International Journal of Business and Quality Research

https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJBQR
E-ISSN: 2985-9468

# The Mediating Role of Work Engagement in the Effects of Challenge Stressors and Hindrance Stressors on Employee Performance at PT Wijaya Karya Bangunan Gedung Tbk

**Suryo Sumirat[1*], Sutarno[2] , & Erni Widajanti[3]**

[1,2,3]Department of Management, Universitas Slamet Riyadi Surakarta, Indonesia.

*Corresponding author: suuryoo95@gmail.com

**Abstract**

*This study aims to analyze the effects of challenge stressors and hindrance stressors on employee performance, with work engagement as a mediating variable among employees of PT Wijaya Karya Bangunan Gedung Tbk. The construction industry is characterized by high work demands, job complexity, time pressure, and various obstacles in work implementation. This study employed a quantitative approach using primary data collected through questionnaires distributed to 151 employees of PT Wijaya Karya Bangunan Gedung Tbk. Data were analyzed using multiple regression analysis and path analysis, while the mediation effects were tested using the Sobel Test. The results indicate that challenge stressors have a positive and significant effect on work engagement and employee performance, whereas hindrance stressors have a negative and significant effect on work engagement and employee performance. Furthermore, work engagement has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. The mediation analysis shows that work engagement mediates the effect of challenge stressors on employee performance as well as the effect of hindrance stressors on employee performance. These findings indicate that job demands perceived as challenges can enhance employee engagement and performance, whereas job demands perceived as hindrances can reduce employee engagement and performance. This study reinforces the application of Job Demands–Resources Theory and the Challenge–Hindrance Stressor Framework in explaining the relationships among job demands, work engagement, and employee performance in the construction industry.*

**Keywords: Challenge Stressors, Hindrance Stressors, Work Engagement, Employee Performance, Construction Industry**



Copyright to the author of some rights reserved This work is licensed under aCreative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Business and Quality Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJBQR
E-ISSN: 2985-9468

## INTRODUCTION

The construction industry is one of the sectors characterized by high levels of work-related stress due to the complex, dynamic, and high-risk nature of its work. Construction workers are required to complete their tasks in accordance with the time, cost, and quality targets established by the company. According to Marsden (2025), the main sources of stress among construction workers include long working hours, tight project deadlines, high-pressure work environments, job insecurity, and heavy physical demands. The high level of stress in the construction sector is also evidenced by the findings of a study published by the University of Cambridge in 2024. The study found that approximately 70% of construction workers reported experiencing moderate to very high levels of work-related stress. Furthermore, 80% of respondents stated that work-related stress had a negative impact on their work, while 75% reported that work-related stress also affected their personal lives (Blair Winkler et al., 2024). High workloads, tight deadlines, and working conditions that are often beyond workers' control are dominant factors contributing to work-related stress in the construction sector.

From the perspective of the Challenge–Hindrance Stressor Framework developed by (Cavanaugh et al., 2000) Not all forms of work-related pressure have the same impact on individuals. Work-related pressures perceived as opportunities for personal growth, gaining new experiences, and achieving accomplishments are categorized as challenge stressors. In contrast, work-related pressures perceived as obstacles to achieving work-related goals are categorized as hindrance stressors. In construction companies, challenge stressors may include high workloads, job responsibilities, task complexity, and demands to complete projects within limited timeframes.

Marsden (2025) Work-related stress can reduce productivity, impair concentration and decision-making, increase absenteeism, and heighten the risk of work-related errors and accidents at project sites. Employees who are able to perceive work-related pressure as a challenge tend to exhibit higher levels of work engagement, whereas pressure perceived as a hindrance may reduce employees' engagement in their work.

The relationship between work-related stress, work engagement, and employee performance has been extensively examined in previous studies. Zhang et al., (2024) found that challenge stressors are perceived as obstacles that can still be overcome and have positive implications for personal development, such as time constraints and task complexity. Meanwhile, hindrance stressors are perceived as barriers that impede the achievement of goals and career development, such as organizational politics and role ambiguity. Mehmood et al., (2026) found that hindrance stressors are negatively associated with job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and employee performance, while being



Copyright to the author of some rights reserved This work is licensed under aCreative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

positively associated with stress levels and turnover intention. These findings indicate that individuals' perceptions of job demands play an important role in determining the impact of work-related stress.

