

The Impact of using Electronic Devices after Work by Employees in Educational Sectors

Md. Ali Hasan*, Mohammad Abdullah Al Mamun**, Md. Bashir Uddin*** & Md. Rafiqul Islam****

*Department of Business Administration, Pundra University of Science and Technology, Bogra, BANGLADESH.

**School of Business Studies, Southeast University, Dhaka, BANGLADESH. E-Mail: mamun7777{at}gmail{dot}com

*** (PhD Fellow), Faculty of Economics and Management Science, International Islamic University Malaysia (IIUM), MALAYSIA.

E-Mail: bashirsiu{at}gmail{dot}com

****Associate, Sarwar & Associates, Banani, Dhaka, BANGLADESH.

Abstract—The Internet, email and mobile communication devices are indispensable today. This study examined the possible effect between the after-hours mobile technology use by employees' and work place fatigue experienced by employees'. It identifies the effective implications for society of emerging mobile technologies such as mobile telephones, laptops, 3G and SMS. Emerging technologies and increased demand for worker productivity during lean economic times have changed the way employees' work. Today, employees routinely check their smartphones at all hours for emails, text messages, voicemails, and other electronic transmissions. The modern workplace includes anywhere within range of a wireless signal. The collected data in this study were explored by the statistical method of multiple regressions. While the number of responses was not high enough to determine statistically significant differences, the data did not show a strong correlation between after-hours mobile technology use and workplace fatigue experienced by student affairs professionals. Employees are provided with Internet access and electronic communications services (which may include, but are not limited to, computers, e-mail, cell phones, iPhones, iPads, PDAs, personal computers and the like) as required for the performance and fulfillment of job responsibilities. All employees are obligated to make effective, safe and responsible use of this technology.

Keywords—After Work Hours; Bangladesh; Employees; Educational Institutions; Electronic Devices; Internet.

Abbreviations—Bring Your Own Device (BYOD); International Data Corporation (IDC); Work-Life Balance (WLB).

I. INTRODUCTION

INDIVIDUALS have increasingly used smartphones in recent years [Source Digit, 23]; Resultantly, a variety of mobile applications have been launched in domains including social media, finance, education, entertainment, health, and government [Hoehle et al., 8; Mosa et al., 16; Zarpou et al., 25]. The pervasiveness of mobile computing devices and services has generated numerous projections for the growth of the mobile workforce. The International Data Corporation (IDC) estimates that the worldwide mobile worker population will increase from just over one billion in 2010 to more than 1.3 billion by 2015 (IDC, 2012), and companies increasingly encourage employees to “bring your own device” (BYOD) for both personal and business use. Mobile devices can be loosely defined as portable devices that have in-built computing or Internet capability [Morley, 15]. Employees are provided with Internet access and

electronic communications services (which may include, but are not limited to, computers, e-mail, cell phones, iPhones, iPads, PDAs, personal computers and the like) as required for the performance and fulfillment of job responsibilities. Communication technologies are an essential life ingredient to the dwellers of today's fast moving global society. The Internet, emails and portable communication devices such as mobile phones, Black Berries, and PDAs form a technology group that has blended itself well into everyday lives of the global community.

As this is a relatively new phenomenon and there is no common international regulatory body, it is difficult to find an official or universally agreed definition. It's important to understand why we turn to mobile technology in the first place. For many people, it's because we're excited to share an idea with a colleague, or want to finish a task so it doesn't become a burden the next day. Yes, taking care of work during non-work time may hurt our relationships with family

and friends — but still, more than three-quarters of full-time workers tell Gallup that the ability to use mobile technology outside normal working hours is a somewhat to very positive development. This study examined the possible effect between the after-hours mobile technology use by employees' affairs professionals and work place burnout experienced by student affairs professionals. Similar to Owens [19], data for this study were collected by employing the Maslach Burnout Inventory [Maslach et al., 14]. However, beyond the rhetoric and of equal importance to policymakers are basic questions related to the measurement of ICT in education, its usage and potential outcomes, including retention and learning achievement. There are those who contend that computers and other ICTs have properties or affordances that directly change the nature of teaching and learning [Kozma & Voogt, 11]. The focus of this study was on the individual's behavior in the workplace and their connectivity behavior after hours (WCBA) using mobile communications technology and its effects on work-life balance (WLB) and organizational efficiency. Richardson & Benbunan-Fich [20] defined connectivity behavior as an individual's use of mobile handheld devices such as an iPad, tablet, laptop or smart device to operate in work-related activity with co-workers during off hours. The increase in technological support of mobile phones in our personal daily activities has brought an opportunity for these devices to be used as an important tool for employees in working place. The general objective of the study was to discover the impact of using mobile phones after works hours.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

