



An Examination of the Workplace and Out of Workplace Leisure Behaviors of Academic Staff*

Ümit Doğan Üstün¹, Nurullah Emir Ekinci², Akay Suner³, Buket Aydemir⁴

^{1,3} Hatay Mustafa Kemal University, Hatay, Turkey

² Yalova University, Yalova, Turkey

⁴ Mersin University, Mersin, Turkey

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 02.06.2020

Received in revised form
27.08.2020

Accepted 02.09.2020

Available online

28.09.2020

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to examine the workplace and out of workplace leisure behaviors of the academic staff according to age and academic title. The study was designed as a cross-sectional quantitative study. 229 teaching academic staff from Hatay Mustafa Kemal University participated in the research voluntarily. To obtain data, workplace and out of workplace leisure behaviors scales were used. The data was analyzed with SPSS 22 for Windows using One Way ANOVA. According to analysis results, both workplace and out of workplace leisure behaviors of the academic staff significantly changed according to age and academic title. As a conclusion this study showed that the most inlying workplace leisure activity for the participants was "activities related to non-business reading," and the most distal activity was "mental activities". On the other hand, the most inlying out of workplace leisure activity was "internet-based activities", and the most distal activity was "society based activities". Besides, these preferences differed significantly according to age and academic title.

Keywords:

Leisure, free-time, work, workplace, leisure attitude

1. Introduction

Concepts of work and leisure included various definitions and limitations from antiquity to present, depending on the conditions of the period in which they were experienced. These definitions and limitations; are mostly shaped by time, place, class, and gender differences (Osmanlı & Kaya, 2014; Ekinci et al., 2017; Keskin & Bayram, 2018; Ayhan et al., 2018). When we examine the concept of leisure, we can observe that leisure was issued in three different periods after the post-World War II. These periods are the Functionalist Period / Post-industrial Community Period (1945-1975), Structural Criticism Period (1975-1990), and the Post-culturalist / Post-modernist Period (1990 to present days) (Rojek, 1997).

In general, functionalist theorists (Roberts, Parker, Kelly, and Dumazedier) focused on the definition of leisure and leisure activities. According to this approach, the boundaries of work and leisure are sharply separated. However, structural criticism period theorists (Deem, Woodward, Clarke & Critcher) were not interested in the definition of leisure. Instead, they emphasized the differences and inequalities between social groups. On the other hand, post-modernist theorists (Rojek, Moorhouse & Coalter) advocated that all limitations and restrictions in the view of leisure should be removed. Besides, they highlighted diversity and mobility approaches (Özçelik, 2017). According to Henderson et al. (2004), both functionalism and structuralism were beneficial for their era. However, today, they fail to offer innovation beyond leisure research.

* This study was presented as an oral presentation at ERPA International Congresses on Education, 10-12 April 2020

² Corresponding Author's Address: Yalova University Sport Science Faculty, Yalova, Turkey

Telephone: +90-226-8156582

e-mail: ekinciemir@gmail.com

<http://dx.doi.org/10.17220/ijpes.2020.04.018>

According to Stebbins (2016), concepts of work and leisure are considered as opposite to each other. However, when it comes to goals and expectations, they are closely related in many ways. When a bridge is established between the concepts, the sharp boundaries become blurry. 'Workplace leisure (interstitial leisure in Stebbins, 2016) is a kind of bridge between work and leisure. Workplace leisure formally defined as the time which employees spend by short breaks (usually a few minutes) during the working time. However, informally, this is not considered as leisure by employees. Meal or coffee breaks are not part of workplace leisure officially. For instance, employees can chat, dream, solve puzzles, memorize their roles for an amateur game, and spend time with mobile phones. These are some examples of leisure behaviors in the workplace. These activities can be chosen with the aim of getting away from work stress, relaxation, or renewal. Besides, according to the leisure paradigm conceived by Neulinger (1981, 1984), workplace leisure can be positioned as a transition element in the process of achieving work-related perceived barriers to perceived freedom.