Similar findings were reported by Restarani et al., (2024) found that challenge stressors have a positive effect on work engagement, whereas hindrance stressors have a negative effect on work engagement. Zheng et al., (2020) found that challenge stressors and hindrance stressors had no significant effect on employee performance in construction companies. Nevertheless, previous studies have shown variations in the effects of challenge stressors and hindrance stressors on work engagement and employee performance across different industrial sectors. Most studies have been conducted in the service, education, and manufacturing sectors, whereas research in the construction sector remains relatively limited, particularly in Indonesia. This is noteworthy because the construction industry has distinct work characteristics, including high time pressure, project complexity, and occupational safety risks.

PT Wijaya Karya Bangunan Gedung Tbk, as one of the leading construction companies in Indonesia, faces high demands for project completion, complex cross-functional coordination, as well as stringent quality and occupational safety targets. These conditions may give rise to various forms of challenge stressors and hindrance stressors that can affect employees' levels of work engagement and performance. Therefore, this study is important to analyze the effects of challenge stressors and hindrance stressors on employee performance through work engagement at PT Wijaya Karya Bangunan Gedung Tbk.

## THEORETICAL REVIEW

The Job Demands-Resources Theory posits that every job has characteristics in the form of job demands and job resources that influence employee well-being, motivation, and performance. The Job Demands-Resources Theory describes two primary processes: the health impairment process and the motivational process. High job demands can deplete employees' energy, leading to stress and reduced performance. According to the Job Demands-Resources Theory, these various job demands can affect employees' psychological conditions, particularly their work engagement.

The Challenge–Hindrance Stressor Framework (CHSF) categorizes work stressors into two types: challenge stressors, which are perceived as opportunities for growth and achievement, and hindrance stressors, which are perceived as obstacles to goal attainment and are associated with negative work outcomes (Pindek et al., 2024). Challenge stressors, such as high workloads, time pressure, and substantial responsibilities, can support personal development and the achievement of goals. Conversely, hindrance stressors, such


Copyright to the author of some rights reserved This work is licensed under aCreative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Business and Quality Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJBQR
E-ISSN: 2985-9468

as role ambiguity, role conflict, and bureaucratic constraints, can impede goal attainment (Zheng et al., 2020).

Challenge stressors, such as high workloads, time pressure, and substantial responsibilities, can facilitate personal growth and goal attainment. Conversely, hindrance stressors, such as role ambiguity, role conflict, and bureaucratic constraints, can impede the achievement of work-related goals (Cavanaugh et al., 2000).

Challenge–Hindrance Stressor Framework proposed by (Cavanaugh et al., 2000) challenge stressors refer to job demands that, although potentially stressful, are perceived as opportunities for learning, competency development, achievement, and career advancement. High workloads, substantial job responsibilities, task complexity, and pressure to complete tasks within a specified timeframe are considered challenge stressors. Individuals who perceive these demands as challenges tend to demonstrate greater motivation to exert their energy and abilities in completing their work.

The findings indicate that challenge stressors have a positive effect on work engagement (Restarani et al., 2024; Tadić et al., 2015; Zhang et al., 2024). The stronger employees' perceptions of job demands as manageable challenges, the higher their level of work engagement. The Job Demands-Resources Theory explains that work engagement is one of the outcomes of the motivational process, which ultimately contributes to improved individual performance. Engaged employees tend to exert greater effort, demonstrate higher levels of work initiative, and be more willing to make extra contributions to the organization. Previous studies have shown that work engagement has a positive effect on employee performance (Alnagbi et al., 2025; Anisa & Mardianto, 2025). In the context of construction companies, various organizational barriers, such as role ambiguity, role conflict, job insecurity, and limited resources, can reduce employees' enthusiasm and engagement at work. These conditions may ultimately lead to a decline in employee performance.

Based on this framework, the following hypotheses were tested:

H1: Challenge stressors have a positive effect on work engagement

H2: Hindrance stressors have a negative effect on work engagement

H3: Work engagement has a positive effect on employee performance

H4: Challenge stressors have a positive effect on employee performance

H5: Hindrance stressors have a negative effect on employee performance

H6: Work engagement mediates the effect of challenge stressors on employee performance

H7: Work engagement mediates the effect of hindrance stressors on employee performance



Copyright to the author of some rights reserved This work is licensed under aCreative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Business and Quality Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJBQR
E-ISSN: 2985-9468

## METHOD

### Research Design

This study employed a quantitative approach, with data collected through questionnaires administered to respondents. The data obtained were subsequently analyzed statistically to examine the relationships and effects of challenge stressors and hindrance stressors on employee performance, with work engagement serving as an intervening variable.

