Is anyone else feeling completely unessential? Meaningful work, identification, job insecurity, and online organizational behavior during a lockdown in the Netherlands

Jaap W. Ouwerkerk

Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam

Jos Bartels

Hong Kong Baptist University

Manuscript under Review

Before publication, please cite as:

Ouwerkerk, J.W., & Bartels, J. (2020). *Is anyone else feeling completely unessential? Meaningful work, identification, job insecurity, and online organizational behavior during a lockdown in the Netherlands*. PsyArXiv (followed by the doi-link)

Author Note

Jaap W. Ouwerkerk, Department of Communication Science, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam.

Jos Bartels, Department of Communication Studies, Hong Kong Baptist University.

We like to thank Bart Cépéro, Fabienne Kes, Tycho Spanjer and Anne de Werker for their help with collecting the data.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Jaap W. Ouwerkerk, Department of Communication Science, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, De Boelelaan 1081, 1081 HV Amsterdam, the Netherlands. E-mail: j.w.ouwerkerk@vu.nl

Abstract

A survey among Dutch employees ($N = 408$) investigated how a lockdown in response to the COVID-19 pandemic affected work perceptions. Results demonstrate that employees who are not working during lockdown, or have strongly reduced work hours, perceive their job as contributing less to the greater good, identify less with their organization, and experience more job insecurity, compared to those who are still performing a high percentage of their work activities. Moreover, the longer employees were in lockdown, the weaker their greater good motivations and the more job insecurity they experienced. Additionally, we investigated the relations of work perceptions with prosocial and deviant online organizational behaviors of employees who were still working. Identification with colleagues and perceiving positive meaning in one's job emerged as significant predictors of online organizational citizenship behavior directed at other individuals (OCB-I), whereas organizational identification predicted such behavior directed at the organization (OCB-O). Moreover, indicative of a job preservation motive, increased job insecurity was related to more online OCB-O, as well as more deviant online behaviors directed at others in the form of cyberostracism and cyberincivility. Based on these findings, we discuss practical lessons for future lockdowns to minimize negative consequences for organizations and employees.

Keywords: COVID-19, Lockdown, Meaningful Work, Identification, Job Insecurity, Organizational Citizenship Behaviors

Is anyone else feeling completely unessential? Meaningful work, identification, job insecurity, and online organizational behavior during a lockdown in the Netherlands

When in March 2020 the Dutch government announced its ‘intelligent’ lockdown in response to the COVID-19 pandemic and published a list of essential jobs, a comedian noted in a column on national radio: “Everywhere applause for healthcare workers, police, postal workers and cleaners, but I have not heard anyone about what that list also means. That millions of Dutch people have just been told that they are doing meaningless work.” (Derks, 2020). In a similar vein, Ruby Buddemeyer (2020) wrote an op-ed in *Cosmopolitan* with the telling title “I’m a beauty editor and feel f*cking useless right now. Is anyone else feeling completely unessential?”. These examples illustrate that a government-ordered lockdown, by strongly emphasizing the difference between essential and unessential workers, may inadvertently impact the extent to which people feel that their job has positive meaning or contributes to the greater good (see Kramer & Kramer, 2020). A lockdown may also affect other work perceptions. Working less during a lockdown implies decreased contact with one’s colleagues and organization, which poses a possible threat to feelings of identification with those entities (e.g., Bartel, Wrzesniewski, & Wiesenfeld, 2012). Moreover, being asked to perform less work activities because one’s job has been deemed unessential will likely elicit feelings of job insecurity. The goal of the present research is to assess the impact of not working during a lockdown, or having strongly reduced work hours, on perceptions of meaningful work, identification, and job insecurity. Additionally, we investigate the relations of these work perceptions with prosocial and deviant online organizational behaviors of employees who are still (partly) working. For this purpose, we distributed a survey among Dutch workers during three lockdown weeks in April 2020 before government measures started to ease and workplaces became more crowded again (see Figure 1).

Relations between work left during lockdown and work perceptions

It is important that employees perceive their work as holding positive meaning and being significant (Steger, Dik, & Duffy, 2012). A meta-analytic review shows that such perceptions of meaningful work are positively related to desirable work outcomes and negatively to undesirable work outcomes (Allen et al., 2019). In the present research we focus on two dimensions of meaningful work identified by Steger et al. (2012) that show the strongest correlations with work-related variables. The first, positive meaning, reflects the subjective experience that what one is doing has personal significance. The second dimension, greater good motivations, is related to the concept of calling (Dik & Duffy, 2009), and reflects the desire to make an impact on the greater good. Kramer and Kramer (2020) have suggested that these perceptions of meaningful work could be altered by changes in the status of occupations during the COVID-19 pandemic. In line with this notion, we suggest that not working or having strongly reduced work hours during a lockdown may elicit or accentuate the notion in some employees that they have what has been termed by anthropologist and activist David Graeber (2013) a ‘bullshit job’. Graeber already imagined that the sudden vanishing of certain jobs would make it more apparent that these were less essential for the functioning of society to begin with. By contrast, being seen as essential by government and society, and therefore maintaining most work activities during a lockdown, may strengthen the idea that one is doing meaningful work. We therefore make the following predictions:

H1a: *Employees who are not working during lockdown, or have strongly reduced work hours, will perceive their job as having less positive meaning, compared to those who are still performing a high percentage of their work activities.*

H1b: *Employees who are not working during lockdown, or have strongly reduced work*

hours, will perceive their job as contributing less to the greater good, compared to those who are still performing a high percentage of their work activities.

Employee identification, or “the perception of oneness with or belongingness to an organization” (Mael & Ashfort, 1992, p. 104), has been recognized as a crucial factor for understanding work behavior (e.g., Riketta, 2005). Under normal circumstances, the basis for this perceived bond between employees and their organization relies upon cues such as dress codes and organizational routines, organizational identifiers such as shared office buildings and the colocation of employees, as well as frequent face-to-face communication (Wiesenfeld, Raghuram, & Garud, 1999). However, working less during a lockdown implies decreased contact with one’s organization, thereby posing a possible threat to employee identification. Indeed, the degree of physical isolation of virtual employees has been linked to lower levels of organizational identification (Bartel et al., 2012). Moreover, some researchers have argued that direct face-to-face contact is even more important for fostering identification with subgroups or teams within an organization (e.g., Millward, Haslam, & Postmes, 2007). Based on these notions, we make the following predictions:

H2a: *Employees who are not working during lockdown, or have strongly reduced work hours, will identify less strongly with their organization, compared to those who are still performing a high percentage of their work activities.*

H2b: *Employees who are not working during lockdown, or have strongly reduced work hours, will identify less strongly with their direct colleagues, compared to those who are still performing a high percentage of their work activities.*

In many countries, unemployment has sharply increased during a lockdown in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. This was also the case in the Netherlands, although the impact has

been limited and delayed by the early announcement of financial support packages for industries and businesses with the aim of retaining employees as long as possible (i.e., during the first week of the lockdown, see Figure 1). However, workers being asked or forced to perform less work activities because their job has been deemed unessential, will arguably experience high levels of job insecurity during lockdown. That is, they are likely to have an overall concern about the continued existence of their job in the future which may lead to various short- and long-term undesirable outcomes (De Witte, 2016). We therefore make the following prediction:

H3: Employees who are not working during lockdown, or have strongly reduced work hours, will experience more job insecurity, compared to those who are still performing a high percentage of their work activities.

