ENGAGEMENT IN RECOVERY EXPERIENCES FROM WORK AMONG POSTSECONDARY FULL-TIME ONLINE FACULTY

MaryAlice Varga, University of West Georgia
Nicole Denniston, Grand Canyon University

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this quantitative correlational design research study was to determine if and to what extent online teaching self-efficacy, years of online teaching experience, and number of weekly telework hours predicted engagement in recovery experiences (using psychological detachment, relaxation-oriented, mastery-oriented, and control of leisure recovery strategies) among faculty who teach postsecondary online courses full time at a university in the southwestern United States. The results of the multiple linear regression model statistically significantly predicted psychological detachment, relaxation, mastery, and control of leisure time. Results indicated that online teaching self-efficacy statistically significantly predicted psychological detachment and mastery. In addition, telework was a significant predictor of relaxation and control. This study provided further insight into the collective use of the predictor variables predicting engagement with psychological detachment, relaxation, mastery, and control recovery experiences. This study builds on the body of knowledge of recovery from work and online teaching, and it participates in practical applications that impact the recovery experiences of online educators.

Keywords: recovery experiences, online teaching self-efficacy, online teaching, telework

INTRODUCTION

Technological advances allow individuals the opportunity to connect and communicate from anywhere in the world and at any time within both the professional and academic realms. With the use of technology and technological advancements, academic institutions can offer online courses to their student population. Today, many universities offer fully online courses and degree programs to the public. These online courses are especially important to those who may be unable to attend brick-and-mortar locations due to personal circumstances. With the growth of postsecondary distance education, there has been an increase in the demand for educators who can teach online courses (Mueller et al., 2013; Portugal, 2015). Distance education is a method of teaching where the student and teacher are physically separated. This separation enables teaching and learning to occur at any time of the day without having a time or place limitation on the learner and teacher (Kentnor, 2015; Ozturk et al., 2018).

Distance educators often engage in telework practices. Telework is considered a flexible arrangement between employers and employees that allows employees to perform work activities from home or another remote location using information technology (Biron & van Veldhoven, 2016; Chiru, 2017; Smith et al., 2018). Many employees view teleworking as a favorable work option as it allows for flexibility, increased productivity, and it includes fewer distractions (Meroño-Cerdán, 2017; Smith et al., 2018). However, in some instances, telework decreased job satisfaction among employees (Smith

et al., 2018). Telework might cause a decrease in job satisfaction due to a lack of personal relationships as found in a face-to-face setting. Not having face-to-face communication requires self-discipline and could have a negative influence on teamwork and work/life balance (Smith et al., 2018). Although telework has benefits, it can also have consequential effects on one's ability to recover from the demands associated with their work.

Faculty who teach courses online full time have different job expectations and work challenges than faculty who teach classes at traditional brick-and-mortar locations. Online faculty can become overwhelmed managing the systems they work with and with the time required of them to perform their various other educational duties (Kian, 2014). The time commitment for faculty who teach online-facilitated courses is often greater than faculty who teach in the face-to-face classroom (Mueller et al., 2013). Additionally, faculty who teach online courses have difficulty detaching from technology during their nonworking hours (Barber & Jenkins, 2014). When working in technology-driven conditions, managing the boundaries between work and home life becomes blurred, and employees are unable to recover from their work demands during their leisure time (Barber & Jenkins, 2014). Not fully recovering from work during nonworking hours has negative consequences on one's health and work performance (Barber & Jenkins, 2014). To fully recover from job demands, Sonnentag and Fritz (2007) propose four different recovery experiences one can engage in during their nonworking hours:

a. Psychological detachment refers to when one can mentally disengage from work during the off-job time.
b. Relaxation-oriented strategies are activities aimed at relaxing the body and mind that are nonchallenging and require little physical and intellectual effort.
c. Mastery-oriented strategies include off-job activities that provide a challenging experience and learning opportunity for experiencing competence and proficiency.
d. Control over leisure time regards a person's ability to choose which activity to pursue during leisure time to include when and how to pursue the chosen activity.

Employees who can effectively manage boundaries and allow time to engage in recovery strategies are more likely to recover from work and return to work refreshed, which will have a positive impact on their health and work performance.

Recovery from work is associated with self-efficacy and workplace well-being. "Given that work-related self-efficacy influences how employees respond to workplace stressors, it is conceivable that the construct may also impact how employees attempt to recover from these stressors when they are outside of work" (Lloyd et al., 2017, p. 125). Individuals who telework or work from home may not have an "outside of work" place to recover. If workplace stress is associated with a place one may retreat to during their nonworking hours to recover from their work, an employee might find it challenging to engage in recovery experiences.

Personal resources such as self-efficacy are used to define sources of motivation and well-being within the workplace (van den Heuvel et al., 2015). Deficits in self-efficacy among online faculty present challenges that threaten the quality of education and instructional success of professors (Horvitz et al., 2015). At the same time, faculty with more experience using technology are found to have higher levels of self-efficacy than those without web-based teaching experience (Chang et al., 2011; Cherry & Flora, 2017; Horvitz et al., 2015). Lee and Tsia (2010) also explained that postsecondary educators who had experience using technology to teach have higher levels of work self-efficacy. Faculty who do not have experience using technology to teach may have a lower level of self-efficacy, which means they can experience higher levels of stress within their job. These higher levels of stress can hinder faculty members from recovering from the stress they experience in the workplace.

