

DEVELOPING AND VALIDATING A MEASURE OF RECOVERY MOTIVES

By

Julia Hope Anglin

Kristen J. Black
Associate Professor and Department Head
of Psychology
(Chair)

Christopher J. L. Cunningham
Guerry Professor and UC Foundation
Professor of Psychology
(Co-chair)

Brian J. O'Leary
Associate Professor of Psychology
(Committee Member)

DEVELOPING AND VALIDATING A MEASURE OF RECOVERY MOTIVES

By

Julia Hope Anglin

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of the University of
Tennessee at Chattanooga in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements of the Degree
of Master of Science: Psychology

The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga
Chattanooga, Tennessee

August 2024

ABSTRACT

“Workplace Recovery” refers to the replenishment of workers' energetic resources which is an important process for bettering workers' personal lives and their organization. Regularly engaging in workplace recovery has significant benefits for work and home domains. Yet, there has been little to no research on what motivates employees on an individual level to participate in recovery behaviors. The present study identified individual motivations to engage in recovery through interviews. Responses were used to create a Motives for Recovery scale which was then validated in a survey study. Three common motivational themes were identified; self-regulation, social and personal development, and externally driven roles. Self-regulation and social/personal development tended to correlate more with well-being outcomes while externally driven role motives tended to correlate with work outcomes. This scale could be used to identify common motivations for engaging in recovery, which can help aid in relevant recovery interventions.

Keywords: Workplace, Recovery, Motivation, Measurement

DEDICATION

To my friends, who are some of the most ambitious and supportive people in my life, I am grateful for the constant uplifting, detachment, and shoulder to lean on. To my mentors, who have instilled a passion for service and grit. My family, who have allowed me to shamelessly chase my dreams. Lastly, to my dad, who I wouldn't have been able to attend graduate school without. I am thankful for not only the resources, yet also the consistent pride and persistence he demonstrated for me, rest in peace.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to those who have supported my academic and professional journey. First and foremost, I would like to thank my thesis chair, Dr. Kristen Black. I have had the amazing opportunity to work with Dr. Black during graduate school, and also during undergraduate. She not only inspired me to pursue a degree in Industrial- Organizational Psychology, yet also instilled a love of research for the betterment of others. I'd also like to thank Dr. Chris Cunningham for developing a graduate program that has inspired me to not only improve as a I-O practitioner, yet also become better as a person. Also, thank you to Dr. O'Leary, who was a steady figure during the ebbs and flows of a rigorous academic experience. Finally, to my cohort who shared this experience with me and taught me how to celebrate accomplishments.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
DEDICATION.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES.....	viii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Conceptualizing Workplace Recovery	2
Recovery Elements and Outcomes	3
Barriers to Workplace Recovery	6
Motivation for Recovery	7
Research Questions and Hypotheses	8
II. STUDY 1: MEASURE DEVELOPMENT.....	11
Participants and Procedure	11
Results	12
Motivations for Recovery Scale Construction.....	18
III. STUDY 2: SCALE VALIDATION.....	19
Participants and Procedure	19
Measures	21
Analytical Overview	23
Results	24
Summary of Support for Research Questions and Hypotheses.....	31
IV. DISCUSSION	40
Recap of Findings.....	40
Implications for Research and Practice	41
Limitations and Future Directions	44
REFERENCES	46

APPENDIX

A. IRB APPROVAL LETTER	50
B. FLIER FOR STUDY 1	52
C. FLIER FOR STUDY 2	54
D. INFORMED CONSENT LETTER AND INTERVIEW SCREENING SURVEY	56
E. INFORMED CONSENT AND VALIDATION SURVEY.....	64
F. INTERVIEW QUESTIONS.....	81
VITA.....	83

LIST OF TABLES

1 Thematic Analysis of Workplace Recovery Motivations from Interviews.....	16
2 Results from a Factor Analysis for the Motivations for Recovery Scale.....	26
3 Correlations for Convergent and Discriminant Validity.....	30
4 Correlations for Hypothesis and Research Question Testing.....	37
5 Correlations for Specific Motivations and Recovery Elements.....	38

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The average person will spend 90,000 hours working in a lifetime, about a third of their life, with the other two-thirds spent sleeping or attempting to enjoy their time away from work (Naber, 2007). “Workplace recovery” reflects an individual’s attempts to restore energy levels in response to the demands of all that work (Janicke et al., 2017; Sonnentag & Fritz, 2007). Existing research on workplace recovery has focused on ways to optimize time away from work while also facilitating better work-life balance. Therefore, workplace recovery occurs when employees engage in some form of self-care during nonwork time. Research suggests that the ability to disengage from work stressors is related to better well-being, improved general health, and increased job performance (Sonnentag & Fritz, 2007; Sonnentag, 2012). Existing research has characterized elements of quality recovery; however, there is a gap in the literature identifying why workers decide to recover from work. Expanding our understanding of individuals' motivation behind recovery activities will provide clarity on the internal process workers rarely intentionally reflect on. For many, engaging in these kinds of activities can either be second nature or non-existent, so it is important to know how organizations can influence employees to hold habitual and impactful recovery to maintain employee well-being and performance. The present study explored employees’ motivations for engaging in recovery activities and examined relationships between different motivations and workplace outcomes,

such as job satisfaction, perceived job stress, and engagement, along with general indicators of well-being.

Conceptualizing Workplace Recovery

Workplace recovery may sound familiar to those who follow media influencers, who have popularized recovery in the form of “self-care.” Self-care scratches the surface, being glorified in the media, reflected in complex skincare routines, coffee in the morning, and TikTok scrolling breaks, which has brought great awareness of the power of a break. These popularized notions of self-care are insufficient and have slacked in showing individuals how to best recover from stress and daily demands. Worse, they can overcomplicate self-care and discourage quality recovery.

Turning to established theory and empirical literature, the Effort Recovery Model proposes that proper recovery requires individuals to detach from their work demands during off-time resulting in a better ability to replenish their energy levels and recover (Meijman & Mulder, 1998). Failure to disengage from work demands increases an individual’s susceptibility to resource depletion which consequently hinders the ability to endure further demands, causing a negative impact to mood and increasing burnout and strain (Sonnentag et al., 2017). Promoting recovery is critical to combating high job demands to reduce the effect of stress and strain (Sonnentag, 2003).

Stress, which can be positive or negative, is a state of arousal in response to work demands (and demands in other domains). Typically, positive stress motivates and energizes workers, whereas negative stress reduces the ability to effectively respond to stimuli. However, all stress damages us physiologically if felt chronically and not interrupted with regular recovery

(Cunningham & Black, 2021). Drawing from the Stressor-Detachment Model, when negative stress is not interrupted by a recovery experience, the stress can turn to strain which can be detrimental to the employee and their organization (Sonnentag & Fritz, 2015; Wendsche et al., 2021). Strain can result in negative affect/emotions, burnout, depression, fatigue, and other serious outcomes (Cunningham & Black, 2021; Wilkinson et al., 2017). Resources that promote recovery experiences can be personal or provided by the organization, so it is important to examine how employers can supply appropriate recovery resources to interrupt the stressor-strain cycle.

Recovery Elements and Outcomes

Past research has found many positive outcomes when workers engage in workplace recovery and identified several key elements to effective recovery (Sonnentag & Fritz, 2007). Of particular note are Sonnentag and Fritz's (2007) four elements of quality workplace recovery: psychological detachment, relaxation, mastery experiences, and control. *Psychological detachment* is a person's ability to separate themselves physically and mentally from work. *Relaxation* is the ability to engage in activities that require little physical and mental activity and lead to increased positive affect. *Mastery* is the act of engaging in challenging experiences and learning opportunities during time off work. *Control* captures an individual's ability to decide what activities they do in their leisure time (Sonnentag & Fritz, 2007).

Of these four elements, psychological detachment has been found to have the strongest relationship with well-being, meaning that when employees engage in detachment from work there is a strong correlation with increased well-being (Headrick et al., 2023; Sonnentag, 2012). Detachment can occur internally and/or externally (Wendsche & Lohmann-Haislah, 2017). On

one hand, detaching internally can look like taking work breaks that involve leaving their desk, going for a short walk, and generally not thinking about job demands during breaks (Coffeng et al., 2015). Engaging in internal detachment has been shown to decrease the need for recovery, fatigue, and increase positive mood (Coffeng et al., 2015). On the other hand, workers can detach externally, so this implies that workers mentally and physically separate from work demands during their nonwork time. Taking walks, socializing with friends, and exercising are examples of external detachment (Steed et al., 2019). Those who detach from work experience less psychological strain, and increased life satisfaction, engagement, psychological well-being and job performance (Sonnentag, 2012; Steed et al., 2019). External detachment and other recovery experiences occurring outside of the workday have been the focus of most recovery research and will be the focus for the proposed study.

Of the remaining elements of recovery, relaxation has been shown to be the second most impactful recovery experience, with decreased psychological distress, work-family conflict, and increased positive affect and life satisfaction (Sonnentag et al., 2017). While mastery experiences and control are also associated with similarly positive outcomes (i.e., less psychological distress and work-family conflict, higher life satisfaction), these elements are not as consistently associated with work and well-being outcomes in the literature compared to psychological detachment and relaxation (Sonnentag et al., 2017).

While there are differences in the effect or impact of each of the four recovery elements just discussed, all are generally associated with improved employee well-being (Singh et al., 2016). Enhancing worker well-being is important because research has shown that poor well-being is associated with decreased work performance and retention and good well-being is related to better life satisfaction, relationships, and physical health (Pierce et al., 2015).

Moreover, when organizations develop and support individual workers' self-efficacy and well-being within the workplace it leads to better performance and engagement, and even a positive spillover effect between work and non-work domains (Adams, 2019).

Spillover occurs when an employee's life outside of work impacts their work quality and life inside of work seeps into their personal life (Lawson et al., 2013). Spillover can either be positive or negative. Positive spillover can be experienced as work-family enrichment, where resources from an individual's personal life enhance that person's work role, and vice versa (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). Positive spillover is associated with higher job satisfaction, physical health, and mental health (McNall et al., 2010). Conversely, negative spillover occurs when stressors and/or demands from work adversely affect home life (Lawson et al., 2013). A common example of negative spillover is work-family conflict which decreases work and life satisfaction, and increases turnover intentions, psychological strain, and mental health (McNall et al., 2010). Recovery processes are directly linked to spillover effects. For example, Sonnentag et al. (2016) found that employees engaged in reenergizing breaks during work had more positive at-home experiences. Additionally, quality recovery outside of work not only combats negative spillover like decreasing work-family conflict, but also relates to improved work performance, reflecting some positive spillover effects (Barber et al., 2019; Sonnentag et al., 2022).

