PENGARUH STRES KERJA DAN KEBOSANAN KERJA TERHADAP KINERJA KARYAWAN DIMEDIASI PERILAKU *CYBERLOAFING* PADA KARYAWAN DINAS TENAGA KERJA KABUPATEN X DI INDONESIA

JURNAL PUBLIKASI



Ditulis Oleh:

Nama	:	Mila Nur Kamila
Nomor Mahasiswa	:	18311090
Program Studi	:	Manajemen
Bidang Konsentrasi	:	Sumber Daya Manusia

FAKULTAS BISNIS DAN EKONOMIKA

UNIVERSITAS ISLAM INDONESIA

2022

HALAMAN PENGESAHAN JURNAL

PENGARUH STRES KERJA DAN KEBOSANAN KERJA TERHADAP KINERJA KARYAWAN DIMEDIASI PERILAKU *CYBERLOAFING* PADA KARYAWAN DINAS TENAGA KERJA KABUPATEN X DI INDONESIA

Ditulis Oleh:

Nama	:	Mila Nur Kamila
Nomor Mahasiswa	:	18311090
Program Studi	:	Manajemen
Bidang Konsentrasi	:	Sumber Daya Manusia

Yogyakarta, 25 November 2022

Telah disetujui dan disahkan oleh

Dosen Pembimbing



Prof. Dr. Muafi S.E., M.Si

The influence of job stress and job boredom on employee performance mediated by cyberloafing behavior: Evidence in Indonesia

Mila Nur Kamila [(a)] and Muafi Muafi [(b)*)]

[(a)] Department of Management, Faculty of Business and Economics, Islamic University of Indonesia

[(b)] Professor, Department of Management, Faculty of Business and Economics Universitas Islam Indonesia

doi: 10.20525/ijrbs.v12i1.2272 URL: https://doi.org/10.20525/ijrbs.v12i1.2272

Abstract

This study aimed to examine and analyze the influence of job stress and job boredom on employee performance mediated by cyberloafing behavior in employees of the Sleman Regency Labor Office. This study uses a quantitative methods by distributing questionnaires to 90 employees of the Sleman Regency Labor Office. The sampling technique used in this study is saturated sampling or census which has the same number of samples and populations. The final sample that meets the criteria amounted to 50 respondents. This study uses the SmartPLS version 3.0 analysis tool with the SEM (Structural Equation Modeling) analysis method. The sampling technique used in this study is saturated sampling or census, with the same number of samples and populations. The final sample that met the criteria was 50 respondents. This study uses the SmartPLS version 3.0 analysis tool with the SEM (Structural Equation Modeling) analysis method. The results of this study explain that; (1) there is a positive and significant influence between job stress on cyberloafing behavior, (2) there is a positive and significant influence between job boredom on cyberloafing behavior, (3) there is a negative and significant influence between cyberloafing behavior on employee performance, (4) there is a significant influence between cyberloafing behavior mediating stress on employee performance, and (5) there is no significant influence between cyberloafing behavior mediating job boredom on employee performance.

Keywords: Job Stress, Job Boredom, Cyberloafing Behavior, Employee Performance

Introduction

Nowadays, lots of people use the internet in all their activities. Numerous companies also use the internet to make work easier. The internet has positive impacts on companies to make their work more effective and efficient. However, there is a negative impact of the internet, such as employees using the internet while working that is unrelated to their work. That is an example of cyberloafing behavior. With internet, employees can be negligent in their work or forget their responsibilities to complete it (Moffan & Handoyo, 2020). According to Lim (2002), cyberloafing is the act of employees using company internet access for personal purposes during working hours. Cyberloafing behavior is carried out by employees, such as sending emails, opening online shopping applications, browsing the internet or browser, chatting, and downloading something on the internet that is not related to work (Henle & Blanchard, 2008).

Cyberloafing behavior can occur due to several factors, one of which is job stress. According to Robbins (2013), employee job stress is a dynamic condition or changes in individuals facing opportunities, demands, and resources related to what the individual wants. The results are considered uncertain and unimportant. According to De Bruin & Taylor (2005), job stress is a psychological discomfort employees feel caused by work environment demands exceeding employee capabilities. The positive impact of job stress is that it can motivate them, stimulate them to work harder, employees to get the job done, and have a stronger need for achievement. The negative impact of job stress can reduce employee productivity, resulting in less effective organizations, job satisfaction problems, and increased absenteeism (Tewal et al., 2017). According to Henle & Blanchard (2008), employees carry out cyberloafing to escape job stress and reduce emotions or pressure on their workload. According to Andel et al. (2019), employees use cyberloafing as a coping mechanism at work. According to Vitak et al. (2011), cyberloafing has positive effects, which can eliminate boredom at work, fatigue, and stress.