Research Questions

We asked four research questions in this study based on the four recovery experiences outlined by Sonnentag and Fritz (2007):

1. If and to what extent do online teaching self-efficacy, years of online teaching experience, and the number of weekly telework hours collectively predict psychological detachment recovery strategies among faculty who teach postsecondary courses full-time online?

2. If and to what extent do online teaching self-efficacy, years of online teaching experience, and the number of weekly telework hours collectively predict relaxation-oriented recovery strategies among faculty who teach postsecondary courses full-time online?
3. If and to what extent do online teaching self-efficacy, years of online teaching experience, and the number of weekly telework hours collectively predict mastery-oriented recovery strategies among faculty who teach postsecondary courses full-time online?
4. If and to what extent do online teaching self-efficacy, years of online teaching experience, and the number of weekly telework hours collectively predict control recovery strategies among faculty who teach postsecondary courses full-time online?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Distance education is not a new way of teaching and can be traced back to the 18th century when universities offered correspondence classes (Kentnor, 2015). Distance education is a method of teaching where instructors and students are physically separated (Kentnor, 2015). Online education followed developments in technology in the 20th century. Universities across the country are developing more online courses and are offering many of their courses through an online format (Northcote et al., 2015). With the increased use and advancement of the new technology, many educational institutions attempt to re-create the dynamics of a physical, face-to-face classroom by transforming and creating online classes (Arasaratnam-Smith & Northcote, 2017). In the fall of 2014, 2.85 million higher education students were taking all their courses online (Allen et al., 2016). Often, faculty who teach online courses are adjunct faculty, meaning they only teach online courses part time (Ferencz, 2017). With the steady growth of postsecondary online education offerings, universities are beginning to incorporate fully online degree programs and courses within their business model. Due to the increased need for online educators, a new population of faculty teaching online courses full time has arisen. The competencies needed to be an effective online instructor include technical skills, a willingness to learn, knowledge of how people learn, content expertise, course design skills, and the ability to assess student learning (Martin et al., 2019). These competencies influence a faculty's online teaching sense of self-efficacy.

Understanding the specific roles and responsibilities of postsecondary faculty who teach online courses full time aids in understanding the stresses they endure on the job. The growing demand for postsecondary online courses and programs produces a need for a better understanding of the activities relating specifically to online instructor time and the commitment required for the courses they teach (Mueller et al., 2013). Faculty who teach full-time online courses spend a significant amount of time providing detailed and holistic, qualitative, and quantitative feedback to students, including individualized attention and discussions in online forums (Mueller et al., 2013). The nature of a full-time online teaching position means faculty members can be reached at any time of day, any day of the week. This accessibility by the student to the instructor can cause increased stress among faculty. Online faculty who can establish a balance between their personal life and work have reduced stress levels and can overcome feelings of being overwhelmed (Portugal, 2015). Time demands and the blurring of boundaries between work and home are contributors to the stress of faculty who teach online courses full time.

An abundance of literature has been established regarding the amount of time and the teaching demands required to teach online courses. Some researchers indicated that teaching online requires more time, while other researchers indicated that online teaching requires less time, than a face-to-face format does (Raffo et al., 2015). Although the results are mixed, variations in teaching workload, demands, and time management strategies are significant concerns for faculty (Portugal, 2015; Raffo et al., 2015; Smith et al., 2015).

Many full-time online faculty in this study telework a maximum of two days out of the workweek. The term telework originated from an analysis by Jack Nilles's about telecommuting during the 1970s (Nilles, 1975). Telework is described as a flexible arrangement between employers and employees that allows employees to perform work activities from home or another remote location using information technology (Biron & van Veldhoven, 2016; Chiru, 2017; Smith

et al., 2018). Telework has increased by 80% due to technological advances, putting the number of teleworkers above 3 million in the United States (Rockmann & Pratt, 2015).

Job satisfaction is commonly studied in conjunction with teleworking (Biron & van Veldhoven, 2016; Rockmann & Pratt, 2015; Smith et al., 2018). Telework offers benefits to employers and employees but also has consequences. The benefits of telework for employers is that it provides cost-savings, such as reduced personnel costs and real-estate expenses, and productivity improvements, such as creating an opportunity to continue to work regardless of weather conditions (Biron & van Veldhoven, 2016). The benefits of telework for employees include control over work location, less work-family conflict, and cost savings in time and money for travel to and from work (Biron & van Veldhoven, 2016), better concentration (Biron & van Veldhoven, 2016; Smith et al., 2018), fatigue reduction (Meroño-Cerdán, 2017), job satisfaction, and organizational commitment (Collins et al., 2016; Meroño-Cerdán, 2017).

On the other hand, negative consequences to telework for employers include the inability of supervisors to control workers directly (Biron & van Veldhoven, 2016). For employees, the negative consequences of telework include professional isolation (Collins et al., 2016; Smith et al., 2018), greater work-family conflict, social isolation, career stagnation (Biron & van Veldhoven, 2016; Collins et al., 2016), and blurred boundaries between work and private life (Boell et al., 2016). With technological innovations and the use of technology within the workplace, creating boundaries between the work and personal life domains is increasingly challenging for employees (Daniel & Sonnentag, 2016). Employees are responsible for successfully managing these boundaries so they can successfully recover from work. Therefore, telework is central to this study and is used to determine the study's predictive power when correlating it in conjunction with online teaching self-efficacy and engagement in the different types of recovery experiences during nonworking hours among postsecondary, full-time online faculty.

