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Abstract

This meta-analysis provides a quantitative review on the relationships between motivational strategies and work-related well-being, and addresses the modulating effects of socioeconomic status (SES). Based upon a total number of 68 studies, involving 49,338 employees, the findings suggest that motivational strategies are associated with one’s well-being at work. Specifically, results indicate that more positive emotion regulation strategies are related to workers’ higher levels of job satisfaction and job performance. Conversely, more self-doubt is related to lower levels of job satisfaction and job performance. More interestingly, SES moderates some effect sizes, which include those related to emotional labor strategies (i.e., deep acting, and surface acting), two emotion regulation strategies commonly used in the service industry, tend to be more useful among low SES workers than the general working populations in managing well-being at work. These findings suggest that future research should identify optimal motivational strategies to improve low SES workers’ overall well-being at work, and consider additional well-being indicators such as work-family interface for these workers.
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Work plays an important role in people’s life. As people spend a significant portion of their lifetime at work, understanding the determining factors of their well-being at work becomes extremely important. Research shows that work-related well-being is a vital component that benefits both employers and employees. Specifically, components of work-related well-being such as job satisfaction (Judge & Watanaba, 1993) and employee performance (Greguras & Diefendorff, 2010) are positive indicators of life satisfaction, as well as reported feelings of fulfillment at work (De Cuyper & De Witte, 2006). Given the benefits of well-being at work, researchers have been investigating its determinants for decades. Consequently, various predictors have been found to relate to job satisfaction and job performance. Motivational strategies, such as emotion regulation strategies and having low self-doubt (i.e., high self-concept stability or certainty), have been found to significantly predict one’s work-related well-being (e.g., Judge, Woolf & Hurst, 2009; Niemann & Dovidio, 2005; De Cremer, Brockner, Fishman, Van Dijke, Van Olffen, & Myer, 2010). Therefore, understanding the influences of motivational strategies on job satisfaction and job performance is crucial, not only for workers to promote their overall well-being, but also for them to improve self-regulation capacity.

Over the past few decades, there has been a growing research interest in motivational strategies specific to emotion regulation. Recently, a large body of research has shown that various emotion regulation strategies such as reappraisal, deep acting and mindfulness tend to be positively related to workers’ job performance, whereas surface acting and suppression negatively predict such work outcomes (e.g., Hülsheger, Alberts, Feinholdt & Lang, 2013; Dane & Brummel, 2014; Hur, Moon & Han, 2014; Diefendorff, Grandey & Dahling, 2011).
Additionally, self-doubt as another motivational strategy is a negative predictor of one’s well-being at work (Kafetsios & Zampetakis, 2008; De Cremer, Brockner, Fishman, Van Dijke, Van Olffen, & Mayer, 2010), and doubting one’s ability reduces one’s motivational level (Oleson, Poehlmann, Yost, Lynch & Arkin, 2000). As self-regulation theory (e.g., Bandura, 1991) suggests, self-regulation capacity is the extent to which one can regulate or alter behaviors, thoughts and emotions during goal striving processes, is the key of motivation. Aligned with self-regulation theory, motivational strategies determine the amount of self-regulation capacity individuals may have, which then strongly predict their well-being (Durand-Bush, McNeil, Harding & Dobransky, 2015).

As previously noted, motivational strategies may play crucial roles in the process of self-regulation, which may assist individuals’ effort to fulfill various social roles. Specifically, the present study argues that being able to utilize emotion regulation strategies in an optimal way and having less self-doubt should have significant implications for employees to maintain well-being and productivity in the workplace. Therefore, it is important to investigate how different motivational strategies relate to employees’ well-being at work. However, the literature in organizational research is limited as it often fails to compare and integrate the different outcomes of work-related well-being that specific motivational strategies may predict. In addition, different occupations have different duties, responsibilities and natures of work; individuals with different backgrounds such as SES who tend to hold different occupations might utilize these motivational strategies in various ways at work. A meta-analysis by Pinquart and Sörensen (2000) indicates that SES is associated with one’s subjective well-being, which justifies the relevance of SES to the research question of the present study concerning workers’ well-being. Unfortunately, the past literature is very limited with regards to understanding the potentially different effects.
between low SES and general working populations. Specifically, how low SES and general working populations utilize various motivational strategies to manage their well-being at work differently.