This section presents an overview of the mobile technology and work life balance literature. A review of prior research provided the foundation for selection of research methodology, data sampling, and data analysis. It is a reality that organizations today have produced new ways for an individual to extend beyond the normal work boundaries making the lives of individuals more complex adding additional stress [Khan & Agha, 9].

However, the literature also includes more positive views. Greenhaus & Powell [7] argue that work and family commitments do not necessarily conflict and that positive experiences in one role can enrich experiences in the other role. Thus, a prominent theme of this literature is finding ways to promote positive consequences while minimizing the negative. A key assumption is that better management of the boundaries between work and non-work will result in desirable states of psychological well-being in which conflicts between work and non-work activities are either resolved or avoided [Greenhaus & Beutell, 7; Richardson et al., 21]. This state is generally referred to as work-life balance. We assume that well managed boundaries may remove ambiguity regarding role expectations and reduce role conflict, leading to success in fulfilling role requirements in both work and personal domains [Major et al., 13].

Technology has changed the way we work and provides challenges in the pursuit of work-life balance. The sections that follow will review prior research, the conservation of resource theory, define stress, resources, resource loss and resource gain and review the conflict between family and work and the balance of both. Various researchers [Boswell & Olson-Buchanan, 2; Lal & Dwivedi, 12; Richardson & Benbunan-Fich, 20; Richardson et al., 21] and others examine the relationship between mobile technology use for work activity after normal work hours and the psychological effect it has on the individual's family life. Additionally, researchers have examined mobile technology use after normal work hours to carry out work-associated activities [Golden & Geisler, 6].

The research performed by Richardson & Benbunan-Fich [20] focused on WCBA using the theoretical model of human agency theory to study this behavior. Human agency theory is based on the school of thought that an individual exercises his or her free will engaging in the use of technology [Carroll, 3]. The research of Richardson & Benbunan-Fich [20] suggests WCBA is a result of organizations distributing mobile devices to their employees conveying the expectation of connectivity to the workplace. Distributing mobile technology to employees signals the availability of communication [Richardson & Benbunan-Fich, 20].

According to Richardson et al., [21] they were Likert-type scales that measured WCBA, subjective norms, and organization distribution. Similarly, the work of Boswell & Olson-Buchanan [2] focused on mobile technology use during non-work time and the way it affected an employee's management of the challenges between home and work. The concentration of the study is on the employee working the normal workday and not those engaged in telework. According to Boswell & Olson-Buchanan [2], the mobile technologies used is inclusive of voice mail, cell phones, email, pagers, and PDAs. Employees are increasingly remaining connected to the workplace extending beyond the normal workday.

The studies by Boswell & Olson-Buchanan [2] and Thomas [23] draw on boundary theory and the integration of roles to examine the differences in using mobile technologies during non-work time and the impact it has on the individual's conflict between work and family. Boundary theory, as developed by Ashforth et al., [1] illustrates an individual's creation of boundaries between home and work defined by time and space.

The study by Richardson et al., [21], as in other work-life balance studies, used quantitative methods to collect data. Scales validated in prior research were used for Richardson et al., [21] study. Likert-type scales were used that measured ambition, work life conflict, job involvement, and affective commitment. In addition, a modified survey was sent to the significant other of the survey respondent [Boswell & Olson-Buchanan, 2]. The results of Richardson et al., [21] research indicated there are differences akin to job involvement and

ambition, which are significantly important in the explanation of mobile technology use after normal work hours.