The other factor that causes employees to cyberloafing is job boredom. According to Rimaz et al. (2020), boredom is a psychological phenomenon caused by many factors and accompanied by decreased performance. Boredom occurs due to monotonous patterns in work life, lack of independence, and lack of enthusiasm for work. Reijseger et al. (2013) define boredom as employees' inability to concentrate and lack interest, passion, and attention to their work. According to Liberman et al. (2011), research shows that employees who feel bored at work tend to behave cyberloafing. According to Wu et al. (2020), if cyberloafing is not adequately controlled, it can lead to fatigue and impair mental health.

According to Pindek et al. (2018), the positive impact of cyberloafing behavior can be used by employees as a coping strategy to deal with the boredom of monotonous work.

According to a survey conducted by APJII (2020), for internet users in Indonesia from 2019 – the second quarter of 2020, there was an increase in internet usage to 73.7% of the population, or equivalent to 196.7 million users. The rise in internet users of 8.9% is equal to 25.5 million users. In addition, there is a survey from America; namely, there are 40% of internet usage by employees in a day, and there are 88% of internet usage outside of work interest, and 66% of employees use the internet within ten minutes or one hour every day (Marketer in Henle & Blanchard, 2008).

In this study, we chose the subject of employees of the X Regency Labor Office because employees doing their work have used computers or laptops connected to the internet and unlimited Wi-Fi. It is feared that this will lead to cyberloafing behavior in the workplace. Employees in government agencies tend to experience job stress and boredom because the work is routine and regular. It is feared that this will trigger employees to cyberloafing at work which can reduce employee performance. Therefore, researchers want to determine whether job stress and boredom affect employee performance mediated by cyberloafing behavior on employees of the X Regency Labor Office in Indonesia.

Literature Review

Theoretical Background and Hypothesis

Relationship between Job Stress and Cyberloafing Behavior

Koay et al. (2017) research reveal that job stress positively correlates with cyberloafing. Arshad et al. (2016) revealed the results of a study that all three types of role stress show a positive correlation with cyberloafing. Role ambiguity and role conflict significantly and positively impact cyberloafing, while role overload does not substantially impact cyberloafing. Moffan & Handoyo (2020) revealed the results of research that cyberloafing behavior has a significant positive effect on job stress, which means that the higher the job stress, the higher the cyberloafing in employees, otherwise the lower the job stress, the lower the cyberloafing in employees.

H1: There is a positive influence of job stress on cyberloafing behavior.

The Relationship of Job Boredom to Cyberloafing Behavior

Husna (2020) stated that his research showed that cyberloafing behavior significantly impacts job boredom. Azizah's (2019) research suggests that boredom mediates the relationship between work underload and cyberloafing. Cyberloafing positively affects job boredom because employees use cyberloafing as a coping strategy to overcome job boredom. Pindek et al. (2018) stated the results of their research that cyberloafing has a positive impact on job boredom because it supports the conceptualization of cyberloafing as a mechanism to overcome boredom.

H2: There is a positive influence of job boredom on cyberloafing behavior.

The Relationship of Cyberloafing Behavior to Employee Performance

H.M.R.D. Kularathne & Y.Y. Senevirathne (2021) stated that their research showed that cyberloafing negatively affects employee performance. Employee performance is reduced due to cyberloafing. Wahyuni et al. (2020) stated in the research results that cyberloafing behavior negatively and significantly affects employee performance. Palladan (2018) stated the results of his research, namely that there is a negative moderating effect of lecturer cyberloafing activities between lectures on innovative behavior and performance dimensions.

H3: There is a negative influence of cyberloafing behavior on employee performance.

The Relationship of Cyberloafing Behavior Mediating Job Stress to Employee Performance

The results of Cahyaningrum & Projo's research (2021) show that administrative staff at X Surakarta Hospital experience role conflict and role ambiguity in carrying out their duties. However, employees feel satisfied at work, and this has a positive impact on employee performance. Cyberloafing has no effect in moderating the relationship between role ambiguity and role conflict on job satisfaction. Stress at a certain level is needed by individuals to grow, control skills, and develop new skills. The results of Özudogru & Yildirim's (2020) research show that job stress moderates the relationship between cyberloafing and employee performance. Koay et al. (2017) showed that cyberloafing is related to job stress but not performance.

H4: There is an effect of cyberloafing behavior mediating the relationship between job stress and employee performance.

The Relationship of Cyberloafing Behavior Mediating Job Boredom to Employee Performance

The results of Mercado et al. (2017) suggest that boredom strongly correlates with cyberloafing. Cyberloafing is highly associated with counterproductive work behavior and has no relationship with other components of job performance. Desnirita & Sari (2022) stated the results of their research that workload can create high job demands that cause fatigue or feelings of boredom at work. The results of this study found that workload (job boredom) and cyberloafing behavior have a significant effect on employee performance.

H5: There is an effect of cyberloafing behavior mediating the relationship between job boredom and employee performance.

Research and Methodology

This research uses a quantitative approach at the X Regency Labor Office. The population and sample in this study were all employees of the X Regency Labor Office, and the sampling technique used a saturated sample or census. The questionnaire was distributed to 90 respondents, but the questionnaire returned as many as 50 respondents who could be analyzed further. The data collection technique in this study used a questionnaire in which each answer point was determined using a Likert scale. The measurement uses a score on each question, namely 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Neutral; 4 = Agree; 5 = Strongly Agree. This study uses the SmartPLS version 3.0 analysis tool with the SEM (Structural Equation Modeling) analysis method.

