

Examining the effect of Challenge-Hindrane stressors on Work Attitude and Behavior

Muhammad Tufail

Abdul Wali Khan University Mardan

Fahad Sultan

Abdul Wali Khan University Mardan

Anum

Abdul Wali Khan University Mardan

Considering the current trends in stressors, this study examines the mediating role of job satisfaction between challenge-hindrane stressors and employee job performance. Adopting time-lagged and two sources data collection technique, the responses were recorded with an interval of one months. Data was collected from 872 white color job holders from different organizations. Results indicated the direct relation of challenge stressors and indirect relation of hindrance stressors with job satisfaction and employee job performance. Moreover, job satisfaction mediated the stressors-job performance relationship while hindrance stressors the mediation results was found inconsistent. Managerial implication and future recommendation have been suggested at the end.

Keywords: challenge-hindrane stressors, job satisfaction, job performance,

Stress is a relatively modern phenomena for modern life and has unavoidable consequences for work. Over the last century, the nature of work has been changed (Beheshtifar & Nazarian, 2013) and both in developed and developing countries, this phenomena has gained attention for the unpleasant effects on both the employees and organizations (Naqvi, Khan, Kant & Khan, 2013). The hostile effects of the working environment on psychological and mental health (Jex & Yankleovich, 2008) and employees' work attitude and behavior (Boyd, Lewin & Sager, 2009) have been confirmed. It has also been found that stress has both positive and negative impact on strain (eg., Semmer, McGrath, & Bheer, 2005; Simona, Shiron, Fried, & Cooper, 2008), based on this notion LePine, Podsakoff, and LePine (2005) acknowledged stress as 'good' or 'bad' with respect to work attitude and behavior. Cavanaugh, Boswell, Roehling, and Boudreau (2000), grounded on the stress theory of Lazarus and Folkman (1984), categorized stressors as challenge and hindrance stressors. Aspects like, level of responsibility, workload and time urgency are considered as challenge stressors, while hindrance stressors encircle role conflict, job insecurity, and role ambiguity. Challenge stressors are considered the vital aspects of personal growth and hindrance stressors are reflected as obstacles to accomplish the targeted goals.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Dr. Fahad Sultan, Assistant Professor, Abdul Wali Khan University Mardan, KPK, Email, fahadsultan@awkum.edu.pk

Contribution of Authors

1. Dr. Muhammad Tufail has contributed in the research conceptualization, methodology, data collection tools, and data collection process.
2. Dr. Fahad Sultan has finalized the literature review.
3. Anum has contributed in data analysis and discussion section.

With respect to work attitude and behavior, it has been investigated that challenges stressors have direct and hindrance stressors are inversely associated with job outcomes (LePine, Podsakoff, & LePine, 2005). Moreover, research studies have confirmed the direct correlation with job satisfaction (Beehr, Glaser, Canali, & Wallwey, 2001) and job performance (LePine, Podsakoff, & LePine, 2005).

Wright and Snell (2005) argued that the connection between JS and JP is debatable yet, the two variables are directly correlated (Judge, Thoresen, Bono, & Patton, 2001; Berghe, 2011). Though both the direct and indirect relationship between stressors with work attitude and behavior (i.e. JS and JP) have been reported (LePine, Podsakoff, & LePine, 2005; Podsakoff, LePine, & LePine, 2007), the question arises that other variables may affect this relationship. Considering these recommendations and to enrich the challenge hindrance stressors literature and to answer the above mentioned question, job satisfaction can be contended the psychological mechanism and further can be proposed for the mediating role between stressors and job outcomes.

Eastern and western cultures are the two main categories with respect to the working environment (Jelavic & Ogilvie, 2010). Studies have recommended that the stress and job outcomes relationship must be investigated in developing countries to add empirical confirmations from this region (Clarke, 2012; Gilboa, Shirom, Fried, & Cooper 2008; Lee, Huh, Kim, Kim, & Seo, 2015; Muse, Harris, & Feild, 2003).