Therefore, the purposes of the present paper are to review, summarize and meta-analyze existing empirical studies on motivational strategies and employees’ well-being at work, as well as examining the potential moderating effects of SES. Most importantly, the present study aims to expand on previous work regarding the relationships of motivational strategies with one’s job satisfaction and job performance (defined as task performance), by integrating two important types of motivational strategies: emotion regulation strategies and self-doubt. Additionally, through examining the potentially different implications of motivational strategies for workers’ well-being between low SES versus general working populations, this study intends to shed light on the motivational processes unique to specific working populations, and inform future research on the under-studied low SES working populations (e.g., blue-collar workers, De Witte, 2015).

Lastly, the present meta-analytic review aims to inform employees with potential motivational strategies that most benefit their well-being and productivity at work, and to reduce potential gaps in our understanding of low and high SES working populations. The following sections provide a brief overview of the relationships between focal motivational strategies and work-related well-being, and discuss how SES may potentially make a difference.

**Emotion Regulation Strategies and Well-being at Work**

Scholars have proposed several theoretical models to demonstrate emotion regulation processes, and one of the most widely used and influential model is Gross’s emotion regulation process model (1998a, 1998b). This model illustrates the processes of modifying emotions that one experiences, and how one expresses these emotions. Since the publication of Gross’s
emotion regulation model, investigation of the effects of emotion regulation has been growing rapidly in the field of industrial-organizational psychology. As part of the self-regulation process, individuals can utilize different emotion regulation strategies to manage and modify negative emotions, and emotion regulation capacity is considered a key predictor of overall well-being. Researchers have been conducting studies to examine potential links between different emotion regulation strategies and well-being at work. However, not all emotion regulation strategies have the same impact on individuals, and some existing studies directly address different impacts among different emotion regulation strategies (e.g., Blau, 2010; Zhang & Zhu, 2008; Fisk & Friesen, 2011).

Expressing positive emotions in the workplace is important as individuals’ emotions or expressions can easily impact others (Hatfield, Cacioppo & Rapson, 1993), specifically in the service industry. Thus, being able to regulate emotions at work is necessary for everyone, not only for ensuring one’s own emotional competence, but also for others who are around them. As discussed earlier, different emotion regulation strategies may impact one’s well-being in different ways. Understanding how employees’ regulation capacities differently impact their work-related well-being can inform future training aimed at improving employees’ emotional competence. To evaluate the specific impact of a certain emotion regulation strategy, the present study analyzes the influences of the following emotion regulation strategies on one’s well-being at work:

*Reappraisal and Suppression* are two of the most common emotion regulation strategies studied (Gross & John, 2003). Reappraisal is a preventative strategy by which individuals reassess their thoughts regarding certain situations or events and then change their thoughts, whereas suppression refers to one’s attempt to suppress and hide ones’ real feelings (i.e.,
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suppressing negative emotions). To date, research on the effects of reappraisal and one’s well-being has been well-established. Recent studies have focused on how reappraisal influences one’s well-being and productivity at work. As a positive indicator of job satisfaction and job performance (Cossette & Hess, 2015; Totterdell & Holman, 2003), reappraisal is an effective strategy that improves one’s well-being. Aligned with self-regulation theory, being able to alter one’s thoughts and feelings is an indispensable skill for one to obtain well-being. Since reappraisal is strongly associated with job satisfaction and job performance, being able to utilize it in the workplace has been a key to improving one’s work-related well-being.

Contradict to reappraisal, suppression has been found to negatively relate to one’s work-related well-being. Prior research shows that suppression not only negatively predicts job satisfaction (Miller, Smart & Rechner, 2015), but it may also negatively predict job performance (Wallace, Edwards, Shull, Arnold & Finch, 2009). In addition, suppressing negative emotions is linked to higher ego depletion (Vohs & Heatherton, 2000). As an indicator of self-regulation failure, ego depletion could contribute to employees’ poorer job performance and lower levels of job satisfaction (Deng, Wu, Leung & Guan, 2016).

*Deep Acting and Surface Acting* are two components of emotional labor, which are regulatory processes that one utilizes to manage his/her feelings during service encounters (Hochschild, 1983). Deep acting refers to those strategies of adjusting one’s internal feelings by making an effort to feel the emotions that one intends to express. In contrast, surface acting refers to strategies which a worker uses to express emotion that he or she does not actually feel (Grandey et al. 2013).