Table 1: Variables, Operational Definitions, Indicator/Items, and Measurement Scale

No.	Variables & References	Operational Definition	Item	Measurement Scale
1.	**Job Stress (X1)** De Bruin & Taylor (2005: Salsabila et al., 2022; Ramlah 2021, et al., 2021)	A situation of psychological discomfort felt by employees caused by demands in the work	There are nine items/indicators; • I feel that I don't have a clear understanding of the tasks and	Likert scale with scores; 1= Strongly Disagree; 2= Disagree; 3 = Neutral; 4 = Agree;

		environment that exceed the employee's ability to meet their needs.	specifications of my job. • I have a poor relationship with my colleagues and superiors in the company. • I feel that the workload is too heavy. • I feel that employee empowerment in the workplace is still lacking. • In my work, I was pressured by many rules. • I cannot work correctly if the tools and equipment needed to do the job are damaged or inadequate. • My job has a promising future. • I often feel distracted or unable to concentrate in noisy or poorly lit	5= Strongly Agree.

			workplace environments. • I lacked support from my family or friends.	
2.	**Job Boredom (X2)** Reijseger et al. (2013)	Boredom is an employee's inability to concentrate on work. Boredom is a state of individual "disconnection" regarding cognition, emotion, and physical strength. Individuals need more interest, passion, and attention toward work.	There are eight items/indicators; • I feel that time passes very slowly when at work • I was bored with my job. • At work, I spent my time aimlessly. • I often feel restless at work • While working, I often daydream. • I feel like my workday never ends • I tend to do other things during work • At my workplace, there is not much I can do.	Likert scale with scores; 1= Strongly Disagree; 2= Disagree; 3 = Neutral; 4 = Agree; 5= Strongly Agree.
3.	**Cyberloafing Behavior (Z)** Lim (2002)	Cyberloafing is the act of employees using company	There are two indicators and 10 statement items; Browsing Activity	Likert scale with scores; 1= Strongly Disagree;

		internet access for personal purposes during working hours. Cyberloafing is done through cyberspace by browsing Web sites for personal interests and goals that make employees forget their duties or obligations at work. Cyberloafing is a deviation of an employee who can spend much time surfing the internet.	• I often visit or access websites at work that are related to personal matters. • I often visit websites about stock investment during working hours. • I often access websites about entertainment during work hours. • I prefer to read the news on the internet. • I often download unique information on the internet while at work. • I buy or shop online during working hours. • I often visit sites or websites for adults or pornography on the internet.	2= Disagree; 3 = Neutral; 4 = Agree; 5= Strongly Agree.

			• I often visit sports websites while at work. E-mail Activity • I often send or receive personal emails during work hours. • I often open or check my email during work hours.	
4.	**Employee Performance (Y)** Mathis & Jackson (2006: Hariadi & Muafi, 2021; Adi Pracoyo et al., 2022)	Performance is what an employee does or does not do. Employee performance can affect how much they contribute to the company.	There are 10 statement items; Quantity • I was able to complete all the work efficiently. • I can complete all work according to the target. Quality • I can complete work according to work standards • I am careful in my work to minimize mistakes. Timeliness • I can complete tasks or work on time as required.	Likert scale with scores; 1= Strongly Disagree; 2= Disagree; 3 = Neutral; 4 = Agree; 5= Strongly Agree.

			• I do not delay the work that I have been given. Workplace attendance • I attend the office by the specified working hours. • I do not leave the office during working hours. Cooperation • I can work well with colleagues in completing work. • I was able to create synergy between employees in all fields.	

Finding and Discussion

Respondents Characteristics

Description of the characteristics of respondents in this study: there were 31 male respondents with a percentage of 62%. Meanwhile, there were 19 female respondents, with a rate of 38%. Respondents in the age category were 18, aged 41 years-50 years with a percentage% (the most respondents). The lowest number of respondents were 2 respondents aged 25 years-30 years, with a percentage of 4 Respondents in the final education category. The highest number of respondents were 30 respondents at the final education level of undergraduate (S1), with a percentage of 60%. Meanwhile, the lowest respondent was 3 at the diploma last education level percentage of 6%. Respondents in the category of the length of service for the most respondents were 17 respondents with a tenure of 11 years-15 years with a percentage of 34%. In contrast, the lowest five respondents with a working period of 6 years-10 years with a rate of 10%.

PLS Result Analysis

This research analysis uses PLS, which consists of 2 parts: Measurement Model Evaluation (Outer Model) and Structural Model Evaluation (Inner Model).

Measurement Model Analysis (Outer Model)

The measurement or outer model consists of convergent validity, discriminant validity, and composite reliability tests.

Convergent Validity

An indicator is considered valid in convergent validity if the loading factor value is> 0.7 or 0.6. In table 2, there is a loading factor value for each indicator.

