

SUPPLEMENTAL REFERENCES

References Included in Meta-analysis

- Allen, B. C., Holland, P., & Reynolds, R. 2015. The effect of bullying on burnout in nurses: The moderating role of psychological running to work: Marathon training, replenishment, and worker well-being detachment. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 71: 381-390.
- Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., Oerlemans, W., & Sonnentag, S. 2013. Workaholism and daily recovery: A day reconstruction study of leisure activities. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 34: 87-107.
- Barber, L. K., & Jenkins, J. S. 2014. Creating technological boundaries to protect bedtime: Examining work-home boundary management, psychological detachment and sleep. *Stress and Health*, 30: 259-264.
- Barber, L. K., & Santuzzi, A. M. 2015. Please respond ASAP: Workplace telepressure and employee recovery. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 20: 172-189.
- Belkin, L. Y., Becker, W. J., & Conroy, S. A. 2016. Exhausted, but unable to disconnect: After-hours email, work-family balance and identification. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 2016: 10353.
- Becker, W. J., Belkin, L. Y., Conroy, S. A., & Tuskey, S. 2018. Killing me softly: Electronic communications monitoring and employee and spouse well-being. *Academy of Management Annual Meeting Proceedings*, 2018: 12574.
- 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: 1635-1654.
- Binnewies, C., Sonnentag, S., & Mojza, E. J. 2009. Daily performance at work: Feeling recovered in the morning as a predictor of day-level job performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30: 67-93.

- Binnewies, C., Sonnentag, S., & Mojza, E. J. 2009. Feeling recovered and thinking about the good sides of one's work. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 14: 243–256.
- Binnewies, C., Sonnentag, S., & Mojza, E. J. 2010. Recovery during the weekend and fluctuations in weekly job performance: A week-level study examining intra-individual relationships. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 83: 419–441.
- Blanco-Donoso, L. M., Garrosa, E., Demerouti, E., & Moreno-Jiménez, B. 2017. Job resources and recovery experiences to face difficulties in emotion regulation at work: A diary study among nurses. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 24: 107-134.
- Boekhorst, J. A., Singh, P., & Burke, R. 2017. Work intensity, emotional exhaustion and life satisfaction: The moderating role of psychological detachment. *Personnel Review*, 46: 891-907.
- Bono, J. E., Glomb, T. M., Shen, W., Kim, E., & Koch, A. J. 2013. Building positive resources: Effects of positive events and positive reflection on work stress and health. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56: 1601–1627.
- Bourgeois, L. R. 2011. *Gambling as stress recovery?: A new perspective on the stress-gambling relationship*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, St. Mary's University.
- Brown, J. W., Shoptaugh, C. F., & Ford, M. T. 2018. *Avoiding stress of work: A review of detachment and savoring coping strategies*. Poster presented at the annual meeting of Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Chicago, IL.
- Chen, Y., Li, S., Xia, Q., & He, C. 2017. The relationship between job demands and employees' counterproductive work behaviors: The mediating effect of psychological detachment and job anxiety. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8: 1-15.
- Cho, E. 2013. *Daily Recovery from Work: The Role of Guilt*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of South Florida.
- Clinton, M. E., Conway, N., & Sturges, J. 2017. "It's tough hanging-up a call": The

- relationships between calling and work hours, psychological detachment, sleep quality, and morning vigor. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22: 28-39.
- Davidson, O. B., Eden, D., Westman, M., Cohen-Charash, Y., Hammer, L. B., Kluger, A. N., Spector, P. E. 2010. Sabbatical leave: Who gains and how much? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95: 953–964.
- de Bloom, J., Geurts, S. A., & Kompier, M. A. 2012. Effects of short vacations, vacation activities and experiences on employee health and well-being. *Stress and Health*, 28: 305-318.
- de Bloom, J., Geurts, S. A., & Kompier, M. A. 2013. Vacation (after-) effects on employee health and well-being, and the role of vacation activities, experiences and sleep. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 14: 613-633.
- de Bloom, J., Kinnunen, U., & Korpela, K. 2015. Recovery processes during and after work: Associations with health, work engagement, and job performance. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 57: 732-742.
- de Jonge, J., Spoor, E., Sonnentag, S., Dormann, C., & van den Tooren, M. 2012. “Take a break?!” Off-job recovery, job demands, and job resources as predictors of health, active learning, and creativity. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 21: 321-348.
- DeArmond, S., Matthews, R. A., & Bunk, J. 2014. Workload and procrastination: The roles of psychological detachment and fatigue. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 21: 137-161.
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Sonnentag, S., & Fullagar, C. J. 2012. Work-related flow and energy at work and at home: A study on the role of daily recovery. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 33: 276-295.

- Demsky, C. A., Ellis, A. M., & Fritz, C. 2014. Shrugging it off: Does psychological detachment from work mediate the relationship between workplace aggression and work-family conflict?. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 19: 195-205.
- Derks, D., & Bakker, A. B. 2014. Smartphone use, work-home interference, and burnout: A diary study on the role of recovery. *Applied Psychology*, 63: 411-440.
- Derks, D., ten Brummelhuis, L. L., Zecic, D., & Bakker, A. B. 2014. Switching on and off...: Does smartphone use obstruct the possibility to engage in recovery activities?. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 23: 80-90.
- Derks, D., van Mierlo, H., & Schmitz, E. B. 2014. A diary study on work-related smartphone use, psychological detachment and exhaustion: Examining the role of the perceived segmentation norm. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 19: 74-84.
- Dettmers, J. 2017. How extended work availability affects well-being: The mediating roles of psychological detachment and work-family-conflict. *Work & Stress*, 31: 24-41.
- Dettmers, J., Bamberg, E., & Seffzek, K. 2016. Characteristics of extended availability for work: The role of demands and resources. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 23: 276-297.
- Dettmers, J., Vahle-Hinz, T., Bamberg, E., Friedrich, N., & Keller, M. 2015. Extended work availability and its relation with start-of-day mood and cortisol. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 21: 105-118.
- de Vries, J. D., Claessens, B. J., van Hooff, M. L., Geurts, S. A., van den Bossche, S. N., & Kompier, M. A. 2016. Disentangling longitudinal relations between physical activity, work-related fatigue, and task demands. *International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health*, 89: 89-101.
- Dijkhuizen, J., Gorgievski, M., van Veldhoven, M., & Schalk, R. 2016. Feeling successful as

- an entrepreneur: A job demands—resources approach. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 12: 555-573.
- Donahue, E. G., Forest, J., Vallerand, R. J., Lemyre, P. N., Crevier-Braud, L., & Bergeron, É. 2012. Passion for work and emotional exhaustion: The mediating role of rumination and recovery. *Applied Psychology: Health and Well-Being*, 4: 341-368.
- Drach-Zahavy, A., & Marzuq, N. 2013. The weekend matters: Exploring when and how nurses best recover from work stress. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 69: 578-589.
- Dugan, A. G., & Barnes-Farrell, J. L. 2017. Time for self-care: Downtime recovery as a buffer of work and home/family time pressures. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 59: 46-56.
- Eddleston, K. A., & Mulki, J. 2017. Toward understanding remote workers' management of work–family boundaries: the complexity of workplace embeddedness. *Group & Organization Management*, 42: 346-387.
- Ellis, A. M. 2015. *Building resources at home and at work: Day-level relationships between job crafting, recovery experiences, and work engagement*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Portland State University.
- Eschleman, K. J., Madsen, J., Alarcon, G., & Barelka, A. 2014. Benefiting from creative activity: The positive relationships between creative activity, recovery experiences, and performance-related outcomes. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 87: 579-598.
- Fang, J., Kunaviktikul, W., Olson, K., Chontawan, R., & Kaewthummanukul, T. 2008. Factors influencing fatigue in Chinese nurses. *Nursing & Health Sciences*, 10: 291-299.
- Feuerhahn, N., Sonnentag, S., & Woll, A. 2014. Exercise after work, psychological mediators, and affect: A day-level study. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 23: 62-79.

- Flaxman, P. E., Ménard, J., Bond, F. W., & Kinman, G. 2012. Academics' experiences of a respite from work: Effects of self-critical perfectionism and perseverative cognition on postrespite well-being. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97: 854-865.
- Fritz, C., & Sonnentag, S. 2005. Recovery, health, and job performance: Effects of weekend experiences. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 10: 187–199.
- 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.
- 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: 977–983.
- García-Ayala, A., Rodríguez-Muñoz, A., Moreno, Y., Antino, M., & Ayllón, E. 2014. The role of psychological detachment and empathy in the relationship between target and perpetrator in workplace bullying situations/El papel del distanciamiento psicológico y la empatía en la relación entre víctima y agresor en situaciones de acoso en el trabajo. *Revista de Psicología Social*, 29: 213-234.
- Garrick, A., Mak, A. S., Cathcart, S., Winwood, P. C., Bakker, A. B., & Lushington, K. 2014. Psychosocial safety climate moderating the effects of daily job demands and recovery on fatigue and work engagement. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 87: 694-714.
- Garrosa, E., Carmona-Cobo, I., Moreno-Jiménez, B., & Sanz-Vergel, A. 2015. El impacto emocional del incivismo laboral y el abuso verbal en el trabajo: El papel protector de la recuperación diaria. *Anales de Psicología*, 31: 190-198.
- Germeys, L., & De Gieter, S. 2017. Psychological detachment mediating the daily relationship between workload and marital satisfaction. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7: 20-36.

- Gillet, N., Morin, A. J., Cougot, B., & Gagné, M. 2017. Workaholism profiles: Associations with determinants, correlates, and outcomes. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 90: 559-586.
- Gilmer, D. O., & Lindsey, A. P. 2018 *General and workplace social support differentially predict recovery experiences*. Poster presented at the annual meeting of Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Chicago, IL.
- Gluschkoff, K., Elovainio, M., Hintsanen, M., Mullola, S., Pulkki-Råback, L., Keltikangas-Järvinen, L., & Hintsanen, T. 2017. Perfectionism and depressive symptoms: The effects of psychological detachment from work. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 116: 186-190.
- Gluschkoff, K., Elovainio, M., Kinnunen, U., Mullola, S., Hintsanen, M., Keltikangas-Järvinen, L., & Hintsanen, T. 2016. Work stress, poor recovery and burnout in teachers. *Occupational Medicine*, 66: 564-570.
- Goodboy, A. K., Martin, M. M., & Brown, E. 2016. Bullying on the school bus: deleterious effects on public school bus drivers. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 44: 434-452.
- Guros, F. 2015. *Thinking About Work at Home: Implications for Safety at Work*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Portland State University
- Hahn, V. C., Binnewies, C., Sonnentag, S., & Mojza, E. J. 2011. Learning how to recover from job stress: Effects of a recovery training program on recovery, recovery-related self-efficacy, and well-being. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 16: 202–216.
- Hahn, V. C., & Dormann, C. 2013. The role of partners and children for employees' psychological detachment from work and well-being. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98: 26–36.
- Hakanen, J., Rodríguez-Sánchez, A. M., & Perhoniemi, R. 2012. Too good to be true

- Similarities and differences between engagement and workaholism among finnish judges. *Cienc Trab*, 14: 72-80.
- Halbesleben, J. R., Wheeler, A. R., & Paustian-Underdahl, S. C. 2013. The impact of furloughs on emotional exhaustion, self-rated performance, and recovery experiences. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98: 492-503.
- Hu, J. L., & Ho, C. W. 2016. Service quality and non-salary mechanism for airline companies in Taiwan. *Journal of Air Transport Management*, 55: 61-66.
- Hülshager, U. R. 2016. From dawn till dusk: Shedding light on the recovery process by investigating daily change patterns in fatigue. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 101: 905-914.
- Hülshager, U. R., Feinholdt, A., & Nübold, A. 2015. A low-dose mindfulness intervention and recovery from work: Effects on psychological detachment, sleep quality, and sleep duration. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 88: 464-489.
- Hülshager, U. R., Lang, J. W., Depenbrock, F., Fehrman, 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: 1113-1128.
- Jalonen, N., Kinnunen, M. L., Pulkkinen, L., & Kokko, K. 2015. Job skill discretion and emotion control strategies as antecedents of recovery from work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 24: 389-401.
- Jennings, K. S. 2017. *Stress as a Badge of Honor: Relationships with Employee Performance, Health, and Well-Being*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Clemson University.
- Kim, S., Park, Y., & Niu, Q. 2017. Micro-break activities at work to recover from daily work demands. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 38: 28-44.
- Kinman, G., Clements, A. J., & Hart, J. 2017. Working conditions, work–life conflict, and

- well-being in UK prison officers: The role of affective rumination and detachment. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 44: 226-239.
- Kinnunen, U., & Feldt, T. 2013. Job characteristics, recovery experiences and occupational Well-being: Testing cross-lagged relationships across 1 year. *Stress and Health*, 29: 369-382.
- Kinnunen, U., Feldt, T., Sianoja, M., de Bloom, J., Korpela, K., & Geurts, S. 2017. Identifying long-term patterns of work-related rumination: Associations with job demands and well-being outcomes. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 26: 514-526.
- Kinnunen, U., Feldt, T., Siltaloppi, M., & Sonnentag, S. 2011. Job demands–resources model in the context of recovery: Testing recovery experiences as mediators. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 20: 805–832.
- Kinnunen, U., Mauno, S., & Siltaloppi, M. 2010. Job insecurity, recovery and well-being at work: Recovery experiences as moderators. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 31: 179-194.
- Kinnunen, U., Rantanen, J., de Bloom, J., Mauno, S., Feldt, T., & Korpela, K. 2016. The role of work–nonwork boundary management in work stress recovery. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 23: 99-123.
- Korpela, K., & Kinnunen, U. 2010. How is leisure time interacting with nature related to the need for recovery from work demands? Testing multiple mediators. *Leisure Sciences*, 33: 1-14.
- Kühnel, J., & Sonnentag, S. 2011. How long do you benefit from vacation? A closer look at the fade-out of vacation effects. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32: 125-143.