Despite evidence for the positive effects of recovery from work demands, many workers in need of recovery do not seek out such opportunities. This phenomenon has been coined as the *recovery paradox*, where the people who often need recovery the most are the least likely to pursue or obtain it (Sonnentag et al., 2017). It is important to identify additional barriers within the workplace and outside of the workplace that keep employees from engaging in recovery and

hindering motivation. Such research can inform how an organization can provide resources to combat these barriers.

Barriers to Workplace Recovery

Employees face demands inside and outside the workplace, as well as internally and externally to themselves, which can impact their ability to engage in recovery experiences. Outside of the workplace, employees hold many non-work roles which can have a spillover effect on an organization such as being a parent, partner, and caregiver (Barnett & Marshall, 2010). These roles can affect workers' abilities to get quality recovery outside of work. For instance, research has shown that black mothers will sacrifice their own well-being and recovery for caregiving responsibilities (Nichols et al., 2023). Furthermore, parents generally report less leisure and fitness recovery than childless adults; mothers are more likely than fathers to waive their own recovery needs such as leisure time or fitness due to family responsibilities (Taniguchi & Shupe, 2012).

The workplace presents multiple demands that can interfere with the recovery process, such as high workload, low supervisor support, and role ambiguity (Cunningham & Black, 2021; Liu et al., 2008; Meijman & Mulder, 1998; Pejtersen et al., 2010). Hernandez et al. (2021) found that individuals are less likely to engage in recovery activities on high workload days relating to increased stress and lower well-being. While there is limited research on how leadership impacts recovery behaviors, supervisor support has been shown to positively impact employee recovery during non-work hours (Bennett et al., 2016). Increased role ambiguity has been shown to decrease recovery behaviors such as psychological detachment and control (Sonnentag & Fritz, 2007). While this research provides insight on individual role-based barriers and organizational

barriers to engage in workplace recovery, there is limited research on more specific individual motivations for recovery behaviors.

Motivation for Recovery

Efforts to increase recovery behaviors may fail if they do not align with worker motivations to engage in recovery. For instance, if an organization encourages recovery for achieving better results at work, this may not resonate with someone who is not achievement-focused. If self-care interventions were utilized, this would be less influential to someone who is more driven by external achievements. Applying basic motivational theories can aid in developing this dimension of recovery research, ultimately helping practitioners and researchers to provide more appropriate resources to promote recovery, accounting for individual differences in motives. When examining a variety of motivational theories (e.g., McClelland's Need for Achievement theory, Equity Theory, Social Learning Theory, Control Theory, and Self-Determination Theory), I proposed that four main motives to engage in personal recovery may arise in the present study: need to achieve, self-regulation, social comparison, and need to belong.

McClelland's (1965) Need for Achievement theory focused on individual differences in motivated behavior based on the level of their need to achieve goals. It is expected that need for achievement will be positively related to engaging in recovery because, as stated previously, mastery is a popular recovery experience which is typically associated with people who are more goal and achievement oriented (McClelland, 1965). Further, looking at self-determination theory, individuals with achievement motives and an appreciation for the importance of self-care could

view recovery as a necessary component to prepare for being successful and competent at work (Deci & Ryan, 2012).

Control Theory would suggest that the ability and desire to self-regulate would emerge as a motivation for workplace recovery (Klein, 1989). Self-regulation involves the proactive ability to be aware of our resource needs, which could act as a motivator for engaging in recovery behaviors and improving work performance. These individuals may be motivated to regulate for goals of improving personal well-being and/or maintaining optimal performance.

Social comparison provides a third motive for engaging in recovery as some employees will want to engage in workplace recovery because they see others also engaging in recovery activities. Equity Theory and Social Learning Theory have shown that individuals learn acceptable behaviors and are motivated by comparing themselves to other employees and ensuring they receive equal treatment (Adams, 1965; Bandura, 1969).

Lastly, based on a fundamental “need to belong,” I expected that the need to develop relationships with others would arise as a motivation for recovery. Historically, people engage in activities where they will be socially accepted and may be motivated by conforming to other individuals' recovery norms to feel as if they belong (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). Such needs for connection could be motivating for individuals to take time away from work for various socially oriented recovery behaviors.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

There is little to no research on personal motivations for workplace recovery. The present study explores these motivations to develop a novel measure that can be used in future research to assess an individual's motivation to engage in workplace recovery. To do this, I collected

qualitative data from interviews to identify common themes related to personal recovery motivations. Interviews were focused on how participants describe their motivations in their own words. Based on existing research, the need to achieve, social comparison, need to belong, and self-regulation were expected motivators for workplace recovery. The qualitative nature of the interviews further allowed for extracting additional themes that were not predicted. Moreover, these themes predicted or revealed through the qualitative study were used as a foundation to create survey items for a self-report measure of motivations for recovery. The present study used the developed measure in a validation survey to examine how the different motivations related with quality recovery experiences and workplace and personal outcomes. In sum, the following research questions were the focus of the study.

Research Question 1: What different personal motivations exist to engage in workplace recovery?

Research Question 2: Will specific personal motivations for recovery be related to specific elements of effective recovery experiences?

Research Question 3: Will specific personal motivations for recovery be related to better work outcomes (e.g., job satisfaction, work engagement and self-rated performance)?

Research Question 4: Will specific personal motivations for recovery be related to better personal well-being outcomes (i.e., perceived stress, subjective well-being)?

While the research questions are largely exploratory, some general hypotheses can be proposed.

Hypothesis 1: Need to achieve, self-regulation, comparison, and need to belong will be common personal motivations for workplace recovery.

The anticipated motivations can be categorized as predominantly internal (i.e., values or behavioral regulations from within an individual) or external (i.e., values or practices based on outside forces; Deci & Ryan, 2012). Need to achieve and self-regulation are considered internal whereas comparison and need to belong are more external (Andreani, 2006; Deci and Ryan, 2000). Internal motivations have shown to be more stable (Miao et al., 2020), considering these motivations are based on an individual's values that they personally identify with.

Hypothesis 2: Individuals who are motivated by need to achieve and self-regulation will engage in activities that have the key elements to effective recovery (i.e. psychological detachment, relaxation, mastery, detachment).

Hypothesis 2a: Motivations that correlate to the key elements to effective recovery (i.e. psychological detachment, relaxation, mastery, detachment) will relate to better work and personal well-being outcomes.

Hypothesis 2b: Need to achieve may also be particularly strongly correlated with mastery recovery experiences, given the nature of these types of experiences that promote personal challenges and growth.

Hypothesis 3: Individuals who are motivated by comparison and need to belong will still engage in quality recovery experiences, but the relationships between these motives and recovery experiences may be weaker.

Hypothesis 3a: Individuals who are motivated by comparison and need to belong will still engage in positive recovery experiences, but the relationships between these motives and work and well-being outcomes may be weaker.

CHAPTER II

STUDY 1: MEASURE DEVELOPMENT

Participants and Procedure

The first study was a qualitative investigation that served as the foundation for the development of a novel self-report measure to be used for psychological research. The qualitative investigation included a working adult sample of 18 people and was focused on understanding common motivations to recovery. Participants were recruited through a convenience sample, with the pertinent inclusion criteria being age (18 years or older) and employment status (working at least 30 hours per week). Attention was paid to recruiting participants that represent diverse demographic characteristics and occupational roles; importantly, there was variety in the degree of segmentation between their work and home domains and whether they had child dependents, as these factors could impact opportunity for recovery. Each participant received a \$20 amazon gift card, and the exact number of interviews were reached when the researcher hit the point of saturation, or the point where no new themes seem to be emerging.

Before conducting the interview, each participant completed a screening survey. The screening survey included questions regarding various demographic topics (i.e. occupation, dependents, race, age, etc.) and they were asked to provide informed consent, per Institutional Review Board requirements. From there, participants were promptly contacted if they

meecriterion requirements, and an interview was scheduled. Data for creating the new scale were gathered using an open-response interview via Zoom. Interviews were scheduled for 30 minutes yet actual times varied between 10-30 minutes. During the interview, participants were presented with a series of open-ended questions gauging their purpose for recovering from work such as, “why do you engage in recovery activities?” The interview guide is provided in Appendix A. Themes gathered from these interviews were used to generate items to assess motivations for workplace recovery.

In regard to participant demographics, the interviews consisted of 12 females and 6 males. The age range of the participants was 23 to 53, with an average age of 35.16 ($SD = 10.35$). The majority of the sample was white (89%), with the remaining two participants identified as Asian (11%). Half of the participants were married or partnered (50%) followed by single (28%), and in a serious relationship (22%). Half of the sample had dependents (both children and adults), with the average number of dependents being one ($SD = 1.14$).

Regarding education level, 50% held a Master’s degree, 33% had a Bachelor’s degree, 11% of participants had a Doctorate degree, and 6% had an Associate degree or two year degree. The average hours worked per week was 39.86 ($SD = 4.24$). Participants held occupations in varying fields, including healthcare, law, human resources, engineering, education, and service.

Results

Each participant interviewed provided multiple motivations for engaging in recovery activities. Participants were primed to reflect on their internal motivations by being asked about their typical recovery habits and if recovery was important to them. Following their responses to these questions they were asked why recovery was important to them, which was when

participants would speak to their personal motivations for recovery. In investigating Research Question 1, 16 themes were found. The themes are described below and summarized in Table 1.

Several of these themes generally aligned with the idea of self-regulation. Specifically, participants noted the need to regulate their emotions and energy, oftentimes with the goal of protecting one's health. Those themes are described in more detail.

Prevent negative emotions

Many participants mentioned engaging in recovery activities to prevent negative emotions and behaviors. For example, one participant mentioned going to the gym, so they would not be grumpy when they were with their family after work.

Mood regulation

Another common reason for recovery among participants was to regulate their mood. Many participants mentioned they could feel themselves becoming stressed or foresee stressful situations so would engage in recovery to replenish their energy to take on demanding tasks.

Mental health maintenance

It was not uncommon for interviewees to mention engaging in recovery so they could maintain and improve their mental health. Multiple participants mentioned that focusing on mental health was their most important task as it led to them engaging in other important recovery activities such as maintaining their physical health and relationships.

Physical health maintenance

Physical health was a major contributor to engaging in recovery, as it led to many participants speaking to physical activities aiding in better focus and a way to detach from various role demands.

Feel the best

Feel the best and look the best are listed as two separate motivations as participant intentionality were different for each. When participants spoke to *feeling* the best, it was typically in regard to eating healthy, being organized, and general fulfillment for themselves.

Work performance

Very few participants directly spoke of engaging in recovery activities to better their work performance, however many participants would say recovery gave them better focus and energy at work. Which in turn, improved general work performance.