Online teaching self-efficacy is an extension of self-efficacy. Bandura (1977) introduced the concept of self-efficacy and defined it as one's belief in their confidence and ability to complete tasks or problems successfully. In organizational research, self-efficacy accounts for individual behaviors that include coping behaviors, levels of stress, achievement, intrinsic interests, and career pursuits (Yu et al., 2015). Previous researchers found a correlation among individuals with a low sense of self-efficacy who are likely to become depressed, have job dissatisfaction, and are more likely to experience burnout (Gregersen et al., 2014). Therefore, the more efficacious the individual, the less likely they experience burnout and, in turn, have a higher level of job satisfaction. Self-efficacy is widely researched within the organizational field and is positively related to perceiving tasks as challenges, which means they are considered an investment of resources, rather than threats, which are an expenditure of resources (Arapovic-Johansson et al., 2017; Peng et al., 2015). If an employee expected to ultimately fail at a task, they would not perform the task to protect their efficacy resources. Peng et al. (2015) noted that the impact of self-efficacy on stress coping and health outcomes varied due to varying levels of self-efficacy over time. Fida et al. (2015) further noted that not all individuals perceive situations in the same way and react differently given the same conditions. Individuals have different ways of approaching and dealing with stressful situations.

The ability for one to deal with stress at work can define the type of receiver experience they choose to engage in during their nonwork hours. The effort-recovery model assists in understanding the recovery process of how employees expend their resources when responding to workplace stress (Hunter & Wu, 2016). Personal resources, such as self-efficacy, are used to define sources of motivation and well-being within the workplace (van den Heuvel et al., 2015). Prior qualitative research can be found about employee self-efficacy and its correlation to workplace stress (Lloyd et al., 2017; Peng et al., 2015). Employees who perceive themselves as efficacious faced difficulties more constructively and persevered when faced with obstacles at work (Fida et al., 2015). When employees are more efficacious about their ability to complete the tasks within their job, they are more likely to respond to workplace stress better than those who are less efficacious. Researchers in the literature examine self-efficacy as it relates to recovery and stress management training in the workplace.

Lloyd et al. (2017) investigated the impact of stress management training on occupational strain over nine months. This longitudinal study indicated that employees with low levels of self-efficacy, but high levels of intrinsic motivation, benefitted from stress management training. On the other hand, employees with low levels of both self-efficacy and intrinsic motivation did not benefit from stress management training. Thus, an employees' level of self-efficacy influenced their stress in the workplace and their ability to recover from this stress.

Work-related self-efficacy relates to the ability to complete tasks required within one's occupation (Dicke et al., 2018). Self-efficacy is not uniform and differs across subjects and domains. A significant issue exists in the literature about how to measure teaching self-efficacy beliefs specific to online instruction (Northcote et al., 2015). Bandura (2006) warned that the construction of a sound self-efficacy scale relies on its relevance to the domain. The concept of self-efficacy has become more prominently researched within organizational psychology and has also been widely researched within the educational field. Components of the social cognitive theory inform that teachers who have a low sense of instructional efficacy are more likely to experience burnout and chronic occupational stress (Bandura, 1993). Traditionally, university teaching is regarded as a low-stress occupation; however, in modern universities, occupational stress is a growing concern (Teichmann et al., 2013).

Ali et al. (2017) examined the relationship between emotional intelligence and online teaching self-efficacy among nurse educators who taught full-time online courses or blended courses (or both). The authors found that the nurse faculty who had higher levels of self-efficacy beliefs and emotional intelligence were more empowered to teach effectively and create positive learning environments. They also found that online teaching self-efficacy was related to the duration of being a nurse educator and the duration of experience teaching online courses. The findings indicated that the duration of teaching online courses has a significant correlation to self-efficacy. Smith et al. (2015) noted that little research had been conducted on the effects of stress in postsecondary faculty who teach online courses. Understanding how the concept of online teaching self-efficacy relates to recovery from work is important to universities employing faculty who teach online courses full time and have the option to telework. If recovery does not take place, employee burnout is likely to occur.

Teacher efficacy is fundamental for student success and the job satisfaction, overall health, well-being, and quality of life of faculty members. With the growth of online courses and the need for online education, the demand for satisfied and efficacious faculty exists (Hampton et al., 2020). Teaching self-efficacy is a construct related to student outcomes that represents teachers' confidence in their ability to facilitate and develop the knowledge, abilities, and values of students (Horvitz et al., 2015). The self-efficacy of online teachers also involves mastering the skills needed to teach online programs (Hampton et al., 2020). Deficits in self-efficacy among online faculty present a challenge that can threaten the quality of education and thesuccess of professors teaching in the online environment (Horvitz et al., 2015). The most significant stressors of online faculty include time constraints, technological issues, and large class sizes (Portugal, 2015; Smith et al., 2015). Increased stress levels among faculty also have consequences on job performance and satisfaction. Smith et al. (2015) found that out of 100 surveys returned from online instructors, all respondents felt their work performance suffered due to increased stress levels. Although some stress is good, too much distress affected the attitude and performance of the faculty. Organizations that provided various ways and educational methods to manage stress aid employees in enhancing their well-being (Smith et al., 2015) and their job self-efficacy (Hampton et al., 2020). Personal resources, such as self-efficacy, are used to define sources of well-being within the workplace (van den Heuvel et al., 2015). The demanding culture of online teaching, lack of time, and constant balance of work-life and personal-life contributed to the increased stress of online faculty.