- Kühnel, J., Sonnentag, S., & Bledow, R. 2012. Resources and time pressure as day-level antecedents of work engagement. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 85: 181-198.
- Lam, J., Mathieu, M., & Escheleman, K. 2015. *The moderating effects of mindfulness on the job recovery process*. Poster presented at the annual meeting of Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Philadelphia, PA.
- Lancaster, P. G. 2013. *Predictors and outcomes of occupational burnout: A five-wave longitudinal study*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Colorado State University.
- Lapierre, L. M., Hammer, L. B., Truxillo, D. M., & Murphy, L. A. 2012. Family interference with work and workplace cognitive failure: The mitigating role of recovery experiences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 81: 227-235.
- Lee, K. H., Choo, S. W., & Hyun, S. S. 2016. Effects of recovery experiences on hotel employees' subjective well-being. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 52: 1-12.
- LeNoble, C. A. 2016. *Depletion today keeps the apple away: Effects of workplace resource processes on daily health behavior and recovery*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Florida Institute of Technology.
- Lin, B.C., & Fritz, C. 2015. *Give me a break! An examination of lunch break recovery*. Poster presented at the annual meeting of Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Philadelphia, PA.
- Mäkikangas, A., Kinnunen, S., Rantanen, J., Mauno, S., Tolvanen, A., & Bakker, A. B. 2014. Association between vigor and exhaustion during the workweek: A person-centered approach to daily assessments. *Anxiety, Stress, & Coping*, 27: 555-575.
- Mariappanadar, S. 2016. Health harm of work from the sustainable HRM perspective: Scale development and validation. *International Journal of Manpower*, 37: 924-944.

- Marzuq, N., & Drach-Zahavy, A. 2012. Recovery during a short period of respite: The interactive roles of mindfulness and respite experiences. *Work & Stress*, 26: 175-194.
- McGrath, E., Cooper-Thomas, H. D., Garrosa, E., Sanz-Vergel, A. I., & Cheung, G. W. 2017. Rested, friendly, and engaged: The role of daily positive collegial interactions at work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 38: 1213-1226.
- Meier, L. L., Cho, E., & Dumani, S. 2016. The effect of positive work reflection during leisure time on affective well-being: Results from three diary studies. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 37: 255-278.
- Mellner, C. 2016. After-hours availability expectations, work-related smartphone use during leisure, and psychological detachment: The moderating role of boundary control. *International Journal of Workplace Health Management*, 9: 146-164.
- Meltzer, D. P. 2016. *Psychological detachment from work and the threat of role ambiguity*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Hofstra University.
- Merino-Tejedor, E., Hontangas, P. M., & Boada-Grau, J. 2017. The assessment of detachment among university students: Validation of the Recovery Experience Questionnaire in educational contexts. *Anales de Psicología/Annals of Psychology*, 33: 342-350.
- Michailidis, E., & Cropley, M. 2017. Exploring predictors and consequences of embitterment in the workplace. *Ergonomics*, 60: 1197-1206.
- Michel, A., Bosch, C., & Rexroth, M. 2014. Mindfulness as a cognitive–emotional segmentation strategy: An intervention promoting work–life balance. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 87: 733-754.
- Michel, A., Turgut, S., Hoppe, A., & Sonntag, K. 2016. Challenge and threat emotions as antecedents of recovery experiences: Findings from a diary study with blue-collar workers. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 25: 674-689.
- Mierswa, T., & Kellmann, M. 2017. Psychological detachment as moderator between

- psychosocial work conditions and low back pain development. *International Journal of Occupational Medicine and Environmental Health*, 30: 313-327.
- Mojza, E. J., Lorenz, C., Sonnentag, S., & Binnewies, C. 2010. Daily recovery experiences: The role of volunteer work during leisure time. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 15: 60-74.
- 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.
- Molino, M., Cortese, C. G., Bakker, A. B., & Ghislieri, C. 2015. Do recovery experiences moderate the relationship between workload and work-family conflict? *Career Development International*, 20: 686-702.
- Moreno-Jiménez, B., & Gálvez Herrer, M. 2013. El efecto del distanciamiento psicológico del trabajo en el bienestar y la satisfacción con la vida: Un estudio longitudinal. *Revista de Psicología del Trabajo y de las Organizaciones*, 29: 145-151.
- Moreno-Jiménez, B., Mayo, M., Sanz-Vergel, A. I., Geurts, S., Rodríguez-Muñoz, A., & Garrosa, E. 2009. Effects of work–family conflict on employees’ well-being: The moderating role of recovery strategies. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 14: 427-440.
- Moreno-Jiménez, B., Rodríguez-Muñoz, A., Pastor, J. C., Sanz-Vergel, A. I., & Garrosa, E. 2009. The moderating effects of psychological detachment and thoughts of revenge in workplace bullying. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 46: 359-364.
- Moreno-Jiménez, B., Rodríguez-Muñoz, A., Sanz-Vergel, A. I., & Garrosa, E. 2012. Elucidating the role of recovery experiences in the job demands-resources model. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 15: 659-669.

- Mostert, K., & Els, C. 2015. The psychometric properties of the Recovery Experiences Questionnaire of employees in a higher education institution. *Journal of Psychology in Africa*, 25: 37-43.
- Nicholson, T., & Griffin, B. 2015. Here today but not gone tomorrow: Incivility affects after-work and next-day recovery. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 20: 218-225.
- Nicholson, T., & Griffin, B. 2017. Thank goodness it's Friday: weekly pattern of workplace incivility. *Anxiety, Stress, & Coping*, 30: 1-14.
- Niks, I. M., Gevers, J. M., De Jonge, J., & Houtman, I. L. 2016. The relation between off-job recovery and job resources: person-level differences and day-level dynamics. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 25: 226-238.
- Nohe, C., Michel, A., & Sonntag, K. 2014. Family–work conflict and job performance: A diary study of boundary conditions and mechanisms. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 353: 339-357.
- Nurmi, N., & Hinds, P. J. 2016. Job complexity and learning opportunities: A silver lining in the design of global virtual work. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 47: 631-654.
- Oerlemans, W. G. M., & Bakker, A. B. 2014. Burnout and daily recovery: A day reconstruction study. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 19: 303-314.
- Oerlemans, W. G., Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. 2014. How feeling happy during off-job activities help successful recovery from work: A day reconstruction study. *Work & Stress*, 28: 198-216.
- Ohly, S., & Latour, A. 2015. Work-related smartphone use and well-being in the evening. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, 13: 174-183.
- Oosthuizen, J., Mostert, K., & Koekemoer, F. E. 2011. Job characteristics, work-nonwork interference and the role of recovery strategies amongst employees in a tertiary institution. *Journal of Human Resource Management*, 9: 1-15.

- Park, Y., & Fritz, C. 2015. Spousal recovery support, recovery experiences, and life satisfaction crossover among dual-earner couples. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100: 557–566.
- Park, Y., Fritz, C., & Jex, S. M. 2018. Daily cyber incivility and distress: The moderating roles of resources at work and home. *Journal of Management*, 44: 2535-2557.
- Park, H. I., & Lee, H. 2015. The effects of recovery-related self-efficacy on occupational health among Korean workers. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 22: 372-394.
- Pereira, D., Bucher, S., & Elfering, A. 2016. Daily impaired detachment and short-term effects of impaired sleep quality on next-day commuting near-accidents—an ambulatory diary study. *Ergonomics*, 59: 1121-1131.
- Pereira, D., & Elfering, A. 2014. Social stressors at work and sleep during weekends: The mediating role of psychological detachment. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 19: 85-95.
- Pereira, D., Gross, S., & Elfering, A. 2016. Social Stressors at work, sleep, and recovery. *Applied Psychophysiology and Biofeedback*, 41: 93-101.
- Pereira, D., Semmer, N. K., & Elfering, A. 2014. Illegitimate tasks and sleep quality: An ambulatory study. *Stress and Health*, 30: 209-221.
- Potok, Y., & Littman-Ovadia, H. 2013. Does personality regulate the work stressor–psychological detachment relationship? *Journal of Career Assessment*, 22: 43-58.
- Poulsen, M. G., Poulsen, A. A., Khan, A., Poulsen, E. E., & Khan, S. R. 2015. Recovery experience and burnout in cancer workers in Queensland. *European Journal of Oncology Nursing*, 19: 23-28.
- Querstet, D., & Cropley, M. 2012. Exploring the relationship between work-related rumination, sleep quality, and work-related fatigue. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 17: 341-353.
- Quinones, C., & Griffiths, M. D. 2017. The impact of daily emotional demands, job resources

- and emotional effort on intensive internet use during and after work. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 76: 561-575.
- Quinones, C., Rodríguez-Carvajal, R., Griffiths, M. D., & Clarke, N. 2015. Cross-national validation of the resources depletion-recovery model: An empirical study of Spanish and British theme park employees. *Aloma: revista de psicologia, ciències de l'educació i de l'esport Blanquerna*, 33: 107-117.
- Ragsdale, J. M., & Beehr, T. A. 2016. A rigorous test of a model of employees' resource recovery mechanisms during a weekend. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 37: 911-932.
- Ragsdale, J. M., Beehr, T. A., Grebner, S., & Han, K. 2011. An integrated model of weekday stress and weekend recovery of students. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 18: 153-180.
- Ragsdale, J. M., Hoover, C.S. & Wood, K., 2016. Investigating affective dispositions as moderators of relationships between weekend activities and recovery experiences. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 89: 734-750.
- Reinecke, L., Hartmann, T., & Eden, A. 2014. The guilty couch potato: The role of ego depletion in reducing recovery through media use. *Journal of Communication*, 64: 569-589.
- Rhee, H., & Kim, S. 2016. Effects of breaks on regaining vitality at work: An empirical comparison of 'conventional' and 'smart phone' breaks. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 57: 160-167.
- Richardson, K. M., & Thompson, C. A. 2012. High tech tethers and work-family conflict: A conservation of resources approach. *Engineering Management Research*, 1: 29-43.
- Rivkin, W., Diestel, S., & Schmidt, K. H. 2015. Psychological detachment: A moderator in the relationship of self-control demands and job strain. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 24: 376-388.

- Rodríguez-Muñoz, A., Antino, M., & Sanz-Vergel, A. I. 2017. Cross-domain consequences of workplace bullying: A multi-source daily diary study. *Work & Stress*, 31: 297-314.
- Rook, J. W., & Zijlstra, F. R. 2006. The contribution of various types of activities to recovery. *European journal of work and organizational psychology*, 152: 218-240.
- Safstrom, M., & Hartig, T. 2013. Psychological detachment in the relationship between job stressors and strain. *Behavioral Sciences*, 3: 418-433.
- Sanz-Vergel, A. I., Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., & Moreno-Jiménez, B. 2011. Daily detachment from work and home: The moderating effect of role salience. *Human Relations*, 6: 775-799.
- Sanz-Vergel, A. I., Demerouti, E., Moreno-Jiménez, B., & Mayo, M. 2010. Work-family balance and energy: A day-level study on recovery conditions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 76: 118-130.
- Sawhney, G., Jennings, K. S., Britt, T. W., & Sliter, M. T. 2018. Occupational stress and mental health symptoms: Examining the moderating effect of work recovery strategies in firefighters. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 23: 443-456.
- Schraub, E. M., Turgut, S., Clavairol, V., & Sonntag, K. 2013. Emotion regulation as a determinant of recovery experiences and well-being: A day-level study. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 20: 309-335.
- Schulz, A. S., Bloom, J., & Kinnunen, U. 2017. Workaholism and daily energy management at work: Associations with self-reported health and emotional exhaustion. *Industrial Health*, 55: 252-264.
- Serrano, S. A. 2015. *Work engagement or workaholism: What's the difference? An empirical investigation of the similarities and differences in climate, performance, and recovery*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Claremont Graduate University.

- Shimazu, A., De Jonge, J., Kubota, K., & Kawakami, N. 2014. Psychological detachment from work during off-job time: Predictive role of work and non-work factors in Japanese employees. *Industrial Health*, 52: 141-146.
- Shimazu, A., Sonnentag, S., Kubota, K., & Kawakami, N. 2012. Validation of the Japanese version of the recovery experience questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational Health*, 54: 196-205.
- Shimazu, A., Matsudaira, K., De Jonge, J., Tosaka, N., Watanabe, K., & Takahashi, M. 2016. Psychological detachment from work during non-work time: Linear or curvilinear relations with mental health and work engagement?. *Industrial Health*, 54: 282-292.
- Singh, P., Burke, R. J., & Boekhorst, J. 2016. Recovery after work experiences, employee well-being and intent to quit. *Personnel Review*, 45: 232-254.
- Smit, B. W., & Barber, L. K. 2016. Psychologically detaching despite high workloads: The role of attentional processes. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 21: 432-442.
- Sonnentag, S. 2001. Work, recovery activities, and individual well-being: A diary study. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 6: 196–210.
- Sonnentag, S. 2003. Recovery, work engagement, and proactive behavior: A new look at the interface between nonwork and work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88: 518–528.
- Sonnentag, S., Arbeus, H., Mahn, C., & Fritz, C. 2014. Exhaustion and lack of psychological detachment from work during off-job time: Moderator effects of time pressure and leisure experiences. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 19: 206-216.
- 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: 393-414.
- Sonnentag, S., & Binnewies, C. 2013. Daily affect spillover from work to home: Detachment from work and sleep as moderators. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 83: 198-208.