As part of the broader self-regulation process, the ability to modify one’s feelings internally (i.e. deep acting) is positively related to one’s work-related well-being (Chou, Hecker...
& Martin), as well as less stress at work (Ghanizadeh & Royaei, 2015). On the other hand, utilizing surface acting leads to stress and burnout (e.g., Hochschild, 1983). Numerous empirical studies indicate that surface acting has negative impacts on both job satisfaction and job performance (e.g., Peng, 2015; Van Gelderen, Konijin, Bakker, 2017, Diefendorff, Erickson, Grandey & Dahling, 2011).

Mindfulness has received an increasing amount of attention in studies of emotion regulation, job satisfaction and job performance. Researchers define mindfulness as the process of being aware of the present moment and accepting emotions as they occur (e.g., Langer, 1989). Prior research shows that being mindful is important for one to obtain better health outcomes and reduce stress levels, depression and anxiety (Bränström, Duncan & Moskowitz, 2011). Focusing on the present moment at work is a way to improve work-related well-being. Indeed, mindfulness is also a positive predictor of job satisfaction (Hülsheger et al. 2013) and job performance (Dane & Brummel, 2014). For example, Dane and Brummel (2014) found that restaurant servers who have utilized mindfulness strategies at work tend to have better job performance.

Several theoretical frameworks may help explain how these emotion regulation strategies may relate to job satisfaction and job performance. Following self-regulation theory (e.g., Bandura, 1991), individuals tend to manipulate and manage both emotion and self-evaluation to fulfill their goals. Baumeister (2007) suggests that failure in self-regulation (e.g., self-control) will result in ego depletion, which increases the probability of making mistakes on tasks (Job, Dweck & Walton, 2010), as well as having negative impacts on task-related outcomes (Deng, Wu, Leung & Guan, 2016). Subsequently, failure in self-regulation might negatively associated with well-being at work. In contrast, success in self-regulation not only strongly predicts higher
levels of motivation, but also predicts higher levels of job performance (Rahman, Ferdausy & Karan, 2012). Prior research on the effects of positive emotion regulation on job performance and job satisfaction is well-established (Wright & Cropanzano, 2000; Judge, Thoresen, Bono & Patton, 2001), therefore, hypothesis 1 is posited as follow:

Hypothesis 1. Positive emotion regulation strategies that include reappraisal, deep acting, and mindfulness will be positively related to: a) job satisfaction and b) job performance.

However, not all motivational strategies predict higher levels of job satisfaction and job performance, such as suppression and surface acting (Holman, Chissick & Totterdell, 2002; Lin & Chang, 2015). As tension and emotional dissonance will occur if one’s behavior does not match what they really feel (Morris & Feldman, 1996), individuals who use either surface acting or suppression at work, tend to experience tension and stress. Baumeister and Heatherton (1996) suggest that stress can possibly deplete one’s self-regulation capacity, which may be positively related to poor job performance and job dissatisfaction. Indeed, stress and pressure have been found to strongly relate to job dissatisfaction (Fairbrother & Warm, 2003) as well as poorer job performance (Siu, 2003). Therefore, it follows that employees who engage in negative emotion regulation strategies will experience negative effects on these work outcomes. Based on the aforementioned theoretical rationale and prior empirical evidence, the following hypothesis is proposed:

Hypothesis 2. Negative emotion regulation strategies that include surface acting and suppression will be negatively related to a) job satisfaction and b) job performance.

Self-doubt and Well-being at Work

As an indicator of motivational strategies, self-doubt refers to the uncertain feeling of one’s abilities to accomplish a task (De Cremer & Sedikides, 2005). Over the years, researchers
have operationalized self-doubt as self-uncertainty, self-esteem instability, and self-concept unclarity, and have found a negative relationship with job satisfaction and job performance (e.g., De Cremer, Brockner, Fishman, Van Dijke, Van Olffen, & Mayer, 2010; Liu, Yang, Zheng, Lu & Schaubroeck. 2017). Self-doubt is positively correlated with social anxiety, defensive pessimism and it is negatively related to self-esteem (Oleson, Poehlmann, Yost, Lynch & Arkin. 2000). With the emerging interests in self-doubt, organizational researchers have also been investigating the effects of self-doubt on one’s well-being at work. Prior research indicates that self-doubt negatively predicts career potential test score and emotional well-being (e.g., Carroll, Arkin and Shade, 2011; Kashdan, Uswatte, Steger & Julian, 2005). Therefore, self-doubt may potentially lead to negative work outcomes.