Different types of recovery experiences exist that employees can engage in during the workday and during nonworking hours to recover from workplace demands. The term recovery originally meant moving from being ill to being healthy (Zijlstra et al., 2014). Recovery from work is the process where individuals' mental and energetic resources are restored and is the post-stress rest period after exposure to a stressor (Meijman

& Mulder, 1998; Zijlstra et al., 2014). Recovery from work can also be defined as the process of eliminating psychological strain caused by job demands and stressful work situations (Meijman & Mulder, 1998; Sonnentag & Fritz, 2015). Recovering from workplace stress enables employees to return to work and handle the stressors associated with their day-to-day job activities.

Other studies about the recovery process during leisure time predicted employee well-being, reactions to stress, and job-related behaviors (Sonnentag & Fritz, 2015). Although engagement in recovery during the workday activities allows for stress relief throughout the day, occupations that enable employees to be accessible during nonworking hours found these breaks during the day not as successful in facilitating their recovery from work. The traditional work-rest cycle included eight hours of work, eight hours of personal time, and eight hours of sleep (Bakker et al., 2015). Considering technological innovations and the use of technology within the workplace, the boundaries between work and personal life become increasingly challenging for employees and can make the work recovery process difficult (Daniel & Sonnentag, 2016). Sonnentag and Fritz (2007) tested and validated four distinct psychological processes of recovery used during nonworking hours that made up the Recovery Experiences Questionnaire (REQ). These distinct psychological processes were referred to as psychological recovery experiences that could be differentiated into moderate various job demands that included: psychological detachment, relaxation, mastery, and control.

METHOD

Context

We used a quantitative methodology with a correlational design in this research study. The Michigan Nurse Educators Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching (MNESEOT; Robinia, 2008) measured the predictor variable of online teaching self-efficacy. The criterion variable of recovery experiences was measured using the REQ (Sonnentag & Fritz, 2007). We used multiple linear regression analyses to run the analysis to test the predictive relationship between four separate criterion and multiple predictor variables.

Participants

Four research questions guide this study and data collection. We collected data from a sample of postsecondary, full-time online faculty who were employed and teleworked at a university in the southwestern United States. We used SurveyMonkey to gather the combined survey data. The sampling criteria we used to select participants were that the participant must telework and have taught at least one course entirely online at the university. The questionnaires were only given to faculty who taught courses online full time at the university, including the faculty chairs. The sampling procedure for this study was convenience sampling, and all 177 eligible faculty were invited to participate. The final dataset included 83 participants.

Data were collected from participants using the MNESEOT by Robinia (2008) and the REQ by Sonnentag and Fritz (2007). The MNESEOT survey instrument has been validated to measure the self-efficacy of faculty who taught online courses, as demonstrated in the studies by Robinia (2008) and Robinia and Anderson (2010). The reliability of the MNESEOT revealed Cronbach's alpha of .93 for the use of the entire instrument (Robinia, 2008). Through factor analysis, the study confirmed four factors: self-efficacy in online student engagement (.93), efficacy in online instructional strategies (.94), efficacy in online classroom management (.93), and self-efficacy for computer skills (.86) (Robinia, 2008). These resulted in a Cronbach's alpha of .93 for the use of the entire instrument (Robinia, 2008). A similar study by Horvitz et al. (2015) examined parts of the MNESEOT that measured Cronbach's alpha above .80 (Horvitz et al., 2015). Thus, it was a reliable tool of measurement to use in correlational research with faculty who teach online courses.

The REQ survey instrument has been validated to measure engagement in different recovery experiences and has been shown to provide consistent data (Demsky et al., 2018; Merino-Tejedor et al., 2017; Sonnentag & Fritz, 2007). Cronbach's coefficient alpha yielded internal consistencies of .89 for psychological detachment, .87 for relaxation, .82 for mastery, and .87 for control (Sonnentag & Fritz, 2007). Merino-Tejedor et al. (2017) validated the factorial saturations and correlations between the four factors, noting the correlations between the factors are statistically significant. These values are favorable compared to the alpha coefficients in other studies that yielded internal consistencies of .74 for psychological

detachment, .74 for relaxation, .86 for mastery, and .84 for control (Merino-Tejedor et al., 2017). The scales of the REQ have good internal consistencies and are short, so they can be used in future research without taking much time to complete in any occupation (Sonnentag & Fritz, 2007).

These survey items used Likert-type responses in the form of phrases and numbers. The questions asked in the demographic section of the survey about other predictor variables were self-report numbers that were filled out by the participant and included the years of online teaching experience and the number of telework hours were self-reported numbers that were filled out by the participant.

RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics for the 83 faculty in the sample are given in Table 1 and Table 2. Table 1 indicates the sample was mostly female, full-time faculty, who taught at the undergraduate level. The data in Table 2 suggest that this group of faculty has worked for the university an average of five or more years and worked at the brick-and-mortar office location for more than half of their 40-hour workweek.