- Sonnentag, S., Binnewies, C., & Mojza, E. J. 2008. "Did you have a nice evening?" A day-level study on recovery experiences, sleep, and affect. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93: 674-684.
- Sonnentag, S., Binnewies, C., & Mojza, E. J. 2010. Staying well and engaged when demands are high: The role of psychological detachment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95: 965-976.
- 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: 204–221.
- Sonnentag, S., & Jelden, S. 2009. Job stressors and the pursuit of sport activities: A day-level perspective. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 14: 165-181.
- Sonnentag, S., & Krueger, 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., & Kühnel, J. 2016. Coming back to work in the morning: Psychological detachment and reattachment as predictors of work engagement. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 21: 379-390.
- Sonnentag, S., Kuttler, I., & Fritz, C. 2010. Job stressors, emotional exhaustion, and need for recovery: A multi-source study on the benefits of psychological detachment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 76: 355-365.
- Sonnentag, S., & Lischetzke, T. 2018. Illegitimate tasks reach into afterwork hours: A multilevel study. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 23: 248-261.
- Sonnentag, S., Mojza, E. J., Binnewies, 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: 257-276.

- Sonnentag, S., Mojza, E. J., Demerouti, E., & Bakker, A. B. 2012. Reciprocal relations between recovery and work engagement: The moderating role of job stressors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97: 842-853.
- Sonnentag, S., & Natter, E. 2004. Flight attendants' daily recovery from work: Is there no place like home? *International Journal of Stress Management*, 11: 366–391.
- Sonnentag, S., & Niessen, C. 2008. Staying vigorous until work is over: The role of trait vigour, day-specific work experiences and recovery. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 81: 435-458.
- Sonnentag, S., Unger, D., & Nägel, I. J. 2013. Workplace conflict and employee well-being: The moderating role of detachment from work during off-job time. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 24: 166-183.
- Sonnentag, S., & Zijlstra, F. R. H. 2006: Job characteristics and off-job activities as predictors of need for recovery, well-being, and fatigue. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91: 330–350.
- Stevens, S. N. 2010. *Understanding how employees unwind after work: Expanding the construct of "recovery"*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Saint Mary's University.
- Taris, T. W., Geurts, S. A., Schaufeli, W. B., Blonk, R. W., & Lagerveld, S. E. 2008. All day and all of the night: The relative contribution of two dimensions of workaholism to well-being in self-employed workers. *Work & Stress*, 22: 153-165.
- 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.
- ten Brummelhuis, L. L., & Trougakos, J. P. 2014. The recovery potential of intrinsically versus extrinsically motivated off-job activities. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 87: 177-199.
- Törnquist Agosti, M., Bringsén, Å., & Andersson, I. 2017. The complexity of resources related

- to work-life balance and well-being—a survey among municipality employees in Sweden. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 28: 2351-2374.
- Trougakos, J. P., Beal, D. J., Green, S. G., & Weiss, H. M. 2008. Making the break count: An episodic examination of recovery activities, emotional experiences, and positive affective displays. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51: 131-146.
- Trougakos, J. P., Hideg, I., Cheng, B. H., & Beal, D. J. 2014. Lunch breaks unpacked: The role of autonomy as a moderator of recovery during lunch. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57: 405-421.
- van Hooff, M. L. 2015. The daily commute from work to home: Examining employees' experiences in relation to their recovery status. *Stress and Health*, 31: 124-137.
- van Hooff, M. L., & de Pater, I. E. 2017. Let's have fun tonight: The role of pleasure in daily recovery from work. *Applied Psychology*, 66: 359-381.
- van Moerkerk, A., & Brenninkmeijer, V. 2015. The relationship between self-control and work-related outcomes: What is the role of lifestyle?. *Gedrag & Organizatie*, 28: 291-314.
- van Wijhe, C., Peeters, M., Schaufeli, W., & Ouweneel, E. 2013. Rise and shine: Recovery experiences of workaholic and nonworkaholic employees. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 22: 476-489.
- Virgă, D., & Paveloni, A. 2015. Psychological capital and well being: The moderating role of psychological detachment. *Psihologia Resurselor Umane*, 13: 53-62.
- Volman, F. E., Bakker, A. B., & Xanthopoulou, D. 2013. Recovery at home and performance at work: A diary study on self-family facilitation. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 22: 218-234.
- von Dreden, C., & Binnewies, C. 2017. Choose your lunch companion wisely: The relationship

- between lunch break companionship, psychological detachment, and daily vigour. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 26: 356-372.
- von Thiele Schwarz, U. 2011. Inability to withdraw from work as related to poor next-day recovery and fatigue among women. *Applied Psychology*, 60: 377-396.
- Waite, E. 2012. *Running to work: Marathon training, replenishment, and worker well-being*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Houston.
- Waltz, P. R. 2016. *Experiencing recovery at work: Energetic benefits of social media micro-breaks*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northern Illinois University.
- Wang, Z., Chen, X., & Duan, Y. 2017. Communication technology use for work at home during off-job time and work–family conflict: The roles of family support and psychological detachment. *Anales de Psicología/Annals of Psychology*, 33: 93-101.
- Ward, S., & Steptoe-Warren, G. 2013. A conservation of resources approach to BlackBerry use, work-family conflict and well-being: Job control and psychological detachment from work as potential mediators. *Engineering Management Research*, 3: 8-23.
- White, E. 2011. Helping to promote psychological well-being at work: The role of work engagement, work stress and psychological detachment using the job demands-resources model. *The Plymouth Student Scientist*, 4: 155-180.
- Winwood, P. C., Bakker, A. B., & Winefield, A. H. 2007. An investigation of the role of non–work-time behavior in buffering the effects of work strain. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 49: 862-871.
- Winwood, P. C., Colon, R., & McEwen, K. 2013. A practical measure of workplace resilience: Developing the resilience at work scale. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 55: 1205-1212.
- Winwood, P. C., Winefield, A. H., Dawson, D., & Lushington, K. 2005. Development and validation of a scale to measure work-related fatigue and recovery: The occupational

- fatigue exhaustion/recovery scale (OFER). *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 47: 594-606.
- Winwood, P. C., Winefield, A. H., & Lushington, K. 2006. Work-related fatigue and recovery: The contribution of age, domestic responsibilities and shiftwork. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 56: 438-449.
- Zacher, H., Brailsford, H. A., & Parker, S. L. 2014. Micro-breaks matter: A diary study on the effects of energy management strategies on occupational well-being. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 85: 287-297.

Table S1

Studies Reporting Both Within- and Between-Person Correlations

Study Authors & Year	Level-1 N	Sample Population	Recovery Construct	Time Lag (Measurement Frequency)	Main Recovery-Related Findings	Between-person and Within-person Findings Comparison
Bakker, Demerouti, Oerlemans, & Sonnentag (2013)	765	Dutch employees recruited through word-of-mouth and website banners that target employees	High duty activities Low duty activities State of being recovered	Daily (before bed) for nine workdays	Time spent on exercise was positively related to recovery. Vigor before bedtime was positively related to recovery. Evening happiness was positively related to recovery.	Between- and within-person correlations were inconsistent, though neither were consistently stronger than the other.
Binnewies, Sonnentag, & Mojza (2009)	359	German and Swiss public service employees	State of being recovered	Twice a day (morning, before work, after work) for five workdays	State of being recovered positively predicts job performance and negatively predicts daily compensatory effort. Job control moderates the relationship between state of being recovered and job performance.	Pattern was consistent across the correlations for state of being recovered with variables at the within- and between-person level.

Binnewies, Sonnentag, & Mojza (2010)	406	Employees from five organizations (three manufacturing, service, and publishing)	Detachment Relaxation Mastery State of being recovered	Twice a week (beginning and end of week) for four workweeks	Detachment and relaxation positively predicted state of being recovered, which then positively predicted task performance, OCB, and personal initiative.	Between- and within-person correlations were almost identical in direction and magnitude.
Bono, Glomb, Shen, Kim, & Koch (2013)	244-1830	Employees of outpatient clinics in a large metropolitan area	Detachment	Five surveys (two morning, two afternoon, one evening) and twelve blood pressure readings (four morning, four afternoon, four evening) daily for fifteen workdays. One additional evening survey on days 8-15	Positive work events were positively associated with detachment. Negative work events were negatively associated with detachment.	Findings were generally similar in pattern for detachment's relationships, with exceptions of blood pressure being negatively correlated to detachment within-person and positively between-person, and family conflict being positively correlated to detachment within-person and negatively between-person. Magnitude of correlations were generally stronger for between-person correlations.
Cho (2013)	898-1079	Full-time employees within a community	Detachment Relaxation	Three times a day (morning, after work, before bed) for fourteen days	Off-job activities had limited relationships with recovery experiences (detachment and relaxation). Recovery experiences were positively related to vitality, fewer physical symptoms, and sleep quality.	Pattern of relationships were consistent across within- and between-correlations for recovery experiences and vitality, sleep quality, and physical symptoms.

Clinton, Conway, & Sturges (2017)	1000	Church of England ministers	Detachment	Daily (after work) for seven days	Detachment positively influenced sleep quality and morning vigor.	Between- and within-person correlations for detachment and: (1) work hours and (2) sleep were nearly identical. Between- and within-person correlations for detachment and vigor were fairly similar as well ($r = .24$ vs. $.12$).
Ellis (2015)	360	Employees at technology firm in USA	Mastery	Three times a day (start of work, lunchtime, end of work) for five workdays	Mastery was not related to job crafting the following day but was related to engagement.	Mastery was significantly related to positive affect in the morning at both the within- and between-person level. However, mastery was only significantly related to lunchtime positive affect at the between-person level.
Feuerhahn, Sonnentag, & Woll (2014)	580	Employees recruited from sports/fitness clubs and exercise groups in Germany	Low duty activities High duty activities Detachment	Twice a day (after work and before bed) for five workdays	Exercise activities predicted positive affect and the relationship was mediated by detachment. Stress at work, daily stressors, and work-related activities negatively predicted detachment.	Majority of correlations between detachment and key variables (affect, activities, stress/stressors) were similar in pattern and magnitude with the exception of work-related activities, where the within-person correlation was much stronger ($r = -.44$ vs. $-.11$). In general, more within-person correlations were significant than between.

Garrick et al. (2014)	915	Teachers and principals from primary and secondary schools	State of being recovered High duty activities	Twice a day (morning and night) for five workdays	State of being recovered was positively related to engagement and negatively related to fatigue. Both of these relationships were moderated by psychosocial safety climate.	Correlations between recovery and study variables were consistent in terms of pattern and magnitude. Nearly all day-level correlations were significant, whereas fewer person-level correlations were significant.
Germeys & De Gieter (2017)	1144	Belgian employees working in different sectors, majority white collar	Detachment	Daily (before bed) for ten workdays	Workload was negatively related to detachment. Daily detachment was positively related to marital satisfaction. Detachment fully mediated the relationship between workload and marital satisfaction.	Of three relevant correlations, two within-person correlations were significantly stronger than between-person correlations.
Hulsheger (2016)	197-423	Convenience sample of Dutch speaking employees from Netherlands, Belgium, Suriname, and Australia	Detachment	Four times a day (morning, work break, end of work, before bed) for five workdays	Detachment was unrelated to morning fatigue. There was no significant cross-level interaction between detachment and the linear or quadratic time trend.	Between-person correlations were generally stronger than within-person correlations but not substantially so (e.g., $r = -.13$ vs. $-.01$). However, one exception was the relationship between detachment and end of work fatigue which showed substantial difference in magnitude and direction for between- and within-person correlations ($r = -.20$ vs. $.06$, respectively).

Hulsheger et al. (2014)	591-599	Employees recruited from organizations in Germany	Detachment	Three times a day (morning, after work, before bed) for ten workdays	Detachment mediates the relationship between mindfulness and sleep quality. Detachment was also negatively related to work demands and increased linearly over the course of the work week. This increase was moderated by trait mindfulness.	Findings were similar in pattern, with between-person correlations being larger in magnitude than day-level correlations, and significance varying based on centering.
Hulsheger, Feinholdt, & Nubold (2015)	836-1314	Employees recruited from organizations in Germany	Detachment	Three times a day (morning, after work, before bed) for ten workdays	Mindfulness interventions did not affect detachment.	Findings are similar in pattern, with between-person correlations being larger in magnitude than day-level correlations.
Kim, Park, & Niu (2017)	842	Office workers in South Korea	Low duty activities	Twice a day (after lunch and after work) for ten workdays	Work demands after lunch were negatively related to engagement in recovery activities. Recovery activities were negatively related to negative affect at work.	Correlations at the between- and within-person levels were almost entirely consistent across recovery activities and their relationships with work demands and affect.
Kühnel, Sonnentag, & Bledow (2012)	475	Employees from German companies in diverse industries	State of being recovered	Three times a day (start of work, noon, end of work) for five workdays	Day-specific state of being recovered positively predicted work engagement	Between- and within-person correlational patterns were similar in terms of direction and magnitude.

LeNoble 2016	1182	Employees from various organizations	Low duty activities High duty activities Recovery	Four times a day (before work, before lunch, end of work, before bed) for ten workdays	In general, resources predicted recovery during and after work, which explained positive well-being and mood at night.	Although some within- and between-person correlations varied, the general pattern of relationships for (1) recovery behaviors and experiences and (2) resources and well-being were consistent in magnitude and direction.
McGrath, Cooper-Thomas, Garrosa, Sanz-Vergel, & Cheung (2017)	336	Employees from various organizations in New Zealand and USA	Recovery	Three times a day (before work, after work, before bed) for five workdays	Sleep quality partially mediated the recovery-positive affect relationship. Morning positive affect then was positively related to work engagement that day, which was positively related to evening recovery.	Within- and between-person correlations involving recovery were nearly identical in magnitude (and identical in direction). Correlations between baseline assessments and aggregated within-person measures were also similar in magnitude (and identical in direction) when involving recovery.
Meier, Cho, & Dumani (2016) – Sample 1	780-819	Employees from several Swiss organizations recruited via students	Detachment	Three times a day (morning, end of work, before bed) for ten workdays and twice a day (morning and before bed) for four non-workdays.	Negative work reflection was negatively related to detachment. Also, detachment was positively correlated with joviality and negatively correlated with depressive and angry moods.	Direction of between- and within-person correlations were consistent, however, between-person correlations were consistently larger in magnitude than within-person correlations.