Although employees spend a third of their time at work during the day, they do not engage in work during all their working time. They need short breaks. The effects of holidays, weekends, and end-of-day activities on employee psychological well-being and work performance have significantly been proved. However, the effects of workplace leisure during the day were less emphasized (Trogakos & Hideg, 2009; Fritz et al., 2013). Recent studies showed that workplace leisure has positive effects in reducing the sense of tiredness (Trogakos & Hideg, 2009; Zacher et al., 2014; Bennett, 2015) and increase in work efficiency (Trogakos & Hideg, 2009; Zacher et al., 2014; Kim et al., 2018). Besides, workplace leisure helps to feel more fit (Zhang, 2018) and increases work attention (Mijović et al., 2015). Workplace leisure also reduces job demands (Kim et al., 2016) and increases employee engagement (Kühnel et al., 2016). Studies also showed that workplace leisure not only has positive psychological effects also has physical effects such as reducing musculoskeletal pain and damages (Galinsky et al., 2007; Van Eerd et al., 2016; Hallbeck et al., 2017; Park et al., 2017).

The positive effects of workplace leisure continue to exist at out of the workplace. According to Haworth Lewis (2005), these benefits are the development or strengthening of a desirable personality disposition (mastery, self-esteem and hardiness), time management competency, and more participation in leisure activities (particularly in physically active leisure). Endrejat et al. (2018), mentioned that no study explicitly examined the effects of leisure time spent with colleagues on employees' life satisfaction. This research gap is surprising, considering that organizations increasingly encourage employees to socialize during and after working hours, for example, through organized sports activities, team evenings, or social hubs. According to given information above in the present study, we aimed to analyze both the workplace and out of workplace leisure attitudes of the academic staff working in Hatay Mustafa Kemal University.

2. Method

2.1. Study Design

The study was designed as a descriptive quantitative cross-sectional study. According to this method, first, data is collected from the sampling to identify the relationships between the patterns and then generalized back to the population (Gratton & Jones, 2010).

2.2. Participants

229 teaching academic staff working in Hatay Mustafa Kemal University participated in the study. The participants were chosen according to random sampling method. The only inclusion criterion was that the participant' s workplace should be located at Tayfur Ata Sökmen Campus. The participants took part in the study voluntarily. Besides, the participants were informed about the study and completed all scales within 10-15 minutes. Informed consent had been obtained from all participants before any assessments were carried out.

Table 1. The Distribution of the demographic information of the participants

Variable		N	%
Age	20-29	67	29.3
	30-39	99	43.2
	40-49	43	18.8
	50+	20	8.7
Marital status	Married	130	56.8
	Single	99	43.2
Academic title	Lecturer	51	22.3
	Research Assistant	108	47.2
	Faculty Member	70	30.6
Seniority	1-4 years	92	40.2
	5-9 years	60	26.2
	10-14 years	35	15.3
	15 & + years	42	18.3
Administrative duty	Yes	46	20.1
	No	183	79.9

2.2. Data Collection Tools

In the study, workplace and out of workplace leisure attitudes scales were used. Özçelik initially developed the scales in 2017. In his study, Özçelik developed two different scales to measure the workplace and out of workplace leisure attitudes. The first scale has four factors and 16 items which evaluate workplace leisure activities. Example items include "I read news & newspapers" (activities related to non-business reading), and "I play computer games" (internet-based activities). The second scale has for factors and 19 items which evaluate out of workplace activities. Example items include "I go to the cinema" (hangout activities), and "I go out for lunch with my family" (family-based activities). The items in both scales are anchored with a five Likert type scale from 1 (completely disagree) to 5 (completely agree) (Özçelik, 2017). In our study; internal consistency coefficients of the scales were .79 for workplace and .84 for out of workplace sub dimensions.

2.3. Data Analysis

SPSS 22 package program was used to analyze the data. In the analyze of the data skewness and kurtosis values were checked to determine whether the data showed a normal distribution. These values were evaluated between -1 and +1 (Büyüköztürk, 2007). As a result of this evaluation, it was seen that the data showed normal distribution. As the hypothesis test, one-way ANOVA was used at 95% confidence level, and Tukey' s Hsd test was used as the second degree test.