While no themes directly related to social comparison, two themes did relate to social presentation and social learning.

Look the best

Looking the best differed from *feeling* the best in that it was primarily focused on maintaining a specific physique and image.

Leadership promotes self-care

Many participants spoke highly of their leadership, where they felt they could prioritize themselves after seeing their supervisor model self-care. Conversely, many participants in demanding industries (i.e. healthcare) spoke of not having the ability to engage in self-care as it is not prioritized in their organization. So, in those cases, recovery is not even considered due to lack of leadership promotion.

Achievement was somewhat present in a few themes. However, it was more commonly the case that individuals focused more broadly on feeling fulfilled in other roles through good self-care. Participants also talked about recovery contributing to their overall identity and feelings of personal growth.

Fulfillment

It came up during multiple interviews that the motivation behind engaging in recovery activities created a more holistic and fulfilling life for participants. Specifically, prioritizing themselves amongst the multiple roles they filled, whether it was work, parent, partner, etc.

Identity maintenance

Identity maintenance was not as common as other motivations; however, it was a bit of an extension from the fulfillment motivation. Participants that spoke to identity wanted to ensure that their job was not all they were and having hobbies (i.e. recovery activities) helped contribute to creating and preserving personal identity.

Growth mindset

Many participants simply have the innate need to grow and develop which pushes them to have hobbies and take care of themselves.

Favorable outcome

This motivation was only mentioned by a couple of interviewees. This came up when an individual would talk about how while they didn't necessarily want to do a recovery activity (i.e. go to gym), yet they would because they knew it would bring them positive feelings afterwards. So, knowing that there would be a favorable outcome in the future was a motivation for engaging in recovery.

Lastly, a few interviews focused on social connection, congruent with belongingness needs.

Connecting with others

Connecting with others was not a widely used term for participants, however many would talk about being closer with their children or developing friendships as drivers for engaging in

recovery. For instance, a mother talked about playing video games with her child to bond with him which would help her to detach from work.

Finally, some interview themes focused less on the motive, but more on what made the recovery activity more likely. These were mostly focused on role management and accountability from others.

Accountability

During many of the interviews, participants talked about how having someone that ensured they did recovery activities or held a routine with, would increase their likelihood of doing said activity. For instance, it was not uncommon for participants to mention having a workout buddy that ensured they went to the gym.

Boundaries

It was very common for participants with unsegmented jobs to utilize recovery activities as a way to separate work life from non-work life. Those with segmented jobs also mentioned this as a motivation to detach from work, however it was consistently mentioned by individuals who could work from home. The ability to stop work tasks and begin recovery, aided in mentally and physically removing themselves from work.

Table 1 Thematic Analysis of Workplace Recovery Motivations from Interviews

Motivation	Frequency	Example Quote
Prevent negative emotions	6	“Yeah, honestly it helps me feel less stressed because knowing that my house is clean going into the next week, it’s like I don’t have to worry about this.”
Mood regulation	9	“If I’ve had no time to myself, I find myself being grumpy, I am just in a blah mood”

Mental health maintenance	8	“Recovery I think it’s really helpful for the mental emotional impact of work, forces you to switch.”
Physical health maintenance	6	“I threw my back out because I was sitting too long, my abs didn’t exist, like I was not physically taking care of myself, so working out allows me to be more present.”
Feel the best	2	“It makes me feel my best.”
Look the best	3	“You know make me look good, make me feel good. You know maybe attract the attention of some wondering eyes.”
Fulfillment	6	“It makes me more, I don’t know what the word is, like wholehearted, just like fulfilled.”
Identity management	5	“It’s weird but for me, it’s more of a keeping up, like not losing my identity in work.”
Leadership promotes self-care	4	“Nicole does a really great job because as a leader, we see her doing things for herself. As an employee feeling like you have the power to do it because she’s not just saying it, she’s also acting on it.”
Work performance	9	“It makes me better when I’m at work, more focused.”
Accountability	4	“I think having an accountability partner is important, if my sister would have texted me that she wasn’t going to the gym, I would have gladly rolled back over to sleep.”
Boundaries	12	“I guess cliché, but just taking control of my life, you know and actually setting those boundaries, especially from a work perspective.”
Favorable outcome	4	“So, I really think that’s what motivates me, that feeling that I know it will bring me.”
Connection	5	“I like the connection with people, like I have all my little gym friends.”
Growth mindset	5	“I’ve always had this little fire under my hands, it has always been there for me. I just want to constantly grow because the feeling of being stagnant is stressful to me.”

Motivations for Recovery Scale Construction

When creating the Motivations for Recovery scale, it was important to incorporate common motivations that emerged during the interviews and for the scale to be behaviorally oriented. The goal in having a behaviorally oriented scale was to have participants reflect on specific moments of recovery and be able to get into their internal thought process in deciding why they chose to engage in their chosen activity. To further this goal, participants were primed by being given a brief definition of what recovery entails and selecting three activities they engage in during a typical week. This was followed by the Motivations for Recovery scale which asked participants how frequently they were motivated to engage in their chosen recovery activities for each of the identified motivations (see Table 1). The frequency response rate ranged from 0 (Never) to 4 (Always) was chosen as a way to have participants reflect on how often they are motivated by the item provided. The final scale included 16 items corresponding to the 15 identified themes, and the option to choose “other” and write-in own motivation (see Appendix A for Motivations for Recovery scale).

CHAPTER III

STUDY 2: SCALE VALIDATION

Participants and Procedure

The purpose of Study 2 was to gather validity evidence for the resultant Motivations for Recovery scale. The target sample was at least 150 people to reach an appropriate participant-to-scale item ratio of 15:1 (Morgado et al., 2017). However, given recruiting challenges and a limited timeline, data was gathered from 110 participants, recruited through contacts within local organizations, contacts, and using social media platforms. The inclusion criteria were age (18 years or older) and employment status (working at least 30 hours per week). Data was collected using an online survey administered via Qualtrics. Individuals who participated were asked to provide informed consent prior to beginning the survey, per Institutional Review Board requirements. To encourage survey completion, participants had the option to enter to receive one of multiple \$20 amazon gift cards in an incentive drawing.

The survey was posted on various social media websites including; Instagram, LinkedIn, and Facebook, all of which were privately posted to avoid fraudulent survey responses. Furthermore, multiple attention checks were included throughout the survey to serve as an extra precaution. Of the 110 participants, 81 passed the attention checks and were retained for data analysis. Regarding demographics, the sample consisted of 82% females and 18% males. Age range of the participants was 21 to 60, with an average age of 31.67 ($SD = 10.09$). The majority of the sample was white (88%), with the remainder identifying as Hispanic or Latina (4%), Black

or African American (4%), Asian (1%), and Other (3%). 49% of participants were married or partnered followed by in a serious relationship (31%), single (14%), divorced or widowed (4%), and 3% were casually dating. Of the 81 participants, 46% indicated having dependents (both children and adults), ranging from 1 to 5 dependents ($SD = 1.1$).

Regarding education level, 43% held a Bachelor's degree, 32% had a Master's degree, 11% some college, 10% of participants had a Doctorate degree, 4% had an Associate degree or two year degree, and 1% high school diploma or GED. The average hours worked per week was 41.06 ($SD = 10.74$). Participants held occupations in varying industries, including: healthcare, education, insurance, law, service, trade, and human resources. 26% of participants held a position in which they could not complete their work outside of their physical workspace, and 74% held roles where their work could spill over into their non-work life.

Reliability and validity of the Motivations for Recovery scale were tested. To test for validity evidence the survey included convergent and discriminant scales to ensure the Motivations for Recovery scale is accurately measuring our intended construct. Convergent scales were perceived stress, job satisfaction, recovery experiences, satisfaction with life, self-rated job performance, and work engagement (Marcatto et al., 2021; NIOSH; Balducci et al., 2010). These represent good measures for convergent validity because the Motivations for Recovery scale will ideally be moderately related to these work and personal outcomes, given prior research that connects recovery more broadly to these constructs (Sonnetag & Fritz, 2007). Social desirability was included as a discriminant scale to ensure the Motivations for Recovery scale is measuring motivations rather than social desirability (Reynolds, 1982).

Measures

Motivations for Recovery. The M-R scale was developed for the current study following qualitative interviews with participants on their reason for engaging in recovery experiences (Part 1 of the study). Participants were first given a list of recovery activities where they were asked to select up to three options that most similarly match the recovery activities they engage in a typical week. Then, they were asked to answer the prompt “Now considering _____ are your typical recovery activities, how frequently would you say you are motivated to engage in this activity/ these activities for each of the following reasons?” and were given 16 motivations that were identified from the interviews. The items were rated on a scale from 0 (Never) to 4 (Always) with a higher score indicating they were more motivated by a given motivation. Reliability and validity of the measure are described more in the results.

Recovery Experiences. The Recovery Experience Questionnaire (Sonnentag & Fritz, 2007) measured the extent to which participants unwind and re-energize from work during non-work time. Four types of recovery experiences were assessed: psychological detachment, relaxation, mastery, and control. The scale contained 16 items total, with 4 items for each recovery experience. Participants rated the extent to which they experience each item during their non-work time on a five-point Likert scale from 1 (I do not agree at all) to 5 (I fully agree). Higher scores indicated more experiences of that with that specific recovery element. Prior researchers found good reliability for each subscale: Cronbach’s alpha of .84 (psychological detachment), .85 (relaxation), .79 (mastery), and .85 (control). Reliability was similar in the present sample; detachment ($\alpha = .80$), relaxation ($\alpha = .84$), mastery (.84), and control (.77).

Job Satisfaction. The Michigan Organization Assessment Questionnaire (MOAQ; (Bowling & Hammond, 2008) job satisfaction scale was used to measure how satisfied

employees are in the workplace. The scale contained 3 items. For instance, one item stated, “In general, I don’t like my job,” with six response options ranging from 1 (Disagree very much) to 6 (Agree very much). Internal consistency reliability was .84 in prior uses of this scale. The present study established Cronbach's alpha of .90.

Work Engagement. The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES-9; Balducci et al., 2010) was used to measure the level of engagement a participant feels toward work. The scale contained nine items asking items such as, “When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work.” Participants rated items on a scale of 0 (never) to 6 (always). Good reliability was found in prior use of the scale, with a Cronbach’s alpha of .92. The present study established Cronbach's alpha of .91.