Meier, Cho, & Dumani (2016) – Sample 2	639-729	Employees recruited via listserv emails and flyers around the community	Detachment	Three times a day (morning, end of work, before bed) for ten workdays	Negative work reflection was negatively related to detachment. Serenity was positively correlated with detachment, while angry and depressive moods were negatively correlated with detachment.	Direction of between- and within-person correlations were consistent, however, between-person correlations were consistently larger in magnitude than within-person correlations.
Michel, Turgut, Hoppe, & Sonntag (2016)	1104	Blue-collar workers at an airport hub in Germany	Detachment Relaxation Mastery Control	Daily (before work) for twelve workdays	Threat emotions decreased detachment and relaxation. Challenge emotions boosted mastery. When employees have low job control, challenge emotions also boosted control.	Between-and within-person correlations differed in magnitude, but not in a consistent manner (i.e., between-person correlations were not consistently stronger than within-person correlations). One drastic difference in direction and magnitude of between- and within-person correlations was the relationship between mastery and challenge emotions (i.e., $-.27$ at the between level and $.27$ at the within-level).

Mojza, Lorenz, Binnewies, & Sonnentag (2010)	529	Employees from city halls and public administration organizations	Low duty activities High duty activities Detachment Mastery	Twice a day (after work and before bed) for five workdays	Engaging in volunteer work during leisure time was positively related to mastery experiences.	Between- and within-person correlations were generally similar in direction and magnitude. Of the twenty-eight pairs of correlations examined, however, there were four notable exceptions that were substantially different, the biggest of which is the difference between between-person and within-person correlations for detachment and time spent on social activities ($r = .21$ vs. $-.16$, respectively).
Mojza, Sonnentag, & Bornemann (2011)	476	Broad community sample of employees who volunteered at least once a week	Low duty activities High duty activities Detachment Mastery	Twice a day (after work and before bed) for ten workdays	Volunteer activities were positively related to detachment and mastery. No other activities were related to detachment and mastery. Detachment in the evening predicted next-day active listening at work.	Relationships between recovery activity variables and affect were somewhat similar in pattern, with several exceptions. For recovery experiences, correlations were generally similar in pattern, with the exception of the mastery-low-effort activities correlation. For recovery experiences, between-person correlations were generally larger in magnitude.

Niks, Gevers, De Jonge, & Houtman (2016)	341	Employees from hospital nursing, operation, laboratory, and emergency departments	Detachment State of being recovered	Three times a workday (before work, after work, before bed) or twice a non-workday (waking and before bed) for eight days	Detachment was positively related to the state of being recovered before going to work, which in turn was positively related to one's level of job resources.	Between-and within-person correlations differed in magnitude, but not in a consistent manner (i.e., between-person correlations were not consistently stronger than within-person correlations).
Nohe, Michel, & Sonntag (2014)	390	Employees recruited from an international German company	Detachment	Twice a day (start of work and end of work) for five workdays	Detachment did not have an effect on job performance at the day-level. However, there was a cross-level buffering effect of general detachment on the relationship between work-family conflict and job performance.	Pattern of results were consistent. Though between-person correlations tended to be stronger, they were not all significant, likely because of smaller sample size (n=95).
Oerlemans & Bakker (2014)	2122	Employees recruited via a Dutch university website and social media	Low duty activities High duty activities State of being recovered	Daily (morning) each workday for two weeks	Time spent on low-effort, social, and physical activities positively predicted vigor, cognitive liveliness, and state recovery.	No differences in pattern of relationships with nine of twelve correlations matching in significance.

Oerlemans, Bakker, & Demerouti (2014)	2558	Employees recruited via an occupational health and well-being website for a Dutch university	Low duty activities High duty activities State of being recovered	Daily (before work) each workday for two weeks	Work-related and household activities were negatively associated with recovery when happiness during activities was low, but not high. Social and physical activities were positively (negatively) associated with recovery when happiness during activities was high (low).	Although the majority of the between-person and within-person correlations differed in their direction, all of these correlations were weak and non-significant.
Park, Fritz, & Jex (2018)	363	Employees recruited from alumni base and via graduate students	Detachment	Twice a day (end of work and morning) for four workdays	Evening detachment was negatively correlated with next morning physical distress.	Between-and within-person correlational patterns were similar in terms of direction and magnitude.
Pereira, Bucher, & Elfering (2016)	107	Employees in the human resources center in a Swiss assurance company	Detachment	Twice a day (after work and before bed) for five workdays	Impaired detachment was highly related to decrease in sleep duration and near-accidents.	Between-and within-person correlational patterns were generally similar in terms of significance and magnitude, although impaired detachment was significantly negatively correlated to sleep duration at the between-person level while not significant at the within-person level likely due to differences in power.

Pereira, Semmer, & Elfering (2014)	403	Employees from various occupations via snowball sampling by six master's degree students	Detachment	Daily (after work) each workday for two weeks	Detachment did not have an effect on sleep fragmentation, sleep-onset latency, sleep efficiency, or sleep duration above and beyond control and other study variables.	Within-person correlations tended to be stronger in the expected direction, while between-person correlations were generally weaker and not significant (in part because of $n=76$ between-person sample size).
Schraub, Turgut, Clavairolly, & Sonntag (2013)	726	Full-time undergraduate students of a German university	Recovery	Daily (before bed) for fourteen days	Recovery partially mediated the relationship between emotional stress during study-related events and affective well-being before bed.	Within-person and between-person correlations are consistent. Significance of correlations likely only differ because of small between-person sample size ($n=63$).
Serrano (2015)	275	Executives and senior managers in a large entertainment company and a medium-sized law firm	Recovery State of being recovered	Three times a day (morning, after lunch, before bed) for five workdays	Momentary recovery was positively correlated with day-level work engagement, day-level performance, and day-level absorption and negatively correlated with day-level workaholism.	Between-and within-person correlational patterns were similar in terms of significance and magnitude.

Smit & Barber (2016)	320	Amazon Mturk participants	Detachment Relaxation	Twice a day (after work and before bed) for five workdays	Daily workload was negatively associated with daily detachment.	Between- and within-person correlations were consistent in direction though the magnitude of between-person correlations were slightly larger than within-person correlations.
Sonnentag & Bayer (2005)	221	Employees in a wide variety of occupations from 10 organizations and self-employed individuals	Low duty activities High duty activities Detachment	Twice a day (after work and before bed) for three workdays	Workload was negatively related to detachment. Detachment was associated with positive mood and low fatigue.	Between- and within-person correlations were almost all consistent in direction and magnitude.
Sonnentag & Binnewies (2013)	289	Employees of medical and dental practices and pharmacies in Germany and Switzerland	Detachment	Three times a day (end of work, before bed, morning) for five workdays	Spillover of positive and negative affect from work to home was attenuated by detachment.	Direction and magnitude of between- and within-person correlations were very consistent.
Sonnentag & Jelden (2009)	273-362	Police from four police organizations in Germany	Low duty activities State of being recovered	Twice a day (after work and before bed) for five workdays	Job stressors were negatively related to the amount of time spent on sport activities after work, whereas the relation with low-effort activities was positive.	Differences in direction and magnitude of between- and within-person correlations existed. However, neither were consistently larger than the other.

Sonnentag & Kuhnel (2016)	1434	Employees from an online-panel provider	Detachment	Twice a day (10AM and 4PM) for ten workdays	Day-level detachment was negatively correlated to reattachment, positively correlated to morning and afternoon work engagement, and morning and afternoon job control.	Between-and within-person correlational patterns were similar in terms of significance and magnitude.
Sonnentag & Lischetzke (2018)	567	Employee from public and private organizations in Germany	Detachment	Twice a day (after work and before bed) for five workdays	At the day level, low self-esteem predicted poor detachment. Poor detachment predicted a further increase in negative affect and a decrease in self-esteem over evening hours. At the between-person level, negative affect was related to poor detachment.	Between- and within-person correlations were all very consistent in direction and magnitude.
Sonnentag & Natter (2004)	145	Flight attendants	Low duty activities High duty activities State of being recovered	Daily (evening) for four workdays	Work-related activities during off-job time decreased wellbeing, whereas spending time on physical activities and experiencing off-job time activities as recovery improved well-being. Time spent on social activities increased depression during the evening.	Effects were generally consistent in direction and magnitude. Two differences in direction were likely due to low effect sizes.

Sonnentag & Niessen (2008)	298	Employees from public administration, insurance, engineering, and various other organizations	State of being recovered	Twice a day (after work and before bed) for five workdays	Accumulated, but not previous night, recovery predicted vigor after work.	Of the four correlations capturing the relationship between day-level and accumulated recovery with work hours and time pressure, all but one were consistent in direction and magnitude. The exception was the relationship between day-level recovery and work hours where the between correlation was stronger ($r = -.23$ vs. $.01$).
Sonnentag & Zijlstra (2006)	442-480	Employees in general and psychiatric hospitals in Germany	Low duty activities High duty activities	Twice a day (after work and before bed) for five workdays	Unfavorable off-job activities predicted a high need for recovery.	Between- and within-person correlations were consistent in direction and magnitude.
Sonnentag (2001)	488-500	Dutch teachers	Low duty activities High duty activities	Daily (before bed) for five workdays	Work-related activities (low-effort activities and physical activities) were negatively (positively) related to well-being before bed.	Between- and within-person correlations between recovery activities and well-being were very consistent in both direction and magnitude. Between-person correlations between work-related, low-effort, and physical activities and well-being before bed were in the same direction as within-person correlations, and only the correlation with physical activities was not statistically significant.

Sonnentag (2003)	707-714	Employees from six public service organizations	State of being recovered	Twice a day (beginning and end of work) for five workdays	Day-level recovery was positively correlated to day-level engagement, day-level personal initiative, and day-level pursuit of learning.	Between-and within-person correlational patterns were similar in terms of significance and magnitude.
Sonnentag, Binnewies, & Mojza (2008)	441	Employees from 36 German and Swiss public service organizations operating at the community level	Detachment Relaxation Mastery	Twice a day (before bed and morning) for five workdays	Low detachment from work during the evening predicted negative activation and fatigue, whereas mastery experiences during the evening predicted positive activation and relaxation predicted serenity.	Direction of between- and within- person correlations were all consistent, with one exception ($r = -.02$ vs. $.01$). Magnitude of correlations vary slightly, with between-person correlations sometimes displaying stronger relationships.
Sonnentag, Mojza, Binnewies, & Scholl (2008)	432	Employees from five German organizations in various industries	Detachment	Twice a week (Monday morning and Friday afternoon) for four workweeks	Detachment was positively related to positive affect and negatively related to negative affect. The relationship between detachment and positive affect was moderated by trait work engagement.	Between- and within-person correlations were consistent in direction and magnitude.

Sonnentag, Mojza, Demerouti, & Bakker (2012)	325	Employees from organizations in a variety of industries	State of being recovered	Twice a day (before work and after work) for five workdays	Recovery was positively related to engagement.	Between- and within-person correlations for recovery (before work and after work) and variables of interest were consistent in direction and generally comparable in magnitude. The biggest difference in magnitude was $r = .43$ vs. $.28$.
Trougakos, Beal, Green, & Weiss (2008)	512	Cheerleading camp instructors	Low duty activities High duty activities	Three times a day (morning, afternoon, evening) for three workdays	Respites related to self-reports of positive emotions while chores related to negative emotions experienced.	Between- and within-person correlations involving respites were consistent in direction and magnitude. However, within-person correlations involving chores tended to be stronger than between-person correlations with one out of four correlations showing non-negligible conflicts in direction and magnitude ($r = -.09$ vs. $.12$).
Trougakos, Hideg, Cheng, & Beal (2014)	444	Administrative employees at a university	Low duty activities Control	Twice a day (after lunch by participant and end of work by coworker) for ten workdays	Relaxing lunch break activities decreased end of day fatigue, while work and social activities on lunch break increased fatigue. Effects of activities were moderated by lunch break autonomy.	Work activities were positively related to fatigue, while social and relaxing activities were negatively related to fatigue. Thus, 2 of 3 effects were consistent.

van Hooff & Pater (2017)	Not listed	Employees from a wide variety of professions	Detachment Relaxation Mastery Control	Five times a day (morning, between 10AM-12PM, between 1:45PM-3:45PM, end of work, between 8PM-10PM) for ten workdays	Mastery and relaxation were negatively related to fatigue.	Between- and within-person correlations were generally consistent in direction and magnitude for detachment, mastery, and control. Between-person correlations involving relaxation were consistently stronger than within-person correlations.
van Hooff (2015)	456-1140	Dutch employees recruited through the social network of a research assistant	Detachment Relaxation Mastery	Three times a day (end of work, after work, before bed) for five workdays	Relaxation during commute predicted serenity/positive affect, while mastery did not. Detachment predicted serenity/positive affect contingent on job demands.	Effects were mostly consistent for within- and between-person correlations. Two correlations have conflicting direction, but neither is significant. Correlations involving job demands were similar except for the relationship between job demands and mastery where the within-person correlation was stronger ($r = .08$ vs. $.24$).
von Dreden & Binnewies (2017)	200	Administrative and service employees from three educational services companies and two municipalities in Germany	Detachment	Three times a day (before lunch, after lunch, end of work) for five workdays	Detachment was positively correlated with vigor and negatively correlated with: colleague companionship, supervisor companionship, and work-related conversation	Between- and within-person correlations were consistent in direction and magnitude, with perhaps one in sixteen correlations showing meaningful discrepancy regarding between- within-person correlations ($r = .04$ vs. $-.13$, respectively).