Lal & Dwivedi [12] examined users that worked at home using mobile phones to remain connected to the workplace. Mobile technologies like the mobile phone enabled users to connect to the workplace at anytime and anywhere regardless of time and location [Lal & Dwivedi, 12; Richardson et al., 21]. Individuals that work traditional office-based, paid employment while at home are designated as “homeworkers” [Lal & Dwivedi, 12]. Homeworkers often work by means of mobile technologies either full time or part time. Lal & Dwivedi [12] focus on the use of mobile phones as the technology that enables the homeworker to remain connected to the workplace. Similarly, research by Boswell & Olson-Buchanan [2] examined the usage of mobile technologies such as mobile phones, voice mail, and the PDA as the enabler for users to remain connected to the workplace during non-work time. Lal & Dwivedi [12] used qualitative methods using semi-structured interviews to research employees designated as a homeworker. The results of the interviews indicated that homeworkers attempted to distinguish between the work and non-work domains by designating time and space for each domain. Although time and space were allocated for each domain, the mobile phone use allowed work to occur outside the times designated.

There are advantages and disadvantages to using e-mail within an organization. An advantage of e-mail use in the organization is an employee can respond to email anytime and anywhere at no cost. In contrast, a disadvantage is email use at anytime and anywhere affects work life balance for the employee [Waller & Ragsdell, 24]. As email is the preferred choice for organizational communication, employee accessibility at all hours intrude on the employee’s work life balance [Kopelman et al., 10].

Work-life balance has increased significance for organizational productivity and efficiency as stress may occur because of pressure to respond to e-mail. Waller & Ragsdell [24] posit absenteeism, high turnover, and burnout can occur for the employee because of stress. Waller & Ragsdell [24] state, “employees describe feelings of anticipation, anxiousness or urges which resulted in a conscious decision to check e-mails despite the negative implications associated with doing so outside of office hours”. The current study seeks to address organizational responsiveness to the employee’s usage of mobile technology after hours, work life balance, and organizational efficiency.

According to Thomas [23], blurring of the work and home domains has created an environment where individuals must choose between family and work or vice versa. The use of technology after hours has the potential to effect work-life balance, organizational productivity, and employees within the organization. A desired outcome of Thomas’ [23] research is balancing the work and non-work domains and the usage of technology after hours. Boundaries, whether behavioral, temporal, or physical, provide organization and

segment the roles a person has in different domains [Olson-Buchanan & Boswell, 18].

III. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The present study was based on primary data. The source of primary data was the opinion survey of different respondent who are related in the educational sectors. The main primary data used in the study will be collected with the help of a structured questionnaire from the selected respondents on the basis of direct interview method. Sources of primary data consist of questionnaires survey, interview, counseling with experts, focus groups discussion and observation.

Questionnaires were imported to Microsoft Excel for descriptive analysis and transcribed interviews were analyzed using qualitative content analysis [Schamber, 22]. The researchers were especially interested in investigating the adoption behaviors of disadvantaged people, studying what factors enable their use of mobile internet services and what barriers exist [Dandan Ma et al., 4]. The primary data will be processed and analyzed using computer SPSS program. Since primary data will be used in the study, so the Pearson correlation technique and use simple statistics on frequency, percentages, mean and standard deviation.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

For data analysis it has been used Frequency Table in every question. The present study shows after working hour people received electronic communication most of the day. The highest frequency of received electronic communication is 17, 14 and 9 respectively and the highest percentage is 42.5 and the lowest is 22.5. From this study, it can be concluded that most of the people who work in educational institution have received electronic communication after working hour.

Table 1: Q1

Q1					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Few days	14	35.0	35.0	35.0
	Most days	17	42.5	42.5	77.5
	Every day	9	22.5	22.5	100.0
	Total	40	100.0	100.0	

In term of necessity or emergency, most of the time they have received electronic communication with the highest percentages at 47.5 and 32.5 is the second highest where the lowest percentage (20%) is less than half of the highest percentage. In addition, the survey shows the frequency also highest 19, 13 and 8 respectively which is directly related to the percentage of receiving electronic communication with their emergency.

Table 2: Q2

Q2					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Sometimes	13	32.5	32.5	32.5
	Most of the times	19	47.5	47.5	80.0
	Always	8	20.0	20.0	100.0
	Total	40	100.0	100.0	

In this case after receiving message, they have expected to reply immediately sometimes, most of the time and always with the frequency 8, 17 and 15 and the percentage is 42.5, 37.5 and 20 respectively.