Self-Rated Job Performance. The seven-item subscale of the in-role job performance scale was used to measure participants' subjective work performance (Williams & Anderson, 1991). This subscale focused on in-role behaviors and achieved a .91 Cronbach’s alpha in prior use of the measure. The original scale, which is rated by a supervisor, was adapted for self-rated performance. A sample item reworded for self-rating states, “Performs tasks expected of me.” To reduce bias, participants rated items in a comparative format, comparing their performance to a colleague in a similar role. Response options were 1 (worse than most colleagues), 2 (worse than some), 3 (about the same as others), 4 (better than some), and 5 (better than most colleagues). The present study established Cronbach's alpha of .93.

Perceived Stress. The Perceived Stress Scale (Cohen, 1983) measured participants' perceived stress in the last month. The short form of this scale contained four items, such as, “In the last month, how often have you felt that things were going your way?” Participants rated their stress on a scale ranging from 0 (never) to 4 (very often). Higher scores indicated higher

perceived stress. Acceptable reliability was achieved in prior research, with a Cronbach's alpha above .70. The present study established Cronbach's alpha of .73.

Satisfaction with Life. The five-item Satisfaction with Life scale measured subjective well-being (Pavot & Diener, 1993). For instance, one item states, "In most ways my life is close to my ideal," with a seven-point scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). High reliability was achieved in prior uses of the scale, with a Cronbach's alpha of .82. The present study established Cronbach's alpha of .91.

Social Desirability. The Marlowe and Crowne scale measured a respondent's tendency to give socially desirable responses. The scale contained 13 items containing true/ false statements such as, "It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged." This scale was used to check for discriminant validity because we do not want the M-R to measure this attribute. Past research has found acceptable reliability with a Cronbach's alpha of .74 (Reynolds, 1982). A sum score was used for the present study because we felt this scale is better characterized as a composite variable, thus reliability is not reported.

Analytical Overview

A factor analysis was conducted to examine the dimensionality of the newly developed measure, and to explore whether the expected overall categories for motivations were present. After themes were identified, reliability of the Motives for Recovery subscales identified were analyzed using Cronbach's alpha. General relationships between the new scale and perceived stress, job satisfaction, recovery experiences, satisfaction with life, self-rated job performance, and work engagement were examined utilizing a correlational analysis.

Results

Table 2 provides the specific items, factor loadings, and alphas for each subscale. Prior to our analysis, we checked our assumptions using KMO and Bartlett's test. Our assumptions were met, with sufficient variability among our items to support factor analysis. To explore the number of factors underlying our set of items, we first conducted a principal components analysis and a parallel analysis. Four factors, which explained 71% of the variance in the items, had Eigen values greater than 1. The scree plot visually indicated four components as well. A parallel analysis only suggested two components, where random data generated a larger Eigen value than our data at 3 components.

To better assess simple structure, a factor analysis with promax rotation was conducted where all items loaded above .40 on one and only one factor. This two-factor structure emerged as the simplest structure. With factor one relating most with internal motivations (e.g., self-regulation, fulfillment, health, interpersonal), whereas externally related items loaded onto factor two (e.g., social requirements, role performance). It is important to note that only three items loaded onto factor two, while the remaining twelve items loaded onto factor one.

To further examine alternative structures, a factor analysis testing a 3-factor structure was conducted, which explained 63% of variance in the items. Another solution with simple structure emerged with 3 factors, with all items loading above .40 on one and only one factor. Looking further into this, internally related items split into two factors; one being related to self-regulation and the second associated with personal and social development. The third factor kept the same three externally linked items, all of which were particularly role-driven.

To determine whether to proceed with a 2-factor model or a 3-factor model, a scale score was created for each of the three dimensions: self-regulation, personal and social development,

and role. The scale scores were correlated to determine if there may be considerable overlap between any dimensions. The external role motivations dimension was correlated with the other two subscales at .25. Self-regulation motivations and personal development motivations correlated at .64, indicating enough distinction to continue with a 3-factor model as the best option.

Reliability of the subscales was examined by calculating Cronbach's alpha for each identified dimension. Regarding the internally related dimensions, self-regulation demonstrated good internal consistency (Cronbach's $\alpha = .89$), as did the social and personal development factor (Cronbach's $\alpha = .82$). As for the external dimension, role driven motivations represented adequate internal consistency (Cronbach's $\alpha = .75$).

Looking more generally at the descriptive statistics, means ranged from 1.30 to 3.12 for all items. Self-regulation motivations were reported the most with an overall mean of 2.80, compared to social and personal development ($M = 2.64$) and the role driven dimension ($M = 1.52$). Some of the most frequently reported motives at the individual item level were mental health maintenance ($M = 3.12$) and favorable outcomes ($M = 2.96$), both of which were self-regulatory motives. The most reported personal and social development motivations were fulfillment ($M = 2.83$) and identity maintenance (2.70). The most commonly reported external role motivation was to perform better at work ($M = 1.77$). External role-based motivations contained the least reported motivations, such as accountability ($M = 1.30$) and leadership modeling ($M = 1.51$). Within the self-regulation subscale, looking the best ($M = 2.27$) was the least frequent motivation, and creating boundaries was the least utilized motivation for the personal and social factor ($M = 2.41$)

Table 2 Results from a Factor Analysis for the Motivations for Recovery Scale

Item	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Factor Loading		
			Self-Regulate	Personal and Social Development	External Role
To prevent negative emotions (i.e. stress, burnout)	2.86	.79	.430	.128	-.116
To regulate my mood	2.84	.78	.627	-.041	-.018
To maintain my mental health	3.12	.86	.492	.295	-.239
To feel my best	2.91	.93	1.010	-.249	.059
For my physical health	2.62	1.27	.926	-.027	-.053
To look my best	2.27	1.27	.729	.032	.198
Because I know it will make me feel better later	2.96	.93	.655	.199	-.031
To create boundaries between work and personal life	2.41	1.08	.270	.482	-.075

To feel connected with others	2.63	1.08	.019	.794	.079
To grow and develop as a person	2.65	1.07	-.086	.732	-.019
To feel fulfilled	2.83	.92	-.099	.635	.052
To maintain an identity outside of work	2.70	1.18	.333	.504	.108
Because my boss promotes prioritizing self-care	1.51	1.31	-.247	.090	.703
Because someone holds me accountable	1.30	1.20	.182	.017	.780
To perform my best at work	1.77	1.29	.016	-.034	.634
Cronbach's <i>a</i>			.89	.82	.75

Note. *N*=81

Table 3 provides the correlations for convergent and discriminant validity evidence for the three subscales. Convergent validity is found when the newly developed subscales are moderately and significantly correlated with theoretically similar constructs; there were mixed results for the three dimensions. Recovery experiences were significantly and positively correlated with all motivations for recovery, except for external role. Thus, more internal motivations seemed to correlate with better recovery elements, while external motivations did not necessarily relate to more restorative recovery.

Regarding work-related variables, work engagement was not significantly correlated with self-regulation, but was positively correlated with the personal/social development and external role dimensions. Thus, being motivated for more developmental or role-based reasons seems to related to work-related emotions (i.e., engagement), while being motivated for personal regulation may not translate to better work-related attitudes. Job satisfaction was only correlated with role-driven items, which makes sense to some degree, as those items were more directly related to work factors. Self-rated work performance was not related to any dimensions, which could be a function of rating one's own performance as unreliable.

Next, considering personal well-being outcomes, perceived stress was not correlated with external role-driven motivation, however self-regulation and personal/social development motivations had a negative relationship with perceived stress, indicating stress was rated lower the more frequently these motivations were endorsed. Life satisfaction was the only measure used for convergent validity that significantly and positively correlated with all motivations. In sum, the varied relationships for convergent validity may be a result of the small sample size, or an insufficient or inadequate measure of the intended construct. Nonetheless, motivations were

generally related to better recovery and better well-being, though to a lesser degree if motivations were driven by external roles.

Discriminant validity was evidenced by no significant correlations between the newly developed scale and a theoretically dissimilar construct. Social desirability was used as the discriminant measure which was not related to any of the Motivations for Recovery subscales. Therefore, the measured motivations were not overly influenced by a desire to give socially acceptable response.

Table 3 Correlations for Convergent and Discriminant Validity

Variable	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3
1. Self-regulate	81	2.80	.76	-	-	-
2. Social and Personal Development	81	2.64	.82	-	-	-
3. External Role	81	1.52	1.03	-	-	-
<i>Convergent Validity</i>						
4. Recovery Experiences	81	3.48	.53	.34**	.36**	0.21
5. Engagement	81	4.34	.97	.19	.31**	.50**
6. Work performance	81	3.26	.39	-.09	-.04	-.02
7. Perceived Stress	81	1.87	.60	-.33**	-.33**	-.08
8. Life Satisfaction	81	5.01	1.29	.32**	.40**	.26*
9. Job Satisfaction	81	4.33	1.35	.04	.09	.37**
<i>Discriminant Validity</i>						
10. Social Desirability	81	19.84	2.91	.17	.17	-.02

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

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

Summary of Support for Research Questions and Hypotheses

The first research question sought to answer what different personal motivations existed to engage in workplace recovery which was addressed previously in Table 1. Hypothesis 1 further addressed this question by predicting that four common personal motivations would arise; need to achieve, self-regulation, comparison, and need to belong. Results from the factor analysis partially supported the prediction, with self-regulation emerging as a theme. However, the remaining two factors were not fully congruent with initial predictions. Five items loaded onto the second factor which related to social and personal development. This could be related to social comparison to some degree, but is still more inwardly focused. The social dimension could also be related to some need to achieve as growth and development are at the core of both of these variables. Three items loaded onto a factor that was driven by role demands (relational, work, subordinate). While this could be related to a need to belong to some degree, it was more a factor influenced by social roles and role requirements than a desire for connection.

The self-regulation motivational dimension can be characterized as the ability to combat feelings of stress or strain before they actually occur. So, individuals driven by self-regulation to engage in recovery activities may be especially in tune with recognizing and foreseeing negative emotions (i.e. stress, strain) and know what they need to either maintain or regain energy. On the other hand, those motivated by personal development are more likely to engage in recovery activities if they feel that it will contribute to their growth as a person. While many recovery activities can contribute to this factor, something that makes this motivation unique from the others is that there is a certain level of fulfillment tied to this motivation. For instance, a recovery activity like working out can contribute to growth, however there is not an obvious tie to internal development like journaling would have. Lastly, those who are motivated by social roles may be

more inclined to engage in recovery activities if there is another person who is impacting their decision. For instance, an individual motivated by social roles may not regularly work out because they particularly enjoy it, but instead do this activity because the individual needs to fill the role of a workout partner. So, there is a certain level of perceiving someone else's needs, and taking on a role that meets those needs.