Challenge Hindrance Stressors

Considering the outcomes, stressors are characterized mainly bifold. Stressors experience strain and challenge stressors are directly associated with directly or indirectly workplace outcomes. While hindrance stressors are indirectly correlated to job outcomes (LePine, & LePine, 2007). Challenge stressors are considered the “eustress”, no doubt are stressful but result in positive behavior. Opposite to this, hindrance stressor are considered the “distress” are work-related requests or circumstances incline to impede individuals’ employment goals and are decidedly connected with potential misfortune/hurt (Boswell, Olson-Buchanan, & LePine, 2004).

Yerkes and Dodson (1908) were of the view that up to certain level, stressors make the job enthusiastic and evoke the higher degree of work engagement and beyond some point, the individuals in organizations texture anxiety and involve in harmful behavior. In organizational settings, stress is a phenomena refers to employees’ physiological, behavioral and psychological response to strain (Cooper, Dewe, & O’Driscoll, 2001). Earlier, Jex (1998) categorized such responses in three categories

Mental distress, burnout and any other form of physical strain and are considered as physiological strains (see LePine, Podsakoff, & LePine, 2005; Shirom, Toker, Berliner, & Shapira, 2008) and are directly correlated with stressors (Boswell, Olson-Buchanan & LePine, 2004). Contrary to the first view, anxiety, frustration, and despair (Jex, 1998), and dissatisfaction due to job demands are included in Psychological distress (French, Caplan, & Harrison, 1982; Schmidt, 2007). Lastly, the behavioral strain integrates the behavior that workers embrace as a response to stress and comprise higher absenteeism and lower job performance (Spector & Jex, 1998; Fox & Spector, 1999).

Selye (1976, 1982) laid emphasis on physiological stress and suggested that stress types should not be differentiated on the bases of the level of stress but on types that individuals encounter. Transitional stress theory was primarily suggested by Lazarus and Folkman, (1984) and

elaborated that stress is the result of convention between individuals and working premises. Transactional theory of stress has an emphasis on the process and consequences of stress. This theory suggests that individuals evaluate working conditions in terms of anticipated gain or loss and thus, adopt the suitable coping strategy. When the situation is appraised as helpful for personal achievement, the stressors are tackled as positive and trailed by constructive consequences like OC and productivity (Simmons & Nelson, 2001). Contrary to the main view, when the stressors are seen adversely, at that point the outcomes are not ideal (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984).

In the event that workers anticipate potential benefits and gain from stressors, at that point a psychological adapting technique is utilized, trailed by higher efforts of endeavors and inspiration in achieving their goals. Contrary, if employees anticipate possible damages from occupation stress than enthusiastic adapting strategy is utilized by them, trailed by expiration in inspiration and lower commitment (Dewe, Cox, & Ferguson, 1993; LePine, Podsakoff, & LePine, 2005). Notwithstanding the way that stressors are connected with strain, they are having autonomous and clashing consequences for work attitude and behavior (Kushnir & Melamed, 1991; LePine, LePine, & Jackson, 2004; Boswell et al., 2004).

In two Meta-analysis, conducted by LePine, Podsakoff, & LePine, (2005) and Podsakoff, LePine, & LePine, (2007) classified the stressors as challenge and hindrance stressors and suggested that challenge and hindrance strain result in psychosomatic strain. In addition, with the two stressors workers experience strain, for example, OC, JP, JS, and inspiration are decidedly identified with challenge stressor while contrarily identified with hindrance stressors.

Stressors and Job performance

Challenge stressors produce optimistic inclination and vivacious adapting style of tackling job issues. For instance, a study was carried out on the college students and was found that at the time of exams their level of stress is high and mental and intellectual performance is also high than normal working days (Kofman, Meiran, Greenberg, Balas, & Cohen, 2006).

Hindrance stressors are viewed as awful and make the undesirable inclination and are made out of components like job insecurity, role conflict, and role ambiguity (Cavanaugh et al., 2000). As indicated by Lazarus and Folkman (1984), hindrance stressors pledge dormant pensive performance and lead employees either to reduced endeavors or haul out from any conditions. Studies have found that expertise acquisitions and information preparing viability are diminished by nervousness, and is a key well of decreased job performance (Ackerman, 1987; Anderson, 1987; Eysenck & Calvo, 1992).