Table 3: Q3

Q3					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Sometimes	8	20.0	20.0	20.0
	Most of the times	17	42.5	42.5	62.5
	Always	15	37.5	37.5	100.0
	Total	40	100.0	100.0	

Based on their interest, to respond to these messages immediately where the frequency of most of the times and always is the almost same 19 and 18 but the opinion in sometimes is the very lowest 3. Interestingly, the percentage of most of the times and always is almost equal 47.5 and 45.

Table 4: Q4

Q4					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Sometimes	3	7.5	7.5	7.5
	Most of the times	19	47.5	47.5	55.0
	Always	18	45.0	45.0	100.0
	Total	40	100.0	100.0	

In terms of frequency, they got message from vendors/suppliers is the highest frequency rank with 7 and the second highest is 6 where immediate superior/supervisor and CEO/COO or top management is shows the same frequency with 5 and subordinates is the third with the frequency rank of 4.

Table 5: Q5

Q5			
Initiator of the Communication	Rank (According to Frequency)		Remarks
(5a) Immediate superior/supervisor	5	45%	
(5b) Other Managers	1	50%	
(5c) CEO/COO or Top Management	5	27.50%	
(5d) Subordinates	4	35%	
(5e) Vendors/Suppliers	7	97.5	
(5f) Customers	6	67%	
(5g) Others (Please identify)	1	37.50%	

About more than half of the employee (57.5%) in education sector, they are feeling sometimes unpleasant or pleasant with the highest frequency of 23 when they received such messages after work hour. It is very clear that almost 40% employee are feeling pleasant with the frequency of 16 when they have received such messages after working hour.

Table 6: Q6

Q6					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Unpleasant	1	2.5	2.5	2.5
	Sometimes unpleasant or pleasant	23	57.5	57.5	60.0
	Pleasant	16	40.0	40.0	100.0
	Total	40	100.0	100.0	

Upon receiving such messages, 75% employee are feeling stressed sometimes with the frequency of 30 where most of the times 20% with very low frequency of 8 only.

Table 7: Q7

Q7					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Sometimes	30	75.0	75.0	75.0
	Most of the times	8	20.0	20.0	95.0
	Always	2	5.0	5.0	100.0
	Total	40	100.0	100.0	

According to satisfaction with their job, 75% employee has satisfied with the highest frequency of 30 where 22.5%

employee is neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with the negligible frequency of 9 only.

Table 8: Q8

Q8					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Neither Sat nor Dissatisfied	9	22.5	22.5	22.5
	Satisfied	30	75.0	75.0	97.5
	Very Satisfied	1	2.5	2.5	100.0
	Total	40	100.0	100.0	

It is very interesting that satisfaction with their job and life in general is exactly same value in both frequency and percentage with 30 and 75 respectively. The 20% employees are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with their life in general with the frequency of 8. Only 5% are very satisfied with their life in general.

Table 9: Q9

Q9					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Neither sat nor dissatisfied	8	20.0	20.0	20.0
	Satisfied	30	75.0	75.0	95.0
	Very satisfied	2	5.0	5.0	100.0
	Total	40	100.0	100.0	

Rating working place of them, most of the employee are very pleasant with 77.5% and frequency 31 whereas only 15% with the frequency of 6 neither pleasant nor unpleasant and only 7.5% is very pleasant with their working place with the 3 frequency.

Table 10: Q10

Q10					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Neither pleasant nor unpleasant	6	15.0	15.0	15.0
	Pleasant	31	77.5	77.5	92.5
	Very pleasant	3	7.5	7.5	100.0
	Total	40	100.0	100.0	

Rating of their immediate superior, in educational institution 90% employee agreed that their immediate superior is supportive with 36 frequency and only 10% employee feel very supportive with the frequency of 4 only.