### Setting and Study Population

The population of this study comprised all employees of PT Wijaya Karya Bangunan Gedung Tbk.

### Sampling Technique Procedure

The sampling method employed in this study was the saturated sampling method (census sampling). Accordingly, the sample consisted of 151 employees. The sample size was determined based on the calculation of 5–10 times the total number of indicators used for the study variables, with an adequate sample size ranging from 100 to 200 respondents (Tamunu & Tumewu, 2014).

### Instruments

Data were collected through a structured questionnaire using a five-point Likert scale, ranging from "Strongly Disagree" (1) to "Strongly Agree" (5). The instruments were designed based on dimensions validated in previous literature:

**Kinerja Karyawan (Y)** was measured using an instrument adapted from previous studies (Koopmans et al., 2014) including task performance and contextual performance.

**Challenge Stressors ($X_1$)** was measured using an instrument adapted from previous studies Cavanaugh et al., (2000) including workload, work pace, job complexity, and job responsibilities.

**Hindrance Stressors ($X_2$)** was measured using an instrument adapted from previous studies Cavanaugh et al., (2000) including role ambiguity, inadequate resources, organizational politics, administrative complexity, interpersonal conflict, job insecurity, and role conflict

**Work Engagement (Z)** was measured using an instrument adapted from previous studies Schaufeli et al., (2002) including vigor, dedication, dan absorption.



Copyright to the author of some rights reserved This work is licensed under aCreative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Business and Quality Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJBQR
E-ISSN: 2985-9468

**Data Collection**

Before the questionnaires were distributed, the researchers obtained formal research permission from PT Wijaya Karya Bangunan Gedung Tbk. The entire data collection process was conducted in accordance with research ethics, ensuring that the identities and confidentiality of all respondents were strictly protected. The primary data collected from 151 respondents were then checked for completeness and processed using statistical software for subsequent analysis.

**Data Analysis**

The data were analyzed using IBM SPSS version 26 through descriptive statistical analysis. Multiple linear regression analysis was employed to test the hypotheses, while path analysis using the Sobel test was conducted to examine the mediating effects. The hypotheses were considered supported when the significance level was $p < 0.05$.

**RESULTS**

**Table 1: Variable Index Values**

| Variable | Average Likert Score | Index Value | Category |
|---|---|---|---|
| Challenge stressors | 3,9629 | 74,07 | High |
| Hindrance stressors | 2,9130 | 48,825 | Medium |
| Work engagement | 3,9656 | 74,14 | High |
| Employee Performance | 4,3038 | 85,29 | High |

Table 1 presents the results of the descriptive statistical analysis. Challenge stressors had an index value of 74.07, while work engagement had an index value of 74.14; both were categorized as high. Hindrance stressors had an index value of 48.825, which was categorized as moderate. Meanwhile, employee performance had the highest index value of 85.29 and was categorized as high. Overall, the respondents perceived their job demands as challenging, demonstrated a high level of work engagement, and exhibited high employee performance, while hindrances in the workplace were at a moderate level.

**Testing the hypothesis**

Challenge stressors, hindrance stressors, and work engagement significantly predict employee performance. These hypotheses were tested using multiple linear regression analysis and path analysis (Sobel test), with the results presented in Tables 2a–2c.



Copyright to the author of some rights reserved This work is licensed under aCreative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Business and Quality Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJBQR
E-ISSN: 2985-9468

**Table 2a: Model of Challenge Stressors dan Hidrogance Stressors terhadap Work Engagement**

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted $R^2$ | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | .427 | .182 | .171 | .48116 |

**Table 2b: Model of Challenge Stressors dan Hidrogance Stressors terhadap Work Engagement**

| Model | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Regression | 7.636 | 2 | 3.818 | 16.491 | .000[b] |
| Residual | 34.265 | 148 | .232 | | |
| Total | 41.901 | 150 | | | |

**Table 2c: Coefficients Predicting Work Engagement dari Challenge Stressors dan Hidrogance Stressors**

| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients (B) | Std. Error | Standardized Coefficients (Beta) | t | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (Constant) | 3.835 | .253 | | 15.130 | .000 |
| X1 | .309 | .082 | .365 | 3.767 | .000 |
| X2 | -.376 | .066 | -.556 | -5.742 | .000 |