In view of the Vroom (1964) expectancy theory, Lazarus and Folkman (1984) made a refinement among stressors and furthermore estimated the clashing associations with worker work conduct (for example, JP) and suggested that the unpleasant circumstance is assessed by employees as undermining or a particular achievement. In addition, stressors are relied upon to be identified with opinions in regard to the relationship between endeavors made on adapting the interest and odds of achievement in satisfying the job demands (expectancy). Stressors are likewise expected to be identified with convictions in regards to the relationship between achievement in satisfying the interest and accomplishing results (instrumentality) that have some related measure of advantages (valence).

LePine, Podsakoff, and LePine, (2005) elaborated that motivation plays a vigorous role between hard work made to accomplish the targets and possibility of achieving the goals. They

settled that with hindrance stressors employees' level of inspiration and productivity reduces and it is trusted that no endeavors are made in accomplishing these interests. Additionally, the results were not productive. The approach used to cover these interest is intellectual separating and withdrawal while challenge stressors are related with more productivity and inspiration, likewise, employees apply more prominent exertion in adapting these requests through feeling based or critical thinking mode and accomplishing esteemed results. It can be argued that stressors assist the employees to result in higher performance and vice versa. Likewise, an individual will consider job stressors as a challenge along these lines, appearing better performance, while others will consider equivalent to hindrance and will be at lower performance (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Thus:

H₁: Workplace Challenge stressors have a significant impact on work performance.

H₂: Hindrance stressors have a significant impact on work performance

Theoretical Background

The connection of challenge-hindrance stressors and JS can be based on social exchange theory (Emerson, 1976). That explains that when individuals perceive the working condition and environment cooperative and supporting their personal growth and development, the benefit will be got by those employees and thus, will exhibit a positive emotion that leads to positive relation with challenge stressors. Contrary to this, if the working environment is perceived hard rather than supporting individuals' personal growth and development, the negative emotions arise and thus, exhibit the inverse association with JS. Additionally, the challenge stressors are positively, and hindrance stressors are inversely associated with JS (Podsakoff, LePine, & LePine, 2007).

In the same way, Balance theory (Heider, 1958) elaborated that in any social setting individuals will choose stability or balance in their behaviors. Accordingly when individuals perceive the working environment as of restrictive form achieving their goals and completion their normal targets, will not demonstrate constructive behavior, and the balance will not be maintained (Boswell et al, 2004). In the same year, Kirk-Brown & Wallace (2004) confirmed the direct link of challenge stressors with JS among professional groups. More recently, according to Tufail, Shehzad, Gul and Khan (2017).

Mediating role of job satisfaction

Job satisfaction is a vital ancestor of employee job performance and has been confirmed as a mediator in a link of job characteristics – employee OCB relationship (Chiu & Chen, 2005) as well as in relation between organization service orientation and employee OCB (Varela & García, 2006); in organizational commitment relation with self-reported performance (Vandenabeele, 2009) in self-leadership behavioral based strategies relation team performance relationship (Politis, 2006), in role stressors relation with affective commitment (Malik, & Waheed, 2010); job stressors - organizational commitment relation (Yousef, 2002); and job satisfaction as a mediator in homological network (Crede, Chernyshenko, Stark, Dalal, & Bashshur, 2007). It elaborates that work attitude and behavior are affected through job satisfaction. In the same vein, Webster, Beehr, and Christiansen (2010) found the mediating role of JS in a link of challenge hindrance stressors and OCB.

As stress is the exchange among workers and condition. It implies that if working conditions are according to the desired level, the workers will be persuaded and will show positive feelings towards their occupations and therefore, in consequences the presentation will be at upscale state.

