**<H1> Meta-analysis study of well-being and job performance**

**<H1> Search Protocol**

The decisions that led to the development of this protocol were based on information from activities such as (a) literature review on well-being and work performance, (b) meta-analysis reading of related topics, (c) test searches in each database, (d) discussion with co-researchers, and (e) inquiry with expert researchers in the area.

The methodology of this protocol was based on the PRISMA (Liberati et al., 2009; Moher et al., 2009) statement to inform systematic reviews and meta-analyzes. Access to the databases was made through the institutional accounts of the Universidad del Norte, which has access to a large number of full-text articles. Additionally, different references on reviews and meta-analyzes (e.g. Hegdes & Olkin, 1985; Viechtbauer, 2005) were taken into account to support the procedures of this protocol.

<H2> ***1. Eligibility Criteria (Prisma No. 6)***

1.1. Types of studies

1.1.1. To include: Cross-sectional and longitudinal studies that report correlations.

1.1.2. to exclude: Daily, multi-level studies, case studies, qualitative studies and experimental studies.

1.2. Types of reports

1.2.1. to include: Full texts of empirical articles, reviews. Texts in press and thesis are accepted.

1.2.2. to exclude: Call of papers, Editorials, reflections, letters, brochures, book chapters.

1.3. Language

1.3.1. For search: English

1.3.2. Restrictions on the language of the results: None.

1.4. Types of study participants: Only workers, from any sector, level and area.

1.5. Search period: Unlimited, defined by the database.

<H2> ***2. Sources of Information (Prisma No. 7)***

Databases: Ebscohost, SCOPUS, Web of Science, Proquest, Jstor

<H2> ***3. Search (Prisma No. 8)***

3.1. Search strategy: It is carried out several times to ensure the result. Carried out in the years 2017, 2018, 2019 and 2020 by the same researcher. Alerts in the databases for sending to the email of new articles that result with the search equation.

3.2. Search type: Advanced

3.3. Place of search in databases: Titles

3.4. Search terms.

3.4.1. For inclusion of articles: the “OR” connector was used to include in the same search the dimensions of well-being and also for the dimensions of job performance. Direct wellness domains such as subjective well-being, psychological well-being, or social well-being will not be searched directly because the term well-being will itself generate the other results. The same for the case of job performance, where it is not necessary to search for the terms job performance, work performance or occupational performance.

“Positive mental health” OR

flourishing

“Well-being” OR

Wellbeing OR

“Positive affect” OR

“Negative affect” OR

“Life satisfaction” OR

“Satisfaction with life” OR

Happiness OR

“Self-acceptance” OR

“Positive relations” OR

“Positive relationships” OR

“Personal growth” OR

Autonomy OR

“Environmental mastery” OR

“Purpose in life” OR

Social integration OR

“Social contribution” OR

“Social updating” OR

“Social coherence” OR

“Social acceptance”

Performance OR

“Task performance” OR

“In-role behavior” OR

“In-role behaviour” OR

“In-role performance” OR

Proactive OR

Proactivity OR

Adaptive OR

Creative OR

Innovate OR

Innovation OR

Contextual OR

“Extra-role” OR

Citizenship OR

Citizen OR

Prosocial OR

Counterproductive

To exclude articles:In some cases the “OR” connector was used to exclude the following terms. These terms within a title may indicate that the article does not correspond to the objective of this study.

Firm performance OR

Reproductive performance OR

Growth performance OR

Exam performance OR

Cycling performance OR

System performance OR

Financial performance OR

Cognitive performance OR

Academic performance OR

Macroeconomic performance OR

Economic performance OR

Business performance OR

Safety performance OR

Student OR

Organizational performance

General search specifications in data: Due to the large number of terms you would have to have many invitations for each search. We carried out several tests and determined that the most efficient and effective way is to include within the advanced search, all the wellness terms, or the amount that the base allows, within the first search field, and in the second field, the group of terms of the first type of job performance. You must save the search and download the CVS table of articles. Then do the same with the second group of terms of job performance, until finished. If all the terms are included in the same search, so many articles will be identified that it is difficult to determine which ones are job performance. For each search it is easier for database filters to be applied more effectively.