Table 1. Participant Demographics for Categorical Variables (n=83)

	Frequency	Percent
Gender		
Female	49	59.0%
Male	31	37.3%
No Response	3	3.6%
Online Full-Time Faculty Member		
Yes	82	98.8%
No	1	1.2%
Degree Level Taught		
Undergraduate	66	79.5%
Graduate	36	43.4%
Doctoral	9	10.8%
Undergraduate and Graduate	22	26.5%
Graduate and Doctoral	3	3.6%
Undergraduate, Graduate, and Doctoral	1	1.2%

Table 2. Participant Demographics for Continuous Variables* (n=83**)

	Mean	Median	Std Dev	Std Err
Age	44.18	41.50	9.07	1.05
Courses Taught/Week	5.13	5.00	1.93	0.21
# Students at One Time	111.42	100.00	39.13	4.30
Years Taught Online at the University	6.29	7.00	2.84	0.31
Average Hours Working in Office/Week	24.01	24.00	6.03	0.66

Note: *Does not include study variables that are also demographic variables. See the next section.
**Only n=74 respondents provided their age

Scale Reliability

Cronbach's alpha reliability statistics for each scale variable are summarized in Table 3. It can be seen that all reliability values are greater than the generally accepted minimum of .70, indicating acceptable reliability for all scale variables used; thus, all scale variables were used in the data analyses.

Table 3. Cronbach Alphas for Scale Variables (n=83)

Variable	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha
Online Teaching Self-Efficacy	32	0.952
Psychological Detachment	4	0.911
Relaxation	4	0.937
Mastery	4	0.901
Control	4	0.897

Multiple Regression Results

The primary data analysis procedure used to address the research questions and the associated hypotheses tests was multiple linear regression. Once all eight assumptions associated with multiple regression testing were met, as shown in Table 4, the results of the four regression models and the overall prediction of the regression model indicated that each model was statistically significant for each research question. The three predictors collectively predicted each criterion to a statistically significant degree.

Table 4. Summary of Overall Regression Model Results (n=83)

	R	R2	Adj. R2	F	Sig.
RQ1	.36	.13	.10	3.93	.011
RQ2	.39	.15	.12	4.73	.004
RQ3	.36	.13	.10	3.93	.011
RQ4	.37	.14	.11	4.27	.008

The $F(3, 79) = 3.93$, $p < .05$ value suggests the answer to RQ1 was "yes," and the null hypothesis was rejected. For the individual predictors in the first research question, it can be seen in Table 5 that online teaching self-efficacy was the only predictor variable to statistically significantly predict psychological detachment.

Table 5. Predictor Beta Weights for Predicting Psychological Detachment (RQ1)

Predictor	Unstandardized *B*	Standardized *β*	Sig.
Online Teaching Self-Efficacy	0.28	0.28	.02
Years Taught Online	.05	.04	.72
Average Hours Worked from Home/Week	,-.06	-.13	.27

As previously noted in table 4, the R2 value suggests that the overall model is statistically significant, indicating the three predictors combined do predict the criterion. The $F(3, 79) = 4.73$, $p < .05$ value suggests that the answer to RQ2 was "yes" and the null hypothesis was rejected. In research question two, the average hours worked from home/week (telework hours) was the only predictor variable to statistically significantly predict relaxation-oriented recovery strategies as shown in Table 6.

Table 6. Predictor Beta Weights for Predicting Relaxation (RQ2)

Predictor	Unstandardized *B*	Standardized *β*	Sig.
Online Teaching Self-Efficacy	0.10	0.11	.33
Years Taught Online	.13	.11	.30
Average Hours Worked from Home/Week	-.13	-.32	.01

As previously noted in Table 4, the overall model is statistically significant. The $F(3, 79) = 3.93$, $p < .05$ value suggests that the three predictors combined do predict mastery-oriented recovery strategies. The answer to RQ3 was "yes" and the null hypothesis was rejected. Concerning the individual predictors in research question three, online teaching self-efficacy significantly statistically predicted mastery-oriented recovery strategies.

Table 7. Predictor Beta Weights for Predicting Mastery (RQ3)

Predictor	Unstandardized *B*	Standardized *β*	Sig.
Online Teaching Self-Efficacy	0.22	0.25	.04
Years Taught Online	-.02	-.02	.87
Average Hours Worked from Home/Week	-.07	-.17	.16

As previously noted in Table 4, the overall model is statistically significant, indicating that the three predictor variables combined do predict the criterion of control recovery strategies $F(3, 79) = 4.27$, $p < .05$. The answer to RQ4 was "yes" and the null hypothesis was rejected. For research question four, it can be seen in Table 8 that the average number of hours worked from home during the week (telework hours) significantly statistically predicted control over leisure time recovery strategies.

Table 8. Predictor Beta Weights for Predicting Control (RQ4)

Predictor	Unstandardized *B*	Standardized *β*	Sig.
Online Teaching Self-Efficacy	0.13	0.16	.18
Years Taught Online	.10	.10	.37
Average Hours Worked from Home/Week	-.10	-.26	.03

The results of the multiple linear regression analysis revealed that the multiple regression statistically predicted recovery experiences among all types of recovery: psychological detachment, relaxation, and mastery-oriented recovery strategies. At the same time, the results of the multiple linear regression showed that the predictor variable of years of online teaching experience did not statistically significantly predict any of the four recovery experiences. Additionally, online teaching self-efficacy predicted psychological detachment and mastery-oriented recovery strategies among full-time online faculty. The results further indicated that the number of weekly telework hours significantly statistically predicted relaxation-oriented recovery strategies and control over leisure time among faculty.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This study offers a more comprehensive

understanding of the various factors that attributed to recovery among faculty who teleworked and taught online courses full time at the postsecondary level. Moreover, the findings of this study contribute to the existing body of knowledge regarding recovery from work in a technology-based job to include positions in the academic realm.