Waltz (2016)	578	MBA students and alumni at a large Midwestern university via snowball sampling and researchers' own social network	Detachment	Five times a day (one every two hours during an eight-hour workday and one before bed) for five workdays	Detachment was positively correlated with need for recovery and fatigue and negatively correlated with number of social media micro-breaks	Between- and within-person correlations were largely consistent with some exceptions. The within-person correlations between detachment and happiness/sleepiness were significantly positively correlated while between-person correlations were not (although positive). Also, the within-person correlation between detachment and vigor was negatively significant ($r = -.12$) while the between-person correlation was not.
Zacher, Brailsford, & Parker (2014)	829	Employees of Australian University	Low duty activities	Every hour throughout a single workday	Non-work activities predicted increases in vitality and decreases in fatigue.	Pattern of correlations at the within- and between-person level were identical in direction and roughly consistent in magnitude.

Table S2

Antecedents and Outcomes Included In Meta-Analysis

Major Variable Grouping	Constructs Included
Overload demands	Effort/Reward imbalance Overload Overtime Quantitative job/task demands Requirements for after-work availability Role conflict Time pressure Temporal demands Work intensity Work pace Workload
Cognitive demands	Conflicts about tasks Cognitive demands Decision making demands Information processing demands Job/task complexity Job insecurity Lack of information/support Learning demands Mental load Problem solving demands Role ambiguity Situational constraints Uncertainty
Physical demands	Physical demands Unpleasant working conditions
Emotional demands	Aggression/Bullying (being the target of bullying) Emotional demands Emotional control demands Emotional dissonance Emotional load Peer/supervisor/work relationship problems Relationship conflict Social stressors Social/home conflict Verbal abuse

Emotional demands (continued)	Workplace incivility
Work contextual resources	Colleague companionship Cognitive resources Control of contact after work Decision authority Developmental/learning possibilities Emotional resources Feedback General positive collegial interactions Job autonomy Job/task control Job skill discretion Job/work resources Meaningful work Organized work Personal energy recovery climate Physical resources Positive workday events Psychosocial safety climate Supervisor support for recovery Supportive leadership Supportive working conditions Work social capital Work social support Work variety
Home contextual resources	Family support Non-work social support Partner recovery support Support at home
Personal resources	Core self-evaluations Organization-based self-esteem Occupational self-efficacy Psychological capital Recovery-related self-efficacy Self-efficacy
Psychosomatic well-being	<u>Sleep</u> Poor sleep (R) Sleep awakenings (R) Sleep complaints (R)

<p>Psychosomatic well-being (continued)</p>	<p>Sleep efficiency Sleep fragmentation (R) Sleep inconsistency (R) Sleep onset latency (R) Sleep onset/maintenance problems (R) Sleep problems (R) Sleep quality Sleep quantity/time</p> <p><u>Fatigue</u> Acute fatigue Chronic fatigue Energetic arousal (R) Energy (R) Fatigue Feeling upon arising (R) Need for recovery Sleepiness Vigor (General only – no context of work) (R) Vitality (R)</p> <p><u>General Health</u> Self-reported health Health complaints (R) Perceived health Physical complaints/symptoms (R) Physical distress (R) Physical health Psychosomatic complaints (R) Somatic complaints (R)</p>
<p>Psychological well-being</p>	<p><u>Mental Well-being</u> Affective distress (R) Anxiety (R) Calmness Depressive mood/symptoms/complaints (self-reported / non-clinical) (R) Embitterment (R) Emotional health (R) General psychological well-being Irritation (R) Job/work anxiety/stress (R)</p>

	<p>Mental complaints (R)</p> <p>Mental health symptoms (R)</p> <p>Perceived stress (R)</p> <p>Psychological distress (R)</p> <p>Stress/Strain (R)</p> <p>Threat emotions (R)</p> <p><u>Life Satisfaction</u></p> <p>Life satisfaction</p> <p>Quality of life</p> <p><u>Positive Affect (State)</u></p> <p>Affective well-being</p> <p>Attentiveness</p> <p>Challenge emotions</p> <p>Happiness</p> <p>Joviality</p> <p>Positive affect/emotion/mood</p> <p>Positive affective display</p> <p>Self-assurance</p> <p>Serenity</p> <p>Valence of mood</p> <p><u>Negative Affect (State)</u></p> <p>Angry mood</p> <p>Fear</p> <p>Hostility</p> <p>Negative affect/emotion</p> <p>Sadness</p>
Performance	<p>Interpersonal citizenship behavior</p> <p>Contextual performance</p> <p>Job performance</p> <p>Organizational citizenship behavior</p> <p>Task performance</p>

Note: (R) denotes reverse-coded variables

Table S3

Recovery Conceptualization Coding

Major Variable Grouping	Constructs Included
High duty Activities	Care tasks Childcare/dependent care activities Chores Household activities Resource-consuming activities Work-related activities
Low duty Activities	Fun activities Hope/optimism activities Leisure activities Low-effort activities Non-work creative activities Passive activities Physical/recreational/sport activities Resource-providing activities Respite/non-work activities Self-reward activities Social activities Volunteer activities
Recovery Experiences	Detachment Detachment (emotional, cognitive, physical) Inability to detach (R) Psychological detachment Work downtime Relaxation Mastery Control Autonomy at home or during breaks Combined measures of recovery experience dimensions
State of Being Recovered	Feeling recovered Intershift recovery State of being recovered

Note: (R) denotes reverse-coded variables

Table S4

Cross-Sectional vs. Longitudinal Design Moderator Analysis

S4a. Low Duty Activities

		<i>k</i>	<i>N</i>	\bar{r}	<i>SDr</i>	$\bar{\rho}$	<i>SDρ</i>	80%		95%		% Var
								CV _{LL}	CV _{UL}	CI _{LL}	CI _{UL}	
High Duty												
	Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	Longitudinal	20	2,574	.03	.12	.03	.09	-.08	.15	-.02	.09	50.92%
All Recovery Experiences												
	Cross-Sectional	6	2,409	.18	.15	.20	.16	-.01	.40	.06	.33	9.77%
	Longitudinal	15	2,059	.21	.12	.22	.09	.11	.34	.16	.29	47.20%
Detachment												
	Cross-Sectional	6	2,409	.11	.11	.11	.11	-.03	.26	.02	.21	19.02%
	Longitudinal	12	1,728	.10	.08	.11	.00	.11	.11	.06	.15	100.00%
Relaxation												
	Cross-Sectional	4	1,092	.34	.18	.38	.19	.13	.63	.18	.58	8.47%
	Longitudinal	9	1,365	.26	.15	.28	.13	.11	.45	.18	.38	26.23%
Mastery												
	Cross-Sectional	4	1,991	.16	.09	.18	.09	.07	.30	.08	.28	22.45%
	Longitudinal	8	1,433	.25	.27	.28	.28	-.08	.64	.08	.48	6.97%
Control												
	Cross-Sectional	5	2,191	.21	.18	.22	.20	-.04	.48	.04	.40	6.01%
	Longitudinal	6	1,001	.26	.12	.28	.10	.15	.41	.18	.38	37.24%
State of Being Recovered												
	Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	Longitudinal	7	1,003	.16	.13	.17	.11	.03	.31	.07	.27	38.64%

Note. *k* = number of samples; *N* = total sample size; \bar{r} = sample-size weighted mean correlation; *SDr* = sample-size-weighted observed standard deviation of correlations; $\bar{\rho}$ = corrected mean true-score correlation; *SDρ* = corrected standard deviation of true-score correlation; CV = credibility interval; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit; % Var = percent of variance accounted for by study artifacts. Cells with dashes are instances where there was insufficient data to derive meta-analytic estimates.

S4b. High Duty Activities

	<i>k</i>	<i>N</i>	\bar{r}	<i>SDr</i>	$\bar{\rho}$	<i>SDρ</i>	80%		95%		% Var
							CV _{LL}	CV _{UL}	CI _{LL}	CI _{UL}	
All Recovery Experiences											
Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Longitudinal	12	1,465	-.16	.09	-.17	.01	-.18	-.17	-.23	-.12	99.56%
Detachment											
Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Longitudinal	11	1,387	-.23	.11	-.24	.08	-.34	-.15	-.31	-.18	58.72%
Relaxation											
Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Longitudinal	6	734	-.22	.17	-.23	.15	-.43	-.04	-.37	-.09	26.51%
Mastery											
Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Longitudinal	5	802	.02	.08	.02	.00	.02	.02	-.05	.09	100.00%
Control											
Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Longitudinal	5	660	-.09	.08	-.10	.00	-.10	-.10	-.17	-.02	100.00%
State of Being Recovered											
Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Longitudinal	7	1,003	-.10	.15	-.10	.13	-.27	.06	-.22	.01	32.17%

Note. *k* = number of samples; *N* = total sample size; \bar{r} = sample-size weighted mean correlation; *SDr* = sample-size-weighted observed standard deviation of correlations; $\bar{\rho}$ = corrected mean true-score correlation; *SDρ* = corrected standard deviation of true-score correlation; CV = credibility interval; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit; % Var = percent of variance accounted for by study artifacts. Cells with dashes are instances where there was insufficient data to derive meta-analytic estimates.

S4c. State of Being Recovered

	<i>k</i>	<i>N</i>	\bar{r}	<i>SDr</i>	$\bar{\rho}$	<i>SDρ</i>	80%		95%		% Var
							CV _{LL}	CV _{UL}	CI _{LL}	CI _{UL}	
All Recovery Experiences											
Cross-Sectional	3	2,165	.28	.09	.31	.09	.19	.43	.20	.42	14.03%
Longitudinal	6	685	.40	.10	.45	.06	.37	.53	.37	.53	67.76%
Detachment											
Cross-Sectional	3	2,165	.29	.08	.31	.09	.20	.43	.20	.42	14.84%
Longitudinal	6	685	.39	.10	.45	.06	.37	.53	.37	.53	66.71%
Relaxation											
Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Longitudinal	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Mastery											
Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Longitudinal	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Control											
Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Longitudinal	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Note. *k* = number of samples; *N* = total sample size; \bar{r} = sample-size weighted mean correlation; *SDr* = sample-size-weighted observed standard deviation of correlations; $\bar{\rho}$ = corrected mean true-score correlation; *SDρ* = corrected standard deviation of true-score correlation; CV = credibility interval; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit; % Var = percent of variance accounted for by study artifacts. Cells with dashes are instances where there was insufficient data to derive meta-analytic estimates.

S4d. Detachment

		<i>k</i>	<i>N</i>	\bar{r}	<i>SDr</i>	$\bar{\rho}$	<i>SDρ</i>	80%		95%		% Var
								CV _{LL}	CV _{UL}	CI _{LL}	CI _{UL}	
Relaxation												
	Cross-Sectional	24	11,093	.56	.12	.65	.14	.47	.84	.59	.71	6.46%
	Longitudinal	24	4,374	.52	.19	.59	.21	.33	.86	.51	.68	8.33%
Mastery												
	Cross-Sectional	23	10,912	.18	.13	.21	.14	.03	.38	.15	.27	12.44%
	Longitudinal	19	2,996	.13	.14	.15	.14	-.02	.33	.08	.22	30.80%
Control												
	Cross-Sectional	21	10,502	.37	.12	.43	.14	.25	.61	.37	.49	9.34%
	Longitudinal	16	2,479	.32	.15	.37	.15	.19	.56	.29	.45	24.87%

Note. *k* = number of samples; *N* = total sample size; \bar{r} = sample-size weighted mean correlation; *SDr* = sample-size-weighted observed standard deviation of correlations; $\bar{\rho}$ = corrected mean true-score correlation; *SDρ* = corrected standard deviation of true-score correlation; CV = credibility interval; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit; % Var = percent of variance accounted for by study artifacts. Cells with dashes are instances where there was insufficient data to derive meta-analytic estimates.

S4e. Relaxation

		k	N	\bar{r}	SDr	$\bar{\rho}$	$SD\rho$	80%		95%		%Var
								CV _{LL}	CV _{UL}	CI _{LL}	CI _{UL}	
Mastery												
	Cross-Sectional	21	10,618	.35	.13	.42	.15	.23	.60	.35	.48	8.88%
	Longitudinal	20	3,433	.28	.15	.32	.15	.13	.51	.25	.39	22.47%
Control												
	Cross-Sectional	19	9,982	.56	.12	.65	.13	.48	.83	.59	.72	6.46%
	Longitudinal	17	2,899	.50	.12	.56	.12	.41	.72	.50	.63	22.57%

Note. *k* = number of samples; *N* = total sample size; \bar{r} = sample-size weighted mean correlation; *SDr* = sample-size-weighted observed standard deviation of correlations; $\bar{\rho}$ = corrected mean true-score correlation; *SDρ* = corrected standard deviation of true-score correlation; CV = credibility interval; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit; % Var = percent of variance accounted for by study artifacts. Cells with dashes are instances where there was insufficient data to derive meta-analytic estimates.