Table 2 Loading Factor Value

Latent Variable	Indicator	Item Code	Loading Factor	Description
Job Stress	Ambiguous Role	**X1.1**	0,853	Valid
	Relationship	**X1.2**	0,875	Valid
	Career Progression & Job Security	**X1.3**	0,802	Valid
	Bureaucracy	**X1.4**	0,794	Valid
	Autonomy	**X1.5**	0,909	Valid
	Equipment & Supplies	**X1.6**	0,848	Valid
	Physical Environment	**X1.7**	0,874	Valid
	Workload	**X1.8**	0,864	Valid
	Work/Home Interface	**X1.9**	0,782	Valid
	Perception of Time	**X2.1**	0,897	Valid

Job Boredom	Feelings of Boredom	**X2.2**	0,831	Valid
	Not aware of activities	**X2.3**	0,827	Valid
	Restlessness	**X2.4**	0,897	Valid
	Frequent Daydreaming	**X2.5**	0,927	Valid
	Engage in unrelated thoughts	**X2.6**	0,930	Valid
	Unrelated tasks	**X2.7**	0,876	Valid
	Not many activities to do	**X2.8**	0,786	Valid
Employee Performance	Quantity	**Y1**	0,994	Valid
		Y2	0,994	Valid
	Quality	**Y3**	0,975	Valid
		Y4	0,978	Valid
	Timeliness	**Y5**	0,964	Valid
		Y6	0,966	Valid
	Workplace Attendance	**Y7**	0,959	Valid
		Y8	0,960	Valid
	Cooperation	**Y9**	0,972	Valid
		Y10	0,972	Valid
Cyberloafing Behavior	Browsing Activity	**Z1**	0,794	Valid
		Z2	0,786	Valid
		Z3	0,877	Valid
		Z4	0,776	Valid
		Z5	0,873	Valid
		Z6	0,791	Valid

		Z7	0,739	Valid
		Z8	0,747	Valid
	E-mail Activity	**Z9**	0,859	Valid
		Z10	0,861	Valid

Table 2 shows that all indicators have a loading factor value> 0.70, meaning that all indicators in this study are valid or can be used in research.

Discriminant Validity

The discriminant validity test uses a reflection indicator that looks at the cross-loading value, which each variable must be able to reach> 0.70. The results of the discriminant validity test can be seen in table 3.

Table 3 Cross-loading values

Code	Job Stress	Job Boredom	Employee Performance	Cyberloafing Behavior
X1.1	**0,853**	0,119	0,176	0,314
X1.2	**0,875**	0,161	0,133	0,355
X1.3	**0,802**	0,023	0,212	0,325
X1.4	**0,794**	0,033	0,303	0,219
X1.5	**0,909**	0,100	0,126	0,430
X1.6	**0,848**	0,149	0,207	0,435
X1.7	**0,874**	0,075	0,141	0,439
X1.8	**0,864**	0,203	0,188	0,532
X1.9	**0,782**	-0,071	0,176	0,251
X2.1	0,123	**0,897**	-0,460	0,390
X2.2	0,103	**0,831**	-0,345	0,301
X2.3	-0,081	**0,827**	-0,504	0,274
X2.4	0,295	**0,897**	-0,280	0,414
X2.5	0,129	**0,927**	-0,422	0,442
X2.6	0,138	**0,930**	-0287	0,325
X2.7	-0,055	**0,876**	-0,449	0,279
X2.8	0,065	**0,786**	-0,314	0,199

Y1	0,105	-0,427	**0,994**	-0,289
Y2	0,191	-0,378	**0,994**	-0,227
Y3	0,285	-0,313	**0,975**	-0,185
Y4	0,168	-0,408	**0,978**	-0,310
Y5	0,140	-0,380	**0,964**	-0,267
Y6	0,102	-0,406	**0,966**	-0,277
Y7	0,321	-0,319	**0,959**	-0,249
Y8	0,206	-0,377	**0,960**	-0,293
Y9	0,192	-0,392	**0,972**	-0,302
Y10	0,165	-0,488	**0,972**	-0,387
Z1	0,417	0,436	-0,279	**0,794**
Z2	0,355	0,417	-0,233	**0,877**
Z3	0,392	0,428	-0,338	**0,776**
Z4	0,406	0,062	-0,072	**0,873**
Z5	0,358	0,303	-0,245	**0,791**
Z6	0,362	0,293	-0,242	**0,739**
Z7	0,355	0,230	-0,241	**0,747**
Z8	0,348	0,218	-0,191	**0,859**
Z9	0,379	0,290	-0,274	**0,861**
Z10	0,262	0,381	-0,323	**0,786**

Based on table 3, the cross-loading value of each item has a greater value with its respective construct than with other constructs, so it can be said to have good discriminant validity.

Table 4 shows that the second way to test discriminant validity is to compare the AVE roots in each correlated construct. In this test, discriminant validity can be considered sufficient if the AVE root> correlation between constructs.