3. Results

Table 2. Workplace and out of workplace leisure preferences of the participants

	Variable	N	Mean	SD
Work place leisure	Activities related to non-business reading	229	2.95	.99
	Inner rest activities	229	2.28	.76
	Mental activities	229	1.51	.61
	Internet-based activities	229	2.05	.81
Out of work place leisure	Hangout activities	229	2.65	.74
	Society based activities	229	1.67	.71
	Internet-based activities	229	2.78	.81
	Family-based activities	229	2.75	.81

According to analyze results, the most inlying workplace leisure activity for the participants was "activities related to non-business reading," and the most distal activity was mental activities. On the other hand, the most inlying out of workplace leisure activity was internet-based activities, and the most distal activity was Society based activities".

Table 3. Work place leisure preferences of the participants according to age

Type of Work Place Leisure Activities	Age	N	Mean	SD	F	p	Tukey
Activities related to non-business reading	1 20-29	67	2.73	0.99	1.711	0.166	
	2 30-39	99	3.05	0.99			
	3 40-49	43	3.06	1.01			
	4 50+	20	3.06	0.98			
Inner rest activities	1 20-29	67	2.32	0.81	0.305	0.822	
	2 30-39	99	2.30	0.76			
	3 40-49	43	2.25	0.70			
	4 50+	20	2.15	0.75			
Mental activities	1 20-29	67	1.49	0.61	2.774	0.042	4 > 3
	2 30-39	99	1.51	0.65			
	3 40-49	43	1.40	0.45			
	4 50+	20	1.86	0.68			
Internet-based activities	1 20-29	67	2.28	0.93	4.32	0.006	1 > 3
	2 30-39	99	2.08	0.80			
	3 40-49	43	1.76	0.50			
	4 50+	20	1.84	0.84			

According to One Way Anova results, there was a significant difference in the internet-based activities factor that participants aged between 20-29 scoring higher than the participants aged between 40-49. Besides, there was a significant difference in the mental activities factor that the participants aged 50 and older scoring than the participants aged 40-49. However, there was not any significant difference in the other factors.

Table 4. Work place leisure preferences of the participants according to the academic title

Type of Work Place Leisure Activities	Academic title	N	Mean	SD	F	p	Tukey
Activities related to non-business reading	1 Lecturer	51	3.39	0.98	8.451	0.000	1>2
	2 Research assistant	108	2.72	1.00			
	3 Faculty member	70	3.01	0.89			
Inner rest activities	1 Lecturer	51	2.47	0.85	1.927	0.148	
	2 Research assistant	108	2.25	0.76			
	3 Faculty member	70	2.21	0.69			
Mental activities	1 Lecturer	51	1.67	0.62	3.398	0.035	1>3
	2 Research assistant	108	1.53	0.63			
	3 Faculty member	70	1.38	0.56			
Internet-based activities	1 Lecturer	51	2.25	0.89	4.449	0.013	1>3
	2 Research assistant	108	2.11	0.82			
	3 Faculty member	70	1.83	0.70			

According to one way Anova results, there were significant differences on workplace leisure preferences of the participants according to the academic title in the activities related to non-business reading factor, lecturers scoring higher than the research assistants ($p < 0.001$), in the mental activities factor lecturers, scoring higher than the faculty members ($p < 0.05$), and in the internet-based activities factor lecturers scoring higher than the faculty members ($p < 0.05$).

Table 5. Out of workplace leisure preferences according to the age of the participants

Out of workplace leisure activities		Age	N	Mean	SD	F	p	Tukey
Hangout activities	1	20-29	67	2.74	0.76	2.768	0.043	1>4
	2	30-39	99	2.73	0.75			
	3	40-49	43	2.53	0.72			
	4	50+	20	2.28	0.64			
Society based activities	1	20-29	67	1.62	0.69	0.251	0.861	
	2	30-39	99	1.69	0.75			
	3	40-49	43	1.72	0.74			
	4	50+	20	1.73	0.60			
Internet-based activities	1	20-29	67	3.11	0.85	15.146	0.000	1>3 1>4
	2	30-39	99	2.86	0.73			
	3	40-49	43	2.48	0.59			
	4	50+	20	1.96	0.78			
Family-based activities	1	20-29	67	2.51	0.87	3.61	0.014	2>1
	2	30-39	99	2.89	0.81			
	3	40-49	43	2.89	0.72			
	4	50+	20	2.66	0.61			

According to one way Anova results, there were significant differences in the out of workplace leisure preferences of the participants according to age in the hangout activities, 20-29 aged participants scoring higher than the participants aged 50 or more ($p<0.05$), in the internet-based activities 20-29 aged participants scoring higher than the 40-49 aged and 50 or higher aged participants ($p<0.001$), and in the family-based activities 30-39 aged participants scoring higher than the 20-29 aged participants.