As mentioned previously, failure in self-regulation is negatively associated with task performance, which tends to predict one’s well-being (Judge & Bono, 2001). Indeed, past research has found negative relationships between job satisfaction and job performance (e.g. De Cramer, Brockner, Fishman, Van Dijke, Van Olffen, & Mayer, 2010; Liu, Yang, Zheng, Lu, & Schaubroeck, 2017). Specifically, self-doubt plays an important role in the self-regulation processes (Lambird & Mann, 2006). Having an uncertain feeling about oneself is likely related to ego depletion, which predicts poorer task-related outcomes (Job, Dweck & Walton, 2010), and job dissatisfaction (De Cremer & Sedikides, 2005). Thus, the following hypothesis is also posited:

Hypothesis 3. Self-doubt will be negatively related to a) job satisfaction and b) job performance.

SES as a Moderator

The rapid growth of the economy has led to various forms of inequality. Income and welfare inequality have led to dissatisfaction. Many low SES working populations have stood out
for various reasons, such as their effort to improve poor working conditions and increase benefits. Some examples are the 2013 Hong Kong Docks Strike and the 2016 Verizon Workers Strike in the United States (Cough, 2013; DiMaggio, 2017). On the other hand, the 2010 Foxconn Shenzhen Factory manufacturing workers’ series of suicide cases has drawn global attention – 18 attempted suicides resulted in 14 dead (Tam, 2010). All of these cases and events reveal that low SES workers might have been forced to tolerate poorer working conditions compared to their higher SES counterparts. Additionally, over 78.2 million U.S workers were paid hourly in 2015, and 870,000 of them only earned minimum wage. Thus, we advocate the importance of studying low SES workers’ work-related well-being and factors that could improve it.

As a social factor, SES plays a critical role in one’s life, and different focuses and struggles (e.g., financial burdens and lack of education) have the potential to bring about different coping methods or self-regulatory practices. In fact, Bandura (1991) suggests that social factors play crucial roles in one’s self-regulatory processes. Specifically, research on the relationships between SES and well-being is well-established. González Swanson, Lynch & Williams (2016) find that SES is a positive predictor of one’s job satisfaction. Figure 1. presents a conceptual model focused on the moderating role of SES in the motivational strategies and work-related well-being relationships and thus a research question has been posited:

*Research Question: Does SES moderate the relationships between motivational strategies and work-related well-being, such that the relationships may be different for low SES and general working populations?*
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Methods

Literature Search

The searching technique involved computer-based search for collecting usable data for the present meta-analytic study. To locate existing empirical studies, the search was mainly conducted on online scholastic databases such as PsycINFO, ABI/INFORM, Google Scholar, as well as ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. Additionally, the search was not restricted to any time span as I wanted to locate all empirical studies that investigated the relationships between motivational strategies and well-being at work. To locate usable literature on relationships, I used search terms that associated with motivational strategies (e.g., reappraisal, surface acting, mindfulness, self-doubt and self-uncertainty) and work-related well-being (e.g., job/work satisfaction/performance).

Inclusion Criteria and Coding Technique

Several inclusion criteria were applied to the present meta-analysis. Specifically, empirical studies written in English and published worldwide were included in the present meta-analytic review. Usable articles included empirical studies that quantitatively examined the relationships between: 1) emotion regulation strategies and job satisfaction or job performance; 2) self-doubt and job satisfaction or job performance. Therefore, usable literature only included research that focused on the workplace setting. To examine the moderating effect of SES, relevant empirical articles on low SES populations are included under the conditions that either the median income of a certain occupation is lower than its overall national median income, or if a certain occupation does not require a post-secondary degree.

Based upon these inclusion criteria, a total number of 68 studies with 95 independent samples were retained for the present analysis with a total number of 49,388 employees from 18
different countries/regions (several studies did not identify the information about country/region). Although I did not restrict a time frame for the literature, the empirical studies that included in the present meta-analysis were published between the year 2000 and 2017.

**Procedure**

Calculation processes were based upon Schmidt and Hunter’s (2004) method. For each individual sample, at least one correlation coefficient on the relationships between motivational strategies and work-related well-being was extracted, along with its sample size. Additionally, reliability of scales used to measure both independent and outcome variables were extracted and used in the process of correction for attenuation in focal correlations. To evaluate the moderating effects, the computation processes included both subgroup meta-analytical analyses and independent sample t tests.