Table 4 Discriminant Validity

Variables	Job Stress	Job Boredom	Employee Performance	Cyberloafing Behavior
Job Stress	0,846*			
Job Boredom	0,121	0,873*		

Employee Performance	0,209	-0,443	0,895*	
Cyberloafing Behavior	0,459	0,393	-0,313	0,790*

Description: *root AVE value

Based on table 4, it can be concluded that the AVE root on all constructs is higher than the correlation between these variables and other variables. The job stress variable has an AVE coefficient of 0.715 and an AVE root of 0.846; the root AVE value is higher than the correlation coefficient on the job stress variable with other constructs (job boredom, employee performance, and cyberloafing behavior), which has a correlation coefficient on the job boredom variable of 0.121, employee performance of 0.209, and cyberloafing behavior 0.459. So, the job stress construct can be declared valid because of the AVE root> correlation coefficient. Other variables can be seen in the same way, so it can be stated that all of these variables have high discriminant validity.

Each indicator must be highly correlated with its construct and can be said to be valid if the AVE value > 0.50. The test results are in table 5;

Table 5 AVE Value

Variables	Average Variance Extracted (AVE)	Criteria	Description
Job Stress	0,715	>0,5	Valid
Job Boredom	0,762	>0,5	Valid
Employee Performance	0,801	>0,5	Valid
Cyberloafing Behavior	0,624	>0,5	Valid

In table 5, each variable has an AVE value> 0.5, meaning that all variables are valid.

Composite Reliability / Reliability Test

Reliable variables have a Cronbach's Alpha or composite reliability value >0.7. Cronbach's Alpha or combined reliability value of each research variable.

Table 6 Reliability Test Results-Composite Reliability

Variables	Cronbach's Alpha	Composite Reliability	Criteria	Description
Job Stress	0,951	0,957	>0,7	Reliable
Job Boredom	0,955	0,962	>0,7	Reliable
Employee Performance	0,972	0,976	>0,7	Reliable
Cyberloafing Behavior	0,933	0,943	>0,7	Reliable

Table 6 shows that all variables in this study have a composite reliability value or Cronbach's alpha> 0.7, so it can be said that all variables tested are valid or reliable and can be continued for structural model testing.

Structural Model Evaluation (Inner Model)

The structural or inner model consists of the R-square test and Q^2 Predictive Relevance.

R-Square (R^2)

Table 7 R-Square Value

Variables	R Square	Adjusted R Square
Employee Performance	0,098	0,079
Cyberloafing Behavior	1,000	1,000

Based on table 7, it can be concluded that the model of the effect of work stress and boredom on employee performance provides a value of 0.098. So, it can be explained that job stress and boredom affect employee performance by 9.8%. Likewise, the model of job stress and boredom on cyberloafing behavior provides a value of 1,000, which means that all the variables studied are very influential, or job stress and job boredom affect cyberloafing behavior by 100%. The magnitude of the R-square coefficient is only between 0-1. If, the R-square value has a minus (-) value, it means that there is no influence of X on Y. The smaller the coefficient of determination or R-square value, the weaker the independent variable's impact on the dependent variable. Meanwhile, if the R-square value is closer to 1, it means that there is an influence or it is getting stronger.

Q^2 Predictive Relevance

If the Q^2 value> 0, it indicates that the model has predictive relevance, while if the Q^2 value < 0, it suggests that the model lacks predictive relevance. The Q^2 predictive relevance value has 3 criteria, namely 0.02, 0.15, and 0.35, indicating that the model is weak, moderate, and strong. The test results are in table 8;

Table 8 Q^2 Predictive Relevance

Variables	SSO	SSE	Q^2 (=1-SSE/SSO)
Job Stress	450.000	450.000	
Job Boredom	400.000	400.000	
Employee Performance	500.000	110.490	0.779
Cyberloafing Behavior	500.000	198.135	0.604

Based on table 8, it can be concluded that the Q^2 of each variable has a value> 0, so the variables of job stress, job boredom, cyberloafing behavior, and employee performance have good or predictive solid relevance.

Hypothesis Test

Researchers conducted hypothesis testing using SmartPLS 3.0. There is a significant influence if the p-value <0.05 (5%). If the t-statistic value> 1.96 means that there is a significant influence between variables.

Table 8 Hypothesis Test

Variables	Original Sample (O)	Sample Average (M)	Standard Deviation (STDEV)	T Statistic (|O/STDEV|)	P Values	Description
Job Stress > Cyberloafing Behavior	0,416	0,433	0,125	3,335	0,001*	H1 Accepted
Job Boredom -> Cyberloafing Behavior	0,359	0,360	0,101	3,562	0,000*	H2 Accepted

Cyberloafing Behavior -> Employee Performance	-0,329	-0,351	0,119	2,759	0,006*	H3 Accepted
Job Stress > Cyberloafing Behavior -> Employee Performance	-0,137	-0,147	0,061	2,225	0,025*	H4 Accepted
Job Boredom -> Cyberloafing Behavior -> Employee Performance	-0,118	-0,131	0,063	1,879	0,061*	H5 Rejected

Notes: *significant p-value < 0.05

Table 8 shows the significance of the relationship between variables in this study, namely in H1, H2, H3, and H4 have a p-value of less than 0.05 and a t-statistic value greater than 1.96, which means significance. In contrast, H5 has a p-value of more than 0.05 and a t-statistic value smaller than 1.96, which means insignificant, or this research hypothesis test in H1, H2, H3, and H4 is accepted, while H5 is rejected.