Grounded on Yerkes & Dodson (1908) stress model it very well may be contended that up to certain degree, stress will be measured and handled as challenge by representatives and will buckle

down, however, over a specific point it will inspire negative frame of mind and conduct, along these lines bringing about negative work disposition and conduct. Job satisfaction is a subjective phenomena assessed by individuals (Brief & Weiss, 2002) and the result of cognitive evaluation regarding the job (Hulin & Judge, 2003). The Prior section has discussed the relation between stressors with JS and JP and further JS with JP. Because of these circumstances, there is a need for finding the accurate procedure under which work stressors impact employee job performance. This condition advises for require a situation that Stressors either straightforwardly influence worker work execution or quite possibly just job satisfaction fulfillment is affected by stressors, which consequently increment workers' productivity. Furthermore, it can be argued that challenge stressors-job performance relation will be directly related while that of hindrance stressors and JP will be indirectly related via employee job satisfaction.

Method

For the current study, the responses were recorded from major cities of Pakistan i.e. Faisalabad, Karachi, Lahore, Sialkot Peshawar and Islamabad. The stressors perception varies across the organizations. Therefore, we captured data from various organizations in order to capture maximum variance in job stressors. Through professional and personal contacts of the first author, the organizations were approached, got the formal permission from the Heads and requested the employees to fill the questionnaires. Our aim was to target white-collar employees in each sector. The language of the questionnaire was English that has been used previously in researched studies across Pakistan due to the official language of organizations (see, Khan, Abbas, Gul & Raja, 2015; Raja, John & Ntalianis, 2004). We believed that due to less education, the blue-collar employee might not respond well to the questionnaire. Also, job stressors factors highly affect managers and high professionals because they manage resources and labor in order to achieve the assigned tasks, therefore they are more prone to job stressors.

By using-time lagged and multi-source data collection technique, adopted questionnaires were used. Every questionnaire was attached with a cover letter explaining (a) the key purpose of this research (b) to assure respondents about the confidentiality of their personal information. The participation was volunteer. Information was gathered with an interim of one month so as to stay away from any bias. On the first hand, data about challenge-hindrane stressors, JS and JP was gathered. After one month of the collected data, data about JP was gathered. The direct supervisors/managers were requested to fill the questionnaire for their subordinates. The data collection was a tough activity and the collection process was favorable, without being influenced by any upsetting circumstance.

Purposive sampling technique was used to collect data. In this type of sampling technique, data is collected from respondents, based on researcher's information and verdict (Tongco, 2007). Data was collected from heterogonous sample. A total of 1300 questionnaires were disseminated among white collar employees. Overall we obtained 890 questionnaires. The incomplete questionnaires were excluded and out of the received questionnaires, 872 were useable and thus was used for further analysis. We distributed 335 surveys in education department among faculty members, 221 complete surveys were obtained yielded 66% of response rate. Similarly, 328 surveys were distributed to employees working in public and private banks among which 240 complete surveys were received, the response rate in this area was highest i.e. 73%. Also, 300 questionnaire were distributed to employees working in manufacturing companies, in response 210 surveys were received with a response rate of 70%. Moreover, a total number of surveys distributed to various Nurses and Doctors were 337, total 201 surveys were usable, yielded response rate in the health

sector was 60%. The overall response rate was 68%, such a high response rate is fairly normal Pakistan (Tufail, et al., 2017).

The demographics of the respondents exposed that 81% of the sample consisted of male. Regarding the Age, the sample yielded 19% of the employees were below the 25 years and 6% of the employees were above 46 years of age. A total of 56% of the respondents were having the age between 26 and 35 years. In case of experience, 37% of the sample was having 6 to 10 years of working experience.

Measures

To collect data for the current study measures were copied from previous studies. English was the language of the questionnaire. In Pakistan the official communication is carried out in English Raja, Johns and Ntaliens (2004) so, to fill the questionnaires by the respondents. The responses were recorded on 5 point Likert scale.

Challenge stressors

The researchers assessed challenge stressors by adopting 6 items and hindrance stressors by 5 items. The cronbach alpha for challenge stressors was found 0.76 and that for Hindrance stressors it was found 0.7.

