-dimensions is examined, it is determined that the perception of interpersonal justice is higher than the other justice variables. On the other hand, it has been revealed that the procedural justice, which expresses employees' desire to be a party in decisions to be made in the organization and in the processes to be implemented, is lower than other dimensions.

Table 4. Spearman Correlation Analyze

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Serious Cyberloafing	1					
2. Minor Cyberloafing	.542**	1				
3. Procedural Justice	.215	.130	1			
4. Distributive Justice	-.067	.060	.500**	1		
5. Interpersonal Justice	-.005	.195	.109	.194	1	
6. Informational Justice	.173	.169	.127	.188	.778**	1

**p<0.01

Spearman correlation analysis was used for non-parametric tests to determine the relationship between cyberloafing behavior and organizational justice perception because the data were not fit for normal distribution conditions ($p>0.05$). In Table 4, the findings of the correlation analysis revealing the relationships among the variables are included. According to the results obtained, there is no significant relation between the serious and minor cyberloafing behaviors from the dimensions of cyberloafing and procedural justice. Similarly, there is no statistically significant relationship between distributive justice, interpersonal justice, and informational justice, both from other dimensions of organizational justice with cyberloafing. Thus, the whole hypotheses (H1, H2, H3, H4, H5, H6, H7 and H8) are not supported.

Conclusion

This research is aimed to analyze whether there is a significant relationship between the dimensions of organizational justice and cyberloafing among administrative staff of a public university. Despite negative relations found between organizational justice and cyberloafing in some researches (Lim et al., 2002; Lim, 2005; Henle et al., 2009; Restubog et al., 2011) including one from Turkey (Kaplan and Ögüt, 2012), as convenient with a research practiced in Turkey also (Yıldız et al., 2015), there is not significant relationship found between these two variables. In that research in which organizational justice was investigated by three sub dimensions those are procedural, distributive and interactive, as considering that keeping other conditions same (the sample type and the country), the state that four dimensions scale is much valid and explains more variance (Alkhadher and Gadelrab, 2016, p. 337) would may overcome somehow this “non-relation found” issue. Thus in this research four dimensions of organizational scale which constitutes distributive, procedural, interpersonal and

informational justice. But again the results revealed as same. The reasons may arose from that statement that negative effects of these two variables (organizational justice and cyberloafing) on participants and the perceptions of them. The nervous politics situation in the country could make people feel insecure about their business lives. Besides, people could perceive if they gave any “negative” answer about cyberloafing and/or organizational justice, their working conditions would be in danger. Furthermore, as one of the most important negative sides and assumptions of questionnaire method which is “honesty of participants”, in unfavorable workplace topics such as cyberloafing, majority of participants may go further from honesty principle and give lower scores to items as it is the evident that they work really hard. Apart from that, by interview with a mid-level supervisor after the survey, she pointed out, subordinates of her transform the high scores for their supervisor into lower scores just to avert the favorability of those supervisors by predicting that other departments’ officers would give lower scores for their supervisors in interpersonal and informational dimensions of organizational justice part for some reasons. All those issues could cause non-relationship found statement.

Findings of this research include data obtained from administrative staff working in certain units of a public university. The inclusion of a limited number of personnel working in certain units into the research constitutes the most important limitation of this research. The inclusion of private sector organizations and conducting with a large number of participants in subsequent surveys may allow for different outcomes. In addition, the definition of factors affecting this behavior in the description of cyberloafing, the relationship with various variables such as stress, organizational commitment and burnout can be presented as a suggestion to the next researcher.