**Table 2d: Model of Challenge Stressors, Hidrogance Stressors, dan Work Engagement terhadap Kinerja Karyawan**

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted $R^2$ | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | .701 | .491 | .481 | .35096 |

**Table 2f: Model of Challenge Stressors, Hidrogance Stressors, dan Work Engagement terhadap Kinerja Karyawan**

| Model | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Regression | 17.472 | 3 | 5.824 | 47.285 | .000[b] |
| Residual | 18.106 | 147 | .123 | | |



Copyright to the author of some rights reserved This work is licensed under aCreative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Business and Quality Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJBQR
E-ISSN: 2985-9468

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 35.578 | 150 | | | |

**Table 2g: Coefficients Predicting Kinerja Karyawan dari Challenge Stressors, Hidrogance Stressors, dan Work Engagement**

| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients (B) | Std. Error | Standardized Coefficients (Beta) | t | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (Constant) | 1.730 | .295 | | 5.865 | .000 |
| X1 | .389 | .063 | .498 | 6.206 | .000 |
| X2 | -.237 | .053 | -.380 | -4.487 | .000 |
| Z | .434 | .060 | .471 | 7.240 | .000 |

**Table 2g: Coefficients Predicting Kinerja Karyawan dari Challenge Stressors, Hidrogance Stressors, dan Work Engagement**

| Model | Sobel test statistic | Sig |
|---|---|---|
| X1 -> Z -> Y | 3.34 | .000 |
| X2 -> Z -> Y | -3.80 | .000 |

Tables 2a–2c present the results of the regression analysis conducted to examine whether challenge stressors and hindrance stressors predict work engagement among employees of PT Wijaya Karya Bangunan Gedung Tbk. The results indicate that both predictor variables significantly predict work engagement among the respondents, with an $R^2$ value of 0.182 and $p < 0.05$.

The standardized beta coefficients indicate that challenge stressors had a positive effect on work engagement ($\beta = 0.309$, $p = 0.000$), whereas hindrance stressors had a negative effect ($\beta = -0.376$, $p = 0.000$). The coefficients indicate that a one-point increase in challenge stressors is associated with an increase of approximately 0.309 points in work engagement, whereas a one-point increase in hindrance stressors is associated with a decrease of 0.376 points in work engagement.

Furthermore, the research model explains 18.2% of the variance in work engagement. Therefore, the hypotheses regarding the effects of challenge stressors and hindrance stressors on work engagement are supported.

Tables 2d–2f present the results of the regression analysis conducted to examine whether challenge stressors, hindrance stressors, and work engagement predict employee performance among employees of PT Wijaya Karya Bangunan Gedung Tbk. The results


Copyright to the author of some rights reserved This work is licensed under aCreative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Business and Quality Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJBQR
E-ISSN: 2985-9468

indicate that all three predictor variables significantly predict employee performance, with an $R^2$ value of 0.491 and $p < 0.05$.

The standardized beta coefficients indicate that challenge stressors had a positive effect on employee performance (β = 0.389, p = 0.000), followed by hindrance stressors, which had a negative effect (β = −0.237, p = 0.000), and work engagement, which had a positive effect (β = 0.434, p = 0.000). The coefficients indicate that a one-point increase in challenge stressors is associated with an increase of approximately 0.389 points in employee performance, while a one-point increase in work engagement is associated with an increase of approximately 0.434 points in employee performance. In contrast, a one-point increase in hindrance stressors is associated with a decrease of approximately 0.237 points in employee performance.

Furthermore, the research model explains 49.1% of the variance in employee performance. Therefore, the hypotheses regarding the effects of challenge stressors, hindrance stressors, and work engagement on employee performance are supported.

Table 2g presents the results of the path analysis conducted to examine whether work engagement mediates the effects of challenge stressors and hindrance stressors on employee performance among employees of PT Wijaya Karya Bangunan Gedung Tbk. The results indicate that work engagement mediates the relationships between challenge stressors and employee performance, as well as between hindrance stressors and employee performance. This finding is supported by the Sobel test results, with test statistics of 3.34 and −3.80, respectively, and p = 0.000. Therefore, the mediation hypotheses are supported.