Job satisfaction

To record the responses for job satisfaction the researchers adopted a 20 items scales developed by Weiss, Davis and England (1967). And the scale's cronbach alpha was found 0.97. In the current study, the tool adopted to measure Job satisfaction is widely acceptable and valid, the same has been used in the most recent articles of the refuted journals (see, Noesgaard, & Hansen, 2018; Yan, Yang, Su, Luo, & Wen, 2018; Ahmad, Oranye, & Danilov, 2017; Levesque-Côté, Fernet, Austin, & Morin, 2018).

Job performance

To record the responses about the employee job performance, Williams and Anderson (1991) scale was utilized. It's a 7 items scale. The reliability of the scale was 0.62. The scale is outdated but still has been used in recent articles (see, Wu, Birtch, Chiang, & Zhang, 2018; Van Loon, Kjeldsen, Andersen, Vandenabeele, & Leisink, 2018; Ahn, Lee, & Yun, 2018)

Results

Confirmatory factor analysis

CFA is used to check the construct validity (Ratray & Jones, 2007). Construct validity refers to "the grade to which a measure evaluates the construct it is supposed to be evaluated." (Peter 1981, p. 134). For the calculating of constructive validity the Gerbing and Anderson (1998) procedure was followed. All constructs of the study was found valid and the factor loading was significant ($p < 0.001$). The loadings were above the accepted value i.e. 0.5 (Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson, & Tatham, 2006).

Table 1 given below displays the means, SD, correlations, and reliabilities. The table no 1 makes it clear the direct relation of challenge stressors with JS and JP where ($r = .15, p < .01$) and ($r = .44, p < .01$). Further, the correlation between hindrance stressors with JS and JP was indirect where ($r = -0.22, p < .01$) and job performance ($r = -0.23, p < .01$).

Table 1

Descriptive, Correlation and Reliabilities

	Mean	SD	Gender	Age	Exp	CS	HS	JS	JP
1 Gender	1.19	0.39	1						
2 Age	2.1	0.79	-.218**	1					
3 Experience	2.77	0.34	-.199**	.743**	1				
4 Challenge Stressors	2.28	0.5	-0.04	-0.01	-0.04	(0.76)			
5 Hindrance Stressors	3.71	0.67	0.058	-0.017	0.03	-.169**	(0.7)		
6 Job Satisfaction	2.66	0.97	-0.054	0.007	0.024	.156**	-.222**	(0.97)	
7 Job Performance	2.43	0.53	-0.064	-0.011	-0.022	.442**	-.236**	.509**	(0.62)

N= 872; Cronbach's Alpha presented in parenthesis

Structural equation model (SEM) and hypotheses testing

Model fit was obtained by using SEM. The results of model fit indices specify good fit meeting the criteria of goodness of fit ($\chi^2 = 88.87$, $df = 42$, $\chi^2/df = 3.19$, RMSEA= .05, GFI= .93, AGFI = .94, IFI = .95, CFI = .96) are above the threshold values representing the model fit for the collected data. Preacher and Hayes (2004) technique was followed for the mediating effect of JS between Challenge stressors and JP.

Before checking for mediating effect the conditions were fulfilled. The first condition was that there must be significant association between IV i.e. Challenge Stressors with DV i.e. JP. The said condition was met as ($\beta=0.08$, $t=3.29$, $P < 0.01$) thus H_1 is supported. The second condition for mediating analysis is that the IV will be significantly related to mediating variable. Challenge stressors (IV) is positively significantly related with JS (mediating variable) ($\beta=0.015$, $t=3.29$, $p=0.000$) thus, H_3 is supported. The last condition is to have a significant relation between mediating variable and DV. It is clear from the table that the said condition is also met where ($\beta=0.24$, $t=11.95$, $p=0.000$).

Upon confirming the conditions, bootstrapping technique was applied. The direct link between challenge stressors and JP was significant (0.08, $P < 0.01$), in the same vein, the total effect (0.55, $P < 0.01$) and indirect effect (0.47, $P < 0.01$), via JS was also significant and resulted in partial mediation. Also bootstrapping 95% CI, the lower and high level are in the same line negating the inclusion of zero and was found significant ($p < 0.00$). Thus, the proposed hypothesis was supported.