Discussions

The Effect of Job Stress on Cyberloafing Behavior

This study found that the first hypothesis (H1) **was accepted** and stated that job stress positively and significantly influences cyberloafing behavior. The analysis found that job stress on cyberloafing behavior has a positive influence, so the higher the stress employees feel at work, the higher the cyberloafing behavior. The results in this study are supported by research from Koay et al. (2017); namely, personal demands and job stress positively influence cyberloafing. In research by Arshad et al. (2016), his research shows study three types of role stress positively correlate with cyberloafing. Role ambiguity and role conflict significantly and positively impact cyberloafing, while role overload does not significantly impact cyberloafing. In the research of Moffan & Handoyo (2020), the results showed that cyberloafing behavior

has a significant positive effect on job stress. This means that the higher the job stress, the higher the cyberloafing behavior; on the contrary, the lower the job stress, the lower the cyberloafing behavior. However, job satisfaction variables cannot moderate job stress's effect on employees' cyberloafing.

The Effect of Job Boredom on Cyberloafing Behavior

This study found that the second hypothesis (H2) was **accepted** and stated that job boredom positively and significantly influences cyberloafing behavior. The analysis found that job boredom on cyberloafing behavior has a positive influence, so the higher the job boredom employees feel at work, the higher the cyberloafing behavior. The results of this study are supported by research from Husna (2020), which states the results of his study that cyberloafing behavior has a significant impact on job boredom. In Azizah's research (2019), the results of her study show that boredom mediates the relationship between job underload and cyberloafing. Cyberloafing positively affects job boredom because employees use cyberloafing as a coping strategy (adaptive behavior) to overcome job boredom. Research by Pindek et al. (2018) suggests that cyberloafing positively impacts job boredom because cyberloafing supports the conceptualization of cyberloafing as a mechanism to overcome boredom.

The Effect of Cyberloafing Behavior on Employee Performance

This study found that the third hypothesis (H3) **was accepted** and stated that cyberloafing behavior has a negative and significant effect on employee performance analysis found that cyberloafing behavior on employee performance has a negative influence, which means that the higher the level of cyberloafing behavior carried out by employees in the workplace, the lower employee performance. The results in this study are supported by research from H.M.R.D. Kularathne & Y.Y. Senevirathne (2021) state that the study results show that cyberloafing negatively affects employee performance. Employee performance is reduced due to cyberloafing. In research by Wahyuni et al. (2020), the study results indicate that cyberloafing behavior negatively and significantly affects employee performance. In research by Palladan (2018), the results of his study suggest that there is a negative moderating effect of lecturer cyberloafing activities between lectures on innovative behavior and performance dimensions.

The Effect of Cyberloafing Behavior Mediating Job Stress on Employee Performance

In this study, it was found that the fourth hypothesis (H4) **was accepted** and stated that there was an effect of cyberloafing behavior mediating job stress on employee performance. In the analysis, it was found that cyberloafing behavior mediates job stress on employee performance, there is a negative influence, so the higher the level of cyberloafing behavior carried out by employees at work, the higher the job stress and ultimately will reduce employee performance. The results in this study are supported by research from Cahyaningrum & Projo (2021), which states that there is role conflict and ambiguity in carrying out their duties. However, employees feel satisfied at work, and this has a positive impact on employee performance. Cyberloafing has no effect in moderating the relationship between role ambiguity and role conflict on job satisfaction. Stress at a certain level is required by individuals to grow, control skills, and develop new skills. Research by Özudogru & Yildirim (2020) results of their study indicates that job stress has a moderating effect on the relationship between cyberloafing and employee performance. In the research of Koay et al. (2017), the results of their study indicate that cyberloafing has a significant relationship with job stress but not with performance.

The Effect of Cyberloafing Behavior Mediating Job Boredom on Employee Performance

In this study, it was found that the fifth hypothesis (H5) was **rejected** and stated that there was no effect of cyberloafing behavior mediating job boredom on employee performance. In the analysis obtained, the results showed that cyberloafing behavior mediates job boredom on employee performance; there is no influence which means that the higher the cyberloafing behavior that employees feel does not affect the level of job boredom on employee performance in the workplace. This study does not support the results of research by Mercado et al. (2017), suggesting that boredom shows a strong relationship with cyberloafing. Cyberloafing is highly correlated with counterproductive work behavior and has no connection with other components of job performance. In Desnirita & Sari's research (2022), the results of their study indicate that workload can create high job demands that cause fatigue or feelings of boredom at work. The results of this study found that workload (job boredom) and cyberloafing behavior have a significant effect on employee performance.