Relations between work perceptions and online organizational behaviors during lockdown

Several scholars (e.g., Rotundo & Sackett, 2002; Viswesvaran & Ones, 2000) have argued that not only task performance is crucial for organizational effectiveness, but also organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and counterproductive work behavior (CWB). OCB is behavior that is discretionary and often not rewarded, but nonetheless improves the organization (Organ, 1988), and is directed at other individuals (e.g., helping a colleague) or the organization as a whole (e.g., defending the organization in public), referred to as OCB-I and OCB-O, respectively (Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983). By contrast, CWB is defined as behavior that is harmful to the interests of an organization (Robinson & Bennet, 1995). This behavior can also be directed at other individuals (e.g., being rude to a colleague) or the organization as a whole (e.g., taking brakes longer than necessarily). In the present research we focus on online expressions of OCB-I (e.g., helping a colleague via social media) and OCB-O (e.g., responding positively to messages of one's organization on social media) during lockdown. Moreover, we investigate

online expressions of CWB directed at individuals during lockdown in the form of cyberincivility (Lim & Teo, 2009), that may involve either active cyberincivility (e.g., sending an angry email) or passive acts of cyberostracism (e.g., ignoring an email).

Steger et al. (2012) demonstrated that seeing one's job as having positive meaning and contributing to the greater good are both positively related to OCB. Moreover, Allen et al. (2019) observed small to moderate positive meta-analytic relations between perceptions of meaningful work and OCB. Research directly investigating the relation between meaningful work and CWB is limited. However, a study by Usman et al. (2019) showed that dimensions of meaningful work as identified by Steger et al. (2012) are related to a reduction in online deviant organizational behavior in the form of cyberloafing. We therefore make the following predictions:

***H4a:** The more employees see their job as having positive meaning, the more they engage in online organizational citizenship behavior (OCB-I and OCB-O) during lockdown.*

***H4b:** The more employees see their job as contributing to the greater good, the more they engage in online organizational citizenship behavior (OCB-I and OCB-O) during lockdown.*

***H4c:** The more employees see their job as having positive meaning, the less they engage in cyberostracism and cyberincivility during lockdown.*

***H4d:** The more employees see their job as contributing to the greater good, the less they engage in cyberostracism and cyberincivility during lockdown.*

Organizational identification is an important predictor of motivation at work, as strongly identified employees are more likely to engage in behaviors that benefit their workgroup or organization (e.g., Ouwerkerk, Ellemers, & De Gilder, 1999; Ellemers, De Gilder, & Haslam, 2004). Accordingly, meta-analytic reviews show a robust empirical link between organizational identification and OCB (Riketta, 2005; Van Dick, et al., 2006; Lee, Park, & Koo, 2015).

However, when considering the relation between identification and OCB, the congruence between the focus of identification and OCB dimension under investigation is important (Riketta & Van Dick, 2005). That is, research shows that identification with direct colleagues or one's department increases OCB-I, whereas identification with the organization increases OCB-O (e.g., Christ, et al., 2003). We therefore make the following predictions:

***H5a:** The stronger employees identify with their direct colleagues, the more they engage in online organizational citizenship behavior directed at other individuals (OCB-I) during lockdown.*

***H5b:** The stronger employees identify with their organization, the more they engage in online organizational citizenship behavior directed at the organization (OCB-O) during lockdown.*

As research has focused predominantly on the relation of identification with positive work behavior, evidence for the link between identification and deviant organizational behavior is relatively scarce. However, some recent studies have demonstrated a negative relation between organizational identification and CWB (e.g., Ciampi, et al., 2019; Miao & Zhou, 2020). Moreover, a meta-analysis shows that a strongly related concept, organizational commitment, demonstrates a reliable average negative correlation with CWB (Dalal, 2005). As noted earlier, the specific focus of identification (towards individuals or the organization as a whole) is important when considering the relation with work behavior. As cyberostracism and cyberincivility constitute online expressions of CWB directed at other individuals, we make the following prediction:

***H5c:** The stronger employees identify with their direct colleagues, the less they engage in cyberostracism and cyberincivility during lockdown.*

Empirical evidence linking job insecurity to OCB is equivocal (Lam et al., 2015; Schoss, 2017), with some studies reporting a negative relation (e.g., Reisel et al., 2010), whereas others demonstrate a positive relation (e.g., Feather & Rauter, 2004) or show no relation (e.g., Schreurs, 2012). Similarly, studies linking job insecurity to CWB report both negative correlations (e.g., Probst et al., 2007) and positive correlations (e.g., Reisel et al., 2010). Indeed, Shoss (2017) has identified different psychological mechanisms explaining the link between job insecurity and outcome measures, leading to corresponding and competing predictions regarding workplace behavior.

First, stress-related mechanisms suggest that job insecurity may result in displaced aggression and diminished self-regulation, thereby increasing interpersonal mistreatment and other forms of CWB. Second, social exchange-related mechanisms suggest that job insecurity reflects a breach of the relational psychological contract, resulting in less OCB and more CWB to restore balance. As a third mechanism, Shoss (2017) identified a job preservation perspective that suggests that job insecurity should motivate workers to demonstrate their worth to their employer by devoting extra effort towards behaviors that will be noticed and valued, implying increased OCB directed at the organization as a whole. At the same time, a job preservation motive predicts that employees might mistreat coworkers as a means to compete with potential rivals (Shoss & Probst, 2012). Thus, according to this third perspective, job insecurity may simultaneously increase OCB-O and CWB-I. Given the conflicting predictions, however, we do not formulate specific hypotheses concerning the relation of job insecurity with online organizational behaviors during lockdown but rather present the following research question:

RQ: *How does job insecurity affect online organizational behavior during lockdown in the form of OCB-I, OCB-O, cyberostracism, and cyberincivility?*

Method

Participants and Procedure

The study was conducted online using internet-based survey software. The survey was distributed by a snowball procedure, that started with posting a link in emails and social media messages directed at contacts within the networks of the researchers and a request to forward this link. Before providing consent and checking whether the requirement of having a payed job was met, respondents were told that the research concerned how people experienced work since the COVID-19 pandemic, and it was emphasized that, in accordance with ethical standards of scientific research, their answers would be anonymous. During three lockdown weeks in April 2020 (April 8th to April 29th, see Figure 1), the survey was started by 545 respondents. Of this sample, 542 provided consent and 478 met the requirement of having a payed job. Of these 478 respondents, 408 completed the survey and were included in the analyses. This final sample included 160 male and 248 female respondents ($M_{age} = 29.83$; $SD = 12.57$) from a wide variety of economic sectors (see Table 1). For more details about the composition of the sample, see the description of the background questions. The survey started with background questions concerning the job of the respondent, the organization they worked for, their demographics and living situation, as well as questions related to how work had changed since the lockdown. This was followed by statements assessing work perceptions and questions measuring online organizational behaviors during lockdown.

Measures

Job background questions. Respondents were asked what type of job they had (fulltime, $n = 179$; part-time, $n = 107$; side job combined with education, $n = 81$; payed traineeship, $n = 7$; or payed internship, $n = 34$), how long they had been working for their current employer (less

than 6 months, $n = 63$; 6-12 months, $n = 61$; 1-5 years, $n = 152$; 6-10 years, $n = 34$; 11-15 years, $n = 25$; 16-20 years, $n = 12$; or more than 20 years, $n = 61$), how many hours a week they worked in their job before the lockdown (normal job hours; $M = 29.83$; $SD = 12.57$), and whether they had a supervisory function ($n = 101$) or not ($n = 307$).

Organizational background questions. Respondents were asked to estimate the size of the organization or organizational branch they worked for (1-5, $n = 23$; 6-10, $n = 25$; 11-99, $n = 131$; 100-200, $n = 57$; 201-1000, $n = 70$; or more than 1000 people, $n = 102$), and to indicate in which economic sector this organization could be located best (see Table 1).

Personal background questions. Questions were presented to assess the sex respondents were born with ($n_{male} = 160$; $n_{female} = 248$), age ($M = 29.83$; $SD = 12.57$), and highest completed education level (no education, $n = 0$; primary school, $n = 0$; high school, $n = 54$; lower professional education, $n = 2$; intermediate professional education, $n = 59$; higher professional education, $n = 157$; university, $n = 136$). Additionally, respondents were asked whether they lived with others (with a partner, with their parents, or in a communal living arrangement, $n = 337$) or alone ($n = 71$). Moreover, we asked whether their household included any children ($n_{yes} = 116$) and, if so, whether these children required to be taken care of during the day ($n_{yes} = 40$) and, if so, whether they had to do this themselves more often since the lockdown ($n_{yes} = 38$). We refer to the latter measure as increased care responsibilities.