As previously noted, two of the three subscales tended to correlate with more recovery experiences. Research Question 2 was largely focused on understanding more nuanced relationships between motivation dimensions and specific elements of recovery experiences. It was hypothesized that those motivated by the need to achieve and self-regulation would engage in activities that have more key elements to effective recovery. This was examined by running a correlational analysis between recovery elements (i.e. detachment, relaxation, mastery, and control) and the identified motivation themes (self-regulation, social, and role). Referring to Table 4, there were some interesting relationships that arose. Surprisingly, detachment was not significantly correlated with any of the motivation dimensions. Furthermore, in more nuanced analyses at the item level, detachment was only related to one of the 15 motivations, maintaining mental health (see Table 5). This could raise concerns, considering detachment has been identified as the recovery element most related to well-being benefits, yet none of the motivational dimensions associated with detachment. Alternatively, it may be that detachment is more a function of engaging in the activity versus the motivation for doing so. In other words, detachment may be achieved, regardless of why one engages in the recovery activity to begin with.

Relaxation was significantly correlated with all three dimensions of the Motivations for Recovery scale. Thus, those who are more motivated to recover, regardless of the reason, are

more likely to experience relaxation in their non-work time. Considering the two most common recovery activities were watching TV/movies and sleeping/napping, this relationship does make sense. Both recovery elements, mastery and control, were strongly correlated with self-regulation and social and personal development, but neither elements were related to the external role dimension. Thus, individuals motivated for more internal reasons were likely to experience mastery and control in their non-work time, while those motivated for external reasons were not necessarily more likely to experience such recovery elements.

Overall, Hypothesis 2 was partially supported. While need to achieve did not specifically emerge as a theme, social and personal development contained multiple items that could have similar attributes to achievement (i.e. growth, fulfillment). Social and personal development and self-regulation were strongly correlated with three of the four key elements to effective recovery, which partially aligns with initial predictions that more internal motivations would be related to better recovery.

Motivations that were more highly correlated with the key elements to effective recovery, did not consistently relate to better work and personal well-being outcomes. Self-regulation had significant relationships with only two well-being outcomes: perceived stress ($r = -.33$) and life satisfaction ($r = .32$). Thus, when participants are more motivated by self-regulation their perceived stress decreases and life satisfaction increases. Self-regulation was not related to any of the work outcomes. While individuals motivated by self-regulation may have better personal well-being, this does not necessarily translate into better work outcomes. In other words, if you are motivated by self-regulation to recover, it does not mean you are necessarily feeling and performing better at work.

Personal and social development was related to three of the five work and personal well-being outcomes: engagement ($r = .31$), perceived stress ($r = -.33$), and life satisfaction ($r = .40$). However, personal and social development was not related to job satisfaction. This could be due to these specific motivations being less oriented towards external influences, such as work, and more internally focused. Personal and social development was related to both of the personal well-being outcomes, which would make sense as personal development is tied to a certain level of fulfillment and meaning. While personal and social development is only related to one work outcome, work engagement, this is important to note. Organizations who are having issues with work engagement may benefit from implementing resources to recover related to personal/social development. For example, investing in employees by offering cross-training, attending conferences, technical and interpersonal training, and meaningful work would all likely be motivators.

Role-driven motivations were significantly correlated with job satisfaction ($r = .37$), alongside engagement ($r = .50$) and life satisfaction ($r = .26$). This was slightly surprising considering role was only correlated with one key element to recovery (i.e. relaxation), yet individuals motivated to recover for external role reasons were more likely to report higher work engagement and job satisfaction. Role-driven motivation coefficients were as strong or stronger than the other two motivation dimensions when it came to work-related outcomes. So, while self-regulation and personal development had stronger relationships with personal well-being outcomes, role motivation was more strongly related to work outcomes, which partially supports Hypothesis 2a and Hypothesis 3a. While this could be due to role motivational items being more directly tied to work related language, this still shows that being motivated by social roles may lead to better work outcomes like engagement and job satisfaction. Considering this dimension

includes some aspect of supervisor support and accountability, it would be important for organizations to know that those motivated by social roles are motivated to recover by leaders and colleagues with some level of influence.

Hypothesis 2b was focused on need to achieve and how it would relate more highly with mastery experiences. While need to achieve did not emerge as a theme, personal/social development does have multiple items related to achievement, such as growth and fulfillment. Consequently, the personal and social development dimension is strongly related to mastery experiences and has a stronger coefficient than the other two motivation dimensions. When reframing need to achieve as social and personal development, Hypothesis 2b was supported. While this was touched on briefly, with personal development being strongly related to mastery experiences it will be important for organizations to provide resources that require some level of growth. So, again leaning on learning and development opportunities will be key in motivating recovery habits with these kinds of employees. Furthermore, providing benefits related to personal development and growth that encourage recovery (i.e. therapy, wellness, mindfulness) will aid in hiring and retention.

Lastly, Hypothesis 3 proposed that individuals who are motivated by social comparison and need to belong would have weaker correlations with key elements to recovery. While neither social comparison nor need to belong were clear themes that emerged, they were identified as external motivations. Based on the factor analysis conducted previously, the external role dimension would be considered our external dimension. When replacing social comparison and need to belong with the role dimension, Hypothesis 3 is supported. As role dimension was only strongly correlated with relaxation, but not the other three recovery elements, and had a weaker correlation than self-regulation and personal development. These patterns of relationships

suggest that external motivations have weaker relationships with key elements to recovery compared to internal motivations (i.e. self-regulation and social). Considering that being motivated by social roles does not relate to as many recovery elements and is not as strongly correlated with personal well-being outcomes this could likely mean these employees are less motivated to engage in recovery outside of work and/or that those motivations are less likely to translate into quality, restorative recovery time.

Table 4 Correlations for Hypothesis and Research Question Testing

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. Self-regulate	2.80	.76	-										
2. Personal/Social	2.64	.82	.62**	-									
3. External Role	1.52	1.03	0.17	.25*	-								
4. Detachment	2.77	.85	.19	.07	-.00	-							
5. Relaxation	3.84	.60	.30**	.38**	.29**	.33**	-						
6. Mastery	3.59	.75	.29**	.34**	.14	.13	.47**	-					
7. Control	3.72	.74	.22*	.30**	.21	.29**	.58**	.41**	-				
8. Engagement	4.34	.97	.19	.31**	.50**	.08	.24*	.27*	.29**	-			
7. Work performance	3.26	.39	-.09	-.04	-.02	-.03	.04	-.07	.28*	.10	-		
8. Perceived Stress	1.87	.60	-.33**	-.33**	-.08	-.19	-.35**	-.19	-.21	-.28*	.10	-	
9. Life Satisfaction	5.01	1.29	.32**	.40**	.26*	.14	.29**	.31**	.17	.51**	.05	-.41**	-
10. Job Satisfaction	4.33	1.35	.04	.09	.37**	.14	.16	.08	.16	.73**	-.02	-.37**	.40**

Notes. *N*=81

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

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

Table 5 Correlations for Specific Motivations and Recovery Elements

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1. Prevent negative - emotions															
2. Regulate mood	.66**														
3. Maintain mental health	.54**	.53**													
4. Feel my best	.45**	.55**	.58**												
5. Physical health	.34**	.45**	.46**	.78**											
6. Look my best	.34**	.47**	.43**	.66**	.73**										
7. Favorable outcome	.39**	.44**	.54**	.71**	.62**	.63**									
8. Boundaries	.23*	.30**	.40**	.26*	.22*	.39**	.41**								
9. Connection	.29**	.20	.35**	.27*	.18	.25*	.31**	.40**							
10. Growth	.15	.29**	.41**	.56**	.57**	.61**	.64**	.49**	.43**						
11. Fulfillment	.30**	.31**	.42**	.59**	.38**	.41**	.43**	.40**	.30**	.53**					
12. Identity	.32**	.22*	.41**	.49**	.38**	.49**	.48**	.53**	.48**	.66**	.55**				
13. Leadership promotion	-.02	.01	-.15	-.05	-.07	.09	-.01	.06	.01	.03	.01	.20			
14. Accountability	-.08	.05	-.04	.11	0.12	.20	.11	.05	.23*	.19	.02	0.13	.43**		

15. Work performance	.17	.25*	.11	.27*	.33**	.43**	.25*	.20	.24*	.38**	.21	.31**	.54**	.52**	
16. Detachment	.08	.16	.23*	.15	.16	.15	.09	.05	-.03	.11	.11	.03	.08	-.09	-.01
17. Relaxation	.08	.14	.23*	.31**	.23*	.25*	.37**	.34**	.06	.35**	.33**	.35**	.30**	.13	.28*
18. Mastery	-.01	.15	.25*	.31**	.19	.29**	.33**	.12	.19	.49**	.33**	.21	.07	.09	.18
19. Control	-.05	.21	.11	.21	.23*	.29**	.11	.20	.14	.34**	.27*	.21	.12	.14	.26*

Notes. N=81

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

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

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

Recap of Findings

The present study was designed to identify motivations for recovery and the relationships between different motivations and work and personal outcomes. Motivations that came up during interviews were not exactly what were predicted, but many of the themes had some overlap. It was hypothesized that need to achieve, self-regulation, social comparison, and need to belong would arise as the primary motivational themes. After a thematic analysis of interview data, self-regulation, personal growth, social presentation/ learning, and need to belong appeared to be the main motivational themes. However, after generating self-report items reflecting these themes and conducting a factor analysis we were able to show only partial support for Hypothesis 1, with self-regulation, social and personal development, and external roles emerging as the underlying dimensions.

Hypothesis 2 was mostly supported as social/personal development and self-regulation were strongly correlated with three of the four key elements to effective recovery. Therefore, those who are more motivated by internal factors (such as social/personal development and self-regulation) engage in more and/or better activities that foster more positive elements of recovery. Hypothesis 2a further explored this idea by seeing if those motivations that are correlated with the key elements to recovery, also relate to better work and personal well-being outcomes. This was partially supported as self-regulation and social/personal development were significantly

related to personal well-being outcomes, however they were not as correlated with work outcomes. Furthermore, social/personal development was particularly more strongly correlated with mastery experiences than the other motivations, supporting Hypothesis 2b.

Hypothesis 3 was supported as role dimension was only significantly correlated with relaxation, and had a weaker correlation than self-regulation and personal development with recovery experiences and well-being outcomes. Role driven motivations had stronger relationships with work outcomes, yet weaker relationships with personal well-being, resulting in Hypothesis 3a being partially supported.

Looking more specifically at the recovery elements, it was very surprising to see detachment not correlate with any of the motivational themes, while the other recovery elements related to at least one or more. It could be due to the majority of the sample holding unsegmented jobs (74%), and many of the segmented roles listed leaned towards highly emotionally demanding (i.e. healthcare, law, education) which could lead to an inability to detach from work demands. Furthermore, it could be due to detachment acting as a function of recovery rather than relating to choosing specific activities. Detachment can be involved in essentially any recovery activity that takes place, so it may be experienced for individuals motivated to recover in varying degrees and for varying reasons.