Conclusions

Based on the results of data analysis that has been carried out through distributing questionnaires to employees of the X Regency Labor Office, several conclusions can be stated,

namely: (1) there is a positive and significant influence between job stress on cyberloafing behavior. (2) there is a positive and significant influence between job boredom on cyberloafing behavior. (3) there is a negative and significant influence of cyberloafing behavior on employee performance. (4) there is a significant influence between cyberloafing behavior mediating job stress on employee performance. (5) there is no significant influence between cyberloafing behavior mediating job boredom on employee performance.

High levels of job stress can affect cyberloafing behavior, so organizations need to reduce stress levels in the workplace. Job stress can occur because employees feel the workload given is too heavy. Therefore, organizations need to evaluate the workload felt by employees and provide tasks or jobs by adjusting the ability or portion of employees. Employees also feel that in their jobs, there are not many activities that can be done while at work; therefore, organizations should make variations in work so that employees do not feel bored at work. There is cyberloafing behavior or deviation in the use of the internet by employees in the workplace, so organizations should supervise employees while working and make strict rules regarding limits on internet use in the workplace.

This study's limitations are distributing questionnaires to employees of the X Regency Labor Office during busy periods, so few respondents are willing to fill out questionnaires, and when distributing questionnaires online because, in the conditions of the co-19 pandemic, researchers cannot meet directly with respondents. Therefore, researchers cannot control and assist respondents in filling out the questionnaire.

Acknowledgement

We express our gratitude to Management Department of Universitas Islam Indonesia, who has funded this research with the scheme of Hibah Dosen

Mahasiswa 13/P/Hibah DosMA/PPMJur.Mj/X1/2022

All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, M.N.K., and M, M.; methodology, M.N.K., and M, M., validation, M.M.; formal analysis, M.N.K; investigation, M.N.K.; resources, Y.F., and M, M., writing—original draft preparation, M.N.K., and M, M.; writing—review and editing, M, M. **Funding:** This research was funded individually, not by a particular organization or institution.

Informed Consent Statement: Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

Data Availability Statement: The data presented in this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to restrictions.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

Andel, S. A., Kessler, S. R., Pindek, S., Kleinman, G., & Spector, P. E. (2019). Is *cyberloafing* More Complex Than We Originally Thought? *Cyberloafing* as a Coping Response to Workplace Aggression Exposure. *Computers in Human Behavior,* 101(01), 124-130. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2019.07.013

APJII. (2020). Survei Pengguna Internet APJII 2019-Q2 2020: Ada Kenaikan 25,5 Juta Pengguna Internet Baru di RI. https://apjii.or.id/content/read/104/503/BULETIN-APJII-EDISI-74--November-2020.

Arshad, M., Aftab, M., & Bukhari, H. (2016). The Impact of Job Characteristics and Role Stressors on *Cyberloafing*: The Case of Pakistan. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications,* 6 (12), 244-252. https://www.ijsrp.org/research-paper-1216.php?rp=P606069

Azizah, S. N. (2019). *Cyberloafing* sebagai strategi mengatasi kebosanan kerja. *Jurnal Fokus Bisnis,* 18(01), 01-07. https://doi.org/10.32639/fokusbisnis.v18i1.301

Cahyaningrum, S. D., & Projo, S. T. (2021). The Effect of Role Stressor on Job Satisfaction and its Effect on Job Performance: *Cyberloafing* as Mediator. *International Journal of Education and Social Science Research*, 04(02), 39-50. http://dx.doi.org/10.37500/IJESSR.2021.4205

De Bruin, G. P., & Taylor, N. (2005). Development of the general work stress inventory. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 35(04), 748-765. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/008124630503500408

Desnirita., & Sari, A, P. (2022). Dampak Beban Kerja dan Prilaku *Cyberloafing* Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Pada PT. Dwidaya World Wide Cabang Wilayah DKI Jakarta. *Jurnal Akademi Akuntansi Indonesia Padang*, 02(01), 01-13. https://doi.org/10.31933/jaaip.v2i1.540

Hariadi, A. R., & Muafi, M. (2022). The effect of transformational leadership on employee performance mediated by readiness to change & work motivation: A survey of PT. Karsa Utama Lestari employees. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science (2147- 4478)*, *11*(6), 252–263. https://doi.org/10.20525/ijrbs.v11i6.1945

Henle, C. A., & Blanchard, A. L. (2008). The Interaction of Work Stressors and Organizational Sanctions on *Cyberloafing*. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 20(3), 383–400. https://www.jstor.org/stable/40604617

Husna, F. H. (2020). Kebosanan Kerja Sebagai Predikor Perilaku *Cyberloafing* Pada Karyawan. *Jurnal Studia Insania*, 08 (01), 43-59. http://dx.doi.org/10.18592/jsi.v8i1.3516

Koay, K, Y., Soh, P, C, H., and Chew, K, W. (2017). *Antecedent and Consequences of Cyberloafing: Evidence from The Malaysian ICT Industry*. First Monday. https://dx.doi.org/10.5210/fm.v21i13.