As more colleges and universities offer courses and degree programs fully online to meet the needs of current and prospective students, there is a need to understand the factors associated with recovery from work factors among faculty who teach these courses and associated programs full-time online via telework. The conservation of resources theory and effort-recovery model assume that recovery occurs when employees replenished their resources during their off-job time (Shimazu et al., 2016; ten Brummelhuis & Bakker, 2012). Employees should be encouraged to take more frequent breaks throughout the workday to facilitate recovery; however, with the increasing use of technology in the workplace, an increasing demand is put on employees to manage the boundaries between their personal life and work. The inability to manage these boundaries impacts their ability to detach from work during their free time (Daniel & Sonnentag, 2016; Mellner, 2016).

Interestingly, the results of this study indicate that years of online teaching experience did not significantly predict any of the recovery experience strategies among faculty teaching online courses full time. Thus, it is possible that years of online teaching experience may only be related to online teaching self-efficacy and not to work. For this type of faculty, the number of years they had taught online courses did not have a relationship with how they recover from their work. This sample has taught online courses an average of $\mu = 7.37$ years, with only 13.2% of faculty having fewer than four years of teaching online courses, and 4.8% only one year of experience teaching courses online. It would be interesting to identify if there would be a difference in the prediction if the population included more faculty who had fewer than four years of online teaching experience.

Further, while an inverse relationship between telework and all recovery experiences exists, the only statistically significant relationship reported from this data was telework hours predicting relaxation-oriented and control recovery strategies. The results of this research study indicate that the more time faculty spend engaging in relaxation-oriented and control recovery strategies, the fewer hours they work from home. Employees who use information and communication technology can have difficulty balancing work and family demands (Derks et al., 2015). The faculty in this research study had problems balancing work time and personal time to engage in relaxation-oriented and control strategies during nonworking hours. Individuals who experienced stress in the work-from-home domain may spend little time on recovery activities (Mostert & Els, 2015). The consequences of telework can also cause employees to have a work-family conflict (Biron & van Veldhoven, 2016; Collins et al., 2016) and blurred boundaries between their work and private lives (Boell et al., 2016).

Another significant finding in this research study was the ability of online teaching self-efficacy to predict psychological detachment and mastery-oriented recovery experience strategies. Empirical studies in organizational research show self-efficacy to be a predictor of job satisfaction and performance (Rigotti et al., 2008; Schyns & von Collani, 2002). This was indicative of the current body of knowledge regarding self-efficacy, where online teaching self-efficacy was a statistically significant predictor of engagement in psychologically detaching and engaging in mastery-type recovery experience strategies. Deficits in self-efficacy among online faculty can present challenges that can threaten the quality of education and the success of professors teaching in the online environment (Horvitz et al., 2015). Facilitated sessions on how to increase their online teaching self-efficacy can benefit faculty (Hampton et al., 2020). These results speak to the significance of self-efficacy and its ability to influence recovery from workplace stress among employees in academia. The recovery process reduces the risk of exhaustion and allows employees to replenish their resources for the next workday (Meijman & Mulder, 1998).

As more employees begin to use solely technology to complete the tasks associated with their jobs, the importance of recovery for employees is essential. Educating institutions and employees on the need for recovery and the factors that can affect their recovery is necessary and can have a

positive impact on employee health, well-being, and job satisfaction. Employees experience more work-to-family enrichment when they perceive their workplace to be flexible in how they complete their work (Daniel & Sonnentag, 2016). Transferring positive work experiences into family life could have beneficial positive effects for employees, and employers benefit from offering flexibility that provides employees with the opportunity to meet the demands of both the work and family domains.

Although employers may offer flexibility in the workplace, these options could cause employees to have blurred work/life boundaries that do not allow for a successful recovery from work. The blurring of boundaries between working and nonworking hours could cause employees not to have enough personal time to unwind successfully from work. Unwinding from one's job is the result of the recovery experiences employees engage in during nonwork hours to recover from workplace demands (Lloyd et al., 2017; Zoupanou et al., 2013). As academic institutions continue to hire faculty to teach online and enable these individuals to telework, it is vital for them to understand the factors that may inhibit their faculty from recovering from the demands associated with their work and to provide structure or guidance on the different types of recovery experiences and ways faculty can recover during their nonworking hours.

REFERENCES

Ali, N., Ali, O., & Jones, J. (2017). High level of emotional intelligence is related to high level of online teaching self-efficacy among academic nurse educators. International Journal of Higher Education, 6(5), 122–130. https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v6n5p122

Allen, E., Seaman, J., Poulin, R., & Straut, T. T. (2016). Online report card: Tracking online education in the United States. Babson Survey Research Group and Quahog Research Group. https://onlinelearningsurvey.com/reports/onlinereportcard.pdf

Arapovic-Johansson, B., Wahlin, C., Kwak, L., Bjorklund, C., & Jensen, I. (2017). Work-related stress assessed by a text message single-item stress question. Occupational Medicine, 67(8), 601–608. https://doi.org/10.1093/occmed/kqx111

Arasaratnam-Smith, L. A., & Northcote, M. (2017). Community in online higher education: Challenges and opportunities. Electronic Journal of e-Learning, 15(2), 188–198.