Table 11: Q11

Q11					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Supportive	36	90.0	90.0	90.0
	Very supportive	4	10.0	10.0	100.0
	Total	40	100.0	100.0	

4.1. Mean and Median

Table 12: Statistics

Statistics			
		Age	Gender
N	Valid	40	40
	Missing	0	0
Mean		38.225	1.58
Median		38.000	2.00
Std. Deviation		8.4352	.501

Table 13: Age

Age					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4.0	1	2.5	2.5	2.5
	28.0	1	2.5	2.5	5.0
	30.0	1	2.5	2.5	7.5
	31.0	1	2.5	2.5	10.0
	32.0	4	10.0	10.0	20.0
	35.0	3	7.5	7.5	27.5
	36.0	5	12.5	12.5	40.0
	37.0	1	2.5	2.5	42.5
	38.0	4	10.0	10.0	52.5
	39.0	3	7.5	7.5	60.0
	40.0	2	5.0	5.0	65.0
	41.0	3	7.5	7.5	72.5
	42.0	3	7.5	7.5	80.0
	43.0	1	2.5	2.5	82.5
	44.0	2	5.0	5.0	87.5
	45.0	1	2.5	2.5	90.0
	48.0	1	2.5	2.5	92.5
	50.0	1	2.5	2.5	95.0
	54.0	1	2.5	2.5	97.5
	60.0	1	2.5	2.5	100.0
	Total	40	100.0	100.0	

In this survey shows the female respondents is more than male with the highest percentage of 57.5 and frequency 23 whereas the male is 42.5% with the frequency of 17.

Table 14: Gender

Gender					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	17	42.5	42.5	42.5
	Female	23	57.5	57.5	100.0
	Total	40	100.0	100.0	

In marital status, 62.5% respondents have married with children with the frequency of 25 and only 17.5%

respondents married but no children with very low frequency at 7. Only 5% respondents is unmarried with 2 frequency.

Table 15: Marital Status

Marital Status					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Married with children	25	62.5	71.4	71.4
	Married but no children	7	17.5	20.0	91.4
	Unmarried	2	5.0	5.7	97.1
	Married	1	2.5	2.9	100.0
	Total	35	87.5	100.0	
Missing	System	5	12.5		
Total		40	100.0		

Among the respondents, 52.5% is the lecturer and 40% is the officer with the frequency of 21 and 16 respectively.

Table 16: Job Position

Job Position					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Officer	1	2.5	2.5	2.5
	Lecturer	1	2.5	2.5	5.0
	lecturer	1	2.5	2.5	7.5
	Lecturer	21	52.5	52.5	60.0
	Officer	16	40.0	40.0	100.0
	Total	40	100.0	100.0	

In this survey, 97.5% of respondents are from educational institution and only 2.5% respondents are from out for education.

Table 17: Industry

Industry					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Education	1	2.5	2.5	2.5
	Education	39	97.5	97.5	100.0
	Total	40	100.0	100.0	

Among the respondents in this survey, 77.5% employees have equal number of subordinate with 31 frequencies and the rest of employee (2.5%) with the same frequency. Only 7.5% employees have 3 subordinate.

Table 18: N Subordinate

N Subordinate					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	31	77.5	77.5	77.5
	2.00	1	2.5	2.5	80.0
	3.00	3	7.5	7.5	87.5
	4.00	1	2.5	2.5	90.0
	6.00	1	2.5	2.5	92.5
	8.00	1	2.5	2.5	95.0
	10.00	1	2.5	2.5	97.5
	11.00	1	2.5	2.5	100.0
	Total	40	100.0	100.0	

In working experience, the highest percentage and frequency is 20, 17.5, 15.5, 12.5, 10 and 7.5 and 8, 7, 6, 5, 4 and 3 respectively.

Table 19: Years Working

Years Working					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	1	2.5	2.5	2.5
	3.00	1	2.5	2.5	5.0
	4.00	7	17.5	17.5	22.5
	5.00	1	2.5	2.5	25.0
	6.00	5	12.5	12.5	37.5
	7.00	4	10.0	10.0	47.5
	8.00	8	20.0	20.0	67.5
	9.00	1	2.5	2.5	70.0
	10.00	6	15.0	15.0	85.0
	11.00	3	7.5	7.5	92.5
	12.00	1	2.5	2.5	95.0
	18.00	2	5.0	5.0	100.0
	Total	40	100.0	100.0	

Among the total respondent has working experience highest percentage is 17.5 there number is 7 and 2.5 is 4 person and according the table are shows below.