**Results**

**Overall Analysis**

Meta-analysis results between all studied motivational strategies and work well-being are presented in Table 1 and 2. Generally, all studied relationships were in hypothesized directions. As posited in hypotheses 1, positive relationships between positive motivational strategies (i.e., reappraisal, deep acting and mindfulness) were observed. Specifically, surface acting ($\rho = -0.42$) and suppression ($\rho = -0.26$) were negatively associated with job satisfaction and job performance ($\rho = -.25$ and .04 respectively). Additionally, self-doubt was negatively related to job satisfaction ($\rho = -.45$) and job performance ($\rho = -.50$) as proposed in hypothesis 3.

**SES as a Moderator**

Independent samples t-tests were conducted to compare the effect sizes of studies using low SES populations with those using general employee populations in effect to address the
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research question. Although SES did not significantly moderate the relationships between all motivational strategies on work-related well-being, it did significantly moderate the relationships between emotional labor strategies (i.e., deep acting and surface acting) and both job satisfaction and job performance. For example, the effect size for low SES worker ($\rho=0.28$, 95% CI $=0.15, 0.40$) on the relationship between deep acting and job satisfaction was significantly larger than the effect size for general working populations ($\rho=0.01$, 95% CI $=-0.04, 0.03$), $t (12) = -2.20$, $p<0.05$; the effect size for low SES workers ($\rho = -0.12$, 95% CI $=-0.25, 0.02$) on the relationship between surface acting and job performance was significantly lower than that general working populations ($\rho = -0.35$, 95% CI $=-0.46, -0.25$), $t (6) = -4.58$, $p <0.005$.

However, due to an insufficient number of studies on the relationship between mindfulness and job satisfaction, as well as on the relationships between self-doubt and both job satisfaction and job performance, I was unable to run a moderating analysis on these relationships.

Discussion

The present meta-analysis finds that all studied positive motivational strategies (i.e., reappraisal, deep acting and mindfulness) are generally positively related to both employees’ job satisfaction and job performance across all included samples. Suppression, surface acting and self-doubt negatively predicted work-related well-being. Although SES did not significantly moderate all relationships in the present analysis, it did moderate the relationships between emotional labor strategies (i.e., deep acting and surface acting and employee work-related outcome). The findings of the present study suggest that deep acting, as an emotional labor strategy tends to be more influential among low SES populations, whereas surface acting has a
higher negative impact among general working populations. The present analysis is consistent with self-regulation theory.

**Implications**

As previously mentioned, past research has often failed to establish how specific motivational strategies that might have different impacts on well-being at work. The findings of the present study are consistent with the past research regarding the impacts of motivational strategies on well-being at work and address the moderating effect of SES. These findings have important implications for future research as the present analysis provides a contrasting viewpoint with existing research in terms of the differential effects of SES.

The present study supports the self-regulation processes by which motivational strategies may impact work-related well-being. The findings of the present meta-analytic review suggest that lower SES working populations tend to have higher job satisfaction and job performance when they use positive emotional regulations strategies at work compared to general working populations. Specifically, low SES workers seem to benefit more from utilizing deep acting. Higher effect sizes could possibly represent that low SES workers utilize these strategies more frequently at work because people with lower SES background have a smaller social network and less social support (Weyers et al., 2008). Thus, low SES population may rely more on motivational strategies as they do not have enough social support when compared to their more advanced counterparts. Although such positive emotion regulation strategies were more beneficial in low SES working population, it could also be indicative of a higher demand of motivational strategies, which presumably represents a higher rate of negative emotions or events they encounter in the workplace.
Due to the unique nature of work, low SES working individuals tend to hold occupations that require a great deal of customer interactions (Moss & Tilly, 2001). As higher frequency of interactions positively associated with deep acting and surface acting (Brotheridge & Lee, 2002), people who need to interact with customers frequently presumably utilize emotional labor strategies more often and become more skillful at using them, which is another possible explanation for why low SES working population experiences stronger benefits from deep acting and less harm from surface acting. In other words, the results may indicate that low SES workers would have higher well-being if they had used emotion regulation strategies at work (i.e., deep and surface acting) in a more skillful way as compared to general working populations.

Another possible explanation of the findings could be attributed to employees’ family backgrounds. Past research indicates that one’s SES is strongly associated with his or her parental SES; individuals who have grown up in low SES families tend to perceive less involvement from their parents compared to their more affluent counterparts (Wang & Sheikh-Khalil, 2014), and in turn, they may have to rely on themselves more often due to insufficient family support. Since self-reliance predicts higher self-regulation capacity, low SES population may have a higher self-regulation capacity, which could then account for the more effective ways of utilizing deep and surface acting strategies to regulate their emotions and in turn benefit their work-related well-being.