## DISCUSSION

The results of the study indicate that challenge stressors, hindrance stressors, and work engagement each have a significant partial effect on employee performance. Furthermore, work engagement was found to mediate the relationships between challenge stressors and hindrance stressors and employee performance at PT Wijaya Karya Bangunan Gedung Tbk.

The findings indicate that positive perceptions of challenge stressors can activate a motivational process that promotes the development of work engagement. Employees who perceive their work as challenging while also providing opportunities for growth tend to be more enthusiastic in carrying out their tasks, demonstrate greater dedication to their work, and maintain a high level of concentration while working. These conditions are reflected in the dimensions of work engagement, namely vigor, dedication, and absorption, which represent employees' high levels of energy, commitment, and involvement in completing their work. Furthermore, the findings reinforce the view that hindrance stressors represent



Copyright to the author of some rights reserved This work is licensed under aCreative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

job demands that tend to generate more negative consequences than benefits for employees. The greater the obstacles perceived in the work environment, the more likely employees are to experience reduced motivation and engagement in their work. This finding is consistent with previous research showing that challenge stressors have a positive effect on work engagement, whereas hindrance stressors have a negative effect on work engagement (Restarani et al., 2024; Sawhney & Michel, 2022; Tong, 2024; Zhang et al., 2024).

The Job Demands–Resources Theory posits that work engagement is one of the outcomes of the motivational process, which ultimately contributes to improved individual performance. Engaged employees tend to exert greater effort, demonstrate higher levels of work initiative, and be more willing to make additional contributions to the organization. This finding is consistent with previous studies showing that work engagement has a positive effect on employee performance (Alnagbi et al., 2025; Anisa & Mardianto, 2025; Khan et al., 2025; Olugbade & Karatepe, 2019). The findings indicate that when employees face high workloads, substantial responsibilities, or complex tasks, they do not necessarily experience a decline in performance. Instead, when these demands are perceived as manageable challenges, employees tend to demonstrate greater enthusiasm for their work, maintain stronger focus when completing tasks, and exhibit greater commitment to their work.

Furthermore, the findings reinforce the role of work engagement as an important mechanism explaining how hindrance stressors affect employee performance. The higher the level of obstacles perceived in the workplace, the lower the level of employee engagement, which in turn leads to a greater decline in performance. This finding is consistent with previous research demonstrating that work engagement fully mediates the relationships between challenge stressors and hindrance stressors and job performance (Olugbade & Karatepe, 2019).

## CONCLUSION

This study examined challenge stressors, hindrance stressors, and work engagement as predictors of employee performance at PT Wijaya Karya Bangunan Gedung Tbk. The empirical findings indicate that challenge stressors, hindrance stressors, and work engagement, both individually and collectively, are significant predictors of employee performance at PT Wijaya Karya Bangunan Gedung Tbk. Furthermore, work engagement mediates the relationships between challenge stressors and hindrance stressors and employee performance.


Copyright to the author of some rights reserved This work is licensed under aCreative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Business and Quality Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJBQR
E-ISSN: 2985-9468

**Recommendations**

Based on the findings of this study, PT Wijaya Karya Bangunan Gedung Tbk is recommended to further examine the clarity of work objectives as an aspect of challenge stressors, given that the indicator related to unclear work objectives had the lowest mean score within this variable. In addition, the company should further examine interpersonal conflicts among employees as part of hindrance stressors, particularly to understand how conflicts with coworkers may hinder work performance and affect both work engagement and employee performance.

Future research is encouraged to further investigate work engagement by considering the aspect of excessive involvement, in which employees become overly focused on their work. This may provide opportunities to examine the balance between work engagement and awareness of the surrounding work environment. Future studies could also investigate the factors that encourage employees to take initiative in performing their tasks without being instructed, including the roles of job resources, leadership, perceived organizational support, and reward systems in enhancing proactive behavior and employee performance.

**Limitations and suggestions for further study**

This study has several limitations that should be considered in future research. Future studies could examine employees across various industrial sectors, such as manufacturing, services, banking, and other sectors, to enable comparisons across different contexts and achieve broader generalizability of the findings. Future research is also encouraged to employ a longitudinal or time-lagged research design to observe changes in challenge stressors, hindrance stressors, work engagement, and employee performance over time, thereby providing a stronger understanding of the relationships among these variables.