Bakker, A. B., Sanz-Vergel, A. I., Rodríguez-Muñoz, A., & Oerlemans, W. G. M. (2015). The state version of the recovery experience questionnaire: A multilevel confirmatory factor analysis. European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 24(3), 350–359. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2014.903242

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. Psychological Review, 84(2), 191–215. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191

Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. Educational Psychologist, 28(2), 117–148. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep2802_3

Bandura, A. (2006). Guide for constructing self-efficacy scales. In F. Pajares & T. Urdan (Eds.), Self-efficacy beliefs of adolescents (pp. 307–337). Information Age.

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: Journal of the International Society for the Investigation of Stress, 30(3), 259–264. https://doi.org/10.1002/smi.2536

Biron, M., & van Veldhoven, M. (2016). When control becomes a liability rather than an asset: Comparing home and office days among part-time teleworkers. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 37(8), 1317–1337. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2106

Boell, S. K., Cecez-Kecmanovic, D., & Campbell, J. (2016). Telework paradoxes and practices: The importance of the nature of work. New Technology, Work and Employment, 31(2), 114–131. https://doi.org/10.1111/ntwe.12063

Chang, T., Lin, H., & Song, M. (2011). University faculty members' perceptions of their teaching efficacy. Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 48(1), 49–60. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2010.543770

Cherry, S. J., & Flora, B. H. (2017). Radiography faculty engaged in online education: Perceptions of effectiveness, satisfaction, and technological self-efficacy. Radiologic Technology, 88(3), 249–262.

Chiru, C. (2017). Teleworking: Evolution and trends in USA, EU and Romania. Economics, Management and Financial Markets, 12(2), 222–229.

Collins, A. M., Hislop, D., & Cartwright, S. (2016). Social support in the workplace between teleworkers, office-based colleagues and supervisors. New Technology, Work and Employment, 31(2), 161–175. https://doi.org/10.1111/ntwe.12065

Daniel, S., & Sonnentag, S. (2016). Crossing the borders: The relationship between boundary management, work-family enrichment and job satisfaction. The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 27(4), 407–426. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2015.1020826

Demsky, C. A., Fritz, C., Hammer, L. B., & Black, A. E. (2018). Workplace incivility and employee sleep: The role of rumination and recovery experiences. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 24(2), 228–240. https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000116

Derks, D., van Duin, D., Tims, M., & Bakker, A. B. (2015). Smartphone use and work-home interference: The moderating role of social norms and employee work engagement. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 88(1), 155-177. doi:10.1111/joop.12083

Dicke, T., Stebner, F., Linninger, C., Kunter, M., & Leutner, D. (2018). A longitudinal study of teachers' occupational well-being: Applying the job demands-resources model. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 23(2), 262–277. https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000070

Ferencz, T. S. (2017). Shared perceptions of online adjunct faculty in the United States who have a high sense of community. Journal of Educators Online, 14(2). https://doi.org/10.9743/jeo.2017.14.2.6

Fida, R., Paciello, M., Tramontano, C., Barbaranelli, C., & Farnese, M. L. (2015). "Yes, I can": The protective role of personal self-efficacy in hindering counterproductive work behavior under stressful conditions. Anxiety, Stress and Coping, 28(5), 479–499. https://doi.org/10.1080/10615806.2014.969718

Gregersen, S., Vincent-Hoper, S., & Nienhaus, A. (2014). The relation between leadership and perceived well-being: What role does occupational self-efficacy play? Journal of Leadership Studies, 8(2), 6–18. https://doi.org/10.1002/jls.21318

Hampton, D., Culp-Roche, A., Hensley, A., Wilson, J., Otts, J. A., Thaxton-Wiggins, A., Fruh, S., & Moser, D. K., (2020). Self-efficacy and satisfaction with teaching in online courses. Nurse Educator, 45(6), 302–306. https://doi.org/10.1097/NNE.0000000000000805

Horvitz, B. S., Beach, A. L., Anderson, M. L., & Xia, J. (2015). Examination of faculty self-efficacy related to online teaching. Innovative Higher Education, 40(4), 305–316. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-014-9316-1

Hunter, E. M., & Wu, C. (2016). Give me a better break: Choosing workday break activities to maximize resource recovery. Journal of Applied Psychology, 101(2), 302–311. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000045

Kentnor, H. E. (2015). Distance education and the evolution of online learning in the United States. Curriculum and Teaching Dialogue, 17(1/2), 21–34. https://digitalcommons.du.edu/law_facpub/24/

Kian, M. (2014). A study of faculty's role in a virtual environment in Iran. International Journal on e-Learning, 13(1), 5–21. Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE).

Lee, M., & Tsai, C. (2010). Exploring teachers' perceived self-efficacy and technological pedagogical content knowledge with respect to educational use of the World Wide Web. Instructional Science, 38(1), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-008-9075-4

Lloyd, J., Bond, F. W., & Flaxman, P. E. (2017). Work-related self-efficacy as a moderator of the impact of a worksite stress management training intervention: Intrinsic work motivation as a higher order condition of effect. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 22(1), 115–127. https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000026

Martin, F., Budhrani, K., Kumar, S., & Ritzhaupt, A. (2019). Award-winning faculty online teaching practices: Roles and competencies. Online Learning Journal, 23(1), 184. https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v23i1.1329

Meijman, T. F., & Mulder, G. (1998). Psychological aspects of workload. In C. De Wolff, P. J. D. Drenth, & T. Henka (Eds.), A handbook of work and organizational psychology (vol. 2). Psychology Press. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203765425