REFERENCE

- Aghaz, A., Sheikh, A. (2016). Cyberloafing and Job Burnout: An Investigation in the Knowledge-Intensive Sector, *Computers in Human Behavior*, 62, p. 51-60.
- Akbulut, Y., Dönmez, O., Dursun, Ö. Ö. (2017). Cyberloafing and Social Desirability Bias among Students and Employees, *Computers in Human Behavior*, 72, p. 87-95.
- Akbulut, Y., Dursun, Ö. Ö., Dönmez, O., Şahin, Y. L. (2016). In Search of a Measure to Investigate Cyberloafing in Educational Settings, *Computers in Human Behavior*, 55, p. 616-625.
- Alkhadher, O., Gadelrab, H. F. (2016). Organizational Justice Dimensions: Validation of an Arabic Measure, *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 24 (4), p. 337-351.
- Askew, K., Buckner, J. E., Taing, M. U., Ilie, A., Bauer, J. A., Coovert, M. D. (2014). Explaining Cyberloafing: The Role of the Theory of Planned Behavior, *Computers in Human Behavior*, 36, p. 510-519.
- Baturay, M. H., Toker, S. (2015). An Investigation of the Impact of Demographics on Cyberloafing from an Educational Setting Angle, *Computers in Human Behavior*, 50, p. 358-366.
- Bebenroth, R., Thiele, K. O. (2017). When Organizational Justice Matters for Affective Merger Commitment, *Thunderbird International Business Review*, 59 (2), p. 227-241.
- Blanchard, A. L., Henle, C. A. (2008). Correlates of Different Forms of Cyberloafing: The Role of Norms and External Locus of Control. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 24, p. 1067-1084.
- Chen, H., Jin, Y. H. (2014). The Effects of Organizational Justice on Organizational Citizenship Behavior in the Chinese Context: The Mediating Effects of Social Exchange Relationship, *Public Personnel Management*, 43 (3), p. 301-313.
- Chih, Y. Y., Kiazad, K., Cheng, D., Capezio, A., Restubog, S. L. D. (2017). Does Organizational Justice Matter? Implications for Construction Workers’ Organizational Commitment, *J. Manage. Eng.* 33 (2), p. 1-9.
- Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the Dimensionality of Organizational Justice: A Construct Validation of a Measure, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86 (3), p. 386-400.
- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L. H., Yeung, K. (2001). Justice at the Millennium: A Meta-Analytic Review of 25 Years of Organizational Justice Research, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86 (3), p. 425-445.

- Crawshaw, J. R., Cropanzano, R., Bell, C. M., Nadisic, T. (2013). Organizational Justice: New Insights from Behavioral Ethics, *Human Relations*, 66 (7), p. 885-904.
- Cropanzano, R., Bowen, D. E., Gilliland, S. W. (2007). The Management of Organizational Justice, *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 21 (4), p. 34-48.
- Crow, M. S., Lee, C. B., Joo, J. J. (2012). Organizational Justice and Organizational Commitment among South Korean Police Officers, *International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 35 (2), p. 402-423.
- DeConinck, J. B. (2010). The Effect of Organizational Justice, Perceived Organizational Support, and Perceived Supervisor Support on Marketing Employees' Level of Trust, *Journal of Business Research*, 63, p. 1349-1355.
- Enoksen, E., Sandal, G. M. (2015). Anxiety-Based Personal Values and Perceived Organizational Justice, *Soc Just Res*, 28, p. 479-492.
- Faldetta, G. (2016). Organizational Caring and Organizational Justice: Some Implications for the Employment Relationship, *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 24 (1), p. 64-80.
- Fu, Y., Lihua, Z. (2012). Organizational Justice and Perceived Organizational Support, *Nankai Business Review International*, 3 (2), p. 145-166.
- George, J., Wallio, S. (2017). Organizational Justice and Millennial Turnover in Public Accounting, *Employee Relations*, 39 (1), p. 112-126.
- Ghosh, P., Rai, A., Sinha, A. (2014). Organizational Justice and Employee Engagement, *Personnel Review*, 43 (4), p. 628-652.
- Glassman, J., Prosch, M., Shao, B. B. M. (2015). To Monitor or not to Monitor: Effectiveness of a Cyberloafing Countermeasure, *Information & Management*, 52, p. 170-182.
- Hannam, K., Narayan, A. (2015). Intrinsic Motivation, Organizational Justice, and Creativity, *Creativity Research Journal*, 27 (2), p. 214-224.
- Henle, C. A., Kohut, G., Booth, R. (2009). Designing Electronic Use Policies to Enhance Employee Perceptions of Fairness and to Reduce Cyberloafing: An Empirical Test of Justice Theory, *Computers in Human Behavior*, 25, p. 902-910.
- Huma, Z., Hussain, S., Thurasamy, R., Malik, M. I. (2017). Determinants of Cyberloafing: A Comparative Study of a Public and Private Sector Organization, *Internet Research*, 27 (1), p. 97-117.
- Jandaghi, G., Alvani, S. M., Matin, H. Z., Kozekanan, S. F. (2015). Cyberloafing Management in Organizations, *Iranian Journal of Management Studies*, 8 (3), p. 335-349.
- Jia, H., Jia, R., Karau, S. (2013). Cyberloafing and Personality: The Impact of the Big Five Traits and Workplace Situational Factors, *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 20 (3), p. 358-365.
- Jiang, Z., Gollan, P. J., Brooks, G. (2017). Relationships between Organizational Justice, Organizational Trust and Organizational Commitment: A Cross Cultural Study of China, South Korea and Australia, *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 28 (7), p. 973-1004.
- Judge, T. A., Colquitt, J. A. (2004). Organizational Justice and Stress: The Mediating Role of Work-Family Conflict, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89 (3), p. 395-404.
- Kaplan, M., Öğüt, A. (2012). The Relationship between Perceived Organizational Justice and Cyberloafing: The Case of Hospital Employees, *İşletme Fakültesi Dergisi*, 13 (1), p. 1-13.
- Karriker, J. H., Williams, M. L. (2009). Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Mediated Multifoci Model, *Journal of Management*, 35 (1), p. 112-135.
- Keklik, B., Kılıç, R., Yıldız, H., Yıldız, B. (2015). An Investigation of the Effect of Cyberloafing Behaviors on Organizational Learning Capacity, *Business and Economics Research Journal*, 6 (3), p. 129-144.
- Lara, P. Z., Tacoronte, D. V., Ding, J. M. T. (2006). Do Current Anti-Cyberloafing Disciplinary Practices Have a Replica in Research Findings? A Study of the Effects of Coercive Strategies on Workplace Internet Misuse, *Internet Research*, 16 (4), p. 450-467.