Search specifications for each database:

Ebscohost: All databases are selected. The search terms for well-being and performance terms for each type are included; that is to say, all those of well-being with those related to task performance, then, those of well-being with those of contextual performance, and so on. In the case where there are too many records, as with “performance”, the option “thesaurus” is chosen, where the term “job performance” is selected; This allowed avoiding all types of performance that were listed in the exclusion terms. Then. read the titles found and make sure they do not exclude the results of "performance" when it appears alone. Limit to full text, full text in PDF, academic publications (refereed), academic publications. The other aspects leave them as they are predetermined by the base. Download table of titles found in CVS format.

SCOPUS: This base does not allow so many terms within the search field. In this sense, the search for the terms related to subjective well-being and the group of terms of the job performance of the task is carried out first. Choose open access and delimit the results based on the terms offered by the base, keywords. Use the same search terms of this protocol to delimit the areas where you want to have results. Then download the CVS database and continue with a new search with the rest of the terms, if the database allows it. This is an example of the equation resulting from the first search is:

TITLE ( ( "Positive mental health" OR "Well-being" OR wellbeing OR "Life satisfaction" OR "Satisfaction with life" ) AND ( performance OR task OR in-role OR intra-role OR "job performance" OR "work performance" ) ) AND ( LIMIT-TO ( ACCESSTYPE(OA) ) ) AND ( LIMIT-TO ( DOCTYPE , "ar" ) ) AND ( LIMIT-TO ( EXACTKEYWORD , "Wellbeing" ) OR LIMIT-TO ( EXACTKEYWORD , "Job Performance" ) OR LIMIT-TO ( EXACTKEYWORD , "Life Satisfaction" ) OR LIMIT-TO ( EXACTKEYWORD , "Mental Health" ) OR LIMIT-TO ( EXACTKEYWORD , "Well-being" ) OR LIMIT-TO ( EXACTKEYWORD , "Productivity" ) OR LIMIT-TO ( EXACTKEYWORD , "Task Performance" ) OR LIMIT-TO ( EXACTKEYWORD , "Performance" ) OR LIMIT-TO ( EXACTKEYWORD , "Employee" ) OR LIMIT-TO ( EXACTKEYWORD , "Work Performance" ) OR LIMIT-TO ( EXACTKEYWORD , "Happiness" ) OR LIMIT-TO ( EXACTKEYWORD , "Psychological Well-being" ) OR LIMIT-TO ( EXACTKEYWORD , "Affect" ) OR LIMIT-TO ( EXACTKEYWORD , "Psychological Well Being" ) OR LIMIT-TO ( EXACTKEYWORD , "Psychological Wellbeing" ) OR LIMIT-TO ( EXACTKEYWORD , "Employee Performance" ) )

Web of Science:

All terms can be included. Open access, articles, research areas (delimit those related to this topic).

TI=(("Positive mental health" OR "Well-being" OR Wellbeing OR "Positive affect" OR "Negative affect" OR "Life satisfaction" OR "Satisfaction with life" OR Happiness OR "Self-acceptance" OR "Positive relations" OR "Positive relationships" OR "Personal growth" OR Autonomy OR "Environmental mastery" OR "Purpose in life" OR "Social integration" OR "Social contribution" OR "Social updating" OR "Social coherence" OR "Social acceptance") AND (Performance OR "Task performance" OR "In-role behavior" OR "In-role performance" OR Proactive OR Proactivity OR Adaptive OR Creative OR Innovate OR Innovation OR Contextual OR “Extra-role” OR Citizenship OR Citizen OR Prosocial OR Counterproductive)) NOT (TI=("Firm performance" OR "Reproductive performance" OR "Growth performance" OR "Exam performance" OR "Cycling performance" OR "System performance" OR "Financial performance" OR "Cognitive performance" OR "Academic performance" OR "Macroeconomic performance" OR "Economic performance" OR "Business performance" OR "Safety performance" OR Student OR "Organizational performance"))

Proquest: All terms can be included. Delimit full text, peer-reviewed articles, scientific journals, main article, article, Subject (delimit terms according to the search terms of this protocol).