S4f. Mastery

	<i>k</i>	<i>N</i>	\bar{r}	<i>SDr</i>	$\bar{\rho}$	<i>SDρ</i>	80%		95%		% Var
							CV _{LL}	CV _{UL}	CI _{LL}	CI _{UL}	
Control											
Cross-Sectional	19	9,982	.36	.12	.43	.13	.27	.59	.37	.49	10.86%
Longitudinal	15	2,768	.31	.15	.36	.15	.17	.54	.27	.44	21.73%

Note. *k* = number of samples; *N* = total sample size; \bar{r} = sample-size weighted mean correlation; *SDr* = sample-size-weighted observed standard deviation of correlations; $\bar{\rho}$ = corrected mean true-score correlation; *SDρ* = corrected standard deviation of true-score correlation; CV = credibility interval; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit; % Var = percent of variance accounted for by study artifacts. Cells with dashes are instances where there was insufficient data to derive meta-analytic estimates.

S4g. Overload Demands

		<i>k</i>	<i>N</i>	\bar{r}	<i>SDr</i>	$\bar{\rho}$	<i>SDρ</i>	80%		95%		% Var
								CV _{LL}	CV _{UL}	CI _{LL}	CI _{UL}	
Low Duty Activities												
	Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	Longitudinal	7	2,943	-.06	.05	-.06	.02	-.09	-.03	-.10	-.02	83.18%
High Duty Activities												
	Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	Longitudinal	4	504	.09	.13	.11	.11	-.04	.25	-.03	.25	45.33%
All Recovery Experiences												
	Cross-Sectional	31	19,457	-.22	.13	-.26	.15	-.45	-.07	-.32	-.21	8.56%
	Longitudinal	26	6,094	-.23	.15	-.27	.16	-.48	-.07	-.34	-.21	16.91%
Detachment												
	Cross-Sectional	30	18,996	-.25	.12	-.30	.13	-.48	-.13	-.35	-.25	9.82%
	Longitudinal	25	5,963	-.25	.14	-.30	.15	-.49	-.10	-.36	-.23	18.52%
Relaxation												
	Cross-Sectional	12	7,068	-.18	.10	-.21	.11	-.36	-.07	-.28	-.14	14.98%
	Longitudinal	6	1,057	-.12	.09	-.14	.06	-.22	-.06	-.22	-.06	65.27%
Mastery												
	Cross-Sectional	10	6,368	-.01	.10	-.01	.11	-.15	.13	-.08	.06	15.62%
	Longitudinal	4	825	.08	.11	.10	.09	-.02	.22	-.02	.21	42.72%
Control												
	Cross-Sectional	12	7,175	-.15	.09	-.17	.10	-.30	-.05	-.23	-.11	19.49%
	Longitudinal	3	749	-.06	.06	-.07	.00	-.07	-.07	-.14	.00	100.00%
State of Being Recovered												
	Cross-Sectional	4	1,648	-.34	.14	-.42	.16	-.63	-.22	-.59	-.26	9.98%
	Longitudinal	7	685	-.15	.17	-.17	.17	-.40	.05	-.32	-.02	30.81%

Note. *k* = number of samples; *N* = total sample size; \bar{r} = sample-size weighted mean correlation; *SDr* = sample-size-weighted observed standard deviation of correlations; $\bar{\rho}$ = corrected mean true-score correlation; *SDρ* = corrected standard deviation of true-score correlation; CV = credibility interval; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit; % Var = percent of variance accounted for by study artifacts. Cells with dashes are instances where there was insufficient data to derive meta-analytic estimates.

S4h. Cognitive Demands

		<i>k</i>	<i>N</i>	\bar{r}	<i>SDr</i>	$\bar{\rho}$	<i>SDρ</i>	80%		95%		%Var
								CV _{LL}	CV _{UL}	CI _{LL}	CI _{UL}	
Low Duty Activities												
	Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	Longitudinal	5	600	.04	.11	.05	.07	-.04	.14	-.05	.15	70.20%
High Duty Activities												
	Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	Longitudinal	4	522	-.01	.08	-.01	.00	-.01	-.01	-.10	.07	100.00%
All Recovery Experiences												
	Cross-Sectional	10	3,390	-.14	.07	-.17	.04	-.22	-.12	-.22	-.13	73.80%
	Longitudinal	7	1,834	-.11	.08	-.14	.05	-.21	-.07	-.20	-.07	65.70%
Detachment												
	Cross-Sectional	10	3,390	-.15	.07	-.19	.04	-.24	-.14	-.23	-.15	71.35%
	Longitudinal	7	1,834	-.14	.09	-.18	.08	-.28	-.07	-.25	-.10	44.61%
Relaxation												
	Cross-Sectional	4	1,727	-.17	.05	-.20	.01	-.22	-.19	-.25	-.15	95.74%
	Longitudinal	4	778	-.09	.05	-.11	.00	-.11	-.11	-.18	-.04	100.00%
Mastery												
	Cross-Sectional	4	1,727	-.07	.05	-.09	.00	-.09	-.09	-.14	-.04	100.00%
	Longitudinal	4	784	-.04	.08	-.05	.03	-.09	.00	-.12	.03	87.96%
Control												
	Cross-Sectional	4	1,727	-.20	.07	-.25	.06	-.32	-.18	-.32	-.18	49.60%
	Longitudinal	3	679	-.13	.02	-.16	.00	-.16	-.16	-.24	-.09	100.00%
State of Being Recovered												
	Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	Longitudinal	4	401	-.18	.06	-.22	.00	-.22	-.22	-.31	-.12	100.00%

Note. *k* = number of samples; *N* = total sample size; \bar{r} = sample-size weighted mean correlation; *SDr* = sample-size-weighted observed standard deviation of correlations; $\bar{\rho}$ = corrected mean true-score correlation; *SDρ* = corrected standard deviation of true-score correlation; CV = credibility interval; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit; %Var = percent of variance accounted for by study artifacts. Cells with dashes are instances where there was insufficient data to derive meta-analytic estimates.

S4i. Emotional Demands

	<i>k</i>	<i>N</i>	\bar{r}	<i>SDr</i>	$\bar{\rho}$	<i>SDρ</i>	80%		95%		% Var
							CV _{LL}	CV _{UL}	CI _{LL}	CI _{UL}	
Low Duty Activities	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Longitudinal	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
High Duty Activities	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Longitudinal	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
All Recovery Experiences											
Cross-Sectional	17	7,324	-.24	.16	-.29	.18	-.52	-.05	-.38	-.20	7.92%
Longitudinal	9	2,058	-.15	.06	-.18	.00	-.18	-.18	-.22	-.14	100.00%
Detachment											
Cross-Sectional	16	7,116	-.25	.16	-.30	.17	-.52	-.08	-.39	-.22	8.55%
Longitudinal	9	2,058	-.17	.06	-.20	.00	-.20	-.20	-.24	-.16	100.00%
Relaxation											
Cross-Sectional	3	1,473	-.16	.09	-.20	.09	-.31	-.08	-.31	-.09	26.94%
Longitudinal	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Mastery											
Cross-Sectional	3	1,473	-.07	.13	-.08	.14	-.26	.11	-.25	.09	11.29%
Longitudinal	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Control											
Cross-Sectional	3	1,473	-.10	.12	-.11	.12	-.27	.05	-.26	.04	14.57%
Longitudinal	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
State of Being Recovered											
Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Longitudinal	6	929	-.16	.06	-.18	.00	-.18	-.18	-.24	-.12	100.00%

Note. *k* = number of samples; *N* = total sample size; \bar{r} = sample-size weighted mean correlation; *SDr* = sample-size-weighted observed standard deviation of correlations; $\bar{\rho}$ = corrected mean true-score correlation; *SDρ* = corrected standard deviation of true-score correlation; CV = credibility interval; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit; % Var = percent of variance accounted for by study artifacts. Cells with dashes are instances where there was insufficient data to derive meta-analytic estimates.

S4j. Contextual Resources – Work

		<i>k</i>	<i>N</i>	\bar{r}	<i>SDr</i>	$\bar{\rho}$	<i>SDρ</i>	80%		95%		% Var
								CV _{LL}	CV _{UL}	CI _{LL}	CI _{UL}	
Low Duty Activities												
	Cross-Sectional	3	341	.06	.08	.07	.00	.07	.07	-.03	.18	100.00%
	Longitudinal	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
High Duty Activities												
	Cross-Sectional	3	257	-.14	.19	-.16	.17	-.38	.06	-.39	.07	32.91%
	Longitudinal	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
All Recovery Experiences												
	Cross-Sectional	29	13,250	.11	.09	.13	.09	.01	.25	.09	.17	26.67%
	Longitudinal	13	1,869	.04	.12	.05	.10	-.08	.19	-.02	.13	48.12%
Detachment												
	Cross-Sectional	26	12,066	.07	.10	.09	.11	-.05	.23	.04	.13	20.70%
	Longitudinal	10	1,600	.00	.12	.00	.10	-.13	.13	-.08	.08	47.11%
Relaxation												
	Cross-Sectional	8	4,611	.09	.07	.11	.07	.02	.21	.06	.17	33.25%
	Longitudinal	3	585	-.04	.07	-.04	.03	-.08	.00	-.13	.05	89.75%
Mastery												
	Cross-Sectional	7	4,428	.16	.05	.19	.04	.14	.25	.15	.24	53.60%
	Longitudinal	3	585	.10	.07	.12	.00	.12	.12	.04	.20	100.00%
Control												
	Cross-Sectional	9	5,235	.20	.08	.24	.08	.14	.35	.19	.30	27.94%
	Longitudinal	3	585	.12	.10	.14	.08	.03	.24	.01	.26	50.54%
State of Being Recovered												
	Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	Longitudinal	10	972	.18	.19	.21	.19	-.02	.45	.08	.34	29.13%

Note. *k* = number of samples; *N* = total sample size; \bar{r} = sample-size weighted mean correlation; *SDr* = sample-size-weighted observed standard deviation of correlations; $\bar{\rho}$ = corrected mean true-score correlation; *SDρ* = corrected standard deviation of true-score correlation; CV = credibility interval; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit; % Var = percent of variance accounted for by study artifacts. Cells with dashes are instances where there was insufficient data to derive meta-analytic estimates.

S4k. Contextual Resources – Home

		<i>k</i>	<i>N</i>	\bar{r}	<i>SDr</i>	$\bar{\rho}$	<i>SDρ</i>	80%		95%		% Var
								CV _{LL}	CV _{UL}	CI _{LL}	CI _{UL}	
Low Duty Activities												
	Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	Longitudinal	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
High Duty Activities												
	Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	Longitudinal	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
All Recovery Experiences												
	Cross-Sectional	7	3,971	.21	.05	.24	.03	.20	.28	.20	.28	65.68%
	Longitudinal	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Detachment												
	Cross-Sectional	6	3,510	.14	.12	.16	.13	.00	.33	.05	.27	11.40%
	Longitudinal	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Relaxation												
	Cross-Sectional	4	990	.19	.10	.22	.08	.11	.32	.11	.32	39.90%
	Longitudinal	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Mastery												
	Cross-Sectional	4	990	.29	.07	.33	.03	.29	.37	.26	.39	82.42%
	Longitudinal	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Control												
	Cross-Sectional	3	815	.31	.04	.35	.00	.35	.35	.29	.42	100.00%
	Longitudinal	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
State of Being Recovered												
	Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	Longitudinal	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Note. *k* = number of samples; *N* = total sample size; \bar{r} = sample-size weighted mean correlation; *SDr* = sample-size-weighted observed standard deviation of correlations; $\bar{\rho}$ = corrected mean true-score correlation; *SDρ* = corrected standard deviation of true-score correlation; CV = credibility interval; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit; % Var = percent of variance accounted for by study artifacts. Cells with dashes are instances where there was insufficient data to derive meta-analytic estimates.

S4I. Personal Resources

	<i>k</i>	<i>N</i>	\bar{r}	<i>SDr</i>	$\bar{\rho}$	<i>SDρ</i>	80%		95%		%Var
							CV _{LL}	CV _{UL}	CI _{LL}	CI _{UL}	
Low Duty Activities											
Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Longitudinal	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
High Duty Activities											
Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Longitudinal	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
All Recovery Experiences											
Cross-Sectional	5	1,312	.39	.14	.45	.14	.27	.62	.32	.58	16.18%
Longitudinal	5	640	.20	.14	.23	.13	.06	.40	.09	.37	36.06%
Detachment											
Cross-Sectional	5	1,312	.36	.14	.42	.15	.23	.61	.29	.56	15.20%
Longitudinal	4	567	.18	.15	.21	.14	.03	.40	.05	.37	30.13%
Relaxation											
Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Longitudinal	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Mastery											
Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Longitudinal	3	295	.20	.09	.23	.00	.23	.23	.12	.34	100.00%
Control											
Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Longitudinal	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
State of Being Recovered											
Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Longitudinal	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Note. *k* = number of samples; *N* = total sample size; \bar{r} = sample-size weighted mean correlation; *SDr* = sample-size-weighted observed standard deviation of correlations; $\bar{\rho}$ = corrected mean true-score correlation; *SDρ* = corrected standard deviation of true-score correlation; CV = credibility interval; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit; %Var = percent of variance accounted for by study artifacts. Cells with dashes are instances where there was insufficient data to derive meta-analytic estimates.