Table 2

Mediating effect of Job Satisfaction between Challenge stressors and Job Performance

Path	Total effect	Direct effect	Indirect effect	95% CI ^c	
				Lower level	High level
CS → JS → JP	0.55	0.08	0.47	0.36	0.63

CS (Challenge stressor), JS (job satisfaction) and JP (job performance)

^a CS → JP

^b (CS → JS) × (JS → JP)

^c Determined by bootstrapping with bias correction

To find out the mediating effect the three conditions were checked. The result showed that Hindrance stressors have negatively significant correlation with JP ($\beta = -0.42$, $t = -4.76$, $p = 0.000$) H_2 was accepted. Secondly it was confirmed that the Hindrance Stressors is having negative significant relation with JS ($\beta = -0.22$, $t = -4.76$, $p = 0.000$) thus, H_4 was supported and lastly, JS is directly associated with JP ($\beta = 0.263$, $t = 11.48$, $P = 0.000$). However, we got inconsistent mediating results. The direct effect ($\beta = -0.42$) is negated by the mediated positive effect ($\beta = 0.37$), yielded a lower total effect (MacKinnon, Fairchild & Fritz, 2007). The indirect effect through JS decreased the direct effect of hindrance stressors on JP. The Lower and High level also contains zero and the hypothesis was not supported.

Table 3

Mediating effect of Job Satisfaction between Hindrance stressors and Job Performance

Path	Total effect	Direct effect	Indirect effect	95% CI ^c	
				Lower level	High level
HS → JS → JP	-0.05	-0.42	0.37	-.38	0.01

HS (hindrance stressor)

^a HS → JP

^b (HS → JS) × (JS → JP)

^c Determined by bootstrapping with bias correction

Discussion

It has already been discussed that challenge stressors is directly correlated with JS and JP. Due to the positive nature of challenge stressors, the positive emotions will be evoked by the employees, lead to high degree of JS and JP. Satisfied employees will show higher productivity (Podsakoff, LePine, & LePine, 2007; LePine, Podsakoff, & LePine, 2005). Hindrance stressors due to negativity will result in negative emotions and lesser productivity. Thus, result in low performance. The homologous negative link of hindrance stressors with JS and JP was confirmed (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; LePine, Podsakoff, & LePine, 2005; Ackerman, 1987). Previous studies also confirmed that factors categorized as hindrance stressors for example job insecurity, role ambiguity, and role conflict have inverse impact on JP (see Cavanaugh et al., 2000; Ashford, Lee, & Bobko 1989; Youssef, 2000; Kalbers & Cenker, 2007, Aghdasi, Kiamanesh & Ebrahim, 2011; Tufail, Hussain, Shahzad & Anum, 2018).

The relationship between JS and JP is well established but debatable. Studies suggested that the link between JS and JP is positive (Judge, Thoresen, Bono, & Patton, 2001; Berghe, 2011). Job satisfaction has been examined as a possible result of job stress (Zivnuska, Kiewitz, Hochwarter, Perrewe, & Zellars, 2002), but is not alternative to strain (Webster, Beehr & Christiansen, 2010). In this domain one more theory advises that job satisfaction is a cognitive and affective condition, and the result of positive or negative evaluative response (Hulin & Judge, 2003). Challenge- hindrance stressors are assessed as positive or negative by individuals, thus JS as well.

The recognized aim of the present investigation was to discover the circuitous connection of challenge- hindrance stressors and JP via JS. The results indicated the partial mediation between challenge stressors and JP, and in case of the mediating effect of JS in a link of hindrance stressors and JP was inconsistent. According to Webster, Beehr and Christiansen (2010), JS mediates the relation between challenge and hindrance stressors and work outcomes. Lazarus (1966) recommended that in adopting, representative purposefully respond to stressors by applying

endeavors to satisfy needs. So, for coping strategy, to be evaluated for the interactional response the workers should initially assess the working conditions to be stressful (Beehr & Franz, 1987).