Jstor and emerald: Based on the previous searches, follow the steps in these bases. In Jstor not so many terms are allowed, it is required to make several combinations.

<H2> ***4. Selection of Studies (Prisma No. 9)***

Each of the titles of the records retrieved is examined to verify that it is a study that attests to the relationship between some type of well-being and some type of job performance and not another type of similar variable such as financial performance. . Compliance with the inclusion and exclusion criteria is verified to filter the results, according to the configuration of each database.

If in doubt, review the summary and the full text instruments. One investigator will be in charge of this task and another will carry out random searches to verify the results. In case of disagreement, discuss and reach agreements.

<H2> ***5. Data Extraction Process (Prisma No. 10 And 11)***

A double-entry matrix is ​​created in Microsoft Excel® to extract the information from each of the selected articles on title, design, number of participants, type of work activity, description of instruments, and classification of work performance and well-being constructs with Based on the wellbeing classifications of Sonnentag (2015), Ayala (2007), and job performance of Ramírez Vielma (2013), the Pearson correlation between dimensions and the directions of reported linear regressions. One investigator performs the entire review and another does random reviews to confirm the data. In case of disagreement, both should review the articles, discuss the points of view based on the supporting scientific literature and make a decision.

<H2> ***6. List of Data (Prisma No. 11)***

A double entry matrix is created in Microsoft Excel® to extract the following information from each of the articles selected in the previous phase:

* Article title and year
* Type of study
* Number of study participants. In the case of longitudinal studies, only the sample from the first application is extracted.
* Participant type. Information about the position or type of company.
* country
* Instruments: Name and description of the instruments used to measure well-being and job performance.
* Type of application of the job performance instrument: Self-evaluation or hetero-evaluation
* Types of well-being and job performance: The instruments used and the dimensions reported in the results of each article are reviewed, and classified according to the three types with their sub-dimensions of well-being found in the Keyes model of complete state of mental health ( 2005), which coincides with the reviews by Ayala (2017) and Sonentag (2015). The five types of job performance follow the Ramírez-Vielma (2013) review.
* Linear regressions: In those articles where linear regressions were performed, identify the predictor and the outcome variable.

<H2> ***7. Risk of Bias in Individual Studies (Prism No. 12)***

To assess the risk of bias in individual studies, one researcher checked that the study reported complete information on the number, work activity, and way of selecting participants; Likewise, it was reviewed that the construct evaluated was consistent with the measurement instrument, if it was inconsistent, the change was made based on the sub-dimensions of well-being found in the Keyes (2005) mental health complete state model. , which coincides with the reviews by Ayala (2017) and Sonentag (2015). The five types of job performance follow the Ramírez-Vielma (2013) review. The second researcher reviewed the changes made regarding the instruments and classifications and in case of inconsistency, they were discussed and agreed with the first reviewer.

<H2> ***8. Summary Measures (Prism No. 13)***

The effect sizes of the meta-analyzes were estimated from the correlations reported in the studies. Fischer's z was calculated for the sampling error of the individual correlations. 95% confidence intervals were identified for each effect. For cases where there was only one study, the r of the study and the 95% confidence intervals are presented. In longitudinal studies, correlations were considered at baseline to ensure equity between studies. The random effects model was used due to the heterogeneity of the study, where each one is far from being a replica of the other, with variation in populations and measures.

Heterogeneity was analyzed with the Q and I2 tests

<H2> ***9. Synthesis of the Results (Prisma No. 14)***

The robustness of the estimated correlations with respect to publication bias was evaluated by inspecting the funnel plots based on the clipping and filling analysis of the random effects models (Duval and Tweedie, 2000; Kepes, Banks, McDaniel and Whetzel, 2012).

<H2> ***10. Risk of Bias Between Studies (Prism No. 15)***

Review of each of the studies, their methodology, instruments, sample selection. Likewise, view the funnel diagrams and verify that there is a distribution of studies on the side and side of the funnel (symmetry).
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