Implications for Research and Practice

Four potential motivations were predicted, but three primary motivations emerged. Self-regulation was an expected motivation that emerged. While self-regulation motivations related to positive recovery and well-being, it did not relate to work outcomes. While reasons for this possibility are explored in the results section, I'd like to further discuss possible variables that

were not looked at in the study that could impact this relationship. Self-regulation may not be a strong motivator for recovery in regards to workplace outcomes due to deadlines and schedules already being in place, however it would be interesting to see if self-regulation would emerge as a predictor of work outcomes if an employee engaged in high amount of job crafting or had higher levels of autonomy in their work. Future research could include measures that gauge these variables, as they could act as moderators between self-regulation as a motivation and work outcomes (i.e. engagement, performance, job satisfaction).

Moreover, in regards to self-regulation as a motivation to recover there was a strong correlation with personal well-being outcomes and recovery elements. While there is a lack of direct correlation between self-regulation and work outcomes, it would still be beneficial for employers to understand how motivated their employees are by self-regulation in their personal lives. As past research has found that our personal and work lives highly influence one another, providing recovery resources and benefits that promote behaviors of self-regulation could increase satisfaction within an employees personal life which would positively spillover into their work life. For an organization this could look like providing training on recognizing symptoms of strain or implementing a flexible schedule for employees to prioritize themselves.

Personal development was an interesting motivational theme to emerge, in regards to recovery. As discussed previously, within the workplace utilizing learning and development initiatives would be a strong way to motivate employees to recover. However, as personal development becomes an increasingly valued piece of our society, it is also becoming an integral part of our work experience. With this in mind, if an organization is also wanting to attract and retain employees that value and are motivated to recover by personal development, they should also have benefits and resources in place that reflect this sentiment. For instance, providing

compensation for therapy, wellness, and practicing mindfulness would possibly be beneficial in attracting employees who value recovery for personal/social or even self-regulation reasons.

Those who were motivated to recover by external roles also tended to report better work outcomes and life satisfaction, but these motivations did not strongly relate to recovery elements. This finding was interesting as it would have been assumed that stronger work outcomes would be associated with stronger recovery elements, however this was not the case for social roles. While it is discussed above that this could be due to the more directly used work language for the role motivation, it is important to understand this implication. If external roles do not have a motivational influence on recovery elements, this could mean that motivating employees to recover solely using roles and external factors could lead to a lack of positive spillover within an employees personal life. While this is not an issue for the organization in the short term, this could cause issues for retaining and committing employees in the long-term, as well as detract from workers' well-being. Utilizing motivations for social roles is important for creating a positive work environment, and hopefully supportive work relationships. However, if organizations focus solely on enforcing social roles as a motivator, this may not as directly support the accumulation of recovery resources that improve personal life. So, if an organization finds their workforce to be largely motivated to recover by social roles, it may also be beneficial to understand other intrinsically motivating factors for them as this would pair strongly with social roles to improve the employees recovery experience more holistically.

All three emerged motivations significantly correlated with relaxation. Overall, this could mean that if employees are motivated for all of these reasons, it would be important for the organization to promote recovery activities that encourage relaxation (i.e. reading, napping, sleep). However, individuals motivated by self-regulation and social development have a

multitude of recovery elements that organizations can provide resources for. For example, activities that involve challenges, new experiences, relaxation, and a higher level of autonomy to increase control over recovery.

Limitations and Future Directions

The first and most important limitation of this study was the lack of diversity represented for the interviews and the survey. For both, the sample was primarily white and female, which cannot be generalized to the larger population. The sample was composed of fairly educated individuals in higher-skill jobs. This could have happened due to using convenience and snowball sampling for each method, creating a homogenous sample. In regards to the interviews, the sample was also limited to those who had access to zoom, creating even more bounds to stay within. Future research could benefit from doing interviews in-person and going into the community to get a wider range of voices. Considering half the sample held a masters degree, this is ungeneralizable to the broader working population. Motivations could greatly differ between economic status, which should be taken into account for further research.

Another important limitation was the smaller sample for the validation study. Research shows that when creating a new measure there should be a ratio of at least ten participants per item, however the present study only reached around five participants per item. Considering this survey was only sent to local contacts and private social media accounts, it makes sense that the participation goal was not reached. However, future research could crowdsource the survey to reach the appropriate item to participant ratio.

Lastly, all emerged motivations were positively oriented. While it is not surprising that interviewees didn't mention less socially desirable motives, such as comparison, equity, and

fitting in, interview questions could aim at this specifically in the future. A motive oriented like this could be interviewees expressing the need to keep up with their social group's accomplishments, or even stating that they went on a vacation because someone else in their office took time off.

REFERENCES

- Balducci, C., Fraccaroli, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2010). Psychometric Properties of the Italian version of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (uwes-9). *European Journal of Psychological Assessment, 26*(2), 143–149. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000020>
- Bandura, A. (1969). Social learning of moral judgments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 11*(3), 275–279. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0026998>
- Barnett, R. C., & Marshall, N. L. (1992). Worker and mother roles, spillover effects, and psychological distress. *Women & Health, 18*(2), 9–40. https://doi.org/10.1300/j013v18n02_02
- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin, 117*(3), 497-529. [doi:https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.117.3.497](https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.117.3.497)
- Bennett, A. A., Gabriel, A. S., Calderwood, C., Dahling, J. J., & Trougakos, J. P. (2016). Better together? Examining profiles of employee recovery experiences. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 101*(12), 1635–1654. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000157>
- Bowling, N. A., & Hammond, G. D. (2008). A meta-analytic examination of the construct validity of the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire Job Satisfaction Subscale. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 73*(1), 63–77. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2008.01.004>
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2017, June 14). *Organization of work: Generic job stress questionnaire*. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Retrieved February 17, 2023, from <https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/topics/workorg/detail088.html>
- Coffeng, J. K., van Sluijs, E. M., Hendriksen, I. J. M., van Mechelen, W., & Boot, C. R. L. (2015). Physical activity and relaxation during and after work are independently associated with the need for recovery. *Journal of Physical Activity and Health, 12*(1), 109–115. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jpah.2012-0452>
- Cohen, S., Kamarck, T., & Mermelstein, R. (1983). A global measure of perceived stress. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 24*, 385-396. <https://ohnurses.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/Perceived-Stress-Scale-4.pdf>
- Cooper, C. L., & Cartwright, S. (1997). An intervention strategy for workplace stress. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 43*(1), 7–16. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0022-3999\(96\)00392-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0022-3999(96)00392-3)

- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2012). Self-determination theory. In P. A. M. Van Lange, A. W. Kruglanski, & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of theories of social psychology* (pp. 416–436). Sage Publications Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446249215.n21>
- Fritz, C., Yankelevich, M., Zarubin, A., & Barger, P. (2010). Happy, healthy, and productive: The role of detachment from work during nonwork time. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(5), 977–983. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019462>
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Powell, G. N. (2006). When work and family are allies: A theory of work-family enrichment. *The Academy of Management Review*, 31(1), 72–92. <https://doi.org/10.2307/20159186>
- Headrick, L., Newman, D. A., Park, Y. A., & Liang, Y. (2023). Recovery experiences for work and health outcomes: A meta-analysis and recovery-engagement-exhaustion model. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 38(4), 821–864. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-022-09821-3>
- Hernandez, R., Pyatak, E. A., Vigen, C. L. P., Jin, H., Schneider, S., Spruijt-Metz, D., & Roll, S. C. (2021). Understanding Worker Well-Being Relative to High-Workload and Recovery Activities across a Whole Day: Pilot Testing an Ecological Momentary Assessment Technique. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(19), 10354. MDPI AG. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/ijerph181910354>
- Janicke, S. H., Rieger, D., Reinecke, L., & Connor, W. (2017). Watching online videos at work: The role of positive and meaningful affect for recovery experiences and well-being at the Workplace. *Mass Communication and Society*, 21(3), 345–367. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15205436.2017.1381264>
- Kim, S., Furst-Holloway, S., Hollensbe, E., Masterson, S., Sprinkle, T., & Bologna, D. (2019). A qualitative study of “online” work breaks. *Organization Management Journal*, 16(4), 235–250. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15416518.2019.1663142>
- Lawson, K. M., Davis, K. D., Crouter, A. C., & O’Neill, J. W. (2013). Understanding work-family spillover in hotel managers. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 33, 273–281. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2012.09.003>
- Marcatto, F., Di Blas, L., Luis, O., Festa, S., & Ferrante, D. (2022). The perceived occupational stress scale. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 38(4), 293–306. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000677>
- McNall, L. A., Nicklin, J. M., & Masuda, A. D. (2010). A meta-analytic review of the consequences associated with work-family enrichment. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25(3), 381–396. [doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-009-9141-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-009-9141-1)
- Meijman, T. F., & Mulder, G. (1998). Psychological aspects of workload. In P. J. D. Drenth & H. Thierry (Ed.), *Handbook of work and organizational psychology*. Vol. 2: Work psychology (pp. 5–33). Hove, England: Psychology.