Table 6. Out of workplace leisure preferences according to the academic title of the participants

Out of workplace leisure activities		Academic title	N	Mean	SD	F	P	Tukey
Hangout activities	1	Lecturer	51	2.83	0.62	2.205	0.113	
	2	Research assistant	108	2.64	0.78			
	3	Faculty member	70	2.55	0.77			
Society based activities	1	Lecturer	51	1.89	0.82	3.304	0.039	1>3
	2	Research assistant	108	1.58	0.69			
	3	Faculty member	70	1.66	0.65			
Internet-based activities	1	Lecturer	51	2.69	0.82	9.090	0.000	2>1 2>3
	2	Research assistant	108	3.01	0.79			
	3	Faculty member	70	2.51	0.75			
Family-based activities	1	Lecturer	51	3.18	0.83	10.362	0.000	1>2 1>3
	2	Research assistant	108	2.57	0.82			
	3	Faculty member	70	2.74	0.68			

According to one way Anova results, there were significant differences in the out of workplace leisure preferences of the participants according to their academic title in the society based activities lecturers scoring higher than the faculty members ($p<0.05$), in the internet-based activities research assistants, scoring higher than both the lecturers and the faculty members ($p<0.001$), and in the family-based activities lecturers scoring higher than both research assistants and the faculty members ($p<0.001$).

4. Discussion

This study aimed to analyze the workplace and out of workplace leisure attitudes of the academic staff. According to analyzed results, it was found that the participants preferred the most activities related to nonbusiness reading as a workplace leisure activity and mental activities the less. On the other hand, they chose the most internet-based activities as out of workplace leisure activities and society based activities the less. A recent study showed that the main of the activities that the academics 'frequently' do as a leisure activity was reading books, newspapers, magazines with a rate of 45.7 % (Tel, 2014). Besides, in a more recent study Başarangil (2018) reported that 106 (44,9%) out of 236 academic staff chose reading books, newspapers, and journals as a leisure activity. Although the mentioned studies did not classify the leisure preferences of the academic staff as the workplace and out of workplace leisure, it can be said that they are compatible with the findings of the current study.

According to analyzed results, the workplace leisure attitudes of the participants showed significant differences according to age and academic title. We understand from the analyzed results that 20-29 aged academic staff chose internet-based activities more than 40-49 aged participants and 50 and older aged participants chose mental activities more than 40-49 aged participants. Lecturers chose activities related to non-business reading more than the research assistants, and internet-based & mental activities more than faculty members. There may be several reasons for these results. Participants with the age range 20-29 can be more familiar with the Internet. Furthermore, the lecturers may want to relax their minds because of excessive course load (Oruç et al., 2010). Besides, the participants may perceive more freedom or flow from a different type of activities. Prior studies showed that participating in workplace leisure activities helps to experience higher levels of positive emotions; such as increased well-being, decreased burnout, better job attitudes, higher job performance, focus on the job and lower levels of negative emotions (Westman & Eden, 1997; Sonnentag, 2003; Trougakos et al., 2008; Yang et al., 2010; Mokoya and Gitari, 2012; Aykan ve Özçelik, 2020).

Analyzed results also showed that out of workplace leisure attitudes of the academic staff showed significant differences according to age and academic title. We understand from the analyzed results that the academic staff age between 20-29 chose to hang out activities more than 50 and more aged participants. Besides, they also chose internet-based activities more than 40-49 aged participants. On the other hand, 30-39 aged participants chose family-based activities more than 20-29 aged academic staff. According to analyzed results, it was also found that lecturers chose family-based and community-based activities. However, research assistants chose internet-based activities. When we examine the literature, we can see that out of workplace leisure participation changes with age, as people getting old, their choices of leisure activities become noticeably different (Mota & Esculcas, 2002).