Table 20: Working Experience

Working Experience					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	1	2.5	2.5	2.5
	4.00	4	10.0	10.0	12.5
	5.00	3	7.5	7.5	20.0
	6.00	1	2.5	2.5	22.5
	8.00	6	15.0	15.0	37.5
	9.00	2	5.0	5.0	42.5
	10.00	7	17.5	17.5	60.0
	11.00	3	7.5	7.5	67.5
	12.00	3	7.5	7.5	75.0
	14.00	3	7.5	7.5	82.5
	15.00	1	2.5	2.5	85.0
	16.00	1	2.5	2.5	87.5
	17.00	2	5.0	5.0	92.5
	25.00	2	5.0	5.0	97.5
	26.00	1	2.5	2.5	100.0
	Total	40	100.0	100.0	

Table 21: Correlations

		Correlations																
		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5a	Q5b	Q5c	Q5d	Q5e	Q5f	Q5g	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11
Q1	Pearson Correlation	1	.814**	.538**	-.007	.155	.354*	-.016	-.132	.241	-.336*	-.240	.118	.150	.292	.018	.473**	.167
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.967	.339	.025	.922	.416	.134	.034	.136	.470	.355	.068	.915	.002	.303
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
Q2	Pearson Correlation	.814**	1	.611**	.162	.235	.371*	.050	-.102	.028	-.446**	-.252	.189	.031	.153	.239	.346*	.175
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.317	.145	.018	.758	.532	.864	.004	.117	.243	.847	.346	.138	.029	.280
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
Q3	Pearson Correlation	.538**	.611**	1	.348*	.374*	.244	.042	.030	.179	-.181	-.295	.087	.055	.251	.146	.110	.147
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.028	.017	.129	.796	.852	.269	.264	.065	.592	.737	.118	.370	.498	.366
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
Q4	Pearson Correlation	-.007	.162	.348*	1	.312	.214	.097	.096	-.097	.005	-.107	.028	.109	-.088	.444**	-.248	-.067
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.967	.317	.028		.050	.185	.553	.557	.552	.974	.512	.862	.505	.589	.004	.124	.680
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
Q5a	Pearson Correlation	.155	.235	.374*	.312	1	.421**	.331*	-.060	-.149	-.147	-.195	.169	.380*	.236	.076	-.072	.120
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.339	.145	.017	.050		.007	.037	.714	.360	.367	.228	.296	.016	.142	.643	.661	.460
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
Q5b	Pearson Correlation	.354*	.371*	.244	.214	.421**	1	.041	.090	.238	-.389*	-.240	-.050	.228	.046	.033	-.011	-.212
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.025	.018	.129	.185	.007		.804	.583	.140	.013	.135	.761	.156	.777	.838	.945	.189
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
Q5c	Pearson Correlation	-.016	.050	.042	.097	.331*	.041	1	.005	-.322*	-.198	-.109	.247	.292	-.063	-.070	-.240	.128
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.922	.758	.796	.553	.037	.804		.975	.043	.221	.505	.124	.067	.701	.666	.135	.432
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
Q5d	Pearson Correlation	-.132	-.102	.030	.096	-.060	.090	.005	1	-.076	.222	-.180	-.087	-.114	-.311	-.183	-.318*	-.510**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.416	.532	.852	.557	.714	.583	.975		.641	.168	.268	.595	.485	.051	.259	.045	.001
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
Q5e	Pearson Correlation	.241	.028	.179	-.097	-.149	.238	-.322*	-.076	1	-.073	-.061	-.113	-.086	.070	-.285	.026	-.053
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.134	.864	.269	.552	.360	.140	.043	.641		.654	.711	.489	.597	.668	.074	.875	.744
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
Q5f	Pearson Correlation	-.336*	-.446**	-.181	.005	-.147	-.389*	-.198	.222	-.073	1	.071	-.396*	-.294	-.064	-.278	-.299	-.152
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.034	.004	.264	.974	.367	.013	.221	.168	.654		.664	.011	.066	.693	.082	.061	.349
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
Q5g	Pearson Correlation	-.240	-.252	-.295	-.107	-.195	-.240	-.109	-.180	-.061	.071	1	-.124	-.068	-.165	-.357*	.061	-.126
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.136	.117	.065	.512	.228	.135	.505	.268	.711	.664		.446	.677	.309	.024	.711	.439
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
Q6	Pearson Correlation	.118	.189	.087	.028	.169	-.050	.247	-.087	-.113	-.396*	-.124	1	.126	.102	.123	.113	.391*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.470	.243	.592	.862	.296	.761	.124	.595	.489	.011	.446		.437	.530	.450	.489	.013
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
Q7	Pearson Correlation	.150	.031	.055	.109	.380*	.228	.292	-.114	-.086	-.294	-.068	.126	1	.235	-.019	.086	.269
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.355	.847	.737	.505	.016	.156	.067	.485	.597	.066	.677	.437		.144	.908	.597	.093
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
Q8	Pearson Correlation	.292	.153	.251	-.088	.236	.046	-.063	-.311	.070	-.064	-.165	.102	.235	1	.206	.396*	.327*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.068	.346	.118	.589	.142	.777	.701	.051	.668	.693	.309	.530	.144		.202	.011	.039
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
Q9	Pearson Correlation	.018	.239	.146	.444**	.076	.033	-.070	-.183	-.285	-.278	-.357*	.123	-.019	.206	1	.062	.280
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.915	.138	.370	.004	.643	.838	.666	.259	.074	.082	.024	.450	.908	.202		.706	.081
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
Q10	Pearson Correlation	.473**	.346*	.110	-.248	-.072	-.011	-.240	-.318*	.026	-.299	.061	.113	.086	.396*	.062	1	.231
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.029	.498	.124	.661	.945	.135	.045	.875	.061	.711	.489	.597	.011	.706		.151
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
Q11	Pearson Correlation	.167	.175	.147	-.067	.120	-.212	.128	-.510**	-.053	-.152	-.126	.391*	.269	.327*	.280	.231	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.303	.280	.366	.680	.460	.189	.432	.001	.744	.349	.439	.013	.093	.039	.081	.151	
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