- Lashari, M., Moazzam, A., Salman, Y., Irfan, S. (2016). Impact of Organizational Trust on Organizational Justice and Organizational Commitment: A Case of University of Sargodha, *JRSP*, 53 (2), p. 170-194.
- Liberman, B., Seidman, G., McKenna, K. Y. A., Buffardi, L. E. (2011). Employee Job Attitudes and Organizational Characteristics as Predictors of Cyberloafing. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 27, p. 2192-2199.
- Lim, V. (2005). The Moderating Effect on Neutralization Technique on Organizational Justice and Cyberloafing, *PACIS 2005 Proceedings*, p. 207-219.
- Lim, V. K. G., Chen, D. J. Q. (2012). Cyberloafing at the Workplace: Gain or Drain on Work, *Behavior & Information Technology*, 31 (4), p. 343-353.
- 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, p. 1081-1093.
- Ohana, M. (2014). A Multilevel Study of the Relationship between Organizational Justice and Affective Commitment, *Personnel Review*, 43 (5), p. 654-671.
- Örcüci, E., Yıldız, H. (2014). “İşyerinde Kişisel İnternet ve Teknoloji Kullanımı: Sanal Kaytarma”, *Ege Akademik Bakış Dergisi*, 14 (1), p. 99-114.
- Özmen, Ö. N. T., Arbak, Y., Özer, P. S. (2007). Adalet Verilen Değerin Adalet Algıları Üzerindeki Etkisinin Sorgulanmasına İlişkin Bir Araştırma, *Ege Academic Review*, 7(1), p. 17-33.
- Proost, K., Verboon, P., Ruysseveldt, J. V. (2015). Organizational Justice as Buffer against Stressful Job Demands, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 30 (4), p. 487-499.
- Rahman, A., Shahzad, N., Kiran, M., Khan, M., Qurashi, F. (2016). Effects of Organizational Justice on Organizational Commitment, *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*, 6 (S3), p. 188-196.
- 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, p. 247-251.
- Roch, S., Shanock, L. R. (2006). Organizational Justice in an Exchange Framework: Clarifying Organizational Justice Distinctions, *Journal of Management*, p. 299-322.
- Rupp, D. E., Ganapathi, J., Aguilera, R. V., Williams, C. A. (2006). Employee Reactions to Corporate Social Responsibility: An Organizational Justice Framework, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27, p. 537-543.
- Sheikh, A., Atashgah, M. S., Adibzadegan, M. (2015). The Antecedents of Cyberloafing: A Case Study in an Iranian Copper Industry, *Computers in Human Behavior*, 51, p. 172-179.
- Soh, P. C. H., Koay, K. Y., Chew, K. W. (2017). Conceptual View of Cyberloafing and Non-Work Domain, *SHS Web of Conferences*, 33, p. 1-7.
- Tenhiala, A., Linna, A., Bonsdorff, M. V., Pentti, J., Vahtera, J., Kivimäki, M., Elovainio, M. (2013). Organizational Justice, Sickness Absence and Employee Age, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 28 (7/8), p. 805-825.
- Ugrin, J. C., Pearson, J. M. (2013). The Effects of Sanctions and Stigmas on Cyberloafing, *Computers in Human Behavior*, 29, p. 812-820.
- Wolfe, S. E., Piquero, A. R. (2011). Organizational Justice and Police Misconduct, *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 38 (4), p. 332-353.
- Yıldız, H., Yıldız, B., Ateş, H. (2015). Is There a Role of Organizational Justice Perceptions on Cyberslacking Activities?, *Bilgi Ekonomisi ve Yönetimi Dergisi*, 10 (2), p. 55-66.
- Yılmaz, F. G. K., Yılmaz, R., Öztürk, H. T., Sezer, B., Karademir, T. (2015). Cyberloafing as a Barrier to the Successful Integration of Information and Communication Technologies into Teaching and Learning Environments, *Computers in Human Behavior*, 45, p. 290-298.