Days in lockdown. Days in lockdown was assessed by the day in April 2020 (8th – 29th) the respondent completed the survey ($M = 11.17$; $SD = 4.85$).

Work percentage left during lockdown. Respondents were first asked whether they were still (partly) working during lockdown ($n = 357$) or that their work was completely halted ($n = 51$). If they were still (partly) working, they were asked to indicate on a slider ranging from

0 to 100% how much of their work activities remained during lockdown ($M = 68.43\%$; $SD = 36.46$). If respondents had indicated that their work was completely halted, they were assigned the value “0” for this measure. Note that the percentage work left during lockdown corresponds with the decline in crowding of workplaces on workdays compared to normal based on Google Community Mobility Reports (see Figure 1), and differed significantly depending on economic sector, $F(14, 393) = 14.17, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .34$. As can be seen in Table 1, four sectors were hit particularly hard with less than 50% of work remaining during lockdown: The hospitality industry and tourism, the airline industry, transport and logistics, and culture, sports and leisure.

(Increase) telework percentage. Telework (increase) was assessed by asking respondents who were still (partly) working on two sliders ranging from 0 to 100% how much of their work they performed at home before the lockdown ($M = 20.21\%$; $SD = 27.53$) and during the lockdown ($M = 66.76\%$; $SD = 39.40$). The difference score (during – before) was used as a measure for increase of telework ($M = 46.55\%$; $SD = 40.53$).

Work perceptions. Measures consisted of statements to which participants could respond on 7-point scales in terms of their own degree of agreement (1 = *total disagreement*, 7 = *total agreement*). We used the two subscales of the Work and Meaning Inventory (Steger et al., 2012) to assess *positive meaning* (4 items, e.g., “I have found a meaningful career”, $M = 5.20, SD = 1.41, \alpha = .89$) and *greater good motivations* (3 items, e.g., “The work I do serves a greater purpose”, $M = 4.87, SD = 1.64, \alpha = .92$). We presented the solidarity subscale of the Group-Level Self-Investment Scale for Identification (Leach et al., 2008) to measure *organizational identification* (3 items, e.g., “I feel committed to my organization”, $M = 5.41, SD = 1.56, \alpha = .94$). The same scale was used to assess *identification with colleagues* (3 items, e.g., “I feel committed to my colleagues”, $M = 5.19, SD = 1.44, \alpha = .93$). Additionally, we formulated one

item to measure *job insecurity* as a result of the lockdown (“I am worried about keeping my job since the lockdown”, $M = 3.11$, $SD = 2.07$).

Online organizational behaviors. When respondents were still (partly) working, and indicated that they had remained in online contact with others in their organization by e-mail, chat, videoconferencing, or social media ($n_{yes} = 318$), 16 questions were presented to assess the frequency with which they engaged in different online organizational behaviors during lockdown using 7-point scales (1 = *never*, 7 = *very often*). Partly based on existing scales that distinguish between offline Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCB) directed towards other individuals (OCB-I) and towards the organization (OCB-O), we formulated four questions intended to measure online OCB-I and four questions to measure online OCB-O. Additionally, partly based on existing scales for active and passive cyberincivility (Lim & Teo, 2009), we formulated four questions intended to measure cyberincivility and four questions to measure cyberostracism. An exploratory factor analysis of the 16 items was conducted to identify the underlying dimensions of these online organizational behaviors (see Table 2). Because the items were non-normally distributed, we opted for a principal axis factor extraction and a promax rotation with Kaiser normalization in line with recommendations (e.g., Costello & Osborne, 2005). The KMO measure of sampling adequacy (.82) indicated that the data were appropriate for analysis. The scree test suggested that four factors should be retained. All four factors had an Eigenvalue greater than 1 and together accounted for 63.47% of the variance. With the exception of one item intended to assess OCB-I, and one item intended to assess OCB-O, all items clearly loaded on the intended factor. Accordingly, after removing these two items, scales were constructed to measure online OCB-I ($M = 4.64$, $SD = 1.40$, $\alpha = .80$), online OCB-O ($M = 3.60$, $SD = 1.49$, $\alpha = .73$), cyberincivility ($M = 1.25$, $SD = 0.51$, $\alpha = .80$), and cyberostracism ($M = 1.53$, $SD = 0.76$, $\alpha = .73$).

= .75).

Other measures. In addition to the measures described above, we presented various single-item measures related to other work perceptions and the frequency of formal and informal communication with others in the organization via different media. However, these measures are beyond the scope of the present article.

Results

Relations between work left during lockdown and work perceptions

We first tested hypotheses 1-3 by examining the differences between employees that are not working at all during lockdown and those that are still (partly) working (see Table 3). As predicted, one-way ANOVA's showed that employees that are not working during lockdown perceive less positive meaning in their work (H1a), have weaker greater good motivations (H1b), identify less strongly with their organization (H2a), identify less strongly with their colleagues (H2b), and experience more job insecurity (H3), compared to those that are still (partly) working, thereby providing initial support for our hypotheses. For a more fine-grained test of hypotheses 1-3, we investigated the relation between work percentage left during lockdown and work perceptions. The zero-order correlations between variables are depicted in Table 4. In line with predictions, work percentage left during lockdown had a positive correlation with greater good motivations, organizational identification, and identification with colleagues, whereas it had a negative correlation with job insecurity. However, there was no significant correlation with positive meaning. To provide a more comprehensive test of these relations, we conducted multiple regressions with work percentage left as predictor, while controlling for age, gender (1 = *male*, 2 = *female*), living situation (1 = *alone*, 2 = *other*), increased care responsibilities (1 = *yes*, 2 = *no*), supervisory function (1 = *yes*, 2 = *no*), days in lockdown, and normal job hours.

Note that this model significantly predicted all five work perceptions (p 's < .001; see Table 5-7).

In line with the zero-order correlation, and in contrast with H1a, the multiple regression predicting positive meaning did not show a relation with work percentage left (see Table 5, left). Additional findings revealed that having a supervisory function and more normal (i.e., pre-lockdown) work hours are related to perceiving more positive meaning in one's job. The multiple regression predicting greater good motivations did show a relation with work percentage left (see Table 5, right). As expected, employees with strongly reduced work hours during lockdown perceive their job as contributing less to the greater good compared to those who are still performing a higher percentage of their work activities (H1b). Interestingly, days in lockdown also predicted greater good motivations. That is, the longer employees were in lockdown, the weaker their greater good motivations. Moreover, those living with others reported stronger greater good motivations than those living alone, suggesting that having direct support at home may strengthen the notion that one's job contributes to the greater good.

The multiple regression predicting organizational identification showed a relation with work percentage left (see Table 6, left). As expected, employees with strongly reduced work hours during lockdown identify less strongly with their organization compared to those who are performing a higher percentage of their work activities (H2a). Additionally, older employees and those with a supervisory function reported stronger identification with their organization. Despite a significant zero-order correlation, the multiple regression predicting identification with colleagues showed no relation with work percentage left (see Table 6, right). Thus, our more fine-grained test did not provide support for H2b, thereby suggesting that whereas organizational identification suffers from a low percentage of work left during lockdown, identification with colleagues does not. Additionally, as was the case for organizational identification, older

employees and those with a supervisory function reported stronger identification with colleagues. Moreover, female respondents showed stronger identification with colleagues.

The multiple regression predicting job insecurity showed a relation with work percentage left (see Table 7). As expected, employees with strongly reduced work hours during lockdown experience more job insecurity compared to those who are still performing a higher percentage of their work activities (H3). Additionally, days in lockdown predicted job insecurity. That is, the longer employees were in lockdown, the more job insecurity they experienced.