V. CONCLUSION

High after-hours availability expectations, high frequency of work-related smartphone use, and low boundary control were associated with poor psychological detachment. Furthermore, boundary control moderated the relationships between both after-hours availability expectations and work-related smartphone use, respectively, and psychological detachment. As such, boundary control mitigated the negative effects of both after-hours availability expectations and work-related smartphone use during leisure on psychological detachment. The results demonstrate that the material features of mobile technologies offer five specific affordances that mobile workers use in managing work-life boundaries: mobility, connectedness, interoperability, identifiability and personalization. These affordances persist in their influence across time, despite their connection to different technology features. Mobile technologies have been in use for over 30 years. Although there are many advantages to mobile communication technology use, including increased productivity, reduced response times and costs, and enhanced customer service, there are also challenges. This study examined the use of mobile communication technology after hours and its effect on work-life balance and organizational efficiency. Quantitative methodology was used in this study to survey 40 participants. Employers should also bear in mind that there might be generational issues at play, with younger employees being both more conversant with social networking sites, and less careful about how they use them. It is potentially quite easy not to think through the ramifications of posting something on a social networking site, how far it might travel, and the difficulties of removing it. Education and reminders to staff on these types of issues should therefore be a key part of any policy or guidance on the use of social media. Norris et al., [17] predicted that mobile devices are becoming a widely used learning device. Also, Dougherty et al., [5] predicted that mobile information patrons are increasing given the prevalence of wireless data communication technology. It is expected that results in this study could serve as a good reference for future researches.