In addition, as Richman, Johnson and Buxbaum (2006) noted, the low wage population tends to earn an hourly wage, and to have fewer benefits, such as dealing with an inflexible schedule, which potentially results in work-family conflict. Managing multiple roles at the same time can be challenge to most individuals. Therefore, future research can focus on how
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Motivational strategies could help low SES workers manage work-family interface, another indicator of well-being was not considered in the present analysis.

Limitations and Future Directions

Due to a limited time frame, the present meta-analytic study may result in inadequate samples and therefore lower statistical power for the analysis are collected without any regional restriction. As a result, cultural difference might not account for income results for a same occupation. For instance, nursing in the United States usually been considered as a higher SES occupation as its median national income is 39% above the national median income across occupations (U.S Census Bureau, 2016). However, nursing in China has often been considered as a relatively low SES occupation as it median income is 70% lower than its overall average income across occupations (World Salaries, n.d). Furthermore, it is not necessary to attain post-secondary education to become an entry-level nurse in China. Thus, people who work in such occupation might experience many similar situations at work even though it is not considered to be the same SES level in different countries. Future research may examine the implications regarding SES differences in similar occupations across countries.

Furthermore, low SES workers, such as manufacturing workers, might have experienced many negative situations. However, while searching relevant studies for the present meta-analysis, it found that there is an inadequate amount of study focusing on the relationships between mindfulness and job satisfaction for low SES workers, as well as an insufficient amount of studies with attention to the effects of low SES workers’ self-doubt on both job satisfaction and job performance. This limitation may in part be due to a relatively short research time frame; it could also be indicative that these research topics are still developing as new areas of interest. It is thereby important to conduct more future studies to examine if lower SES working
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populations (e.g., manufacturing frontline workers) utilize motivational strategies at work differently when compared with other working populations.

Although all our hypotheses were supported by their overall effect sizes, not all independent samples displayed the same patterns of results. For example, a recent research by Kaur and Malodia (2017), which used a hospital setting, suggests a significant negative relationship between deep acting and job satisfaction. In addition, Woodman, Akehurst, Hardy and Beattie (2010) suggests that a little self-doubt could help improve performance since self-doubt could result in effortful action (Bandura & Locke, 2003), which is presumably linked to higher job performance. Future studies can examine other potential modulating factors that impact different SES populations’ relationships between motivational strategies and well-being at work, such as team dynamics and organizational climate.

Conclusion

The present meta-analytic study examines the relationships between motivational strategies and one’s well-being at work, and considers if SES moderates these relationships. The findings of this analysis suggest that low SES working populations and the general working populations did have different demands in using motivational strategies, especially emotional labor strategies. Positive motivational strategies were more beneficial for low SES individuals, whereas negative motivational strategies were less harmful for low SES individuals. Future research may examine if SES moderates other focal motivational outcome relationships as the sample size increases, as well as consider other potential indicators of well-being at work, such as work-family interface.
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### Table 1

*Meta-Analytic Results for Relationships Between Motivational Strategies, Job Satisfaction*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables and moderator</th>
<th>k</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean r</th>
<th>SD ρ</th>
<th>ρ</th>
<th>SD ρ</th>
<th>%SE</th>
<th>Lower 95% CI</th>
<th>Upper 95% CI</th>
<th>t(df)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reappraisal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3070</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>82.96</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>-1.96(8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1279</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suppression</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1239</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>70.13</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.71(4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>57.13</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deep Acting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31525</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-2.20*(12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2373</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>11.81</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29152</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surface Acting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8920</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>16.34</td>
<td>-0.51</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>-7.40***(16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2293</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6497</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>19.77</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mindfulness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-doubt</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2175</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>25.88</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001
Table 2
*Meta-Analytic Results for Relationships Between Motivational Strategies, Job Performance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables and moderator</th>
<th>k</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean r</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>SD p</th>
<th>%SE</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>t(df)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reappraisal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>-1.83(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1051</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>21.41</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-5.74(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>14.24</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>85.82</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Acting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>3261</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>13.84</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>-2.78*(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>8.38</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>35.46</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Acting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>2564</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>23.09</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-4.59**(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1098</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1466</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>55.56</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>3.85(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-doubt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2059</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>39.57</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05; **p<.01; p<.001
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Figure 1. Conceptual model of low SES workers
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