Relations between work perceptions and online organizational behaviors during lockdown

To test hypotheses 4-5, we conducted multiple regressions with work perceptions (positive meaning, greater good motivations, organizational identification, identification with colleagues, job insecurity) as predictors of online organizational behaviors during lockdown, while controlling for age, gender (1 = *male*, 2 = *female*), living situation (1 = *alone*, 2 = *other*), increased care responsibilities (1 = *yes*, 2 = *no*), supervisory function (1 = *yes*, 2 = *no*), days in lockdown, normal job hours, work percentage left, normal telework percentage, and increased telework percentage. Note that this model significantly predicted all four online organizational behaviors (p 's < .001; see Table 8 and 9).

The multiple regression predicting online OCB-I showed a relation with both positive meaning and identification with colleagues (see Table 8, left). As expected, the more positive meaning employees perceive in their job (H4a), and the stronger they identify with their colleagues (H5a), the more they engage in online OCB-I. However, contrary to expectations, no relation was obtained with greater good motivations (H4b). Findings further showed that normal (i.e., pre-lockdown) telework percentage and the increase in telework percentage during lockdown were positively related to online OCB-I, suggesting that more opportunities to engage

in online OCB-I increase such behavior. Moreover, employees with a supervisory function reported more online OCB-I. The multiple regression predicting online OCB-O showed a relation with organizational identification (see Table 8, right). As expected, the stronger employees identify with their organization, the more they engaged in online OCB-O (H5b). However, contrary to expectations, and despite significant zero-order correlations (see Table 4), no relation was obtained with positive meaning (H4a) and greater good motivations (H4b). Relevant to our research question (RQ), increased job insecurity was related to engaging in more OCB-O. Findings further showed that younger employees reported more online OCB-O, which may be indicative of their stronger online presence.

Contrary to our expectations, the multiple regression predicting cyberostracism (see Table 9, left) showed no relation with positive meaning (H4c) and greater good motivations (H4d). Moreover, despite a significant zero-order correlation (see Table 4), no relation was obtained with identification with colleagues (H5c). However, relevant to our research question (RQ), increased job insecurity was related to engaging in more cyberostracism. Findings further showed that younger employees reported more cyberostracism, as was the case with online OCB-O. Additionally, as was the case with online OCB-I, employees with a higher normal (i.e., pre-lockdown) telework percentage reported more acts of cyberostracism. Employees living with others also demonstrated more cyberostracism. The multiple regression predicting cyberincivility (see Table 9, right) showed also no relation with positive meaning (H4c), greater good motivations (H4d), and identification with colleagues (H5c). However, relevant to our research question (RQ), increased job insecurity was related to engaging in more cyberincivility. Findings further showed that employees with a supervisory function are more likely to engage in cyberincivility, as was the case with OCB-I.

Discussion

Kramer and Kramer (2020) suggested that changes in occupational status during the COVID-19 pandemic could alter perceptions of meaningful work. In line with this notion, the present research shows that employees who are not working at all during a lockdown in the Netherlands perceive their job as having less positive meaning and contributing less to the greater good compared to those who are still (partly) working. Additionally, as predicted, employees not working at all during lockdown report less identification with their colleagues and organization, thereby corroborating research on the detrimental effects of physical isolation (Bartel, et al., 2012), and underlining the importance of direct contact and the presence of organizational identifiers, such as the colocation of employees, as suggested by Wiesenfeld et al. (1999). Moreover, our results demonstrate that not working during lockdown, or having reduced work hours, is strongly linked to feelings of job insecurity.

It should be noted, however, that although we did obtain a difference between employees that are not working at all and those that are still (partly) working with respect to perceiving positive meaning in one's job and identification with colleagues, a more fine-grained test of our hypotheses revealed that the percentage of work left during lockdown did not predict these work perceptions. This suggests that it is not so much the *percentage* of work left during lockdown that fosters positive meaning and identification with colleagues, but rather the fact that one has *any* work activities left at all. In other words, our findings indicate that having only a small amount of work activities left during lockdown could be sufficient to maintain perceptions of positive meaning and feelings of identification with colleagues. This implies that organizations, even when normal work activities have completely halted during lockdown, as is often the case in, for example, the hospitality industry, may want to ensure some minimal level of work

activities for their employees. This could be achieved relatively easily by creating new work activities (e.g., making or testing plans for reopening after lockdown).

Arguably, the detrimental effects of a lockdown on other work perceptions may be more difficult to counteract. Indeed, our findings show that the differences between employees not working at all and those still (partly) working were most pronounced with respect to job insecurity and greater good motivations. To make matters worse, the present research suggests that the duration of a lockdown may contribute to these detrimental effects. That is, results show that employees who completed our survey at a later date in the period of three lockdown weeks, report more job insecurity and weaker greater good motivations. This does not mean, however, that nothing can be done by governments and organizations to minimize the negative effects of a lockdown on these work perceptions. Governments can offer financial support packages for industries and businesses with the aim of retaining employees as long as possible. Research shows that, although overall levels of welfare generosity in countries do not have systematic effects on whether or not employees feel secure, social protection measures can reduce feelings of job insecurity (Anderson & Pontusson, 2007). Governments should also consider how they frame differences between jobs when announcing a lockdown to avoid unintended negative effects on greater good motivations. For example, they could emphasize that so-called ‘unessential’ jobs are vital for economic recovery after a lockdown.

Organizations can also play an important role in reducing feelings of job insecurity during lockdown by keeping employees informed at all times. For example, a study by Mauno and Kinnunen (2002) revealed that inadequate organizational communication is one of the most important predictors of job insecurity. Indeed, a meta-analytic review (Keim et al., 2014) showed a moderate negative relationship between perceptions of organizational communication and

feelings of job insecurity.

Organizational communication may also play a crucial role in maintaining a sense of identification with one's organization as a whole during a lockdown. Interestingly, research suggests that electronic communication rather than direct face-to-face communication is more important for fostering identification with one's organization. A study by Milward et al. (2007) showed that, whereas face-to-face communication was more strongly related to identification with one's department than with one's organization, the reverse was true for electronic communication (i.e., email). Indeed, Reicher, Spears and Postmes (1995) have suggested that under certain conditions people's sense of identification could actually be hampered by face-to-face contact, while strengthened by computer-mediated communication. They argue that computer-mediated communication can direct attention to the shared cognitive representation of one's group (i.e., the organization) rather than specific interpersonal relations within this group. This suggest that, when employees are physically isolated during a lockdown, organizations can maintain (or even strengthen) employee identification by means of computer-mediated communication.

The importance of counteracting the negative consequences of not working or reduced work hours on various work perceptions is highlighted by the finding of the present research that these perceptions are related to online organizational behaviors during a lockdown. As expected, identification with colleagues emerged as a significant predictor of online organizational citizenship behavior directed at other individuals, whereas organizational identification predicted such online behavior directed at the organization, thereby corroborating previous research (e.g., Christ, et al., 2003), and underlining the importance of distinguishing between different foci of identification when investigating relations with work behavior (Riketta & Van Dick, 2005).

Additionally, we found evidence for the predicted negative relation between identification with colleagues and deviant online behavior in the form of cyberostracism. It should be noted, however, that this link could only be confirmed on the basis of a zero-order correlation. Moreover, perceiving positive meaning in one's job emerged as a predictor of online organizational citizenship behavior directed at other individuals, although other expected relations between perceptions of meaningful work and online organization behavior were not observed when controlling for other variables, thereby suggesting that perceiving one's work as having positive meaning and contributing to the greater good has a relatively minor impact on online behavior during a lockdown.