- Morgado, F. F. R., Meireles, J. F. F., Neves, C. M., Amaral, A. C. S., & Ferreira, M. E. C. (2017). Scale development: ten main limitations and recommendations to improve future research practices. *Psicologia, reflexao e critica : revista semestral do Departamento de Psicologia da UFRGS*, 30(1), 3. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41155-016-0057-1>
- Naber, A. (2007). One third of your life is spent at work. Gettysburg College.
- Nichols, T. R., Gringle, M. R., & Pulliam, R. M. (2015). “You have to put your children’s needs first or you’re really not a good mother”: Black Motherhood and Self-Care Practices. *Women, Gender, and Families of Color*, 3(2), 165–189. <https://doi.org/10.5406/womgenfamcol.3.2.0165>
- Pavot, W., & Diener, E. (1993). Review of the satisfaction with life scale. *Psychological Assessment*, 5(2), 164-172. [doi:https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.5.2.164](https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.5.2.164)
- Phan, V., & Beck, J. W. (2022). Why do people (not) take breaks? an investigation of individuals’ reasons for taking and for not taking breaks at work. *Journal of Business and Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-022-09866-4>
- Pierce, J. L., Gardner, D. G., & Crowley, C. (2015). Organization-based self-esteem and well-being: Empirical examination of a spillover effect. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 25(2), 181–199. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432x.2015.1028377>
- Reynolds. (1982). Development of reliable and valid short forms of the marlowe-crowne social desirability scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 38(1), 119–125. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-4679\(198201\)38:13.0.CO;2-I](https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-4679(198201)38:13.0.CO;2-I)
- Singh, P., Burke, R. J., & Boekhorst, J. (2016). Recovery after work experiences, employee well-being and intent to quit. *Personnel Review*, 45(2), 232-254. [doi:https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-07-2014-0154](https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-07-2014-0154)
- Sinval, J., van Veldhoven, M., Oksanen, T., Azevedo, L. F., Atallah, Á. N., Melnik, T., & Marôco, J. (2021). Interventions for improving recovery from work. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, 2022(7). <https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.cd014518>
- Sonnentag, S., & Fritz, C. (2014). Recovery from job stress: The stressor-detachment model as an integrative framework. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 36(S1). <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1924>
- Sonnentag, S., & Fritz, C. (2007). The Recovery Experience Questionnaire: Development and validation of a measure for assessing recuperation and unwinding from work. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 12(3), 204–221. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.12.3.204>

- Sonnentag, S., Venz, L., & Casper, A. (2017). Advances in recovery research: What have we learned? What should be done next? *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 22*(3), 365-380. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000079>
- Steed, L. B., Swider, B. W., Keem, S., & Liu, J. T. (2019). Leaving work at work: A meta-analysis on employee recovery from work. *Journal of Management, 47*(4), 867–897. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206319864153>
- Taniguchi, H., & Shupe, F. L. (2012). Gender and family status differences in leisure-time sports/fitness participation. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport, 49*(1), 65–84. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1012690212454762>
- Tetrick, L. E., & Winslow, C. J. (2015). Workplace Stress Management Interventions and Health Promotion. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 2*(1), 583–603. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032414-111341>
- Wendsche, J., de Bloom, J., Syrek, C., & Vahle-Hinz, T. (2021). Always on, never done? how the mind recovers after a stressful workday? *German Journal of Human Resource Management: Zeitschrift Für Personalforschung, 35*(2), 117–151. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23970022211004598>
- Wendsche, J., & Lohmann-Haislah, A. (2017). A meta-analysis on antecedents and outcomes of detachment from work. *Frontiers in Psychology, 7*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.02072>
- Wilkinson, H., Whittington, R., Perry, L., & Eames, C. (2017). Examining the relationship between burnout and empathy in healthcare professionals: A systematic review. *Burnout Research, 6*, 18–29. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.burn.2017.06.003>
- Virtanen, A., De Bloom, J. & Kinnunen, U. Relationships between recovery experiences and well-being among younger and older teachers. *Int Arch Occup Environ Health 93*, 213–227 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00420-019-01475-8>
- Zijlstra, F. R., & Sonnentag, S. (2006). After work is done: Psychological perspectives on recovery from work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 15*(2), 129–138. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13594320500513855>

APPENDIX A

IRB APPROVAL LETTER

Institutional Review Board

Dept 4915
615 McCallie Avenue
Chattanooga, TN 37403
Phone: (423) 425-5867
Fax: (423) 425-4052
instrb@utc.edu
<http://www.utc.edu/irb>

TO: Julia Anglin **IRB # 23-119**
Dr. Kristen Black

FROM: Dr. Cheryl Murphy, Director of Research Integrity
Dr. Susan Davidson, IRB Committee Chair

DATE: 11/8/23

SUBJECT: IRB #23-119: Motivations for Recovery from Work

Thank you for submitting your application for exemption to The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga Institutional Review Board. Your proposal was evaluated in light of the federal regulations that govern the protection of human subjects.

Specifically, 45 CFR 46.104(d) identifies studies that are exempt from IRB oversight. The UTC IRB Chairperson or his/her designee has determined that your proposed project falls within the category described in the following subsection of this policy:

46.104(d)(2)(ii): Research only includes educational tests, surveys, interviews, public observation and information is recorded with identifiers and IRB conducts limited review of privacy and confidentiality

Even though your project is exempt from further IRB review, the research must be conducted according to the proposal submitted to the UTC IRB. If changes to the approved protocol occur, a revised protocol must be reviewed and approved by the IRB before implementation. For any proposed changes in your research protocol, please submit an Application for Changes, Annual Review, or Project Termination/Completion form to the UTC IRB. Please be aware that changes to the research protocol may prevent the research from qualifying for exempt review and require submission of a new IRB application or other materials to the UTC IRB.

A goal of the IRB is to prevent negative occurrences during any research study. However, despite our best intent, unforeseen circumstances or events may arise during the research. If an unexpected situation or adverse event happens during your investigation, please notify the UTC IRB as soon as

The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga is a comprehensive, community-engaged campus of the University of Tennessee System. 

1 of 2

possible. Once notified, we will ask for a complete explanation of the event and your response. Other actions also may be required depending on the nature of the event.

Please refer to the protocol number denoted above in all communication or correspondence related to your application and this approval.

For additional information, please consult our web page <http://www.utc.edu/irb> or email instrb@utc.edu.

Best wishes for a successful research project. |

APPENDIX B

FLIER FOR STUDY 1

RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS NEEDED

Motivations for Recovering from Work

WHAT IS THE STUDY ABOUT?

This thesis is being designed and executed by a graduate student in the Industrial-Organizational Psychology Masters program at University of Tennessee at Chattanooga.

Recovery behaviors can look like participating in enjoyable, re-energizing, and/or self-care activities during non-work time. The purpose of this study is to identify employee reason(s) to engage in recovery behaviors and create a measure that can be used in organizations. The measure will hopefully aid in creating relevant workplace interventions to better worker health and well-being.

WHO CAN JOIN?

You can participate in this study if you are 18 years or older and work at least 30 hours a week.

WHAT WILL I BE ASKED TO DO?

1. Complete screening survey

The screening survey is used to gather certain demographic, work-related, and non-work role information. The purpose is to ensure we have a representative sample.

2. Zoom interview

If you meet the requirements in the screening survey, you will be invited to do an interview over zoom. The interview will take 30 minutes and will consist of various open-ended questions. Questions will pertain to purposes for engaging in recovery.

HOW DO I JOIN?

Click the direct survey link below for the screening survey or contact Julia Anglin. Survey link:

https://utk.co1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_25zERR4kvmpc7JA

This research has been reviewed and approved by the UTC IRB (irb@utc.edu) IRB # 23-119



WHY PARTICIPATE?

- \$20 Gift Card
- Contribute to research!
- Help a student complete a thesis!



JULIA ANGLIN

Master's Candidate, UTC I-O Psychology

Please contact me if you are interested in my research:

Email: hbk521@mocs.utc.edu

Faculty Advisor: Dr. Kristen Black

Email: kristen-j-black@utc.edu

APPENDIX C

FLIER FOR STUDY 2

RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS NEEDED

Motivations for Recovering from Work

WHAT IS THE STUDY ABOUT?

This thesis is being designed and executed by a graduate student in the Industrial-Organizational Psychology Masters program at University of Tennessee at Chattanooga.

Recovery behaviors can look like participating in enjoyable, re-energizing, and/or self-care activities during non-work time. The purpose of this study is to identify employee reason(s) to engage in recovery behaviors and create a measure that can be used in organizations. The measure will hopefully aid in creating relevant workplace interventions to better worker health and well-being.

WHO CAN JOIN?

You can participate in this study if you are 18 years or older and work at least 30 hours a week.

WHAT WILL I BE ASKED TO DO?

You will be asked to complete an online survey administered via Qualtrics. There will be questions relating to work and personal well-being, and should take approximately 10-15 minutes.

HOW DO I JOIN?

If you are interested, please contact Julia Anglin. Contact information to the right. You can also click the link below to be directed to the survey.

Survey link:
https://utk.co1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_37MCSjOYvSqTMUu

This research has been reviewed and approved by the UTC IRB (irb@utc.edu)
IRB # 23-119



WHY PARTICIPATE?

- Enter to win a \$20 Gift Card
- Contribute to research!
- Help a student complete a thesis!



JULIA ANGLIN

Master's Candidate, UTC I-O Psychology

Please contact me if you are interested in my research:

Email: hbk521@mocs.utc.edu

Faculty Advisor: Dr. Kristen Black

Email: kristen-j-black@utc.edu

APPENDIX D

INFORMED CONSENT LETTER AND INTERVIEW SCREENING SURVEY

Default Question Block

INFORMED CONSENT

UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE AT CHATTANOOGA PROTOCOL TITLE: Motivations for Recovering from Work

Please read this consent document carefully before you decide to participate in this study.

Why We Are Conducting the Research

This is a research study designed to contribute to general knowledge. The purpose of this research is to identify common motivations for engaging in workplace recovery.

Who Can Participate?

You must be at least 18 years of age and working at least 30 hours per week to participate in this research.

What You Will Be Asked to Do During the research, we will ask you to respond to a screening survey asking basic demographic and occupational questions. If requirements are met per the responses to the screening survey, you will be invited to an interview conducted over zoom. You will be asked open-ended questions about what you do to recover outside of work and why.

Time Required

We estimate this interview will take 30 minutes.

Risks and Benefits

We know of no risks to participating. The potential benefits of the study include increased awareness of personal motivations toward recovery, contributing to research to better support workers' recovery, and a monetary incentive.

Compensation or Incentives

If you choose to participate in the research and complete a 30-minute interview, you will receive a \$20 Amazon gift card by email within two weeks of your participation.

How Will My Information Be Protected?

Your identity will be kept confidential to the extent provided by law. Your information will be protected by storing it on a password-protected computer, assigning a code number to each study record so that personally identifying information can be removed from the data set that will be used for analyses. A list connecting your name and any other personal information (e.g., email address) to this number will be kept on a password-protected computer. When the study is completed and the data have been analyzed, the list will be deleted. Your name will not be used in any report or publication.

What If I Decide Not to Participate?

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You have the right to withdraw from the study at any time. However, you will only receive the \$20 gift card for a complete interview. If you decide not to participate or withdraw after the study has started, we will discard any information we have already collected from you. What if I Have Questions? If you have questions about the research study or any of the information above, you can contact Julia Anglin via email (hbk521@mocs.utc.edu) or Dr. Kristen Black (kristen-j-black@utc.edu). If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this research, or if you feel you have been placed at risk, you may contact Dr. Susan Davidson, Chair of the UTC Institutional Review Board at (423) 425-1387. This research protocol has been approved by the UTC Institutional Review Board. Additional contact information is available at www.utc.edu/irb.

I have considered all of the above information and have had an opportunity to ask questions about anything that is not clear to me. I am at least 18 years of age, and I choose to participate in this study. Please print name:

I have considered all of the above information and have had an opportunity to ask questions about anything that is not clear to me. I am at least 18 years of age, and I choose to participate in this study. Please sign name:

SIGN HERE

clear

Your interview will be recorded using video and audio recording devices to help us accurately note your responses. These recordings will be kept by the researcher on a password-protected computer. Only the researcher(s) will have access to the recordings. The recordings will be deleted at the completion of our research study, with only a transcript of your responses without your identity being kept. Please select one of the following options: I consent to video and audio recording:

- Yes
- No

Gender

- Man
- Woman
- Prefer to self-describe

Age

What is your occupation?

Number of dependents

Which best describes your work conditions

- My work can spillover into my non-work life (my work can be completed outside of my physical work space)
- My work and non-work life are separated (my work cannot be completed outside of my physical work space)

Race

- White
- Black or African American
- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Asian
- Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
- Other

What is your highest level of education?

- Less than high school
- High school diploma or GED
- Some college
- Associate's/ Two-year degree
- Bachelor's degree
- Master's degree
- Doctorate degree

What is your current relationship status?

- Single
- Married/partnered
- Divorced/widowed
- Serious relationship
- Casual dating

How many adult dependents live in your household?

How many child dependents live in your household?

How many hours do you work in a typical week?

Which times would generally work for you to participate in a 30 minute interview? Check all that apply

- Mondays, 12-1pm
- Mondays, 4-5pm
- Tuesdays, 12-1pm
- Tuesdays, 5-6pm
- Wednesdays, 12-1pm
- Wednesday, 5-6pm
- Thursdays, 12-1pm
- Thursdays, 4-5pm
- Fridays, 12-1pm
- Fridays, 4-5pm
- Saturdays, 10-11am
- Saturdays, 11-12pm

How do you prefer to be contacted?

- Email
- Phone

Please provide your email:

Please provide your phone number:

Powered by Qualtrics

APPENDIX E

INFORMED CONSENT AND VALIDATION SURVEY

Block 1

INFORMED CONSENT

Motivations for Recovery from Work

You are being invited to participate in a research study about motivations to rest and recover outside of work. This study is being conducted at the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga (UTC) by Julia Anglin (hbk521@mocs.utc.edu) and Dr. Kristen Black (kristen-j-black@utc.edu). You were selected as a possible participant in this study because you met inclusion criteria being age (18 years or older) and employment status (working at least 30 hours per week).

The questionnaire(s) will take about 20 minutes to complete.

There are no foreseeable risks or direct benefits to you if you choose to participate in this study. The information gained from this research may benefit others in the future.

This survey is anonymous. Do not include your name or any of your contact information in your responses to the survey. Your responses to the survey will not be linked to your computer, email address or other electronic identifiers. No one will be able to identify you or your answers. You will be given the chance to provide your email address via a separate link to be entered into an incentive drawing.

INCENTIVES

You can enter a drawing for a chance to win an Amazon gift card of \$20. You do not have to participate in the research study to enter the drawing. The odds of winning a prize are approximately 20 in 300 but may vary depending on how many people choose to enter the drawing without completing the study.

To ensure that your survey responses remain anonymous, you will be redirected at the end of the questionnaire to a separate data entry form and asked to provide your contact information. The information that you provide will not be linked to your survey responses in any way.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. You are free to stop answering questions at any time or to decline to answer any question you do not wish to answer for any reason. If you stop the survey before the end, your previous answers will be maintained

by the investigators. After you submit the survey, we cannot remove your responses because we will not know which answers came from you.

Research at UTC involving human participants is carried out under the oversight of the Institutional Review Board. Address questions or problems regarding these activities to Dr. Susan Davidson, UTC IRB Chair, email: susan-davidson@utc.edu; phone: (423) 425-1387.

To enter the prize drawing without participating in the research, click here:

https://utk.col.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_066nByLX6fM0U9E

To continue on to the survey, please indicate your decision regarding participation in this research by selecting a response below:

- I am at least 18 years of age, have read and understand the information above, and want to participate in the study.
- I do not wish to participate in the study, or I am younger than 18 years of age.

Block 2

Please respond to the statements with respect to your non-work

time over the past month. To what extent do you agree that these statements are true of your time outside of work?

	I do not agree at all	I disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	I agree	I fully agree
I forget about work.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I don't think about work at all.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I distance myself from my work.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I get a break from the demands of work.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I kick back and relax.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I use the time to relax.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	I do not agree at all	I disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	I agree	I fully agree
I do relaxing things.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I use the time for leisure.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I learn new things.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I seek out intellectual challenges.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I do things that challenge me.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I do something to broaden my horizons.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	I do not agree at all	I disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	I agree	I fully agree
I feel like I can decide for myself what to do.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I decide my own schedule.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I determine for myself how I will spend my time.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I take care of things the way that I want them done.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Workplace recovery is the act of restoring lost energy and resources that were drained due to work stress. Recovery behaviors are the specific activities we engage in to restore our energy and other resources. Some examples of common recovery activities are: exercising, sleeping or napping, reading, cooking, and engaging in other hobbies or forms of self-care.

Please select up to three options from the following list that match or are most similar to the recovery activities you tend to engage in during a typical week:

Physical exercise

- Body movement (i.e. yoga, hiking, walks)
- Sleep/ Nap
- Social media
- TV/ Movies
- Spending time with friends
- Spending time with family
- Reading
- Cooking/Meal-prepping
- Creative activities (art, music, writing)
- Exploring someplace new/Travel
- Other: (Write in)

Now, considering $\{q://QID24/ChoiceGroup/SelectedChoices\}$ are your typical recovery activities, how frequently would you say you are motivated to engage in this activity/these activities for each of the following reasons?

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
To prevent negative emotions (i.e. stress, burnout)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To regulate my mood	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To maintain my mental health	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
For my physical health	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To feel my best	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

To look my best	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
To feel fulfilled	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To maintain an identity outside of work	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Because my boss promotes prioritizing self-care	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To perform my best at work	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Because someone holds me accountable	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To create boundaries between work and personal life	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
Because I know it will make me feel better later	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To feel connected with others	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To grow and develop as a person	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other [write-in]	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="text"/>					

Default Question Block

The following statements are about how you feel at work. Please read each statement carefully and decide if you ever feel this way about your job. If you have never had this feeling, select 0 (Never). If you have had this feeling, indicate how often you felt it by selecting the option that best describes how frequently you

feel that way.

	Never	Almost never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often	Always
At my work, I feel bursting with energy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
At my job, I feel strong and vigorous	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am enthusiastic about my job	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My job inspires me	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Never	Almost never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often	Always
I feel happy when I am working intensely	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am proud of the work that I do	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am immersed in my job	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I get carried away when I am working	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Please select "6 - Always"	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Think about the people you work with who has a similar job to

you. Think about how you compare to them in regards to your daily work.

	Worse than most colleagues	Worse than some	About the same as others	Better than some	Better than most colleagues
I adequately complete my assigned duties	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I fulfill responsibilities specified in my job description	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I perform tasks that are expected of me	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I meet formal performance requirements of the job	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Think about the people you work with who has a similar job to you. Think about how you compare to them in regards to your daily work.

	Much more than most colleagues	More than some	About the same as others	Less than some	Much less than most colleagues
I neglect aspects of the job I am obligated to perform	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I fail to perform essential duties	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please indicate how often you felt or thought each of the ways described in the items below in the past month:

	Never	Almost never	Sometimes	Fairly often	Very often
In the last month, how often have you felt that you were unable to control the important things in your life?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In the last month, how often have you felt confident about your ability to handle your personal problems?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In the last month, how often have you felt that things were going your way?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In the last month, how often have you felt difficulties were piling up so high that you could not overcome them?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements:

Neither
agree

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	nor disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
In most ways my life is close to my ideal	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The conditions of my life are excellent	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am satisfied with my life	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
So far I have gotten the important things I want in life	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Please select "1 - Strongly disagree"	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please indicate whether the below statements are generally true or false for you:

	False	True
It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability

There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right

No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener

False

True

There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone

I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake

I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget

I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable

I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own

False

True

There have been times
when I was quite
jealous of the good
fortune of others

I am sometimes
irritated by people who
ask favors of me

I have never
deliberately said
something that hurt
someone's feelings

How do you feel about your job? Respond to the following items using the scale provided.

	Disagree very much	Disagree moderately	Disagree slightly	Agree slightly	Agree moderately	Agree very much
In general, I don't like my job.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
All in all, I am satisfied with my job.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In general, I like working here.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Gender

Man

Woman

Prefer to self-describe

What race or races do you consider yourself to be? Please select one or more of these categories.

- White
- Black/ African American
- American Indian
- Alaska Native
- Native Hawaiian
- Other Pacific Islander
- Asian
- Hispanic or Latina
- Refused
- Don't know
- Other

Age

What is your highest level of completed education?

- Less than high school
- High school diploma or GED
- Some college
- Associate's/ Two-year degree
- Bachelor's degree
- Master's degree
- Doctorate degree

What is your occupation?

Which of the following statements best describes your work and non-work life role conditions:

- My work can spillover into my non-work life (my work can be completed outside of my physical work space)
- My work and non-work life are separated (my work cannot be completed outside of my physical work space)

How many hours do you work in a typical week?

What is your current relationship status?

- Single
- Married/partnered
- Divorced/widowed
- Serious relationship
- Casual dating

Number of dependents (child and/or adult care)

Thank you for participating!

Powered by Qualtrics

APPENDIX F

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Walk me through some typical activities during your non-work time.
 - a. “Non work time” = anytime you are not at work. So in between shifts, weekends (if you’re off during the weekends).
2. Provide an example of those activities that help you to rest, recover, re-energize yourself after a work day.
 - a. PROBE question: here are some recovery activities people do...
3. Do you have other ways you re-energize during your non-work time?
4. What motivates you to engage in_____?
5. If there are days when you don’t do_____. What typically keeps you from doing it?
6. Is there anything you’d like to do, but don’t do? Why?
7. What would need to change for you to be able to do it?
8. Are there any other thoughts around your recovery/ rest habits that you feel we haven’t talked about?

VITA

Julia Anglin was raised in Dickson, Tennessee by Andrea and Keith Barrett. After graduating high school, she took a break from school to better understand her values and reflect on how to fully live within them. Realizing quickly that many of these values align with continued growth and a passion for learning, Julia was back in school after a year. While attending the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga, she had the opportunity to work in a research lab, assist teaching multiple classes, and explore various work paths. She graduated with a Bachelor of Science in Psychology in May 2022. After being poured into from various professors and mentors, she decided to continue her education at UTC in the Master of Science, Industrial- Organizational Psychology program. Julia graduated in May 2024 with her MSIO degree and has begun her career as a practitioner in the healthcare industry. Future career plans include returning to school to earn her doctorate, to fulfill a life-long goal of teaching.