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(2), 146–164. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijwhm-07-2015-0050

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, 33(2), 342. doi:10.6018/analesps.33.2.249811

Meroño-Cerdán, A. L. (2017). Perceived benefits of and barriers to the adoption of teleworking: Peculiarities of Spanish family firms. Behaviour and Information Technology, 36(1), 63–74. https://doi.org/10.1080/0144929x.2016.1192684

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(1), 37–43. https://doi.org/10.1080/14330237.2014.997006

Mueller, B., Mandernach, B. J., & Sanderson, K. (2013). Adjunct versus full-time faculty: Comparison of student outcomes in the online classroom. Journal of Online Learning and Teaching, 9(3). https://jolt.merlot.org/vol9no3/mueller_0913.htm

Nilles, J. (1975). Telecommunications and organizational decentralization. In IEEE Transactions on Communications, 23(10), 1142–1147. https://doi.org/10.1109/tcom.1975.1092687

Northcote, M., Gosselin, K. P., Reynaud, D., Kilgour, P., & Anderson, M. (2015). Navigating learning journeys of online teachers: Threshold concepts and self-efficacy. Issues in Educational Research, 25(3), 319–344. https://www.iier.org.au/iier25/northcote.pdf

Ozturk, D. S., Ozturk, F., & Ozen, R. (2018). The relationship between prospective teachers' readiness and satisfactions about web-based distance education. Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education, 19(1), Article 11, 147–162.

Peng, A. C., Schaubroeck, J. M., & Xie, J. L. (2015). When confidence comes and goes: How variation in self-efficacy moderates stressor-strain relationships. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 20(3), 359–376. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038588

Portugal, L. M. (2015). Work ethic, characteristics, attributes, and traits of successful online faculty. Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 18(1). http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/spring181/portugal181.html

Raffo, D. M., Brinthaupt, T. M., Gardner, J. D., & Fisher, L. S. (2015). Balancing online teaching activities: Strategies for optimizing efficiency and effectiveness. Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 18(1). http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/spring181/raffo_brinthaupt_gardner_fisher181.html

Rigotti, T., Schyns, B., & Mohr, G. (2008). A short version of the occupational self-efficacy scale: Structural and construct validity across five countries. Journal of Career Assessment, 16(2), 238–255. https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072707305763

Robinia, K. A. (2008). Online teaching self-efficacy of nurse faculty teaching in public, accredited nursing programs in the state of Michigan (Doctoral dissertation, Western Michigan University). ScholarWorks@WMU. https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations/811

Robinia, K. A., & Anderson, M. L. (2010). Online teaching efficacy of nurse faculty. Journal of Professional Nursing, 26, 168–175. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.profnurs.2010.02.006

Rockmann, K. W., & Pratt, M. G. (2015). Contagious offsite work and the lonely office: The unintended consequences of distributed work. Academy of Management Discoveries, 1(2), 150–164. https://doi.org/10.5465/amd.2014.0016

Schyns, B., & von Collani, G. (2002). A new occupational self-efficacy scale and its relation to personality constructs and organizational variables. European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 11(2), 219–241. https://doi.org/10.1080/13594320244000148

Shimazu, A., Matsudaira, K., Jonge, J. D., 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(3), 282–292. https://doi.org/10.2486/indhealth.2015-0097

Smith, G. S., Brashen, H. M., Minor, M. A., & Anthony, P. J. (2015). Stress: The insidious leveler of good, unsuspecting, online instructors of higher education. Journal of Social Change, 7(1), 56–58. https://doi.org/10.5590/josc.2015.07.1.05

Smith, S. A., Patmos, A., & Pitts, M. J. (2018). Communication and teleworking: A study of communication channel satisfaction, personality, and job satisfaction for teleworking employees. International Journal of Business Communication, 55(1), 44–68. https://doi.org/10.1177/2329488415589101

Sonnentag, S., & Fritz, C. (2007). The Recovery Experience Questionnaire: Development and validation of a measure for assessing recuperation and unwinding from work. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 12(3), 204–221. https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.12.3.204

Sonnentag, S., & Fritz, C. (2015). Recovery from job stress: The stressor-detachment model as an integrative framework. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 36(S1), S72–S103. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1924

Teichmann, M., Ilvest, J., & Soone, I. (2013). Online occupational stress intervention systems for academics. In Proceedings of the 2013 International Conference on Education and Educational Technologies (pp. 87–92).

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(4), 445–455. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029213

van den Heuvel, M., Demerouti, E., & Peeters, M. C. W. (2015). The job crafting intervention: Effects on job resources, self-efficacy, and affective well-being. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 88(3), 511–532. https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12128

Yu, X., Wang, P., Zhai, X., Dai, H., & Yang, Q. (2015). The effect of work stress on job burnout among teachers: The mediating role of self-efficacy. Social Indicators Research, 122, 701–708. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-014-0716-5

Zijlstra, F. R. H., Cropley, M., & Rydstedt, L. W. (2014). From recovery to regulation: An attempt to reconceptualize 'recovery from work.' Stress and Health, 30(3), 244–252. https://doi.org/10.1002/smi.2604

Zoupanou, Z., Cropley, M., & Rydstedt, L. W. (2013). Recovery after work: The role of work beliefs in the unwinding process. PLoS One, 8(12), e81381. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0081381