**REFERENCES**

Alnagbi, M. A., Aldabbas, H., Gernal, L., Elamin, A. M., & Ahmed, A. Z. E. (2025). Work engagement and individual work performance in the UAE: the mediating role of work-life balance. Frontiers in Sociology, 10(April), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.3389/fsoc.2025.1567207

Anisa, O. M., & Mardianto, M. (2025). Pengaruh Work Engagement Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan di PT. Capella Patria Utama Cabang Padang. CAUSALITA : Journal of



Copyright to the author of some rights reserved This work is licensed under aCreative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Psychology, 3(2), 312–319. https://doi.org/10.62260/causalita.v3i2.538

Blair Winkler, R., Middleton, C., & Remes, O. (2024). Work-Related Stress and Coping: A Comparative Analysis of On-Site and Office-Based Workers in UK Building Construction. Healthcare (Switzerland), 12(21), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare12212117

Cavanaugh, M. A., Boswell, W. R., Roehling, M. V., & Boudreau, J. W. (2000). An empirical examination of self-reported work stress among U.S. managers. Journal of Applied Psychology, 85(1), 65–74. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.1.65

Khan, A. N., Soomro, M. A., & Pitafi, A. H. (2025). AI in the Workplace: Driving Employee Performance Through Enhanced Knowledge Sharing and Work Engagement. International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction, 41(17), 10699–10712. https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2024.2436611

Koopmans, L., Bernaards, C. M., Hildebrandt, V. H., Cw, H., & Vet, D. (2014). Measuring individual work performance : Identifying and selecting indicators. 00, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.3233/WOR-131659

Marsden, L. (2025). Building a Culture of Mental Wellbeing in Construction. Majestic Construction. https://majesticconstruction.co.uk/case-study/building-a-culture-of-mental-wellbeing-in-construction/?utm_source=chatgpt.com

Mehmood, I., Azeem, M. U., & Haq, I. ul. (2026). The impact of high-performance work systems on job performance and stress through performance pressure and challenge–hindrance stressor: The moderating role of grit. Asia Pacific Journal of Management.

Olugbade, O. A., & Karatepe, O. M. (2019). Stressors, work engagement and their effects on hotel employee outcomes. Service Industries Journal, 39(3–4), 279–298. https://doi.org/10.1080/02642069.2018.1520842

Pindek, S., Meyer, K., Valvo, A., & Arvan, M. (2024). A Dynamic View of the Challenge-Hindrance Stressor Framework: a Meta-Analysis of Daily Diary Studies. Journal of Business and Psychology, 39(5), 1107–1125. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-024-09933-y



Copyright to the author of some rights reserved This work is licensed under aCreative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Restarani, H., Sartika, D., & Muizu, W. O. Z. (2024). Pengaruh Challenge Hindrance Stressor Framework Terhadap Work Engagement Dan Burnout. Jurnal Manajemen Terapan Dan Keuangan, 13(04), 1108–1123. https://doi.org/10.22437/jmk.v13i04.33323

Sawhney, G., & Michel, J. S. (2022). Challenge and Hindrance Stressors and Work Outcomes: the Moderating Role of Day-Level Affect. Journal of Business and Psychology.

Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., Bakker, A. B., & Alez-rom, V. G. (2002). The Measurement Of Engagement And Burnout : A Two Sample Confirmatory Factor. 71–92.

Tadić, M., Bakker, A. B., & Oerlemans, W. G. M. (2015). Challenge versus hindrance job demands and well-being: A diary study on the moderating role of job resources. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 88(4), 702–725. https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12094

Tamunu, M., & Tumewu, F. (2014). Analyzing the Influence of Price and Product Quality on Buying Decision Honda Matic Motorcyles in Manado. Jurnal Riset Ekonomi, Manajemen, Bisnis Dan Akuntansi.

Tong, J. (2024). To reflect or to detach after work? Relating interpersonal challenge and hindrance stressors to engagement and burnout. International Journal of Stress Management.

Zhang, J., Zhang, Q., Wang, Y., Xiao, B., Wang, S., Xu, Y., & Li, Y. (2024). Daily challenge-hindrance stress and work engagement in preschool teacher: the role of affect and mindfulness. BMC Public Health, 24(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-024-20255-9

Zheng, J., Gou, X., Li, H., Xue, H., & Xie, H. (2020). Linking challenge–hindrance stressors to safety outcomes and performance: a dual mediation model for construction workers. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 17(21), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17217867



Copyright to the author of some rights reserved This work is licensed under aCreative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.