Koay, K, Y., Soh, P, C, H., and Chew, K, W. (2017). Do Employees' Private Demands Lead to *Cyberloafing*? The Mediating Role of Job Stress. *Management Research Review*, 40(9), 1025-1038. https://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-11-2016-0252

Kularathne, H. M. R. D., & Senevirathne, Y. Y. (2021). Does *Cyberloafing* Adversely Effect to Employee Performance. *Asian Journal of Social Science and Management Technology*. 03(02), 01-06.

Liberman, B., Seidman, G., McKenna, K. Y. A., & Buffardi, L. E. (2011). Employee Job Attitude and Organizational Characteristics as Predictors of *Cyberloafing*. *Computer in Human Behavior*, 27(1), 2192-2199. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2011.06.015

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. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.161

Mathis, R. L., & Jackson, J. H. (2006). Human Resource Management. Jakarta: Salemba Empat.

Mercado, B. K., Giordano, C., & Dilchert, S. (2017). A Meta-Analytic Investigation of *Cyberloafing*. *Career Development International*, 22 (5), 546-564. https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-08-2017-0142

Moffan, M. D. B., & Handoyo, S. (2020). Pengaruh Stres Kerja terhadap *Cyberloafing* dengan Kepuasan Kerja Sebagai Variabel Moderator pada Karyawan di Surabaya. *Jurnal Magister Psikologi UMA*, 12(1), 64-72. http://dx.doi.org/analitika.v11i1.3401

Özudogru, M., & Yildirim, Y. T. (2020). Investigation of The Moderator Effect of Job Stress on The Relationship Between. *Afyon Kocatepe University Journal of Social Sciences*, 22(02), 467-490. https://doi.org/10.32709/akusosbil.532359

Palladan, A. A. (2018). Moderating Effects of *Cyberloafing* Activity on Innovative Work Behaviour and Lecturers Job Performance. *International Journal of Advanced Studies in Social Science & Innovation (IJ ASSI)*, 02(01), 1-22. http://dx.doi.org/10.30690/ijassi.21.03

Pindek, S., Krajcevska, A., & Spector, P. E. (2018). *Cyberloafing* as a Coping Mechanism: Dealing with Workplace Boredom. *Computers in Human Behavior*. 86(01), 147-152. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2018.04.040

Adi Pracoyo, N., Naelati Tubastuvi, Santoso, S. B., & Wahyuni, S. (2022). Determinants of employee performance: The mediating role of job satisfaction . *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science (2147- 4478)*, *11*(2), 144–156. https://doi.org/10.20525/ijrbs.v11i2.1595

Ramlah, S., Sudiro, A., & Juwita, H. A. J. (2021). The influence of compensation and job stress on turnover intention through mediation of job satisfaction. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science (2147- 4478)*, *10*(4), 117–127. https://doi.org/10.20525/ijrbs.v10i4.1206

Reijseger, G., Schaufeli, W. B., Peeters, M. C. W., Taris, T. W., Beek, I. V., & Ouweneel, E. (2013). Watching the Paint Dry at Work: Psychometric Examination of the Dutch Boredom Scale. *Anxiety, Stress & Coping: An International Journal*, 26(5), 508-525. https://doi.org/10.1080/10615806.2012.720676

Rimaz, S., Mohammadi, I., Abolghasemi, J., Gholami, A., Taheri, F., & Moradi, Y. (2020). Psychometric Properties of a Farsi Version of the Dutch Boredom Scale Questionnaire (DUBS) in Iranian University of Medical Sciences Employees. *Iran Occupational Health*. 17(1), 11-24. http://ioh.iums.ac.ir/article-1-2014-en.html

Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2013). Organizational Behavior. Edisi 15. New Jersey: Pearson.

Salsabilla, A., Margono Setiawan, & Jiwa Juwita, H. A. (2022). The effect of workload and job stress on job satisfaction mediated by work motivation. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science (2147- 4478)*, *11*(9), 97–106. https://doi.org/10.20525/ijrbs.v11i9.2209.

Tewal, B. T., Adolfina., Pandowo, M, H, C., & Tawas, H, N. (2017). Perilaku Organisasi. Cetakan Pertama. Bandung: CV Patra Media Grafindo.

Vitak, J., Crouse, J., & Larose, R. (2011). Personal Internet Use at Work: Understanding Cyberslacking. *Computer in Human Behavior*, 27(01), 1751-1759. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2011.03.002

Wahyuni, R., Irfani, H., & Mariana, R. (2020). Kinerja Pegawai Ditinjau dari Perilaku *Cyberloafing* dan Komitmen Organisasi. *Psyche 165 Journal*, 13(02), 240-245. https://doi.org/10.29165/PSIKOLOGI.V13I2.1369

Wu, J., Mei, W., Liu, L., & Ugrin, J, C. (2020). The Bright and Dark Sides of Social *Cyberloafing*; Effects on Employee Mental Health in China. *Journal of Business Research*, 112(01), 56-64. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.02.043