Moreover, it has also been supported that stressors are associated with potential harm even if stressors are positive in nature, also appraisal should be considered before coping strategy, although it is not essential that the exertion associated with stress (physical stressors) should be felt (Weber Beehr, & Love, 2011). These results are in line with studies based on physical stressors such as toxic, dirt, noise and heat. Thus for physical stressors outcomes can be achieved without appraisal and same is the case with social stressors (Seeber & Iregren, 1992).

Managerial Implication

This study provides some practical implication for managers. First, organizations facing problems in desired employee job performance should give special attention to work stressors. Challenge stressors provide opportunities for personal gain and growth and the employees feel suffocated while working on the same position for long, it is desired that to make jobs more attractive job rotation would be a good strategy. Hindrance stressors put barriers in achieving tasks; thus, proper counseling should be carried out and thus precautionary measures should be adopted by organizations to overcome the hindrance stressors. It would be the perception rather than actual stressors that detracts employee from performing better. It is worth mentioning here that such employees be properly trained to eliminate the stress and to enhance their skills to meet the required level of performance. Moreover, for better performance employees will work in a supportive work environment as it helps employees in dealing with job stressors, by providing them the needed information and necessary tool. Technology also motivates them toward their goals.

Limitations and Future Directions

While conducting the current study several limitations were noted. First, the data was collected through adopted questionnaires; therefore, our results may have common method variance. CMV is not a problem but has been overstated (Spector et al., 2006). Second, the responses of the respondents might be biased in term of reporting the level of stressors as the employees were already known to the fact that the main theme of this study was to explore the relation of stressors with work attitude and behavior. Third, the job performance was measured as a uni-dimension instead of tow dimension i.e. contextual and task performance. Forth limitation was the dominance of the male respondents (81%) and lastly, the working hours are from 9 am to 4 pm in multinational companies, suggesting that the stressors' level might be low in lesser working hour's organizations.

Even though, having some limitations, this study elaborates some future research recommendations. For example, other job outcomes like CWB and intentions to quit can also be checked for the mediating role of organizational commitment. CWB and turnover intentions have the same negative nature as hindrance stressors, upon investigating the mediating role of OC would yield interesting results. Higher the level of OC might reduce the negativity between hindrance stressors and CWB when placed as mediator. It is conceivable that with a high level of OC the Hindrance stressors might not have homological negative consequences for work conduct. We encourage the stressors' relation with knowledge hiding and coping may be investigated.

Conclusion

The present study contributes to the emerging literature of stressors relationship with work attitude and behavior. Though job satisfaction mediates the connection of stressors and JP, the

influence of hindrance stressors on job performance was still found inconsistent. And the negative effects were not turned to the desired level.

References

- Ackerman, P. L. (1987). Individual differences in skill learning: An integration of psychometric and information processing perspectives. *Psychological bulletin*, *102*(1), 3-27.
- Aghdasi, S., Kiamanesh, A. R., & Ebrahim, A. N. (2011). Emotional Intelligence and organizational commitment: testing the mediatory role of occupational stress and job satisfaction. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *29*, 1965-1976.
- Ahmad, N., Oranye, N. O., & Danilov, A. (2017). Rasch analysis of Stamps's Index of Work Satisfaction in nursing population. *Nursing open*, *4*(1), 32-40.
- Ahn, J., Lee, S., & Yun, S. (2018). Leaders' core self-evaluation, ethical leadership, and employees' job performance: The moderating role of employees' exchange ideology. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *148*(2), 457-470.
- Anderson, J. R. (1987). Skill acquisition: Compilation of weak-method problem situations. *Psychological review*, *94* (2), 192-210.
- Ashford, S. J., Lee, C., & Bobko, P. (1989). Content, cause, and consequences of job insecurity: A theory-based measure and substantive test. *Academy of Management journal*, *32*(4), 803-829.
- Beehr, T. A., & Franz, T. M. (1987). The current debate about the meaning of job stress. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management*, *8*(2), 5-18.
- Beehr, T. A., Glaser, K. M., Canali, K. G., & Wallwey, D. A. (2001). Back to basics: Re-examination of demand control theory of occupational stress. *Work & Stress*, *15*, 115-130.
- