Work, Rest, Repeat: An Examination of the Relationship Between Psychological Detachment and Positive Work Experiences Across the Workweek

by

Denisa Luta

A Thesis
presented to
The University of Guelph

In partial fulfilment of requirements
for the degree of
Masters of Arts
in
Psychology

Guelph, Ontario, Canada

ABSTRACT

WORK, REST, REPEAT: AN EXAMINATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PSYCHOLOGICAL DETACHMENT AND POSITIVE WORK EXPERIENCES ACROSS THE DAYS OF THE WORKWEEK

Denisa Luta
University of Guelph, 2016

Advisors:
Professor Jeffrey R. Spence
Professor David J. Stanley
Professor Deborah Powell

Building on the cyclical nature of the workweek and on theoretical advances on entrainment, I explored the interplay between positive affect, work engagement and psychological detachment over the course of the workweek. More specifically, my study addressed two questions: are daily fluctuations in positive affect and work engagement entrained (or aligned) to the workweek in terms of rhythm or cycle, and to what extent does psychological detachment facilitate the entrainment of positive affect and work engagement to the workweek? I tested these ideas with 145 employees who provided daily ratings of positive affect, work engagement, and psychological detachment over the course of 10 consecutive workdays. Growth modelling indicated that positive affect followed a curvilinear pattern, reaching its lowest point midweek. Furthermore, multilevel modelling indicated that daily psychological detachment was positively related to daily positive affect. Practical and theoretical implications of these findings are discussed in the conclusion.

Work, Reset, Repeat: An Examination of the Relationship Between Psychological Detachment and Positive Work Experiences Across the Workweek

Expressions such as "Blue Monday" and "Thank God it's Friday" reflect the belief that mood is the worst on Monday and improves over the course of the week. Researchers refer to this notion as "entrainment" or the fact that certain processes may follow predictable temporal patterns. In line with these notions, research has revealed that the structure of the workweek strongly structures people's lives and activities (e.g., Larsen & Kasimatis, 1990; Beal & Ghandour, 2010). Researchers have argued that the week originated from human beings' need to introduce some sort of a temporal predictability, routine and order into their lives (Zerubavel, 1985; Larsen & Kasimatis, 1990). Zerubavel (1985) goes as far as to say that the invention of the week was "one of the most significant breakthroughs in human beings' attempts to break away from being prisoners of nature and create a social world of their own" (p. 11). The first people to establish a weekly cycle were the ancient Babylonians, who, lacking modern technology, believed that there were seven planets in the solar system. The number seven held such a power to them that they structured their rituals and planned their days around it (Zerubavel, 1985). Christians and Muslims eventually adopted this seven-day weekly structure, and played a major role in its diffusion throughout the rest of the world (Zerubavel, 1985). Today, nearly 4,000 years after the Babylonians first "invented" the week, its seven-day structure remains firmly intact.

The seven-day week is the fundamental organizing principle behind how work is structured. For most people, the week consists of a repeating and cycle of weekdays (or schooldays) and weekends. This predictable and recurring cycle provides structure not only to organize activities and responsibilities (e.g., working or going to school Monday through Friday, engaging in leisure activities on Saturday and Sunday) but also structures psychological states

that go along with these activities (Larsen & Kasimatis, 1990). Entrainment has been used to explain why some psychological states such as positive and negative affect conform to a weekly rhythm, such as feeling down on Monday as compared to the weekend and upbeat on Friday (Beal & Ghandour, 2011; Larsen & Kasimatis, 1990).

To date, the entrainment literature has been mostly focused on weekly fluctuations of positive and negative affect (e.g., Larsen & Kasimatis, 1990; Beal & Ghandour, 2010). Using Conservation of Resource theory as a theoretical framework, I seek to replicate earlier research showing that positive affect exhibits a predictable pattern of change across the workweek. Additionally, I broaden this line of research by investigating whether work engagement – another indicator of positive work-related experiences – also exhibits a predictable pattern of change across the workweek. Positive affect and work engagement have been found to have positive associations with long and short-term employee well-being and positive organizational functioning (e.g. Sonnentag & Fritz, 2015; Saks, 2006). As such, empirically identifying *when* and *why* employees experience high levels of positive affect and work engagement is imperative for fostering employee well-being and organizational performance over time.

Second, I extend the entrainment literature by integrating it with the concept of psychological detachment. Specifically, I investigate whether psychological detachment – a so-called prototypical recovery experience – facilitates the entrainment of positive work-related experiences to the workweek. Psychological detachment is the experience of disengaging from work during non-work hours (e.g., evenings, weekends; Sonnentag & Fritz, 2007). Psychological detachment involves distancing oneself from work both physically (i.e., by not working) and mentally (i.e., by not thinking about work; Sonnentag & Fritz, 2007). Research indicates that psychological detachment is associated with higher employee health, well-being and work performance (Sonnentag & Fritz, 2007; Sonnentag & Fritz, 2015). I add to previous research by

exploring the importance of psychological detachment for explaining weekly fluctuations in positive affect and work engagement.

Learning more about the interplay between positive affect, work engagement and psychological detachment and time is vital for gaining a comprehensive understanding of employees' positive work-related experiences across the workweek. Overall, the theoretical contributions of my study are twofold: (1) to investigate weekly cycles of positive affect and work engagement and (2) to offer insights on the effects of psychological detachment on these cycles. Practically speaking, the identification of these weekly cycles and the role of psychological detachment therein may inform the timing of occupational health intervention programs, as well as inform the type of content that need to be addressed within these types of programs.

In the next section, I will introduce and compare the concepts of positive affect and work engagement. I will then discuss the importance of examining within-person fluctuations in positive affect and work engagement across the workweek. After that, I will discuss the role of psychological detachment for predicting within-person fluctuations in positive affect and work engagement across the workweek.

Positive Affect and Work Engagement

As previously mentioned, I focus on two indicators of positive work-related experiences: positive affect and work engagement. I conceptualize positive affect as short-term positive emotional states felt in different degrees during workdays, including experiences of joy, contentment and happiness (Diener, Wirtz, Tov, Kim-Prieto, Choi, Oishi, & Biswas-Diener, 2009). In essence, I conceptualize positive affect as capturing individuals' positive experiences related to feelings of well-being. In line with the conceptualization of work engagement introduced by Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-Roma, and Bakker (2002), I conceptualize work

engagement as a positive affective-motivational state. Work engagement consists of three dimensions: vigour, dedication, and absorption. Vigour implies a high level of mental energy at work and a willingness to persist in the face of difficulties and obstacles. Dedication refers to enthusiasm, inspiration, and the experience of significance and pride at work. Absorption implies full concentration and the experience of time passing by quickly. In essence, work engagement describes how employees *experience* their work: as something invigorating, as an important and meaningful pursuit and as captivating and engrossing (Schaufeli et al., 2002). Recent research highlights the importance of assessing work engagement as an omnibus construct, instead of assessing each sub-dimension separately. For instance, Fong and Ho (2015) demonstrated the reliability of work engagement as a composite measure. In addition, daily diary studies support the use of work engagement as an omnibus construct (e.g., Sonnentag, 2003; Sonnentag & Fritz, 2007; Bakker, Petrou, & Tsaousis, 2013).

Enduring work engagement and trait positive affect are correlated with one another, and they are conceptually related (Macey & Schneider, 2008). More particularly, the vigour component of work engagement is linked to energy and alertness that are also characteristic of high positive affect (Macey & Schneider, 2008). However, vigour is only one component of work engagement and it is measured by only one third of all work engagement items (Sonnentag, Mojza, Binnewies, & Schnoll, 2008). Work engagement also consists of motivational (i.e., dedication) and cognitive (i.e., absorption) dimensions. Therefore, enduring work engagement and trait positive affect are distinct constructs that provide unique information about positive work-related experiences (Macey & Schneider, 2008).

Researchers and practitioners have long highlighted the importance of positive affect and work engagement for improving positive organizational functioning and increasing organizational success (e.g., Sonnentag & Fritz, 2015; Sonnentag & Fritz, 2003; Harter, Schmidt,

& Hayes, 2002; Richman, 2006; Saks, 2006). Traditionally, most research on positive affect and work engagement has focused on differences between individuals and has treated day-to-day fluctuations within these constructs sources of measurement error (Bakker, 2014). More recently, researchers have started examining day-to-day fluctuations of positive affect and work engagement within-persons, as evidenced by the growing number of studies adopting experience sampling or daily diary designs (e.g., Sonnentag et al., 2008; Fritz, Sonnentag, Spector, & McInroe, 2009; Halbesleben, Harvey, & Bolino, 2009; Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Heuven, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2008; Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2009). Whereas enduring work engagement refers to how employees feel in general, over long periods of time, state work engagement reflects to short-term experiences that fluctuate within the same individual (e.g., day to day; Sonnentag 2003). Previous research on work engagement indicates that engagement fluctuates substantially within-persons from day to day (i.e., 42% of variance in work engagement across seven diary studies was shown to be attributable to within-person variance) (Bakker, 2014; Xanthopoulou & Bakker, 2013).

State work engagement and state positive affect have been shown to be similar yet distinct constructs (Reis, Arndt, Lischetzke, & Hoppe, 2016). For instance, a recent study showed that despite being conceptually related, daily vigour and daily absorption and daily positive affect do not necessarily co-occur (Reis et al., 2016). In other words, the study revealed that employees do not necessarily simultaneously experience high levels of state vigour, state absorption, and state positive affect. Altogether, this study indicates that state positive affect and state work engagement are distinctive positive work-related experiences that can occur independently from one another.

Entrainment of Positive Affect and Work Engagement to the Workweek

In addition to fluctuating daily, positive affect and work engagement may exhibit predictable change patterns over the course of the workweek. This expectation is based on the concept of *entrainment*; that is, because workweeks follow a recurring and predictable schedule, positive work-related experiences become similarly aligned or entrained (Larsen & Kasimatis, 1990). Larsen and Kasimatis (1990) provided the first indication that the positive affect is strongly influenced by weekly framework. More precisely, in a sample of undergraduate students, Larsen and Kasimatis (1990) observed that positive affect followed a repeating weekly cycle, reaching its lowest point on Monday, and then picking up as the weekend approached, peaking on Saturday. More recently, Beal and Ghandour (2010) found, in a sample of employees of an IT company, a repeating cycle in which positive affect fell to its lowest point on Wednesday, and then rose as the weekend neared, peaking on Saturday. These studies provide preliminary evidence that positive affect follows a curvilinear rather than linear pattern of change across the week. The difference of the trough day may be due to the different samples, students (Larsen & Kasimatis) and employees (Beal & Ghandour). First, I seek to examine the dynamic pattern of positive affect across the days of the workweek with a sample of employees. Second, I seek to extend this line of research by exploring the extent to which work engagement fluctuates across the workweek.

To predict the specific weekly patterns of positive affect and work engagement, I draw upon on previous research and Conservation of Resources theory. The basic assumption of Conservation of Resources theory is that employees strive to foster, conserve, and protect the quality and quantity of their personal resources, while guarding against resource loss (Hobfoll, 1989; Hobfoll & Shirom, 2001). Personal resources are broadly defined as "objects, personal characteristics, conditions, or energies that are valued in their own right or that are valued because they act as conduits to the achievement or protection of valued resources" (Hobfoll,

1989, p. 516). The theory states that stress and impaired work-related wellbeing occurs whenever people experience or anticipate resource loss or whenever they fail to reap the rewards from resources they have invested (Hobfoll, 1989). Conversely, gaining and replenishing resources is said to enhance work-related well-being and resilience. Stressors in the work environment have the potential to threaten and deplete personal resources. Because of resource depletion in the environment, respite periods (e.g., during evenings and weekends) represent an important opportunity not only to refrain and recuperate from work-related demands and stressors but also to gain additional resources.

According to previous findings (e.g., Beal & Ghandour, 2010), positive affect increases on the weekend and follows a curvilinear weekly pattern characterized by a U-shape. The fact that positive affect increases on the weekend is consistent with Conservation of Resources theory, which states that the weekend respite provides individuals with the opportunity to replenish and gain additional resources, including positive affect. However, empirical research on sleep, recovery, and fatigue (i.e., Rook & Ziljstra, 2006) indicates that the beneficial effects of the weekend respite begin to wane as early as Sunday evening as individuals start thinking of their upcoming work-related demands, suggesting that employees anticipate resource loss early in the workweek. Because employees anticipate and perceive greater work-related demands early in the workweek, affective resources are more likely to be taxed earlier in the workweek, leading to a decrease in positive affect after the weekend high. Then, as the workweek progresses and employees tackle some of their work-related demands, they encounter and perceive less work-related stressors. Additionally, as the workweek progresses, the weekend draws closer, and employees begin anticipate recovering and replenishing their affective resources once more. Perhaps the anticipation of resource recovery on the weekend holds the same effect as having actually recovering the resources. Taken together, I theorize that as the workweek progresses and

employees complete their work-related demands and additionally anticipate resting and replenishing their affective resources on the weekend, they begin to feel better. Thus, affective resources are most likely to be depleted in the middle of the workweek, and, in consequence, employees likely experience the lowest levels of positive affect in the mid-week. Therefore, I predict that positive affect follows a curvilinear pattern characterized by a U-shape, falling from a high point after the weekend respite, reaching its lowest levels midweek when employees are in the midst of tackling work-related demands, which drains their resource supply, and then picking up as the weekend approaches, as employees become less preoccupied with work and anticipate resting and recovering once again (Hypothesis 1).

Because of the conceptual closeness between positive affect and work engagement, the existing literature on positive affect is helpful in understanding the patterns of work engagement across the workweek. Like positive affect, I suspect that work engagement is strongly influenced by the structure of the workweek and thus follows a predictable pattern of change across the workweek. Because of the conceptual closeness between state positive affect and state work engagement, I suspect that work engagement also follows a non-linear cycle from Monday to Friday. However, it is unlikely that positive affect and work engagement follow the same weekly cycle, as recent evidence indicates that state work engagement and state positive affect do not necessarily occur simultaneously (Reis et al., 2016), Actually, although work engagement is conceptually related to positive affect and both are positive work-related experiences, the constructs are also distinct in numerous ways. Whereas positive affect simply reflects affective reactions and experiences, work engagement is a more complex process that potentially requires a greater investment of resources at the beginning of the workweek. As previously mentioned, previous research suggests that employees are troubled by upcoming work-related demands early in the workweek when they anticipate resource loss (i.e., Rook & Ziljstra, 2006). However, as

previously mentioned, work engagement is a more complex process that potentially requires a greater and different set of resources than positive affect. According to Conservation of Resource theory, an anticipation of resource loss at the start of the week would signal to the employee the need to invest additional resources to prevent resource losses in order to perform adequately. As the workweek progresses, employees begin to tackle their work-related demands and reap the rewards from this initial investment of resources, thereby, gaining resources. Conservation of Resource theory states that resource gains allow for the continuation of the work effort and therefore this mid-week resource gain should lead to increased work engagement. However, as the workweek draws to a close, employees begin to anticipate the upcoming weekend, where they do not anticipate resource loss, and so they begin to wind down in preparation (i.e., by becoming less engaged). In consequence, work engagement likely drops off at the end of the workweek. As a result, work engagement might reveal a cycle much like that for positive affect, but in reverse, peaking midweek after the initial investment of resources and then trailing off towards the weekend when employees no longer anticipate resource loss. Thus, I predict that work engagement follows a curvilinear weekly pattern characterized by an inverted U-shape (Hypothesis 2).

Thus, taken together, I expect that the combination of the anticipation of demands and recovery influence the likelihood of experiencing positive work-related experiences across the days of the week. Drawing upon Conservation of Resource theory, empirical evidence demonstrating the distinctiveness of state work engagement and state positive affect, and empirical evidence assessing fluctuations in positive affect to date, I propose two divergent predictions for positive affect and work engagement:

Hypothesis 1: Positive affect changes over the course of the workweek. It follows a U-shaped curvilinear pattern across the workweek.

Hypothesis 2: Work engagement changes over the course of the week. It follows an inverted U-shaped curvilinear pattern across the workweek.

The Role of Psychological Detachment

Both Conservation of Resources theory and empirical research suggest that recovery experiences can buffer against resource loss and promote the replenishment of resources, resulting in higher levels of positive affect and engagement (Sonnentag & Fritz, 2007; 2015). One important element of successful recovery is psychological detachment. Psychological detachment has been described as an experience of mentally "switching off" or "letting go" of work-related thoughts during non-work hours (e.g., evenings, weekends; (Sonnentag & Fritz, 2007). Put simply, detachment implies refraining from work-related activities or thoughts after returning home from work (Sonnentag & Fritz, 2007).

The stressor-detachment model proposes that detachment plays a key role in undoing the strain processes that result from exposure from work-related stressors (Sonnentag & Fritz, 2015). More precisely, the stressor-detachment model argues that detachment is vital because it gives employees a break from work-related demands, which reduces their negative consequences (Sonnentag & Fritz, 2015). Detachment is closely related to engagement in pleasurable and preferred leisure-time activities that create positive experiences and energy (Fritz, Sonnentag, Spector, & McInroe, 2010). Engaging in these pleasurable leisure-time activities helps employees to unwind and to gain new perspectives and experiences that allow them maintain a positive view of their jobs (Fritz et al., 2010). Such positive experiences and perspectives then become apparent in increased levels of positive affect and work engagement (Fritz et al., 2010). Conversely, continued preoccupation with work-related thoughts makes it difficult for individuals to enjoy and capitalize on other, potentially enriching leisure-time activities and experiences. Put differently, not engaging in these activities and experiences implies missing out

on opportunities to recover, meaning that the strain processes continue and consume further resources (Sonnentag & Fritz, 2015; Fritz et al., 2010). Thus, continued preoccupation with work-related thoughts after work implies missed out on opportunities to increase positive work-related affect and work engagement.

In general, studies show that employees who detach from work experience higher levels of positive affect and work engagement and report lower levels of strain, such as need for recovery, emotional exhaustion, sleep difficulties, and health complaints (Sonnentag & Fritz, 2015; Sonnentag & Fritz, 2007; ten Brummelhuis & Bakker, 2012; Sonnentag, Binnewies, & Mojza, 2010). Importantly, researchers have tested these ideas using both between- and within-person designs. In particular, within-person studies support the idea that the detachment helps employees' regulate their short-term affective and energetic resources (Sonnentag & Fritz, 2007; Fritz et al., 2010; Sonnentag & Bayer, 2005; ten Brummelhuis & Bakker, 2012). For instance, a diary study demonstrated that the more employees detached from work in the evening, the more cheerful and content and less fatigued and depleted they were at bedtime (Sonnentag & Bayer, 2005). Moreover, another diary study showed that the more participants detached from work in the evening, the more vigour they experienced at work the next morning (ten Brummelhuis & Bakker, 2012). Additionally, Conservation of Resource theory suggests that recovery experiences (i.e., detachment) provide an important opportunity for employees to restore and rebuild resources that have been depleted throughout the workday. This suggests that employees who rest and recover (i.e., by detaching) have greater resources to cope with work-related demands throughout the course of their workday and are therefore likely to experience at positive work-related experiences. Thus, I hypothesize psychological detachment during non-work hours to be positively related to daily positive work-related experiences:

Hypothesis 3: Evening psychological detachment from work during non-work time will be positively related to (a) positive affect and (b) work engagement at work the next day.

Furthermore, combining Conservation of Resources theory with the concept of entrainment, I predict that recovery – represented by psychological detachment – will moderate the change patterns of positive work-related experiences across the workweek. Detachment aids in the recovery of personal resources. According to Conservation of Resource theory, employees who possess personal resources are less negatively affected by stressful circumstances encountered during the days of the workweek, because they are able to draw on substitute resources (Hobfoll, 2002). This implies that employees who are recovered in the morning are less likely to lose resources and therefore can maintain their positive affect and work engagement levels even when facing work-related stressors and difficulties. Thus, I expect that the predictive patterns of positive work-related experiences over the course of the workweek will be contingent on employees psychologically detaching from work.

Generally speaking, I expect that fluctuations in positive work-related experiences will not only be influenced by days of the week, but also by the day-to-day effects of psychological detachment. As mentioned previously, detachment is related to participation in leisure activities (Sonnentag & Fritz, 2015). Employees who successfully detach and engage in pleasurable and preferred leisure-time activities should experience positive experiences and energy. As predicted by the stressor-detachment model, such positive experiences and energy should then become apparent in increased levels of positive experiences replenishing affective and energetic resources available to use at work (Sonnentag & Fritz, 2015). These replenished affective and energetic resources allow employees to be less prone to losing resources through work-related demands, challenges, and problems. These employees should have less need for the weekend to come in order to replenish resources because continuous daily replenishment prevents loss or

loss anticipation. Therefore, I predict the effects of entrainment to be weaker when employees succeed in psychologically detaching from work during evening hours.

Taken together, I expect that psychological detachment and the days of the week will combine to influence the likelihood of experiencing positive work-related experiences. In particular, I expect that the patterns of positive work-related experiences will be less influenced by the structure of the workweek and thus more stable when individuals are successful in detaching. Therefore, in the present study, I propose the following hypothesis:

> Hypothesis 4: Daily psychological detachment from work during non-work time will moderate the day-of-the-week effects on (a) positive affect and (b) work engagement, such that these positive work-related experiences will be less influenced by the structure of the workweek when individuals detach from work during non-work hours.

Method

Overview

To address my research questions, I employed interval-contingent experience-sampling methodology (ESM). In ESM, also known as daily diary studies, participants complete the same surveys every day over the course of several days. ESM allows for assessment of temporal dynamics, such as weekly cycles (Ohly, Sonnentag, Niessen, and Zapf, 2010). With interval-contingent reports, participants report their experiences in their natural context at steady, predetermined intervals. Typically, these intervals represent meaningful units of time, such as the end of the day or lunchtime. This technique avoids the retrospective bias produced by questionnaires that are responded to at the end of the day, because it allows for the assessment of phenomenon in their natural context (Ohly et al., 2010). Nevertheless, the assessment is still potentially removed in time from individuals' actual experiences, allowing for possible memory

decay (Reis & Judd, 2000). To facilitate recall, I chose time intervals that represent natural and reasonable breaks in the day such as noontime (i.e., lunchtime).

Participants completed a pre-screen inventory assessing demographic and job relevant variables and two short surveys every day for 10 consecutive workdays. Participants needed to complete the pre-screen inventory prior to completing the daily surveys.

Sample and Procedure

One-hundred and fourty-five participants were recruited from a variety of organizations and occupations in North America using a number of recruitment methods. First, I recruited participants a snowball technique, by approaching working individuals in my own network, in turn, approached other working individuals in their own networks. Second, I recruited participants using online message boards, such as Craig's List and Kijjiji. Lastly, I placed advertisements in public places in the Greater Toronto Area, such as bus shelters. I advertised the study broadly as a study on daily workplace thoughts, feelings, and behaviours, without mention of my focal constructs or hypotheses.

Participants who expressed interest in participating in the study were instructed to complete an online pre-screen inventory. The pre-screen inventory consisted of demographic information (e.g., age, gender, education, and ethnicity) and job relevant characteristics (e.g., occupational tenure, job tenure, hours worked weekly, etc.). To be eligible for the study, participants were required to work fulltime hours (i.e., 9 AM to 5 PM), Monday to Friday. Only individuals who worked regular workweeks were included because my hypotheses rested on the idea that positive affect and work engagement are entrained to the workweek. I assumed that the pattern of change in positive affect and work engagement over the week would be different for individuals who work nights and weekends compared to those who have nights and weekends off.

Individuals who met the eligibility criteria began the daily diary portion of the study. To obtain a complete workweek data series for everyone, each participant was scheduled to begin the daily portion of the study on Monday. To match participants' data across days, participants were assigned a unique 6-digit identifier code.

For the daily part of the study, participants were auto-sent a survey link from Qualtrics every morning (at 9:00 AM, survey closed at 11:59 AM) and every afternoon (at 3:00 PM, survey closed at 10:59 PM) for 10 consecutive workdays. Evening psychological detachment was assessed the following morning so as to not interfere with participants' detachment experiences. Daily positive affect and work engagement were assessed in the afternoon.

As an incentive to participate and a reward for their efforts, participants were paid $5 for completing the pre-diary survey and $1 for completing each daily survey. The University of Guelph Research Ethics Board approved the study.

Had all 145 participants completed every survey across 10 days it would have resulted in 1450 data points. The use of online-based surveys allowed me to easily to exclude participants' data that did complete the surveys attentively or within the instructed time-frames. Researchers have recommended excluding data points if participants respond to survey items faster than the rate of 2 seconds per item and on the basis of 6 to 14 invariant responses in a row (Costa & McCrae, 2008; DeSimone, Harms, & DeSimone, 2015; Huang et al., 2012). Consequently, I used these guidelines to exclude data points when participants finished the surveys too quickly (i.e., spent less than 2 seconds per item) or provided invariant responses (i.e., provided 14 or more invariant responses in a row). In total, I collected 1,100 data points (resulting in a response rate of 76.55% across time and participants). However, I excluded 170 data points from this number. Thus, because some participants did not complete every daily survey and because I additionally excluded 170 data points, I only collected 940 data points, resulting in a response

rate of roughly 65.27% across time and participants. In general, data was missing towards the end of the two workweeks (e.g., Thursdays and Fridays). Table 10 shows the distribution of the data points in more detail.

For Hypothesis 1, a post hoc power analysis revealed that there was a 91% chance of finding significance based on the effect size and the sample size used in the study. For Hypothesis 2, a post hoc power analysis revealed that there was a 2% chance of finding significance based on the effect size and the sample size used in the study. For Hypothesis 3a, a post hoc power analysis revealed that there was a 91% chance of finding significance based on the effect size and the sample size used in the study. For Hypothesis 3b, a post hoc power analysis revealed that there was a 54% chance of finding significance based on the effect size and the sample size used in the study. For Hypothesis 4a, a post hoc power analysis revealed that there was a 2% chance of finding significance based on the effect size and the sample size used in the study. For Hypothesis 4b, a post hoc power analysis revealed that there was a 26% chance of finding significance based on the effect size and the sample size used in the study.

Participants (80.69% female, 18.62% male) had a mean age of 32.47 (*SD* = 8.56), worked an average of 40.65 hours per week (*SD* = 15.49), had been with their organization for 3.35 years (*SD* = 4.46), and had been in their current position for 2.01 years (*SD* = 2.70). The sample consisted of employees from various industry sectors, including healthcare (e.g., veterinary technicians, physiotherapists, and therapists) education (e.g., communications coordinators, librarian technicians, and teachers) and business (e.g., clerks, analysts, and consultants). Approximately thirty-seven percent of the sample held less than a University degree, 40% completed a University degree, and 18.62% held a Master's degree or greater.

Measures

Pre-Screen Questionnaire

Demographics and Study-Specific Characteristics. In the pre-screen inventory, participants reported their age, gender, ethnicity, education, employment status, job tenure, and working schedule.

Morning Diary Survey

Daily Psychological Detachment. Daily psychological detachment was assessed the following morning using the four-item subscale of the Recovery Experience Questionnaire (Sonnentag & Fritz, 2007). Sample items include: "I was able to distance myself from work" and "I forgot about work" (see Appendix A). Participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they felt "this way, last evening, in your free time after work." Responses were rated on a 5-point Likert scale (ranging from 1 = "I do not agree at all" to 5 = "I fully agree"). The Cronbach's alpha for this scale was .95.

Afternoon Diary Surveys

Daily Positive Affect. Daily positive affect was assessed using the 6-item positive experience subscale of the Scale of Positive and Negative Experience (SPANE) (Diener et al., 2009). Sample items include: "positive" "content," and "good" (see Appendix B). Participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they felt "this way at work today." Responses were made on a 5-point response scale (ranging from 1 = "very slightly or not at all" to 5 = "extremely"). The Cronbach's alpha for this scale was .92.

Daily Work Engagement. Work engagement was assessed with nine items from the state version of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) (Schaufeli et al., 2002; Schaufeli et al., 2006). The scale consists of three subscales: *absorption* (α = .74; three items, e.g., "I was immersed in my work"), *vigour* (α = .81; three items, e.g., "At my job, I felt strong and vigorous"), and *dedication* (α = .82; three items, e.g., "My job inspired me") (see Appendix C).

Participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they felt this way "at work today." Responses were made on a 7-point Likert scale (ranging from 0 = "never" to 6 = "always"). In general, the items were highly reliable (α = .91).

Time. Day of the week (Monday to Friday) was used to predict positive affect and work engagement. Time was coded from 0 to 4 where Monday was 0 and Friday was 4.

Analyses

Because the dataset had a hierarchical structure where daily data were nested in persons, I analyzed the data using growth and multilevel modeling, a method recommended for ESM data (Ohly et al., 2010). Specifically, I carried out the growth and multilevel analyses using the nlme and multilevel packages in R. The within-individual level of analysis consisted of the outcome measures of positive affect and work engagement and the predictors consisted of psychological detachment and day of the week (time).

For hypothesis 1 and 2, I did not center the daily predictor (e.g., time). For hypotheses 3 and 4, I centered the daily predictor (e.g., psychological detachment) at the respective person mean, in order to remove between-person variance (Enders & Tofighi, 2007; Ohly et al., 2010).

Results

Descriptive statistics and correlations between each of the variables can be found in Table 1.

Test of Hypotheses

U-shape pattern of positive affect over time

I hypothesized that there would be curvilinear U-shaped relation between positive affect and time, such that positive affect would be highest at the beginning and end of the workweek (Hypothesis 1). I tested this using growth modelling using the step-by-step approach outlined by

Bliese (2013). First, I estimated the residual ICC and determine whether positive affect randomly varied among individuals. Second, I examined the relationship between positive affect and time. Third, I modelled in more complicated error structures such as autocorrelation and heteroscedasticity.

First, I estimated a null model (i.e., a model with no predictors) and calculated the residual ICC. I then calculated the within-person variance in positive affect using the following formula: $(\sigma^2/(\sigma^2+\tau_{00}))$. Forty percent of the variance in positive affect was within-persons (0.3880/(0.3880+0.5909) = 0.3964). Second, I modelled the fixed relationship between time and positive affect. I began by modelling the linear relationship (Model 1) and then added the quadratic relationship (Model 2) (see Table 2). To test the linear relation between time and positive affect, I regressed positive affect on time in a model with a random intercept (Model 1, Table 2). The results indicated that the linear time effect did not predict positive affect (γ_{10} = 0.01, *SE* = 0.01, *ns*, 95% CI [-0.01, 0.30]). To test whether the curvilinear relationship between quadratic time (i.e., time^2) and positive affect, I regressed positive affect on time^2 in a model with a random intercept (Model 2, Table 2). The results indicated that the curvilinear effect of time positively predicted positive affect (γ_{20} = 0.03, *SE* = 0.01, $p < .01$, 95% CI [0.01, 0.05]), in the form of a U-shape as expected. I tested whether model fit improved by incorporating an autoregressive structure with serial correlations and heterogeneity in the error structures. The model that allowed for autocorrelation did not fit the data better than the model that assumed no autocorrelation (diff*2log = 0.73, *df* = 1, *ns*). The model that included autocorrelation and allowed for variance heterogeneity did not result in improvement of model fit (diff*2log = 0.00, *df* = 1, *ns*).

Thus, Hypothesis 1 was supported. As expected, positive affect followed a U-shaped curvilinear pattern across the workweek.

Inverted U-shape pattern of work engagement over time

I hypothesized that there would be a curvilinear relationship between work engagement and time, such that work engagement would be highest midweek (Hypothesis 2). Once again, I tested this using growth modelling using the step-by-step approach outlined by Bliese (2013).

First, I estimated a null model (i.e., a model with no predictors) and calculated the residual ICC. I then calculated the within-person variance in work engagement using the following formula: $(\sigma^2/(\sigma^2+\tau_{00}))$. Forty-seven percent of the variance in work engagement was within-persons (0.6923/(0.6923+0.7729) = 0.4725). Second, I modelled the fixed relationship between time and work engagement. I began by modelling the linear relationship (Model 1, Table 3) and then added the quadratic relationship (Model 2, Table 3). To test the linear relation between time and work engagement, I regressed work engagement on time in a model with a random intercept (Model 1). The results indicated that the linear time effect was significant (γ_{10} = 0.07, *SE* = 0.02, $p < .001$, 95% CI [0.03, 0.11]), indicating that work engagement increased linearly Monday to Friday. To test the curvilinear relationship between quadratic time (i.e., time^2) and work engagement, I regressed work engagement on time^2 in a model with a random intercept (Model 2, Table 3). The results indicated that the curvilinear effect of time was not significant (γ_{20} = -0.01, *SE* = 0.02, *ns*, 95% CI [-0.05, 0.03]. I tested whether model fit improved by incorporating an autoregressive structure with serial correlations and heterogeneity in the error structures. The model that allowed for autocorrelation did not fit the data better than the model that assumed no autocorrelation (diff*2log = 3.12, *df* = 1, *ns*). The model that included

autocorrelation and allowed for variance heterogeneity did not result in improvement of model fit (diff*2log = 0.19, *df* = 1, *ns*).

I reran the regression analyses separately for each sub-dimensions of work engagement (see Appendix D). For vigour, the linear time effect was significant (γ_{10} = 0.08, *SE* = 0.02, $p <$ .001, 95% CI [0.04, 0.12]), indicating that vigour increased linearly Monday to Friday. The curvilinear effect of time was not significant (γ_{20} = -0.03, *SE* = 0.02, *ns*, 95% CI [-0.07, 0.01]). The models that included autocorrelation (diff*2log = 0.02, *df* = 1, *ns)* and that allowed for variance heterogeneity (diff*2log = 0.01, *df* = 1, *ns*) did not result in improvement of model fit.

For dedication, the linear time effect was significant (γ_{10} = 0.05, *SE* = 0.02, $p <$ .05, 95% CI [0.01, 0.09]), indicating that dedication increased linearly Monday to Friday. The curvilinear effect of time was not significant (γ_{20} = 0.01, *SE* = 0.02, *ns*, 95% CI [-0.03, 0.05]). The models that included autocorrelation (diff*2log = 2.70, *df* = 1, *ns)* and that allowed for variance heterogeneity (diff*2log = 0.11, *df* = 1, *ns*) did not result in improvement of model fit.

For absorption, the linear time effect was significant (γ_{10} = 0.08, *SE* = 0.02, $p <$ .001, 95% CI [0.04, 0.12]), indicating that absorption increased linearly Monday to Friday. The curvilinear effect of time was not significant (γ_{20} = -0.02, *SE* = 0.02, *ns*, 95% CI [-0.06, 0.02]). The model that included autocorrelation showed an improvement of model fit over the previous model (diff*2log = 7.71, *df* = 1, $p <$ .01). The model that allowed for variance heterogeneity did not result in improvement of model fit (diff*2log = 0.82, *df* = 1, *ns*).

Taken together, Hypothesis 2 was not supported. Unexpectedly, work engagement (and its sub-dimensions) followed a linear pattern across the workweek.

Daily psychological detachment predicting daily positive affect

I hypothesized that there would be a positive relationship between daily psychological detachment and daily positive affect (Hypothesis 3a). I tested this hypothesis by computing a multilevel regression with random intercepts: positive affect as the criterion and psychological detachment as the predictor (see Table 4). The analyses revealed that the multilevel regression model showed significant improvement in fit over the null model (diff*2log = 453.92, $df = 1$, $p <$ .001). Detachment was a significant predictor for positive affect ($\gamma_{10} = 0.09$, $SE = 0.03$, $p < .01$, 95% CI [0.03, 0.15]). This result indicated that the more participants detached from work during the evening hours, the more positive affect they experienced at work the next day. Thus, Hypothesis 3a was supported.

Daily psychological detachment predicting daily work engagement

I hypothesized that there would be a positive relationship between daily psychological detachment and daily work engagement (Hypothesis 3b). I tested this using a multilevel regression with random intercepts: work engagement as the criterion and psychological detachment as the predictor (see Table 5). The analyses revealed that the multilevel regression model showed significant improvement in fit over the null model (diff*2log = 553.74, $df = 1$, $p <$ .001). However, detachment was not a significant predictor for work engagement ($\gamma_{10} = 0.07$, $SE = 0.04$, *ns*, 95% CI [-0.01, 0.15]).

I reran these multilevel regression analyses separately for each sub-dimension of work engagement (see Appendix D). Appendix D shows the multilevel regressions with vigour, dedication, and absorption as the criterion variables and detachment as the predictor. Detachment was not a significant predictor of vigour ($\gamma_{10} = 0.10$, $SE = 0.05$, *ns*, 95% CI [0.00, 0.20]), dedication ($\gamma_{10} = 0.07$, $SE = 0.05$, *ns*, 95% CI [0.07, 0.17]), or absorption ($\gamma_{10} = 0.03$, $SE =$ 0.05, *ns*, 95% CI [-0.07, 0.13]).

Thus, taken together, I did not find support for Hypothesis 3b.

Daily detachment predicting changes in positive affect

I hypothesized that daily psychological detachment would moderate the day-of-the-week effects on positive affect (Hypothesis 4a). I test this using a multilevel regression with positive affect as the criterion and psychological detachment, time^2, and the product terms between psychological detachment and time^2 as the predictors (see Table 6). The product term between psychological detachment and time^2 was not significant ($\gamma_{50} = 0.00$, *SE* = 0.01, *ns*, 95% CI [0.02, -0.02]), suggesting that daily detachment did not moderate the curvilinear relation between positive affect and the days of the workweek (time^2). Thus, Hypothesis 4a was not supported.

Daily detachment predicting changes in work engagement

I hypothesized that psychological detachment would moderate the day-of-the-week effects on work engagement (Hypothesis 4b). Since the quadratic trend was not significant (Model 2, Table 3), I tested the linear relation using a multilevel regression with work engagement as the criterion and psychological detachment, time, and the product term between psychological detachment and time as the predictors (see Table 7). The product term between psychological detachment and time was not significant ($\gamma_{30} = -0.02$, *SE* = 0.03, *ns*, 95% CI [0.08, 0.04]), suggesting that daily detachment did not moderate linear relationship between work engagement and time (see Table 7). Thus, Hypothesis 4b was not supported.

I reran these multilevel regression analyses separately for each sub-dimension of work engagement. Appendix D shows the multilevel regressions with vigour, dedication, and absorption as the criterion variable and psychological, time, and the product term between psychological detachment and time as the predictors. For vigour, the product term between psychological detachment and time was not significant ($\gamma_{30} = -0.06$, *SE* = 0.03, *ns*, 95% CI [-

0.14, 0.02]). For dedication, the product term between psychological detachment and time was not significant ($\gamma_{30} = 0.01$ *SE* = 0.04, *ns*, 95% CI [-0.07, 0.09]). For absorption, the product term between psychological detachment and time was not significant ($\gamma_{30} = -0.03$ *SE* = 0.04, *ns*, 95% CI [-0.11, 0.05).

In summary, the results indicated that positive affect followed a U-shaped curvilinear pattern across the workweek (Hypothesis 1). Contrary to my expectations, work engagement did not follow an inverted U-shaped curvilinear pattern across the week (Hypothesis 2). However, the results revealed that work engagement followed a linear pattern across the workweek. Finally, the results revealed that daily psychological detachment was positively related to positive affect (Hypothesis 3a). Contrary to my expectations, daily psychological detachment was not positively related to daily work engagement (Hypothesis 3b). Moreover, daily psychological detachment did not predict changes in positive affect (Hypothesis 4a) or work engagement (Hypothesis 4b) across the workweek.

Additional analyses

The effects of psychological detachment might accumulate to influence the pattern of change of positive work-related experiences across the workweek. To explore this possibility, I examined whether week-level detachment moderated the day-of-the-week effects on positive affect and work engagement. I computed week-level psychological detachment by aggregating the daily detachment ratings at the week level. I computed growth-level models with positive affect and work engagement as the criterion variables and week-level psychological detachment and time (and time^2 for positive affect) as the predictors (see Tables 8 and 9). For positive affect, the product term between week-level psychological detachment and time^2 was not significant ($\gamma_{50} = 0.01$, *SE* = 0.01, *ns*, 95% CI [-0.01, 0.01]), suggesting that week-level detachment did not

moderate the curvilinear relationship between positive affect and the days of the week (time^2). For work engagement, the product term between week-level detachment and time was significant ($\gamma_{50} = 0.04$, $SE = 0.02$, $p < 0.01$, 95% CI [0.00, 0.08]), indicating that week-level detachment moderated the linear relationship between work engagement and the days of the week.

Discussion

Research suggests that the workweek has a strong influence on peoples' lives (e.g., Larsen & Kasimatis, 1990; Beal & Ghandour, 2010). Drawing upon the concept of entrainment, I investigated whether daily fluctuations in positive affect and work engagement are entrained (or aligned) to the workweek in terms of rhythm or cycle, and whether psychological detachment facilitates the entrainment of these positive work-related experiences to the workweek. The results indicated that positive affect followed a curvilinear pattern from Monday to Friday, reaching its lowest point midweek. Contrary to my expectations, work engagement did not follow a curvilinear pattern from Monday to Friday. Unexpectedly, the results indicated that work engagement followed a linear pattern, increasing from Monday to Friday. The results indicated that daily psychological detachment was positively related to daily positive affect. Finally, the additional analyses revealed that week-level psychological detachment the pattern of work engagement across the workweek, indicating that week-level detachment is particularly important for employees to stay engaged until the end of the workweek.

The purpose of my research was thus to contribute to a better understanding of the entrainment and recovery processes. To better understand these processes, I integrated the concept of entrainment with Conservation of Resources theory. According to Conservation of Resource theory, employees strive to gain, maintain, and protect their resources (Hobfoll, 1989). Certain activities and experiences in the work environment threaten or deplete personal

resources. Because of resource depletion, recovery experiences (specifically detachment) from work during evenings and weekends represent an important opportunity to replenish lost resources (Sonnentag & Fritz, 2007; Sonnentag & Fritz, 2015). The empirical findings partly support my hypotheses, suggesting that entrainment, Conservation of Resources theory (Hobfoll, 1989; Hobfoll & Shirom, 2001), and the stressor-detachment model (Sonnentag & Fritz, 2015) can be used to predict fluctuations in positive work-related experiences across the workweek.

The results revealed that positive affect and work engagement (including all of its sub-dimensions) followed a predictable weekly pattern. In addition, and consistent with Conservation of Resource theory and the stressor-detachment model, positive affect was influenced by recovery periods (e.g., weekends) and experiences (e.g., detachment).

More precisely, the results replicated previous findings (e.g., Beal & Ghandour, 2010) showing that positive affect was strongly aligned to the workweek in terms of pace or rhythm. As previously mentioned, positive affect followed a U-shaped curvilinear pattern across the workweek, peaking midweek. The fact that positive affect is relatively high at the beginning of the workweek may be explained by the fact that employees feel well-rested and positive after the weekend respite. However, research indicates that by the end of the weekend, employees begin to worry once more and anticipate the work-related demands that lie ahead and so the positive affect experienced on the weekend drops off in the first part of the week (Rook & Ziljstra, 2007; Hulsheger et al., 2014). Then, as the workweek progresses and employees tackle these work-related demands and anticipate recovering on the weekend once more, they begin to feel better. Thus, as a consequence of the increased worrying by the end of the weekend and first part of week (and the associated resource depletion) and the increased anticipation for the weekend towards the second part of the workweek (and the association resource gains), employees experience the lowest levels of positive affect in the middle of the workweek.

The results also suggest that work engagement conforms or is entrained to a predictable weekly pattern. However, contrary to my expectations, the linear slope was positive, suggesting that work engagement increases from Monday to Friday. These findings suggest that employees experience the highest levels of engagement at the end of the week, which means they continue to stay engaged until the end of the workweek, not wind down in preparation for the weekend as predicted. How can I account for these unexpected findings? As previously mentioned, Conservation of Resource theory suggests that employees gain resources throughout the week as they tackle their anticipated work demands. The present findings suggest that work engagement corresponds linearly with this positive trend of resource gain. Future research should further test these speculations.

Furthermore, the results revealed that psychological detachment was positively related to positive affect. This finding is consistent with previous studies indicating that psychological detachment is associated with higher positive affect (Sonnentag & Fritz, 2007). Although the causal interpretation of these finding remains tentative, the present study suggests that evening psychological detachment helps to regulate employees' day-to-day positive work-related affect (Sonnentag et al., 2008). However, contrary to my expectations, the results revealed that psychological detachment was not significantly related to work engagement (or any of its sub-dimensions). One explanation for these findings is that detachment might only facilitate work engagement under certain circumstances, for instance when work is particularly stressful or challenging. Another possibly is that these results may have been biased, as I did not have enough statistical power to test this relationship.

Contrary to my expectations, daily and week-level psychological detachment did not moderate the pattern of positive affect across the workweek. Put differently, participants experienced a similar curvilinear pattern of positive affect over the course of the workweek

irrespective of their daily or week level of psychological detachment. Moreover, week-level psychological detachment moderated the linear pattern of work engagement across the workweek. How can I account for these results? One possibility is that the psychological detachment may be effective for boosting positive affect in the short-run and its beneficial effects may wane over time. As noted by Sonnentag and Fritz (2015), day-to-day demands and stressors unfolding at work have a very strong immediate impact on state positive affect, which may be overriding the benefits of detachment (see also Gross, Semmer, Meier, Kalin, Jacobshagen, & Tschan, 2011; Rodell & Judge, 2009). Conversely, detachment may be more effective for boosting work engagement over time. Taken together, the present findings suggest that psychological detachment offers more limited benefits for positive affect and more sustained benefits for work engagement.

Strengths and Weaknesses

My study has several strong points worth noting, such as the use of an applied sample, which contributed to the generalizability of my findings. My study also has a number of limitations. First, I relied on self-report measures, which may have introduced the problem of common method variance (i.e., variance that is attributable to the measurement method rather than the constructs themselves; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). It would be interesting for future researchers to expand on these results by testing the relationship between observer ratings of psychological detachment and observer ratings of positive affect and work engagement. However, it is important to note the core constructs (i.e., positive affect, work engagement, and psychological detachment) refer to very subjective experiences and that self-report is the most commonly used approach for assessing them. More than this, regarding psychological detachment, Sonnentag and Kruel (2006) revealed no differences in the relationships between a self-report measure of detachment and a number of variables and a

family report of detachment and the same subset of variables. Nonetheless, to minimize common method bias, I measured the predictor and outcome variables at different time points during the day. Although future studies could opt to include observer measures, the separation of measurement points in my study suggests that it is unlikely that my results are solely attributable to common method bias.

Another limitation is that my study does not warrant conclusions about causality. Future research should explore the possibility of reverse causation or the possibility for third variables influencing the relationships between the core constructs. For example, it is possible that employees higher in positive work-related affect have an easier time mentally separating themselves from their work, which in turn, then influences the entrainment of positive affect to the workweek in terms of pace or rhythm. Or, possibly, a third variable might be influencing both psychological detachment and positive work-related affect. Future researchers should thus explore these possibilities in more detail. This is something that may be easier to achieve in a controlled laboratory setting rather than in a field setting.

Future Research

Future studies may benefit from replicating and refining the methodology of my study. Replicating my study with a larger sample and over a longer time frame would allow for greater statistical power and would improve the accuracy of the effect sizes. In addition, multi-source measures of the core constructs (i.e., positive affect, work engagement, and detachment) could be used to obtain more objective assessments of positive work-related experiences and recovery. Lastly, since I theorized that weekly trends in positive affect and vigour are also affected by the anticipation for the weekend to come, a measure of this anticipation could be employed in order to more concretely assess its impacts on positive work-related experiences.

I only focused on change patterns in positive affect and work engagement over the course of the regular Monday-to-Friday workweek and only considered participants working fulltime hours (i.e., 9 AM to 5 PM). Perhaps the biggest question I left unanswered concerns the extent to which these results extend to employees working more flexible hours. It is likely that the pattern of change in positive affect and work engagement over the week is different for individuals who work nights and weekends compared to those who have nights and weekends off. However, further research is needed to substantiate these claims and determine whether these results extend to individuals working more flexible hours. Moreover, future researchers can extend on my study to include Saturdays and Sundays in order to capture changes in positive affect and work engagement occurring not only across the five-day workweek but also across the full seven-day cycle.

My study suggests that, due to the effects of entrainment, weekly fluctuations in affect exhibit a general, cyclical pattern. However, previous research also suggests that individuals differ in susceptibility to the effects of entrainment (e.g., Larsen & Kasimatis). For instance, the cyclical effects of positive affect have been shown to be stronger for introverts than for extroverts (Larsen & Kasimatis, 1990). To gain a complete picture of the entrainment process, it is important to learn more about the personality or individual difference factors that facilitate or thwart the entrainment of positive affect and work engagement to the working week. Thus, future research should examine the relationship between positive work-related functioning and other personality or individual difference factors.

Implications for Practice

Though the effect sizes were small, the identification of weekly trends in positive affect and work engagement may serve as a guide for the planning of practical and effective interventions. When planning interventions to boost positive affect and work engagement over time (e.g., the

throughout the workweek), occupational health psychologists may take these results into consideration. Moreover, having more insight into the highs and lows of positive affect and work engagement may allow managers to schedule weekly activities and assign work tasks with a better sense of regulating their employees' moods and engagement levels.

The results also hold relevance for individuals. Although causal interpretation of the results must remain tentative, the present study suggests that psychological detachment is positively associated with positive work-related experiences. As such, individuals should be made aware of the association between detachment and positive work-related experiences. Beyond this, employees may be encouraged to pursue pleasurable and engaging leisure-time activities that require full distraction from work-related thoughts. Employers may take an active role in helping employees to detach from their jobs by setting explicit organizational policies and norms around after-work availability and making sure employees adhere to these policies (Sonnentag et al., 2008).

Conclusion

The present study contributes to a better understanding of the patterns of positive affect and work engagement across the workweek. It also adds to research on recovery processes by highlighting the association between psychological detachment and positive work-related experiences. In conclusion, I hope that my study will encourage and inspire other researchers to continue exploring the dynamics of positive work-related experiences.

References

Beal, D. J., & Ghandour, L. (2011). Stability, change, and the stability of change in daily workplace affect. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *32*(4): 526-546.

Bakker, A. B. (2014). Daily fluctuations in work engagement: An overview and current directions. *European Psychologist*, *19*: 227-236.

Bliese, P. (2013). *Multilevel Modelling in R (2.5). A brief introduction to R, the mulielvel package and the nlme package*. Retrieved from: https://cran.r-project.org/doc/contrib/Bliese_Multilevel.pdf

Crawford, E. R., LePine, J. A., & Rich, B. L. (2010). Linking job demands and resources to employee engagement and burnout: A theoretical extensions and a meta-analytic test. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *95*(5): 834-848.

Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (2008). The revised NEO personality inventory (NEO-PI-R). In G. J. Boyle, G. Matthews, & D. H. Saklofske (eds). The SAGE handbook of personality theory and assessment (pp. 179-198). London: SAGE.

DeSimone, J. A., Harms, P. D., & DeSimone, A. J. Best practice recommendations for data screening. Management Department Faculty Publications. Paper 124.

Diener, E., Wirtz, D., Tov, W., Kim-Prieto, C., Choi, D., Oishi, S., & Biswas-Diener, R. (2009). New measures of well-being: Flourishing and positive and negative feelings. *Social Indicators Research*, *39*, 247-266.

Enders, C. K., & Tofighi, D. (2007). Centering predictor variables in cross-sectional multilevel models: A new look at an old issue. *Psychological Methods*, *12*(2): 121-138.

Fritz, C., Sonnentag, S., Spector, P. E., & McInroe, J. A. (2010). The weekend matters: Relationships between stress recovery and affective experiences. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *31*: 1137-1162.

Gross, S., Semmer, N. K., Meier, L. L., Kalin, W., Jacobshagen, N., & Tschan, F. (2011). The effect of positive events at work on after-work fatigue: They matter most in face of adversity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *96*, 654-664.

Halbesleben J.R., Harvey J., & Bolino M.C. (2009). Too engaged? A conservation of resources view of the relationship between work engagement and work interference with family. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. *94*(6): 1452-65.

Harter, J.K., Schmidt, F.L. & Hayes, T.L. (2002). Business unit level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*(2): 268–279.

Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, *44*(3): 513-524.

Hobfoll, S. E. (2001). The influence of culture, community, and the nested-self in the stress process: Advancing conservation of resources theory. *Applied Psychology*, *50*(3): 337-421.

Huang, J. L., Curran, P. G., Keeney, J., Poposki, E. M., & DeShon, R. P. (2012). Detecting and deterring insufficient effort responding to surveys. *Journal of Business Psychology*, *27*, 99-114.

Korunka, C., Kubicek, B., Prem, R., & Cvitan, A. (2012). Recovery and detachment between shifts, and fatigue during a twelve-hour shift. *Work*, *41*, 3227-3233.

Hülsheger, U. R., Lang, J. W., Depenbrock, F., Fehrmann, C., Zijlstra, F. R., & Alberts, H. J. 2014. The power of presence: The role of mindfulness at work for daily levels and change trajectories of psychological detachment and sleep quality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *99*(6): 1113-1128.

Larsen, R. J., & Kasimatis, M. (1990). Individual differences in entrainment of mood to the weekly calendar. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *58*(1): 164-171.

LePine, J. A., Podsakoff, N. P., & LePine, M. A. (2005). A meta-analytic test of the challenge stressor-hindrance stressor framework: An explanation for inconsistent relationships among stressors and performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, *48*, 764-775.

Macey, W. H., & Schneider, W. (2007). The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, *1*: 3-30.

Mojza, E., J., Sonnentag, S., & Bornemann, C. (2011). Volunteer work as a valuable leisure time activity: A day-level study on volunteer work, non-work experiences, and well-being at work. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *84*, 123-152.

Ohly, S., Sonnentag, S., Niessen, C., & Zapf, D. 2010. Diary studies in organizational research: An introduction and some practical recommendations. *Journal of Personnel Psychology, 9*(2): 79-83.

Pereira, D. & Elfering, A. (2014). Social stressors at work, sleep quality and psychosomatic health complaints – A longitudinal ambulatory field study. *Stress and Health*, *30*, 43-52.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *88*: 879-903.

Reiss, H. T., & Judd, C. M. (2000). Handbook of research methods in social and personality psychology. United States: Cambridge University Press.

Rodell, J. B., & Judge, T. A. (2009). Can "good" stressors spark "bad" behaviors? The mediating role of emotions in links of challenge and hindrance stressors with citizenship and counterproductive behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *94*, 1438-1451.

Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *21*(7): 600-619.

Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., Gonzalez-Roma, V., & Bakker, A. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two factor sample confirmatory factor analytical approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *3*: 71-92.

Schaufeli, W. B., Arnold, B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement within a short questionnaire: A cross-national study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *66*: 701-716.

Sonnentag, S. (2001). Work, recovery activities, and individual well-being: A diary study. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, *6*(3): 196-210.

Sonnentag, S., & Bayer, U. V. (2005). Switching off mentally: predictors and consequences of psychological detachment from work during off-job time. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *10*(4): 393-414.

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.

Sonnentag, S., & Fritz, C. (2015). Recovery from job stress: The stressor-detachment model as an integrative framework. Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 36(1): 72-103.

Sonnentag, S., & Kruel, U. (2006). Psychological detachment from work during off-job time: The role of job stressors, job involvement, and recovery-related self-efficacy. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *15*, 197-217.

Sonnentag, S., Mojza, E. V., Binneweis, C., & Scholl, A. (2008). Being engaged at work and detached at home: A week-level study on work engagement, psychological detachment, and affect. *Work & Stress*, *22*(3): 257-276.

Sonnentag, S., & Ziljstra, F. R. (2006). Job characteristics and off-job activities as predictors of need for recovery, well-being, and fatigue. Journal of Applied Psychology, 91(2): 330-350.

Tadic, M., Bakker, A. B., & Oerleman, W. G. M. (2015). Challenge versus hindrance job demands and well-being: A diary study on the moderating role of job resources. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 88*, 702-725.

ten Brummelhuis, L. L., & Bakker, A. B. (2012). Staying engaged during the week: The effect of off-job activities on next day work engagement. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *17*, 445-455.

Richman, A. (2006). Everyone wants an engaged workforce how can you created it? *Workspan*, *49*: 36-39.

Rook, J. W., & Ziljstra, F. R. H. (2006). The contribution of various types of activities to recovery. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *16*: 218-240.

Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*(6): 1063-1070.

Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A.B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2009). Reciprocal relationships between job resources, personal resources, and work engagement. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *74*: 235-244.

Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A.B., Heuven, E., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2008). Working in the sky: A diary study on work engagement among cabin attendants. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *13*(4); 345-356.

Zerubavel, E. (1985). The seven day circle: The history and meaning of the week. New York: Free Press.

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics and Correlations Between Daily Variables

	Mean	***SD***	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
1. Psychological Detachment	3.52	1.08	-					
2. Positive Affect	2.77	0.96	-.06 [-0.12, -0.01] [+]	-				
3. Vigour	3.80	1.37	-.12** [-0.18, -0.06]	.83** [0.81, 0.85]	-			
4. Dedication	4.04	1.36	-.12** [-0.18, -0.06]	.84** [0.82, 0.86]	.91** [0.90, 0.92]	-		
5. Absorption	4.11	1.25	-.13** [-0.19, -0.07]	.79** [0.77, 0.81]	.86** [0.85, 0.87]	.91** [0.90, 0.92]	-	
6. Work engagement	3.98	1.20	-.12** [-0.18, -0.06]	.84** [0.82, 0.86]	.95** [0.95, 0.96]	.97** [0.97, 0.97]	.96** [0.96, 0.96]	-

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.***$p < .001$. N = 145.
[+] I am reporting the 95% confidence intervals.
These correlations were calculated using all of the days, which does not account for non-independency.

Table 2

Multilevel Estimates for Regression Model Predicting Positive Affect (Hypothesis 1)

	Model 1				Model 2			
	Estimate	95% CI	*SE*	*t*	Estimate	95% CI	*SE*	*t*
Intercept, γ_{00}	2.80	[2.66, 2.94]	0.07	38.14***	2.85	[2.69, 3.01]	0.08	37.44***
Weekday linear slope (time), γ_{10}	0.01	[-0.01, 0.30]	0.01	0.46	-0.12	[-0.22, -0.02]	0.05	-2.42*
Weekday quadratic slope (time^2), γ_{20}					0.03	[0.01, 0.05]	0.01	2.67**
-2*log				2111.60				2145.66
Diff -2*log				6.41*				0.11
df				1				1

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.***$p < .001$.

[+] I calculated the 95% confidence intervals by hand. In the first step, I multiplied the standard error by 1.96 (i.e., 0.07*1.96 = 0.1372). To calculate the lower end of the range, I subtracted the value obtained in the first step (i.e., 0.1372) from the standardized estimate (i.e., 2.80 – 0.1372= 2.66). To calculate the upper end of the range, I added the value obtained in the first step (i.e., 0.1372) to the standardized estimate (i.e. 2.80 +0.1372 = 2.94).

[*]Note: Model 1 was compared to a null model with the intercept as the only predictor.

Table 3

Multilevel Estimates for Regression Model Predicting Work Engagement (Hypothesis 2)

	Model 1				Model 2			
	Estimate	95% CI	*SE*	*t*	Estimate	95% CI	*SE*	*t*
Intercept, γ_{00}	3.87	[3.69, 4.05]	0.09	44.84***	3.85	[3.67, 4.03]	0.09	42.07***
Weekday linear slope (time), γ_{10}	0.07	[0.03, 0.11]	0.02	3.57**	0.12	[-0.02, 0.26]	0.07	1.74
Weekday quadratic slope (time^2), γ_{20}					-0.01	[-0.05, 0.03]	0.02	-0.74
-2*log				2603.91				2609.78
Diff -2*log				6.63*				-5.87*
df				1				1

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.***$p < .001$.

*Note: Model 1 was compared to a null model with the intercept as the only predictor.

Table 4

Multilevel Estimates for Regression Model Predicting Positive Affect (Hypothesis 3a)

	Estimate	95% CI	*SE*	*t*
Intercept, γ_{00}	2.82	[2.68, 2.96]	0.07	40.75***
Psychological detachment, γ_{10}	0.09	[0.03, 0.15]	0.03	2.74**
-2*log				1651.23
Diff -2*log				453.92***
df				1

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.***$p < .001$.

*Note: This model was compared to a null model with the intercept as the only predictor.

Table 5

Multilevel Estimates for Regression Model Predicting Work Engagement (Hypothesis 3b)

	Estimate	95% CI	*SE*	*t*
Intercept, γ_{00}	3.96	[3.80, 4.12]	0.08	48.02***
Psychological detachment, γ_{10}	0.07	[-0.01, 0.15]	0.04	1.45
-2*log				2056.80
Diff -2*log				553.74***
df				1

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.***$p < .001$.

*Note: This model was compared to a null model with the intercept as the only predictor.

Table 6

Multilevel Estimates for Regression Model Predicting Positive Affect (Hypothesis 4a)

	Estimate	95% CI	*SE*	*t*
Intercept, γ_{00}	2.81	[2.67, 2.95]	0.07	38.84***
Weekday quadratic slope (time^2), γ_{20}	0.00	[0.00, 0.00]	0.00	0.37
Psychological detachment, γ_{30}	0.08	[-0.02, 0.18]	0.05	1.79
Weekday(time^2)*psychological detachment, γ_{50}	0.00	[-0.02, 0.02]	0.01	0.18

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.***$p < .001$.

Table 7

Multilevel Estimates for Regression Model Predicting Work Engagement (Hypothesis 4b)

	Estimate	95% CI	*SE*	*t*
Intercept, γ_{00}	3.86	[3.66, 4.06]	0.10	42.24***
Weekday linear slope (time) γ_{10}	0.06	[0.02, 0.10]	0.02	2.82**
Psychological detachment, γ_{20}	0.09	[-0.05, 0.23]	0.07	1.23
Weekday (time)*psychological detachment, γ_{30}	-0.02	[-0.08, 0.04]	0.03	-0.62

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.***$p < .001$.

Table 8

Additional Analyses for Week-level Detachment Model Predicting Positive Affect (Hypothesis 4a)

	Estimate	95% CI	*SE*	*t*
Intercept, γ_{00}	2.83	[2.52, 3.14]	0.16	18.20***
Weekday quadratic slope (time^2), γ_{20}	-0.02	[-0.04, -0.00]	0.01	-1.46
Psychological detachment, γ_{30}	-0.01	[-0.09, 0.07]	0.04	-0.19
Weekday(time^2)*psychological detachment, γ_{50}	0.01	[-0.01, 0.01]	0.00	1.89

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.***$p < .001$.

Table 9

Additional Analyses for Week-level Detachment Model Predicting Work Engagement (Hypothesis 4b)

	Estimate	95% CI	*SE*	*t*
Intercept, γ_{00}	4.16	[3.75, 4.57]	0.21	19.71***
Weekday linear slope (time) γ_{10}	-0.08	[-0.20, 0.04]	0.06	-1.32
Psychological detachment, γ_{20}	-0.08	[-0.20, 0.04]	0.06	-1.41
Weekday (time)*psychological detachment, γ_{30}	0.04	[0.00, 0.08]	0.02	2.52**

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.***$p < .001$.

Table 10

Distribution of the Data Points Throughout the Two Weeks of Data Collection

Week	Day	Time Point	Total Particip
1	Monday	Morning	127
1	Monday	Afternoon	126
1	Tuesday	Morning	116
1	Tuesday	Afternoon	115
1	Wednesday	Morning	105
1	Wednesday	Afternoon	114
1	Thursday	Morning	109
1	Thursday	Afternoon	102
1	Friday	Morning	97
1	Friday	Afternoon	94
2	Monday	Morning	99
2	Monday	Afternoon	97
2	Tuesday	Morning	90
2	Tuesday	Afternoon	93
2	Wednesday	Morning	85
2	Wednesday	Afternoon	84
2	Thursday	Afternoon	82
2	Thursday	Morning	81
2	Friday	Morning	83
2	Friday	Afternoon	83

Appendix A

Daily Psychological Detachment (Morning Survey)

Sonnentag, S., & Fritz, C. (2007). The Recovery Experience Questionnaire: Development and validation of a measure. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *12*, 204-221.

Please indicate to what extent you **FELT THIS WAY LAST EVENING AFTER WORK**:

1 I do not agree at all
2 I do not agree
3 Neutral
4 I agree
5 I fully agree

1. I forgot about work.
2. I did not think about work at all.
3. I distanced myself from my work.
4. I got a break from the demands of work.

Appendix B: SPANE (Evening Questionnaire)

Citation: Diener, E., Wirtz, D., Biswas-Diener, R., Tov, W., Kim-Prieto, C., Choi, D., et al. (2009). New measures of well-being. The Netherlands: Springer. The collected works of Ed Diener.

Indicate to what extent you **FELT THIS WAY AT WORK TODAY.**

1 Very slightly or not at all
2 A little
3 Moderately
4 Quite a bit
5 Extremely

1. Positive
2. Good
3. Pleasant
4. Happy
5. Joyful
6. Contented

Appendix C

Daily Work Engagement (Afternoon Survey)

Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., Gonzalez-Roma, V., & Bakker, A. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two-factor sample confirmatory factor analytical approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *3*, 71-92.

Please indicate to what extent you **FELT THIS WAY AT WORK TODAY:**

0 Never
1 Almost never
2 Rarely
3 Sometimes
4 Often
5 Very often
6 Always

1. Today at my work, I felt bursting with energy.
2. Today at my job, I felt strong and vigorous.
3. Today, I was enthusiastic about my job.
4. Today, my job inspired me.
5. Today, when I got up in the morning, I felt like going to work.
6. Today, I felt happy when I was working intensely.
7. Today, I was proud of the work I did.
8. Today, I was immersed in my work.
9. Today, I got carried away when I was working.

Appendix D

Multilevel Estimates for Regression Model Predicting Vigour (Hypothesis 2)

	Model 1				Model 2			
	Estimate	95% CI	*SE*	*t*	Estimate	95% CI	*SE*	*t*
Intercept, γ_{00}	3.67	[3.65, 3.69]	0.10	35.97***	3.62	[3.60, 3.64]	0.10	34.08***
Weekday linear slope (time), γ_{10}	0.08	[0.04, 0.12]	0.02	3.59**	0.18	[0.04, 0.32]	0.07	2.48*
Weekday quadratic slope (time^2), γ_{20}					-0.03	[-0.07, 0.01]	0.02	-1.50
-2*log				2785.00				2788.98
Diff -2*log				6.96**				-3.98*
df				1				1

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.***$p < .001$.

*Note: Model 1 was compared to a null model with the intercept as the only predictor.

Multilevel Estimates for Regression Model Predicting Dedication (Hypothesis 2)

	Model 1				Model 2			
	Estimate	95% CI	*SE*	*t*	Estimate	95% CI	*SE*	*t*
Intercept, γ_{00}	3.96	[3.94, 3.98]	0.10	40.91***	3.97	[3.95, 3.98]	0.10	38.87***
Weekday linear slope (time), γ_{10}	0.05	[0.01, 0.09]	0.02	2.37*	0.02	[-0.14, 0.18]	0.08	0.31
Weekday quadratic slope (time^2), γ_{20}					0.01	[-0.03, 0.05]	0.02	0.39
-2*log				2898.71				2904.62
Diff -2*log				-0.13				-5.91*
df				1				1

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.***$p < .001$.

*Note: Model 1 was compared to a null model with the intercept as the only predictor.

Multilevel Estimates for Regression Model Predicting Absorption (Hypothesis 2)

	Model 1				Model 2				Model 3			
	Estimate	95% CI	*SE*	*t*	Estimate	95% CI	*SE*	*t*	Estimate	95% CI	*SE*	*t*
Intercept, γ_{00}	3.98	[3.80, 4.16]	0.09	45.96***	3.95	[3.77, 4.13]	0.09	42.81***	3.98	[3.80, 4.16]	0.09	46.35
Weekday linear slope (time), γ_{10}	0.08	[0.04, 0.12]	0.02	3.47***	0.15	[-0.01, 0.31]	0.08	1.93	0.08	[0.04, 0.12]	0.02	3.54
Weekday quadratic slope (time^2), γ_{20}					-0.02	[-0.06, 0.02]	0.02	-0.96				
-2*log				2819.52				2824.72				2811.80
Diff -2*log				6.18*				-5.20*				7.71**
df				1				1				1

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.***$p < .001$.

*Note: Model 1 was compared to a null model with the intercept as the only predictor.

Multilevel Estimates for Regression Model Predicting Vigour (Hypothesis 3b)

	Estimate	95% CI	*SE*	*t*
Intercept, γ_{00}	3.77	[3.59, 3.95]	0.10	39.16***
Psychological detachment, γ_{10}	0.10	[0.00, 0.20]	0.05	1.96
-2*log				2791.96
Diff -2*log				596.69
df				1

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.***$p < .001$.

*Note: This model was compared to a null model with the intercept as the only predictor.

Multilevel Estimates for Regression Model Predicting Dedication (Hypothesis 3b)

	Estimate	95% CI	*SE*	*t*
Intercept, γ_{00}	4.03	[3.85, 4.20]	0.09	43.89***
Psychological detachment, γ_{10}	0.07	[0.07, 0.17]	0.05	1.22
-2*log				2293.98
Diff -2*log				604.60
df				1

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.***$p < .001$.

*Note: This model was compared to a null model with the intercept as the only predictor.

Multilevel Estimates for Regression Model Predicting Absorption (Hypothesis 3b)

	Estimate	95% CI	*SE*	*t*
Intercept, γ_{00}	4.08	[3.92, 4.24]	0.08	50.60***
Psychological detachment, γ_{10}	0.03	[-0.07, 0.13]	0.05	0.67
-2*log				2205.80
Diff -2*log				610.90
df				1

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.***$p < .001$

*Note: This model was compared to a null model with the intercept as the only predictor.

Multilevel Estimates for Regression Model Predicting Vigour (Hypothesis 4b)

	Estimate	95% CI	*SE*	*t*
Intercept, γ_{00}	3.68	[3.46, 3.90]	0.11	34..83***
Weekday linear slope (time) γ_{10}	0.06	[0.02, 0.10]	0.02	2.39*
Psychological detachment, γ_{20}	0.19	[-0.18, 0.35]	0.08	2.40*
Weekday (time)*psychological detachment, γ_{30}	-0.06	[-0.14, 0.02]	0.04	-1.67

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.***$p < .001$.

Multilevel Estimates for Regression Model Predicting Dedication (Hypothesis 4b)

	Estimate	95% CI	*SE*	*t*
Intercept, γ_{00}	3.94	[3.74, 4.14]	0.10	38.26***
Weekday linear slope (time) γ_{10}	0.05	[-0.01, 0.11]	0.03	1.87
Psychological detachment, γ_{20}	0.03	[-0.15, 0.21]	0.09	0.37
Weekday (time)*psychological detachment, γ_{30}	0.01	[-0.07, 0.09]	0.04	0.35

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.***$p < .001$.

Multilevel Estimates for Regression Model Predicting Absorption (Hypothesis 4b)

	Estimate	95% CI	*SE*	*t*
Intercept, γ_{00}	3.96	[3.78, 4.14]	0.09	42.80***
Weekday linear slope (time) γ_{10}	0.07	[0.03, 0.11]	0.02	3.01**
Psychological detachment, γ_{20}	0.07	[-0.09, 0.23]	0.08	0.79
Weekday (time)*psychological detachment, γ_{30}	-0.03	[-0.11, 0.05]	0.04	-0.67

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.***$p < .001$.