4. Conclusion

The present research showed that both the workplace and out of workplace leisure attitudes of the academic staff showed differences according to age and academic title. Different types of leisure preferences can be explained with an individual's willingness to potential leisure participation (Mannell & Kleiber, 1997). Furthermore, according to Walker and Wang (2008), leisure attitude reflects the intrinsic motivation of individuals and can predict actual engagement in leisure activities. In conclusion, we can say that different intrinsic motivations play a role in the workplace and out of workplace leisure participation of the academic staff. Therefore, internalization of the work place and out of work place leisure attitudes of the academic staff may help them to overcome work stress empower their willingness. Besides, due to the limited number of studies in the literature, it is important to carry out future studies on the subject to have a better understanding of the phenomenon.

References

- Ayhan, C., Ekinci, N. E., Yalçın, I., & Yiğit, Ş. (2018). Investigation of constraints that occur during participation in leisure activities by high school students: A sample of Turkey. *Education Sciences*, 8(2), 86: 1-9.
- Aykan, E., & Özçelik, Z. (2020). Mesai içi ve dışı boş zaman davranışlarının yönetimi: Teorik çerçeve. *MANAS Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 9(1), 590-604.

- Başarangel, İ. (2018). Akademisyenlerin boş zaman aktivitelerine katılımı, iş tatmini ve iş verimliliği: Kırklareli üniversitesi'nde bir araştırma. *Turizm Akademik Dergisi*, 5(2), 155-170.
- Bennett A. (2015). *Take five? Examining the impact of micro break duration, activities, and appraisals on human energy and performance*. (Unpublished doctoral thesis). Virginia Commonwealth University, Virginia, USA.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2007). *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı*. (7.Baskı), Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.
- Ekinci, N. E., Yalçın, İ., & Soyer, F. (2017). Digital game addiction level of high school students in Turkey. *Acta Kinesiologica*, 11(2), 98-103.
- Endrejat, P. C., Barthauer, L., & Kauffeld, S. (2018). Let's go out for a drink after work! The relation between leisure time spent with colleagues and employees' life satisfaction. *Journal of Workplace Behavioral Health*, 33(1), 63-74.
- Fritz, C., Ellis, A. M., Demsky, C. A., Lin, B. C., & Guros, F. (2013). Embracing work breaks: Recovering from work stress. *Organizational Dynamics*, 42(4), 274-280.
- Galinsky, T. L., Swanson, N. G., Sauter, S. L., Dunkin, R., Hurrell, J. J., & Schleifer, L. M. (2007). Supplementary breaks and stretching exercises for data entry operators: A follow-up field study. *American Journal of Industrial Medicine*, 50(7), 519-527.
- Gratton, C., & Jones, I. (2010). *Research Methods for Sports Studies*. London Taylor & Francis.
- Hallbeck, M. S., Lowndes, B. R., Bingener, J., Abdelrahman, A. M., Yu, D., Bartley, A., & Park, A. E. (2017). The impact of intraoperative microbreaks with exercises on surgeons: A multi-center cohort study. *Applied Ergonomics*, 60, 334-341.
- Haworth, J., & Lewis, S. (2005). Work, leisure and well-being. *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 33(1), 67-79.
- Henderson, K. A., Presley, J., & Bialeschki, M. D. (2004). Theory in recreation and leisure research: Reflections from the editors. *Leisure Sciences*, 26, 411-425.
- Keskin, U., & Bayram, A. (2018). Rekreatif aktivitelerin tüketim ürünleri sınıflandırması bağlamında değerlendirilmesi. *Sportif Bakış: Spor ve Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 5(SI1), 1-13.
- Kim, S., Park, Y., & Headrick, L. (2018). Daily micro-breaks and job performance: General work engagement as a cross-level moderator. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 103(7), 772- 786.
- Kim, S., Park, Y., & Niu, Q. (2016). Micro-break activities at work to recover from daily work demands. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 38(1), 28-44.
- Kühnel, J., Zacher, H., de Bloom, J., & Bledow, R. (2016). Take a break! Benefits of sleep and short breaks for daily work engagement. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 26(4), 481-491.
- Mannell, R. C., & Kleiber, D. A. (1997). *A social psychology of leisure*. State College, PA: Venture Publishing Inc.
- Mijović, P., Ković, V., Mačuzić, I., Todorović, P., Jeremić, B., Milovanović, M., & Gligorijević, I. (2015). Do micro-breaks increase the attention level of an assembly worker? An ERP study. *Procedia Manufacturing*, 3, 5074-5080.
- Mokaya, S. O., & Gitari, J. W. (2012). Effects of workplace recreation on employee performance: The case of Kenya Utalii College. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 2(3), 176-183.
- Mota, J., & Esculcas, C. (2002). Leisure-time physical activity behavior: structured and unstructured choices according to sex, age, and level of physical activity. *International journal of behavioral medicine*, 9(2), 111-121.
- Neulinger, J. (1981). *The psychology of leisure*. Springfield III.: Charles C. Thomas Publisher.
- Neulinger, J. (1984). Key questions evoked by a state of mind conceptualization of leisure. *Society and Leisure*, 7(1), 23-36.