By contrast, job insecurity emerged as a significant predictor of online organizational citizenship behavior directed at the organization, as well as deviant online behaviors directed at other individuals in the form of cyberostracism and cyberincivility. Thus, job insecurity was simultaneously linked with more online expressions of OCB-O and more online expressions of CWB-I. This finding is not only important for understanding online organizational behaviors during a lockdown, but also for our knowledge about the consequences of job insecurity during a crisis in general, as most studies examining job insecurity do so during a period of relative stability (cf. Adkins, Werbel, & Farh, 2001). The findings of the present research suggest that in a crisis a job preservation motivation prevails (cf. Shoss, 2017), encouraging workers to demonstrate their worth to their employer by showing increased online OCB directed at the organization (e.g., defending the organization via email, chat, videoconferencing or social media), as well as to compete with potential rivals by mistreating colleagues (e.g., using CAPS in an email to 'shout') or even sabotaging coworkers (e.g., not forwarding an email important to them).

Limitations and future research

When in March 2020 a national lockdown in the Netherlands was announced, we were interested in how not working, or working less, as a result of this drastic measure would affect work perceptions. For this purpose, we immediately started to construct a survey and quickly distributed this by a snowball procedure. As we had no way of knowing how long the lockdown would last, and we did not want to waste a good crisis, time was of the essence. Obviously, taking more time for organizing the survey's distribution by, for example, a commercial panel, could have resulted in obtaining a more representative sample of Dutch workers. However, as noted, we were able to distribute the survey among workers from a wide variety of economic sectors that were affected differently with respect to the percentage of work activities left during lockdown. Moreover, we controlled for various personal and work-related factors in our analyses.

Spector (2019) noted that this is also the place in a research article where authors usually acknowledge the inferiority of using a cross-sectional design for identifying causal relations, and recommend using a longitudinal design for future research. According to Spector (2019), however, "the ability of the longitudinal design to reflect causality has been overstated and it offers limited advantages over the cross-sectional design in most cases in which it is used" (p.125). Although we agree with the sentiment of this observation, this does not mean that we do not see important benefits of doing longitudinal research in the future when investigating the consequences of a lockdown on work perceptions and work behavior. Whereas its ability to reflect causality may be overstated, it also enables researchers to capture changes over time in a turbulent situation. Indeed, time-related factors could be important when investigating the effects of a lockdown, as illustrated by our own finding that the duration of the lockdown influenced

respondents' perceptions of greater good motivations and job insecurity. Moreover, the relevance of the empirical basis for making predictions may change rapidly during a crisis such as the current pandemic. For example, we predicted that having less work activities left during lockdown (i.e., less direct contact) would lower employee identification, partly based on a study by Bartel et al. (2012) that demonstrated that the degree of physical isolation of virtual workers decreases organizational identification. However, this study showed also that this effect is mediated by the lack of perceived respect that is generally experienced by virtual workers. Given that working from home may quickly become 'the new normal' and more widely accepted, the detrimental effects on perceived respect as experienced by current virtual workers may weaken, thereby possibly changing also the link between physical isolation and identification (cf. Millikin & Bechky, 2020).

Another limitation of the present research is its reliance on single-source self-report data. Using alternative sources of data such as peer and supervisor reports in future research could serve as a control for sources of method variance (e.g., Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Podsakoff, 2012). It should be noted, however, that the work perceptions under investigation in the present research are difficult to assess by others, even under normal circumstances. The same is true for the frequency with which employees engage in various online prosocial and deviant behaviors. Indeed, others have argued that, although some OCBs and CWBs may be observable by others, most of these behaviors may be difficult to notice or are intentionally hidden (e.g., Dalal, 2005; Spector, Bauer, & Fox, 2010). Consequently, self-report measures of OCB and CWB show better discriminant validity compared to ratings by others, that often reflect general impressions as a more objective basis for making judgments is lacking (e.g., Dalal, 2005; Spector, Bauer, & Fox, 2010; Spector, 2019).

Conclusion

Countries have taken drastic measures to contain the COVID-19 pandemic. Many governments have implemented various forms of local or national lockdowns, often urging or forcing people in ‘unessential’ jobs to work from home as much as possible or to stop working altogether. Policy makers are often well-informed about the public health benefits and economic costs of such measures, but have to make their decisions with only limited information about the implications for the well-being of individual employees. The present research demonstrates that not working, or working less, as a consequence of a government-ordered lockdown is related to employees perceiving their job as having less meaning, identifying less with their colleagues and organization, and experiencing more job insecurity. Although the pandemic has led to an unprecedented focus of scientists, with about 4% of all scientific outputs from February to July 2020 dealing with this topic, a vast majority of these papers concern medical and biological issues, and 60% are opinion pieces not reporting original data (Odone et al., 2020). We therefore urge researchers in the domain of organizational sciences to gather empirical data that can help governments and organizations to better understand the impact of a lockdown or other measures in response to the COVID-19 pandemic on individual employees. By doing so, they will not only make a vital and urgently needed scientific contribution, but may also feel slightly less unessential.

References

- Adkins, C. L., Werbal, J. D., & Farh, J. L. (2001). A field study of job insecurity during a financial crisis. *Group & Organization Management*, 26, 463-483.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601101264004>
- Allan, B. A., Batz-Barbarich, C., Sterling, H. M., & Tay, L. (2019). Outcomes of meaningful work: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Management Studies*, 56, 500–528.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12406>
- Anderson, C. J., & Pontusson, J. (2007). Workers, worries and welfare states: Social protection and job insecurity in 15 OECD countries. *European Journal of Political Research*, 46, 211-235. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6765.2007.00692.x>
- Bartel, C. A., Wrzesniewski, A., & Wiesenfeld, B. M. (2012). Knowing where you stand: Physical isolation, perceived respect, and organizational identification among virtual employees. *Organizational Science*, 23, 743-757. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1110.0661>
- Buddemeyer, R. (2020, April 17). I'm a beauty editor and feel f*cking useless right now. Is anyone else feeling completely unessential? Cosmopolitan website.
<https://www.cosmopolitan.com/style-beauty/beauty/a32175767/social-distancing-beauty-editor-job-essay/>
- Ciampa, V., Sirowatka, M., Schuh, S.C., Fraccaroli, F., & Van Dick, R. (2019) Ambivalent identification as a moderator of the link between organizational identification and counterproductive work behaviors. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 8, 1–16.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-019-04262-0>
- Christ, O., Van Dick, R., Wagner, U., & Stellmacher, J. (2003). When teachers go the extra-mile: Foci of organizational identification as determinants of different forms of organizational

- citizenship behavior among schoolteachers. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 73, 329–341. <https://doi.org/10.1348/000709903322275867>
- Costello, A. B., & Osborne, J.W. (2005). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: Four recommendations for getting the most out of your data. *Practical Assessment, Research and Evaluation*, 10, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.7275/jyj1-4868>
- Dalal, R. S. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 1241–1255. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.6.1241>
- Derks, P. (2020, March 18). Zinloze Nederlanders, deze is voor jullie. De Nieuws BV [radio broadcast]. NPO Radio1. <https://www.nporadio1.nl/opinie-commentaar/22429-zinloze-nederlanders-deze-is-voor-jullie>
- De Witte, H. (2016). On the scarring effects of job insecurity (and how they can be explained). *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health*, 42, 99–102. <https://doi.org/10.5271/sjweh.3545>
- Dik, B. J., & Duffy, R. D. (2009). Calling and vocation at work: Definitions and prospects for research and practice. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 37, 424–450. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000008316430>
- Ellemers, N., De Gilder, D., & Haslam, S. A. (2004). Motivating individuals and groups at work: A social identity perspective on leadership and group performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 29, 459–478. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2004.13670967>
- Feather, N. T., & Rauter, K. A. (2004). Organizational citizenship behaviors in relation to job status, job insecurity, organizational commitment and identification, job satisfaction and work values. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77, 81–94.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1348/096317904322915928>