S4m. Mental Well-being

		k	N	\bar{r}	SDr	$\bar{\rho}$	$SD\rho$	80%		95%		% Var
								CV _{LL}	CV _{UL}	CI _{LL}	CI _{UL}	
Low Duty Activities												
	Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	Longitudinal	6	616	.07	.09	.07	.00	.07	.07	-.01	.15	100.00%
High Duty Activities												
	Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	Longitudinal	5	529	-.08	.05	-.08	.00	-.08	-.08	-.17	.00	100.00%
All Recovery Experiences												
	Cross-Sectional	23	11,228	.25	.08	.29	.08	.19	.39	.25	.33	27.82%
	Longitudinal	17	2,813	.23	.12	.27	.12	.12	.42	.20	.33	36.48%
Detachment												
	Cross-Sectional	21	10,194	.26	.09	.30	.09	.18	.42	.25	.34	22.33%
	Longitudinal	16	2,750	.23	.13	.27	.13	.10	.45	.20	.35	29.62%
Relaxation												
	Cross-Sectional	9	5,157	.25	.06	.28	.06	.20	.36	.23	.33	35.51%
	Longitudinal	5	626	.24	.18	.28	.19	.04	.51	.10	.46	21.70%
Mastery												
	Cross-Sectional	9	5,157	.16	.10	.19	.10	.06	.32	.12	.26	16.10%
	Longitudinal	4	449	.11	.16	.11	.13	-.06	.27	-.05	.26	42.91%
Control												
	Cross-Sectional	9	5,519	.21	.09	.24	.09	.13	.35	.18	.30	20.99%
	Longitudinal	4	424	.31	.08	.36	.00	.36	.36	.27	.44	100.00%
State of Being Recovered												
	Cross-Sectional	3	1,546	.41	.09	.49	.07	.40	.58	.40	.58	28.97%
	Longitudinal	3	289	.44	.12	.52	.12	.37	.67	.36	.68	40.73%

Note. *k* = number of samples; *N* = total sample size; \bar{r} = sample-size weighted mean correlation; *SDr* = sample-size-weighted observed standard deviation of correlations; $\bar{\rho}$ = corrected mean true-score correlation; *SDρ* = corrected standard deviation of true-score correlation; CV = credibility interval; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit; %Var = percent of variance accounted for by study artifacts. Cells with dashes are instances where there was insufficient data to derive meta-analytic estimates.

S4n. Positive Affect – State

		<i>k</i>	<i>N</i>	\bar{r}	<i>SDr</i>	$\bar{\rho}$	<i>SDρ</i>	80%		95%		% Var
								CV _{LL}	CV _{UL}	CI _{LL}	CI _{UL}	
Low Duty Activities												
	Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	Longitudinal	8	1,104	.08	.09	.09	.01	.07	.10	.03	.15	98.26%
High Duty Activities												
	Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	Longitudinal	7	969	-.02	.10	-.02	.06	-.10	.05	-.10	.05	72.94%
All Recovery Experiences												
	Cross-Sectional	3	698	.36	.09	.40	.07	.31	.50	.30	.51	43.67%
	Longitudinal	20	2,200	.22	.14	.25	.13	.09	.41	.18	.32	41.76%
Detachment												
	Cross-Sectional	3	698	.20	.28	.22	.31	-.18	.62	-.14	.58	5.07%
	Longitudinal	14	1,624	.20	.14	.23	.14	.06	.41	.15	.32	36.43%
Relaxation												
	Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	Longitudinal	6	741	.22	.10	.25	.07	.16	.35	.16	.34	65.38%
Mastery												
	Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	Longitudinal	8	919	.16	.13	.18	.11	.05	.32	.09	.28	50.53%
Control												
	Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	Longitudinal	4	523	.25	.07	.29	.00	.29	.29	.21	.38	100.00%
State of Being Recovered												
	Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	Longitudinal	3	518	.34	.01	.39	.00	.39	.39	.31	.47	100.00%

Note. *k* = number of samples; *N* = total sample size; \bar{r} = sample-size weighted mean correlation; *SDr* = sample-size-weighted observed standard deviation of correlations; $\bar{\rho}$ = corrected mean true-score correlation; *SDρ* = corrected standard deviation of true-score correlation; CV = credibility interval; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit; %Var = percent of variance accounted for by study artifacts. Cells with dashes are instances where there was insufficient data to derive meta-analytic estimates.

S4o. Negative Affect – State

		k	N	\bar{r}	SDr	$\bar{\rho}$	$SD\rho$	80%		95%		%Var
								CV _{LL}	CV _{UL}	CI _{LL}	CI _{UL}	
Low Duty Activities												
	Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	Longitudinal	4	381	-.18	.28	-.21	.29	-.58	.17	-.51	.09	12.42%
High Duty Activities												
	Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	Longitudinal	4	413	-.01	.06	-.01	.00	-.01	-.01	-.11	.08	100.00%
All Recovery Experiences												
	Cross-Sectional	4	1,352	-.33	.12	-.39	.13	-.55	-.22	-.52	-.25	16.73%
	Longitudinal	15	1,805	-.24	.11	-.28	.07	-.37	-.19	-.34	-.23	66.78%
Detachment												
	Cross-Sectional	3	1,144	-.30	.12	-.35	.12	-.51	-.19	-.50	-.20	15.39%
	Longitudinal	13	1,556	-.24	.12	-.29	.09	-.40	-.17	-.35	-.22	56.46%
Relaxation												
	Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	Longitudinal	7	913	-.31	.16	-.36	.15	-.55	-.17	-.49	-.23	27.24%
Mastery												
	Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	Longitudinal	5	700	-.05	.06	-.05	.00	-.05	-.05	-.13	.02	100.00%
Control												
	Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	Longitudinal	3	429	-.19	.04	-.22	.00	-.22	-.22	-.31	-.13	100.00%
State of Being Recovered												
	Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	Longitudinal	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Note. *k* = number of samples; *N* = total sample size; \bar{r} = sample-size weighted mean correlation; *SDr* = sample-size-weighted observed standard deviation of correlations; $\bar{\rho}$ = corrected mean true-score correlation; *SDρ* = corrected standard deviation of true-score correlation; CV = credibility interval; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit; % Var = percent of variance accounted for by study artifacts. Cells with dashes are instances where there was insufficient data to derive meta-analytic estimates.

S4p. Life Satisfaction

		<i>k</i>	<i>N</i>	\bar{r}	<i>SDr</i>	$\bar{\rho}$	<i>SD\rho</i>	80%		95%		% Var
								CV _{LL}	CV _{UL}	CI _{LL}	CI _{UL}	
Low Duty Activities												
	Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	Longitudinal	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
High Duty Activities												
	Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	Longitudinal	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
All Recovery Experiences												
	Cross-Sectional	13	3,780	.26	.10	.30	.09	.19	.42	.25	.36	32.63%
	Longitudinal	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Detachment												
	Cross-Sectional	12	3,319	.22	.13	.26	.13	.09	.42	.18	.34	20.86%
	Longitudinal	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Relaxation												
	Cross-Sectional	5	1,676	.32	.07	.37	.05	.31	.43	.31	.43	56.49%
	Longitudinal	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Mastery												
	Cross-Sectional	5	1,676	.34	.12	.39	.11	.26	.53	.29	.49	21.11%
	Longitudinal	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Control												
	Cross-Sectional	4	1,501	.30	.11	.35	.10	.22	.47	.24	.45	24.00%
	Longitudinal	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
State of Being Recovered												
	Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	Longitudinal	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Note. *k* = number of samples; *N* = total sample size; \bar{r} = sample-size weighted mean correlation; *SDr* = sample-size-weighted observed standard deviation of correlations; $\bar{\rho}$ = corrected mean true-score correlation; *SD\rho* = corrected standard deviation of true-score correlation; CV = credibility interval; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit; % Var = percent of variance accounted for by study artifacts. Cells with dashes are instances where there was insufficient data to derive meta-analytic estimates.

S4q. Fatigue

	<i>k</i>	<i>N</i>	\bar{r}	<i>SDr</i>	$\bar{\rho}$	<i>SDρ</i>	80%		95%		% Var
							CV _{LL}	CV _{UL}	CI _{LL}	CI _{UL}	
Low Duty Activities											
Cross-Sectional	4	1,745	-.13	.10	-.14	.10	-.27	-.01	-.25	-.03	21.16%
Longitudinal	13	1,473	-.11	.11	-.12	.07	-.20	-.03	-.18	-.06	69.62%
High Duty Activities											
Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Longitudinal	10	1,082	.10	.08	.10	.00	.10	.10	.04	.16	100.00%
All Recovery Experiences											
Cross-Sectional	8	2,758	-.32	.21	-.37	.22	-.66	-.09	-.53	-.21	5.83%
Longitudinal	19	2,604	-.22	.18	-.26	.19	-.50	-.02	-.35	-.17	20.29%
Detachment											
Cross-Sectional	8	2,564	-.36	.23	-.43	.25	-.75	-.11	-.60	-.25	4.87%
Longitudinal	16	2,266	-.20	.20	-.24	.21	-.50	.02	-.35	-.13	17.32%
Relaxation											
Cross-Sectional	3	864	-.30	.23	-.34	.26	-.68	-.01	-.65	-.04	5.29%
Longitudinal	9	1,133	-.22	.17	-.25	.16	-.46	-.04	-.37	-.13	25.78%
Mastery											
Cross-Sectional	4	984	-.16	.10	-.18	.09	-.30	-.06	-.29	-.07	38.53%
Longitudinal	5	808	-.09	.07	-.11	.00	-.11	-.11	-.18	-.04	100.00%
Control											
Cross-Sectional	4	996	-.29	.19	-.34	.20	-.60	-.09	-.54	-.14	10.37%
Longitudinal	4	612	-.15	.09	-.18	.04	-.22	-.13	-.26	-.09	85.77%
State of Being Recovered											
Cross-Sectional	5	2,453	-.61	.10	-.70	.12	-.85	-.55	-.81	-.60	7.26%
Longitudinal	7	683	-.52	.15	-.58	.12	-.74	-.43	-.69	-.48	31.43%

Note. *k* = number of samples; *N* = total sample size; \bar{r} = sample-size weighted mean correlation; *SDr* = sample-size-weighted observed standard deviation of correlations; $\bar{\rho}$ = corrected mean true-score correlation; *SDρ* = corrected standard deviation of true-score correlation; CV = credibility interval; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit; % Var = percent of variance accounted for by study artifacts. Cells with dashes are instances where there was insufficient data to derive meta-analytic estimates.

S4r. Sleep

		<i>k</i>	<i>N</i>	\bar{r}	<i>SDr</i>	$\bar{\rho}$	<i>SDρ</i>	80%		95%		% Var
								CV _{LL}	CV _{UL}	CI _{LL}	CI _{UL}	
Low Duty Activities												
	Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	Longitudinal	3	242	.05	.04	.05	.00	.05	.05	-.08	.18	100.00%
High Duty Activities												
	Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	Longitudinal	4	278	-.08	.16	-.09	.12	-.24	.06	-.25	.08	56.30%
All Recovery Experiences												
	Cross-Sectional	7	2,270	.26	.07	.31	.07	.23	.40	.25	.38	47.43%
	Longitudinal	20	3,074	.17	.11	.21	.08	.10	.31	.16	.26	56.29%
Detachment												
	Cross-Sectional	6	2,099	.27	.07	.33	.07	.24	.42	.26	.40	42.28%
	Longitudinal	17	2,742	.17	.12	.20	.11	.07	.34	.14	.26	42.87%
Relaxation												
	Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	Longitudinal	5	490	.24	.11	.29	.05	.22	.35	.19	.38	84.79%
Mastery												
	Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	Longitudinal	3	338	.08	.12	.09	.09	-.02	.21	-.05	.24	62.13%
Control												
	Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	Longitudinal	3	225	.18	.12	.24	.00	.24	.24	.11	.37	100.00%
State of Being Recovered												
	Cross-Sectional	4	1,860	.41	.10	.52	.10	.39	.64	.42	.62	19.47%
	Longitudinal	3	168	.33	.17	.39	.14	.22	.57	.19	.60	51.28%

Note. *k* = number of samples; *N* = total sample size; \bar{r} = sample-size weighted mean correlation; *SDr* = sample-size-weighted observed standard deviation of correlations; $\bar{\rho}$ = corrected mean true-score correlation; *SDρ* = corrected standard deviation of true-score correlation; CV = credibility interval; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit; % Var = percent of variance accounted for by study artifacts. Cells with dashes are instances where there was insufficient data to derive meta-analytic estimates.

S4s. Health

		<i>k</i>	<i>N</i>	\bar{r}	<i>SDr</i>	$\bar{\rho}$	<i>SDρ</i>	80%		95%		% Var
								CV _{LL}	CV _{UL}	CI _{LL}	CI _{UL}	
Low Duty Activities												
	Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	Longitudinal	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
High Duty Activities												
	Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	Longitudinal	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
All Recovery Experiences												
	Cross-Sectional	11	7,713	.18	.10	.22	.12	.06	.37	.14	.29	11.94%
	Longitudinal	10	2,095	.15	.12	.18	.12	.03	.33	.09	.26	33.08%
Detachment												
	Cross-Sectional	10	7,252	.20	.08	.24	.08	.13	.35	.18	.30	20.11%
	Longitudinal	9	1,943	.16	.12	.16	.15	-.03	.34	.05	.26	20.22%
Relaxation												
	Cross-Sectional	7	5,911	.23	.06	.27	.07	.18	.36	.21	.33	22.13%
	Longitudinal	3	613	.18	.08	.21	.01	.20	.23	.13	.29	97.55%
Mastery												
	Cross-Sectional	7	5,911	.15	.05	.17	.04	.12	.23	.13	.22	44.41%
	Longitudinal	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Control												
	Cross-Sectional	8	6,372	.19	.07	.22	.08	.12	.33	.17	.28	20.42%
	Longitudinal	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
State of Being Recovered												
	Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	Longitudinal	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Note. *k* = number of samples; *N* = total sample size; \bar{r} = sample-size weighted mean correlation; *SDr* = sample-size-weighted observed standard deviation of correlations; $\bar{\rho}$ = corrected mean true-score correlation; *SDρ* = corrected standard deviation of true-score correlation; CV = credibility interval; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit; %Var = percent of variance accounted for by study artifacts. Cells with dashes are instances where there was insufficient data to derive meta-analytic estimates.