- Oruç, K. O., Çekin, E., & Tenderis, A. E. (2010). Türkiye'deki devlet üniversitelerinde öğretim elemanlarının ders yükü. *Journal of World of Turks*, 2(3), 213-238.
- Osmanlı, U., & Kaya, S. (2014). Püritanizmden hedonizme değişen boş zaman kavramı. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyolojik Araştırmalar E-dergisi*.
- Özçelik Z. (2017). *Çalışanların mesai içi ve dışı boş zaman davranışlarının iş performansı ve ruhsal sağlıkları üzerindeki etkisi*. (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Erciyes Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Kayseri.
- Park, A.E., Zahiri, H.R., Hallbeck, M.S., Augenstein, V., Sutton, E., Yu, D., . . . Bingener, J. (2017). Intraoperative "micro breaks" with targeted stretching enhance surgeon physical function and mental focus: A multicenter cohort study. *Annals of Surgery*, 265(2), 340-346.
- Rojek, C. (1997). Leisure theory: Retrospect and prospect. *Society and Leisure*, 20(2), 383-400.
- Sonnentag, S. 2003. Recovery, work engagement, and proactive behavior: A new look at the interface between non-work and work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 518-528.
- Stebbins R. A. (2016). *Serbest zaman fikri temel ilkeler*. (Çev: Demirel ve ark.). Ankara: Spor Yayınevi.
- Tel, M. (2014). Surveying of the leisure time activities of the academicians employed at the school of physical education and sports (Turkey Example). *Indian Journal of Fundamental and Applied Life Sciences*, 4 (S4), 2100-2111.
- 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(1), 131-146.
- Trougakos, J. P., & Hideg, I. (2009). Momentary work recovery: The role of within-day work breaks. *Research in Occupational Stress and Wellbeing*, 7, 37-84.
- Van Eerd, D., Munhall, C., Irvin, E., Rempel, D., Brewer, S., Van Der Beek, A. J., ... & Amick, B. (2016). Effectiveness of workplace interventions in the prevention of upper extremity musculoskeletal disorders and symptoms: an update of the evidence. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 73(1), 62-70.
- Walker, G. J., & Wang, X. (2008). The meaning of leisure for Chinese/Canadians. *Leisure Sciences*, 31(1), 1-18.
- Westman, M., & Eden, D. (1997). Effects of a respite from work on burnout: Vacation relief and fade out. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 516-527.
- Yang, X., Telama, R., Hirvensalo, M., Hintsanen, M., Hintsanen, T., Pulkki-Räback, L., & Viikari, J. S. A. (2010). The benefits of sustained leisure-time physical activity on job strain. *Occupational medicine*, 60(5), 369-375.
- 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(3), 287-297.
- Zhang, C. (2018). *Work and non-work activities in replenishing workday energy: Meetings, individual work, and micro breaks*. (Unpublished doctoral thesis). University of Michigan, Michigan, USA.