- Graeber, D. (2003). On the phenomenon of bullshit jobs: A work rant. *STRIKE Magazine*, 3, 10-11. <https://www.strike.coop/bullshit-jobs>
- Keim, A. C., Landis, R. S., Pierce, C. A., & Earnest, D. R. (2014). Why do employees worry about their jobs? A meta-analytic review of predictors of job insecurity. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 19, 269–290. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0036743>
- Kramer, A., & Kramer, K. Z. (2020). The potential impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on occupational status, work from home, and occupational mobility. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 119. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2020.103442>
- Lam, C. F., Liang, J., Ashford, S., & Lee, C. (2015). Job insecurity and organizational citizenship behavior: Exploring curvilinear and moderated relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100, 499-510. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038659>
- Leach, C. W., Van Zomeren, M., Zebl, S., Vliek, M. L. W., Pennekamp, S. F., Doosje, B., Ouwerkerk, J. W., & Spears, R. (2008). Group-level self-definition and self-investment: A hierarchical (multi-component) model of in-group identification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95, 144-165. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.95.1.144>
- Lee, E. S., Park, T. Y., & Koo, B. (2015). Identifying organizational identification as a basis for attitudes and behaviors: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 141, 1049–1080. <https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000012>
- Lim, V. K. G., & Teo, T. S. H. (2009). Mind your E-manners: Impact of cyber incivility on employees' work attitude and behavior. *Information & Management*, 46, 419-425. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2009.06.006>

- Mael, F., & Ashforth, B. (1992). Alumni and their alma mater: A partial test of the reformulated model of organizational identification. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13, 103-123.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030130202>
- Mauno, S., & Kinnunen, U. (2002). Perceived job insecurity among dual-earner couples: Do its antecedents vary according to gender, economic sector and the measure used? *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 75, 295-314.
<https://doi.org/10.1348/096317902320369721>
- Miao, Q., & Zhou, J. (2020). Corporate hypocrisy and counterproductive work behavior: A moderated mediation model of organizational identification and perceived importance of CSR. *Sustainability*, 12, 1847. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12051847>
- Millkin, F. J., & Bechky, B. A. (2020). Covid-19 and the abrupt change in the nature of work lives: Implications for identification and communication. Managing organizations in a time of crisis. NYU STERN.
http://people.stern.nyu.edu/moliva/syllabi/Bechky_Milliken_changing.work.brief.pdf
- Millward, L. J., Haslam, S. A., & Postmes, T. (2007). Putting employees in their place: the impact of hot desking on organizational and team identification. *Organizational Science*, 18, 547-559. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1070.0265>
- Odone, A., Signorelli, C., Stuckler, D., Galea, S., & the University Vita-Salute San Raffaele COVID-19 literature monitoring working group (2020). The first 10,000 COVID-19 papers in perspective: Are we publishing what we should be publishing? *European Journal of Public Health*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/ckaa170>
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

- Ouwerkerk, J. W., Ellemers, N., & De Gilder, D. (1999). Group commitment and individual effort in experimental and organizational contexts. In N. Ellemers, R. Spears, & B. Doosje (Eds.), *Social identity: Context, commitment, content* (pp. 184-204). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2012). Sources of method bias in social science research and recommendations on how to control it. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 63, 539–569. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-120710-100452>
- Probst, T. M., Stewart, S. M., Gruys, M. L., & Tierney, B. W. (2007). Productivity, counterproductivity and creativity: The ups and downs of job insecurity. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 80, 479-497. <https://doi.org/10.1348/096317906X159103>
- Reicher, S. D., Spears, R., & Postmes, T. (1995). A social identity model of deindividuation phenomena. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 6, 161–198. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14792779443000049>
- Reisel, W. D., Probst, T. M., Chia, S. L., Maloles, C. M., & König, C. J. (2010). The effects of job insecurity on job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, deviant behavior, and negative emotions of employees. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 40, 74–91. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2753/IMO0020-8825400105>
- Riketta, M. (2005). Organizational identification: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 66, 358–384. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2004.05.005>
- Riketta, M., & Van Dick, R. (2005). Foci of attachment in organizations: A meta-analytic comparison of the strength and correlates of workgroup versus organizational identification and commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 67, 490-510.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2004.06.001>

Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 555–572.

<https://doi.org/10.5465/256693>

Rotundo, M., & Sackett, P. R. (2002). The relative importance of task, citizenship, and counterproductive performance to global ratings of job performance: A policy-capturing approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 66–80. [https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-](https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.1.66)

[9010.87.1.66](https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.1.66)

Schellevis, J. (2020, May 22). We gaan weer vaker naar kantoor, goed ventileren is belangrijk.

NOS nieuws. <https://nos.nl/collectie/13839/artikel/2334731-we-gaan-weer-vaker-naar-kantoor-goed-ventileren-is-belangrijk>

Schreurs, B., van Emmerik, I. J. H., Günter, H., & Germeyns, F. (2012). A weekly diary study on the buffering role of social support in the relationship between job insecurity and employee performance. *Human Resource Management*, 51, 259–279.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/hrm.21465>

Shoss, M. K. (2017). Job insecurity: An integrative review and agenda for future research.

Journal of Management, 43, 1911–1939. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206317691574>

Shoss, M. K., & Probst, T. M. (2012). Multilevel outcomes of economic stress: An agenda for future research. In P. Perrewe, C. Rosen, & J. Halbesleben (Eds.), *Research in occupational stress and well-being: The role of economic context on occupational stress and well-being*. (Vol. 10, pp. 43–86). Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing.

Smith, C. A., Organ, D., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68, 653–663. [https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-](https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.68.4.653)

[9010.68.4.653](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-018-09613-8)

Spector, P. E. (2019). Do not cross me: Optimizing the use of cross-sectional designs. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 34, 125–137. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-018-09613-8>

Spector, P. E., Bauer, J. A., & Fox, S. (2010). Measurement artifacts in the assessment of counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior: Do we know what we think we know? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95, 781–790.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019477>

Steger, M. F., Dik, B. J., & Duffy, R. D. (2012). Measuring meaningful work: The Work and Meaning Inventory (WAMI). *Journal of Career Assessment*, 20, 322–337.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072711436160>

Usman, M., Javed, U., Shoukat, A., & Bashir, N. A. (2019): Does meaningful work reduce cyberloafing? Important roles of affective commitment and leader-member exchange.

Behaviour & Information Technology. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0144929X.2019.1683607>

Van Dick, R., Grojean, M. W., Christ, O., & Wieseke, J. (2006). Identity and the extra mile:

Relationships between organizational identification and organizational citizenship

behaviour. *British Journal of Management*, 17, 283–301. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8551.2006.00520.x)

[8551.2006.00520.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8551.2006.00520.x)

Viswesvaran, C., & Ones, D. S. (2000). Perspectives on models of job performance.

International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 8, 216– 226.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00151>

Wiesenfeld, B. M., Raghuram, S., & Garud, R. (1999). Communication patterns as determinants of organizational identification in a virtual organization. *Organizational Science*, 10, 777-

790. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.10.6.777>

Preprint

Table 1

Distribution of Respondents among Sectors and Differences in Work Percentage Left between Sectors

Sector:	<i>n</i>	%	Work% left	
			<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Hospitality and Tourism	35	8.6	24.54 _a	39.08
Airline Industry	21	5.1	26.29 _a	33.60
Transport and Logistics	11	2.7	40.36 _{ab}	38.91
Culture, Sports, and Leisure	13	3.2	45.08 _{ab}	41.02
Commercial Services	29	7.1	58.69 _{bc}	37.21
(Retail) Trade	46	11.3	70.15 _{bcd}	34.84
Government and Public Administration	33	8.1	77.12 _{cd}	28.76
Education and Science	29	7.1	78.62 _{cd}	27.90
Healthcare and Welfare	59	14.5	79.10 _{cd}	26.14
Media and Communication	12	6.6	85.22 _{cd}	17.18
Justice and Security	16	3.9	90.63 _d	15.63
Financial Services	26	6.4	90.77 _d	18.72
Information Technology	13	3.2	93.00 _d	9.37
Manufacturing, Production, and Construction	15	3.7	93.60 _d	11.72
Other	35	8.6	66.66 _{bcd}	36.49

Note: $N = 408$; Means with different subscripts in a column are different at the .05 significance level using Tukey's HSD.