S4t. Performance

	<i>k</i>	<i>N</i>	\bar{r}	<i>SDr</i>	$\bar{\rho}$	$\bar{\rho}_{inter}$	<i>SDρ</i>	80%		95%		% Var
								CV _{LL}	CV _{UL}	CI _{LL}	CI _{UL}	
Low Duty Activities												
Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Longitudinal	3	493	.22	.08	.25	.32	.05	.19	.31	.15	.35	74.60%
High Duty Activities												
Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Longitudinal	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
All Recovery Experiences												
Cross-Sectional	6	4,155	.16	.04	.20	.24	.02	.18	.22	.17	.23	89.72%
Longitudinal	7	918	.09	.08	.10	.12	.00	.10	.10	.04	.16	100.00%
Detachment												
Cross-Sectional	5	3,984	.08	.06	.10	.12	.05	.04	.16	.05	.15	44.93%
Longitudinal	5	683	-.03	.16	-.04	-.04	.16	-.24	.16	-.19	.12	28.79%
Relaxation												
Cross-Sectional	3	3,711	.17	.02	.21	.26	.00	.21	.21	.18	.24	100.00%
Longitudinal	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Mastery												
Cross-Sectional	3	3,711	.24	.03	.30	.36	.00	.30	.30	.27	.33	100.00%
Longitudinal	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Control												
Cross-Sectional	3	3,711	.18	.05	.22	.27	.04	.18	.27	.17	.28	47.83%
Longitudinal	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
State of Being Recovered												
Cross-Sectional	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Longitudinal	5	710	.10	.05	.13	.15	.00	.13	.13	.05	.20	100.00%

Note. *k* = number of samples; *N* = total sample size; \bar{r} = sample-size weighted mean correlation; *SDr* = sample-size-weighted observed standard deviation of correlations; $\bar{\rho}$ = corrected mean true-score correlation; $\bar{\rho}_{inter}$ = mean true-score correlation corrected for unreliability (using local coefficients alpha for recovery variables and a meta-analytic interrater reliability of .52 for performance; Viswesvaran et al., 1996); *SDρ* = corrected standard deviation of true-score correlation; CV = credibility interval; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit; % Var = percent of variance accounted for by study artifacts. Cells with dashes are instances where there was insufficient data to derive meta-analytic estimates.

Table S5

Time Lag Analysis

Analyses examine relationships where predictors were measured temporally prior to recovery activities, experiences, and states (Tables S5a-b) or outcomes were measured temporally after recovery activities, experiences, and states (Tables S5c-e). If multiple time-lagged correlations were reported (e.g., Time 1-Time 2, Time 1-Time 3; Time-2, Time-3), the mean correlation of proximal relationships (Time 1-Time 2; Time 2-Time 3) was used in calculations.

S5a. Demands – Time Lag Only

Variable	<i>k</i>	<i>N</i>	\bar{r}	<i>SDr</i>	$\bar{\rho}$	<i>SDρ</i>	80%		95%		% Var
							CV _{LL}	CV _{UL}	CI _{LL}	CI _{UL}	
Overload Demands											
Low Duty Activities	7	2,943	-.07	.08	-.08	.06	-.16	.00	-.14	-.02	42.28%
High Duty Activities	4	504	.09	.13	.10	.12	-.05	.25	-.04	.25	42.62%
All Recovery Experiences	14	2,433	-.19	.10	-.22	.08	-.33	-.12	-.28	-.17	52.00%
Detachment	13	2,302	-.21	.09	-.25	.04	-.30	-.19	-.29	-.20	78.00%
Relaxation	5	655	-.14	.10	-.16	.06	-.24	-.09	-.25	-.07	75.12%
Mastery	3	424	.11	.17	.15	.17	-.07	.36	-.07	.36	27.00%
Control	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
State of Being Recovered	4	426	-.15	.21	-.17	.24	-.47	.13	-.42	.08	19.00%
Cognitive											
Low Duty Activities	4	495	.03	.12	.04	.09	-.08	.16	-.08	.17	57.72%
High Duty Activities	3	417	.02	.05	.03	.00	.03	.03	-.07	.13	100.00%
All Recovery Experiences	4	1,037	-.12	.09	-.15	.08	-.26	-.05	-.25	-.05	48.30%
Detachment	4	1,037	-.12	.10	-.15	.10	-.29	-.02	-.27	-.03	36.54%
Relaxation	3	377	-.09	.07	-.10	.00	-.10	-.10	-.20	.00	100.00%
Mastery	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Control	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
State of Being Recovered	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Emotional Demands											
Low Duty Activities	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
High Duty Activities	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
All Recovery Experiences	6	1,182	-.19	.05	-.22	.00	-.22	-.22	-.28	-.17	100.00%
Detachment	6	1,182	-.20	.05	-.23	.00	-.23	-.23	-.28	-.17	100.00%
Relaxation	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Mastery	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Control	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
State of Being Recovered	4	659	-.15	.06	-.17	.00	-.17	-.17	-.25	-.10	100.00%
Physical Demands											
Low Duty Activities	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
High Duty Activities	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
All Recovery Experiences	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Detachment	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Relaxation	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Mastery	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Control	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
State of Being Recovered	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Note. *k* = number of samples; *N* = total sample size; \bar{r} = sample-size weighted mean correlation; *SDr* = sample-size-weighted observed standard deviation of correlations; $\bar{\rho}$ = corrected mean true-score correlation; *SDρ* = corrected standard deviation of true-score correlation; CV = credibility interval; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit; % Var = percent of variance accounted for by study artifacts. Cells with dashes are instances where there was insufficient data to derive meta-analytic estimates.

S5b. Resources – Time Lag Only

Variable	<i>k</i>	<i>N</i>	\bar{r}	<i>SDr</i>	$\bar{\rho}$	<i>SDρ</i>	80%		95%		% Var
							CV _{LL}	CV _{UL}	CI _{LL}	CI _{UL}	
Contextual Resources - Work											
Low Duty Activities	3	341	.06	.08	.07	.00	.07	.07	-.03	.18	100.00%
High Duty Activities	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
All Recovery Experiences	7	639	.13	.14	.16	.11	.02	.31	.05	.27	53.52%
Detachment	4	341	-.01	.07	-.01	.00	-.01	-.01	-.12	.10	100.00%
Relaxation	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Mastery	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Control	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
State of Being Recovered	6	631	.08	.15	.10	.14	-.08	.28	-.04	.24	41.27%
Contextual Resources - Home											
Low Duty Activities	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
High Duty Activities	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
All Recovery Experiences	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Detachment	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Relaxation	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Mastery	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Control	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
State of Being Recovered	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Personal Resources											
Low Duty Activities	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
High Duty Activities	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
All Recovery Experiences	4	567	.21	.14	.25	.13	.08	.42	.09	.40	33.56%
Detachment	4	567	.15	.14	.17	.13	.00	.35	.02	.33	33.64%
Relaxation	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Mastery	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Control	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
State of Being Recovered	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Note. *k* = number of samples; *N* = total sample size; \bar{r} = sample-size weighted mean correlation; *SDr* = sample-size-weighted observed standard deviation of correlations; $\bar{\rho}$ = corrected mean true-score correlation; *SDρ* = corrected standard deviation of true-score correlation; CV = credibility interval; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit; %Var = percent of variance accounted for by study artifacts. Cells with dashes are instances where there was insufficient data to derive meta-analytic estimates.

S5c. Psychological Well-being – Time Lag Only

Variable	<i>k</i>	<i>N</i>	\bar{r}	<i>SDr</i>	$\bar{\rho}$	<i>SDρ</i>	80%		95%		% Var
							CV _{LL}	CV _{UL}	CI _{LL}	CI _{UL}	
Mental Well-being											
Low Duty Activities	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
High Duty Activities	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
All Recovery Experiences	6	1,239	.17	.12	.20	.11	.07	.34	.10	.30	37.21%
Detachment	6	1,239	.17	.12	.20	.11	.07	.34	.10	.30	37.21%
Relaxation	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Mastery	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Control	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
State of Being Recovered	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Positive Affect - State											
Low Duty Activities	3	277	.07	.07	.08	.00	.08	.08	-.04	.19	100.00%
High Duty Activities	3	287	-.01	.12	-.01	.06	-.08	.06	-.14	.12	79.33%
All Recovery Experiences	12	1,385	.20	.12	.23	.10	.10	.36	.15	.31	52.15%
Detachment	9	1,090	.20	.11	.23	.08	.13	.33	.16	.31	64.56%
Relaxation	4	579	.23	.11	.26	.11	.12	.40	.13	.39	42.32%
Mastery	5	684	.13	.11	.15	.08	.04	.25	.04	.25	58.34%
Control	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
State of Being Recovered	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Negative Affect - State											
Low Duty Activities	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
High Duty Activities	3	287	-.04	.04	-.05	.00	-.05	-.05	-.17	.07	100.00%
All Recovery Experiences	8	969	-.22	.12	-.26	.10	-.39	-.13	-.35	-.17	51.35%
Detachment	7	851	-.21	.12	-.25	.10	-.38	-.13	-.35	-.16	53.69%
Relaxation	4	622	-.20	.05	-.23	.00	-.23	-.23	-.30	-.15	100.00%
Mastery	4	595	-.09	.03	-.10	.00	-.10	-.10	-.18	-.02	100.00%
Control	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Life Satisfaction											
Low Duty Activities	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
High Duty Activities	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
All Recovery Experiences	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Detachment	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Relaxation	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Mastery	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Control	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
State of Being Recovered	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Note. *k* = number of samples; *N* = total sample size; \bar{r} = sample-size weighted mean correlation; *SDr* = sample-size-weighted observed standard deviation of correlations; $\bar{\rho}$ = corrected mean true-score correlation; *SDρ* = corrected standard deviation of true-score correlation; CV = credibility interval; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit; % Var = percent of variance accounted for by study artifacts. Cells with dashes are instances where there was insufficient data to derive meta-analytic estimates.

S5d. Psychosomatic Well-being – Time Lag Only

Variable	<i>k</i>	<i>N</i>	\bar{r}	<i>SDr</i>	$\bar{\rho}$	<i>SDρ</i>	80%		95%		% Var
							CV _{LL}	CV _{UL}	CI _{LL}	CI _{UL}	
Fatigue											
Low Duty Activities	3	260	-.13	.15	-.13	.12	-.29	.02	-.31	.04	48.21%
High Duty Activities	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
All Recovery Experiences	9	1,529	-.26	.20	-.29	.20	-.56	-.03	-.44	-.15	13.89%
Detachment	7	1,296	-.28	.19	-.33	.20	-.59	-.08	-.49	-.17	13.47%
Relaxation	5	655	-.17	.14	-.20	.12	-.36	-.04	-.33	-.07	38.09%
Mastery	3	503	-.10	.07	-.11	.00	-.11	-.11	-.20	-.03	100.00%
Control	3	439	-.17	.11	-.19	.09	-.31	-.08	-.33	-.06	51.64%
State of Being Recovered	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Sleep											
Low Duty Activities	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
High Duty Activities	3	225	-.12	.14	-.14	.09	-.26	-.02	-.31	.03	65.75%
All Recovery Experiences	14	1,923	.19	.12	.23	.11	.09	.37	.16	.30	45.50%
Detachment	12	1,736	.18	.12	.21	.10	.09	.34	.14	.28	48.95%
Relaxation	3	353	.21	.12	.26	.08	.15	.36	.12	.39	62.31%
Mastery	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Control	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
State of Being Recovered	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Health											
Low Duty Activities	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
High Duty Activities	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
All Recovery Experiences	4	898	.20	.06	.24	.00	.24	.24	.18	.31	100.00%
Detachment	4	891	.23	.03	.28	.00	.28	.28	.22	.35	100.00%
Relaxation	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Mastery	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Control	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
State of Being Recovered	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Physiological Well-being											
Low Duty Activities	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
High Duty Activities	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
All Recovery Experiences	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Detachment	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Relaxation	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Mastery	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Control	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
State of Being Recovered	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Note. *k* = number of samples; *N* = total sample size; \bar{r} = sample-size weighted mean correlation; *SDr* = sample-size-weighted observed standard deviation of correlations; $\bar{\rho}$ = corrected mean true-score correlation; *SDρ* = corrected standard deviation of true-score correlation; CV = credibility interval; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit; % Var = percent of variance accounted for by study artifacts. Cells with dashes are instances where there was insufficient data to derive meta-analytic estimates.

S5e. Performance – Time Lag Only

Variable	<i>k</i>	<i>N</i>	\bar{r}	<i>SDr</i>	$\bar{\rho}$	$\bar{\rho}_{inter}$	<i>SDρ</i>	80%		95%		% Var
								CV _{LL}	CV _{UL}	CI _{LL}	CI _{UL}	
Performance												
Low Duty Activities	3	493	.22	.08	.25	.32	.05	.19	.31	.15	.35	74.60%
High Duty Activities	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
All Recovery Experiences	5	814	.11	.08	.13	.16	.03	.09	.16	.05	.20	89.25%
Detachment	4	588	-.10	.10	-.11	-.14	.05	-.18	-.04	-.21	-.02	74.51%
Relaxation	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Mastery	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Control	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
State of Being Recovered	4	655	.11	.05	.14	.17	.00	.14	.14	.06	.21	100.00%

Note. *k* = number of samples; *N* = total sample size; \bar{r} = sample-size weighted mean correlation; *SDr* = sample-size-weighted observed standard deviation of correlations; $\bar{\rho}$ = corrected mean true-score correlation; $\bar{\rho}_{inter}$ = mean true-score correlation corrected for unreliability (using local coefficients alpha for recovery variables and a meta-analytic interrater reliability of .52 for performance; Viswesvaran et al., 1996); *SDρ* = corrected standard deviation of true-score correlation; CV = credibility interval; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit; % Var = percent of variance accounted for by study artifacts. Cells with dashes are instances where there was insufficient data to derive meta-analytic estimates.