REFERENCES

- [1] B.E. Ashforth, G.E. Kreiner & M. Fugate (2000), "All in a Day's Work: Boundaries and Micro Role Transitions", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 25, No. 3, Pp. 472-491.
- [2] W.R. Boswell & J. Olson-Buchanan (2007), "The Use of Communication Technologies after Hours: The Role of Work Attitudes and Work-Life Conflict", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 33, No. 4, Pp. 592-610.
- [3] J. Carroll (2008), "Theorizing the IT Artifact for Mobility: A Portfolio, Not a Singularity", *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth International Conference on Information Systems*, Pp. 1-17.
- [4] Dandan Ma, Jia Tina Du, Yonghua Cen & Peng Wu (2016), "Exploring the Adoption of Mobile Internet Services by Socioeconomically Disadvantaged People", *Aslib Journal of Information Management*, Vol. 68, No. 6, Pp. 670-693.
- [5] M.J. Dougherty, M. Santi, M.S. Brose, C. Ma, A.C. Resnick, A.J. Sievert & J.A. Biegel (2010), "Activating Mutations in BRAF Characterize a Spectrum of Pediatric Low-Grade Gliomas", *Neuro-oncology*, Vol. 12, No. 7, Pp. 621-630.
- [6] A.G. Golden & C. Geisler (2007), "Work-Life Boundary Management and the Personal Digital Assistant", *Human Relations*, Vol. 60, No. 3, Pp. 519-551.
- [7] J.H. Greenhaus & N.J. Beutell (1985), "Sources of Conflict between Work and Family Roles", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 10, No. 1, Pp. 76-88.
- [8] H. Hoehle, X. Zhang & V. Venkatesh (2015), "An Espoused Cultural Perspective to Understand Continued Intention to Use Mobile Applications: A Four-Country Study of Mobile Social Media Application Usability", *European Journal of Information Systems*, Vol. 24, No. 3, Pp. 337-359.
- [9] S.A. Khan & K. Agha (2013), "Dynamics of the Work Life Balance at the Firm Level: Issues and Challenges", *Journal of Management Policy & Practice*, Vol. 14, No. 4, Pp. 103-114.
- [10] R.E. Kopelman, J.J. Greenhaus & T.F. Connolly (1983), "A Model of Work, Family, and Interrole Conflict: A Construct Validation Study", *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, Vol. 32, Pp. 198-215.
- [11] R.B. Kozma & J. Voogt (2003), "Technology, Innovation, and Educational Change: A Global Perspective: A Report of the Second Information Technology in Education Study", *Module 2. ISTE (Interntl Soc Tech Educ)*.
- [12] B. Lal & Y.K. Dwivedi (2010), "Investigating Homeworkers' Inclination to Remain Connected to Work at 'Anytime, Anywhere' Via Mobile Phones", *Journal of Enterprise Information Management*, Vol. 23, No. 6, Pp. 759-774.
- [13] V.S. Major, K.J. Klein & M.G. Ehrhart (2002), "Work Time, Work Interference with Family, and Psychological Distress", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 87, No. 3, Pp. 427.
- [14] C. Maslach, S.E. Jackson & M.P. Leiter (1986), "Maslach Burnout Inventory", *Palo Alto*.
- [15] D. Morley (2008), "Understanding Computers in a Changing Society", Third Edition, *Cambridge*.
- [16] A.S.M. Mosa, I. Yoo & L. Sheets (2012), "A Systematic Review of Healthcare Applications for Smartphones", *BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making*, Vol. 12, Article no. 67 (Accessed May 10, 2015).
- [17] C. Norris, A. Hossain & E. Soloway (2011), "Using Smartphones as Essential Tools for Learning", *Educational Technology*, Vol. 51 No. 3, Pp. 18-25.
- [18] J.B. Olson-Buchanan & W.R. Boswell (2006), "Blurring Boundaries: Correlates of Integration and Segmentation between Work and Nonwork", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 68, No. 3, Pp. 432-445.
- [19] D.C. Owens (2014), "A Guide to the Extrapyrmidal Side-Effects of Antipsychotic Drugs", *Cambridge University Press*.
- [20] K. Richardson & R. Benbunan-Fich (2011), "Examining the Antecedents of Work Connectivity Behavior during Non-Work Time", *Information and Organization*, Vol. 21, No. 3, Pp. 142-160.
- [21] C.R. Richardson, J.M. Thompson, M.M. Glanzer, J.L. Johnson & A.V. Morine (2009), "U.S. Patent No. D605, 850", Washington, DC: *U.S. Patent and Trademark Office*.
- [22] L. Schamber (2000), "Time-line Interviews and Inductive Content Analysis: Their Effectiveness for Exploring Cognitive Behaviors", *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, Vol. 51, No. 8, Pp. 734-744.
- [23] J.A. Thomas (2014), "Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics", *Routledge*.
- [24] A.D. Waller & G. Ragsdell (2012), "The Impact of e-Mail on Work-Life Balance", *Aslib Proceedings, Emerald Group Publishing Limited*, Vol. 64, No. 2, Pp. 154-177.
- [25] T. Zarpou, V. Saprikis, A. Markos & M. Vlachopoulou (2012), "Modeling Users' Acceptance of Mobile Services", *Electronic Commerce Research*, Vol. 12, No. 2, Pp. 225-248.