Table 2

Exploratory Factor Analysis with Promax Rotation of Online Organizational Behaviors (Pattern Matrix)

<i>how often do you ...</i>	Component			
	1	2	3	4
help direct colleagues via email, chat, videoconferencing or social media when they have a work-related problem?		.82		
make suggestions to direct colleagues via email, chat, videoconferencing or social media to make the performance of their job easier?		.93		
support your direct colleagues via email, chat, videoconferencing or social media when they feel uncomfortable or have a bad day?		.54		
respond positively to messages of direct colleagues on social media (for example, by 'liking' them)?*			.76	
speak positively about your organization via email, chat, videoconferencing or social media?			.71	
make suggestions for improvements within your organization via email, chat, videoconferencing or social media?*		.42	.32	
defend your organization via email, chat, videoconferencing or social media?			.51	
respond positively to messages of your organization on social media (for example, by 'liking' them)			.76	
deliberately not forward an email to someone at work, although you know this is important for him or her?				.46
on purpose omit information in an email to someone at work, although you know this information is important to him or her?				.69
deliberately wait long with responding to an email that is directed to you personally from someone at work?				.78
completely ignore an email that is directed to you personally from someone at work?				.74
send an impolite email to someone at work?		.69		
make fun of a colleague in an email?		.85		
send an angry email to someone at work?		.71		
use CAPS in an email to someone at work to 'shout'?		.67		
Eigenvalue	4.20	3.15	1.44	1.37
Cumulative % of variance explained	26.24	45.92	54.90	63.47

Note: Only factor loadings > .20 are depicted; cross-loadings in italics; *item deleted from scale.

Table 3

Differences between Employees that are Not Working during Lockdown and those who are Still (Partly) Working

Variable:	Not Working (<i>n</i> = 51)		Still (Partly) Working (<i>n</i> = 357)		<i>F</i> (1,406)	<i>p</i>	η_p^2
	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	95% CI	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	95% CI			
Positive Meaning	4.75 (1.48)	[4.33, 5.16]	5.27 (1.39)	[5.12, 5.41]	6.22	.013	.015
Greater Good Motivations	4.22 (1.61)	[3.77, 4.67]	4.96 (1.63)	[4.80, 5.13]	9.29	.002	.022
Identification with Organization	4.93 (1.77)	[4.44, 5.43]	5.48 (1.52)	[5.32, 5.64]	5.54	.019	.013
Identification with Colleagues	4.81 (1.62)	[4.35, 5.27]	5.25 (1.41)	[5.10, 5.39]	4.12	.043	.010
Job Insecurity	4.37 (2.00)	[3.81, 4.93]	2.93 (2.02)	[2.72, 3.14]	22.79	.000	.053

Table 4

Correlations Between Variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. Normal Job Hours												
2. Work% Left	.33***											
3. Normal Telework%	.12*	.03										
4. Increase Telework%	.14**	.22***	-.38***									
5. Positive Meaning	.22***	.08	-.06	-.02								
6. Greater Good Motivations	.13**	.16**	-.10	.02	.51***							
7. Identification with Organization	.16**	.17**	-.09	.07	.57***	.33***						
8. Identification with Colleagues	.19***	.14**	-.04	-.00	.51***	.31***	.76***					
9. Job Insecurity	-.04	-.30***	-.05	.03	.05	-.09	-.04	.01				
10. Online OCB-I	.23***	.19***	.10	.20**	.24***	.06	.25***	.31***	.08			
11. Online OCB-O	.09	-.02	-.01	-.00	.29***	.13*	.29***	.26***	.18**	.40***		
12. Cyberostracism	.07	-.01	.14**	-.04	-.10	-.09	-.18***	-.14*	.12*	.09	.22***	
13. Cyberincivility	.11*	-.07	.10	-.08	-.09	-.05	-.15**	-.09	.10	.03	.14*	.43***

Note: *N* = 408 with exception of telework (*n*₃₋₄ = 357) and online organizational behaviors (*n*₁₀₋₁₃ = 318); **p* < .05; ***p* < .01; ****p* < .001.

Table 5

*Multiple Regressions of Work Percentage Left on Positive Meaning and Greater Good**Motivations*

	Positive Meaning						Greater Good Motivations					
	<i>B (SE B)</i>	95% CI	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>		<i>B (SE B)</i>	95% CI	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	
Age	0.01 (0.01)	[-0.00, 0.02]	.08	1.57	.117		0.00 (0.01)	[-0.01, 0.02]	.03	0.61	.545	
Gender	0.26 (0.15)	[-0.03, 0.55]	.09	1.76	.080		0.10 (0.18)	[-0.24, 0.45]	.03	0.58	.559	
Living Situation	0.18 (0.18)	[-0.18, 0.53]	.05	0.98	.326		0.47 (0.21)	[0.06, 0.89]	.11	2.23	.026	
Increased Care	-0.22 (0.25)	[-0.70, 0.26]	-.04	-0.90	.371		0.21 (0.25)	[-0.35, 0.78]	.04	0.74	.459	
Supervisory Function	-0.45 (0.17)	[-0.78, -0.13]	-.14	-2.74	.006		-0.35 (0.29)	[-0.73, 0.03]	-.09	-1.80	.073	
Days in Lockdown	-0.01 (0.01)	[-0.03, 0.02]	-.02	-0.39	.699		-0.04 (0.19)	[-0.07, -0.00]	-.11	-2.16	.032	
Normal Job Hours	0.02 (0.01)	[0.01, 0.03]	.19	3.40	.001		0.01 (0.01)	[-0.00, 0.03]	.08	1.52	.130	
Work% Left	0.00 (0.00)	[-0.00, 0.00]	.01	0.13	.899		0.01 (0.00)	[0.00, 0.01]	.13	2.46	.014	
Model	$N = 408; R^2 = .08, F(8, 399) = 4.38, p = .000$						$N = 408; R^2 = .06, F(8, 399) = 3.35, p = .000$					

Table 6

Multiple Regressions of Work Percentage Left on Identification

	Identification with Organization						Identification with Colleagues					
	<i>B (SE B)</i>	95% CI	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>		<i>B (SE B)</i>	95% CI	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	
Age	0.02 (0.01)	[0.01, 0.03]	.17	3.19	.002		0.02 (0.01)	[0.01, 0.03]	.19	3.70	.000	
Gender	0.22 (0.17)	[-0.10, 0.55]	.07	1.35	.178		0.32 (0.15)	[0.02, 0.61]	.11	2.09	.037	
Living Situation	0.19 (0.07)	[-0.21, 0.58]	.05	0.93	.354		0.20 (0.18)	[-0.16, 0.56]	.05	1.11	.269	
Increased Care	-0.17 (0.20)	[-0.70, 0.37]	-.03	-0.62	.537		-0.10 (0.25)	[-0.58, 0.39]	-.02	-0.38	.703	
Supervisory Function	-0.37 (0.27)	[-0.73, -0.01]	-.10	-2.03	.043		-0.47 (0.17)	[-0.80, -0.14]	-.14	-2.82	.005	
Days in Lockdown	-0.02 (0.18)	[-0.05, 0.01]	-.07	-1.44	.151		-0.01 (0.02)	[-0.04, 0.02]	-.03	-0.69	.491	
Normal Job Hours	0.01 (0.01)	[-0.01, 0.02]	.07	1.29	.197		0.01 (0.01)	[0.00, 0.02]	.11	1.93	.055	
Work% Left	0.01 (0.00)	[0.00, 0.01]	.13	2.46	.015		0.00 (0.00)	[-0.00, 0.01]	.08	1.53	.128	
Model	$N = 408; R^2 = .08, F(8, 399) = 4.44, p = .000$						$N = 408; R^2 = .10, F(8, 399) = 5.58, p = .000$					

Table 7

Multiple Regression of Work Percentage Left on Job Insecurity

	Job Insecurity					
	<i>B (SE B)</i>	95% CI	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	
Age	-0.00 (0.00)	[-0.02, 0.01]	-.03	-0.59	.558	
Gender	0.25 (0.21)	[-0.17, 0.67]	.06	1.16	.249	
Living Situation	-0.36 (0.26)	[-0.87, 0.15]	-.07	-1.39	.166	
Increased Care	-0.11 (0.35)	[-0.80, 0.58]	-.02	-0.31	.757	
Supervisory Function	0.19 (0.24)	[-0.28, 0.65]	.04	0.80	.425	
Days in Lockdown	0.07 (0.02)	[0.03, 0.11]	.16	3.25	.001	
Normal Job Hours	0.01 (0.01)	[-0.01, 0.03]	.07	1.29	.199	
Work% Left	-0.02 (0.00)	[-0.02, -0.01]	-.32	-6.50	.000	
Model	$N = 408; R^2 = .13, F(8, 399) = 7.20, p = .000$					

Table 8

Multiple Regressions of Work Perceptions on Online OCB-I and Online OCB-O

	Online OCB-I					Online OCB-O				
	<i>B (SE B)</i>	95% CI	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>B (SE B)</i>	95% CI	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Age	-0.00 (0.01)	[-0.01, 0.01]	-.05	-0.79	.433	-0.02 (0.01)	[-0.03, -0.01]	-.18	-3.08	.002
Gender	0.03 (0.16)	[-0.28, 0.34]	.01	0.19	.849	0.28 (0.18)	[-0.07, 0.63]	.09	1.58	.114
Living Situation	-0.15 (0.19)	[-0.51, 0.22]	-.04	-0.80	.426	0.03 (0.21)	[-0.38, 0.45]	.01	0.15	.879
Increased Care	-0.28 (0.24)	[-0.76, 0.20]	-.06	-1.14	.257	0.20 (0.28)	[-0.34, 0.74]	.04	0.74	.458
Supervisory Function	-0.55 (0.17)	[-0.88, -0.21]	-.17	-3.23	.001	-0.23 (0.19)	[-0.61, 0.15]	-.07	-1.19	.234
Days in Lockdown	-0.02 (0.02)	[-0.05, 0.01]	-.06	-1.19	.235	0.03 (0.02)	[-0.01, 0.06]	.08	1.53	.127
Normal Job Hours	0.01 (0.01)	[-0.00, 0.03]	.10	1.83	.069	0.01 (0.01)	[-0.00, 0.03]	.08	1.30	.195
Work% Left	0.00 (0.00)	[-0.00, 0.01]	.09	1.62	.107	-0.00 (0.00)	[-0.01, 0.00]	-.04	-0.61	.546
Normal Telework%	0.01 (0.00)	[0.01, 0.02]	.22	3.78	.000	0.00 (0.00)	[-0.00, 0.01]	.05	0.80	.426
Increase Telework%	0.01 (0.00)	[0.01, 0.02]	.30	4.93	.000	0.00 (0.00)	[-0.01, 0.00]	-.01	-0.20	.838
Positive Meaning	0.15 (0.07)	[0.01, 0.29]	.15	2.15	.033	0.12 (0.08)	[-0.04, 0.28]	.11	1.49	.139
Greater Good	-0.06 (0.05)	[-0.16, 0.04]	-.07	-1.23	.221	0.01 (0.06)	[-0.11, 0.12]	.01	0.11	.914
Identification (O)	-0.05 (0.08)	[-0.21, 0.11]	-.06	-0.65	.517	0.18 (0.09)	[0.00, 0.36]	.18	1.99	.048
Identification (C)	0.28 (0.08)	[0.13, 0.43]	.28	3.60	.000	0.11 (0.09)	[-0.07, 0.28]	.10	1.22	.223
Job Insecurity	0.07 (0.04)	[-0.00, 0.14]	.10	1.93	.054	0.12 (0.04)	[0.04, 0.20]	.16	2.90	.004
Model	$N = 318; R^2 = .27, F(15, 302) = 7.48, p = .000$					$N = 318; R^2 = .18, F(15, 302) = 4.37, p = .000$				

Table 9

Multiple Regressions of Work Perceptions on Cyberostracism and Cyberincivility

	Cyberostracism					Cyberincivility				
	<i>B (SE B)</i>	95% CI	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>B (SE B)</i>	95% CI	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Age	-0.01 (0.00)	[-0.02, -0.01]	-.21	-3.66	.000	-0.00 (0.00)	[-0.01, 0.00]	-.04	-0.61	.546
Gender	-0.07 (0.09)	[-0.25, 0.12]	-.04	-0.70	.483	-0.11 (0.06)	[-0.23, 0.02]	-.10	-1.68	.094
Living Situation	0.25 (0.11)	[0.03, 0.46]	.12	2.22	.027	0.04 (0.07)	[-0.10, 0.19]	.03	0.57	.571
Increased Care	0.02 (0.14)	[-0.27, 0.30]	.01	0.10	.918	0.10 (0.10)	[-0.09, 0.29]	.06	1.06	.288
Supervisory Function	-0.09 (0.10)	[-0.29, 0.11]	-.05	-0.88	.381	-0.20 (0.07)	[-0.33, 0.07]	-.17	-2.95	.003
Days in Lockdown	-0.00 (0.01)	[-0.02, 0.01]	-.03	-0.45	.656	-0.01 (0.01)	[-0.02, 0.01]	-.06	-1.10	.273
Normal Job Hours	0.01 (0.00)	[-0.00, 0.02]	.11	1.81	.072	0.00 (0.00)	[-0.00, 0.01]	.09	1.52	.131
Work% Left	0.00 (0.00)	[-0.00, 0.00]	.01	0.18	.857	-0.00 (0.00)	[-0.00, 0.00]	-.05	-0.78	.439
Normal Telework%	0.00 (0.00)	[0.00, 0.01]	.14	2.24	.026	0.00 (0.00)	[-0.00, 0.00]	.07	1.05	.296
Increase Telework%	0.00 (0.00)	[-0.00, 0.00]	.00	0.00	.997	0.00 (0.00)	[-0.00, 0.00]	-.02	-0.35	.724
Positive Meaning	-0.01 (0.04)	[-0.10, 0.07]	-.02	-0.31	.756	-0.02 (0.03)	[-0.08, 0.03]	-.06	-0.82	.413
Greater Good	-0.02 (0.03)	[-0.08, 0.04]	-.03	-0.52	.602	0.00 (0.02)	[-0.04, 0.04]	.01	0.19	.852
Identification (O)	-0.07 (0.05)	[-0.16, 0.02]	-.14	-1.47	.142	-0.06 (0.03)	[-0.12, 0.01]	-.17	-1.82	.070
Identification (C)	0.01 (0.05)	[-0.09, 0.10]	.01	0.11	.914	0.01 (0.03)	[-0.05, 0.08]	.04	0.44	.664
Job Insecurity	0.05 (0.02)	[0.01, 0.10]	.14	2.53	.012	0.03 (0.01)	[0.00, 0.06]	.13	2.22	.027
Model	$N = 318; R^2 = .13, F(15, 302) = 3.01, p = .000$					$N = 318; R^2 = .11, F(15, 302) = 2.60, p = .001$

Figure 1. Timeline of the Lockdown in the Netherlands. The vertical axis displays the estimated percentage of decline in crowding of workplaces on workdays during the COVID-19 pandemic compared to normal according to Google Community Mobility Reports (based on Schellevis, 2020).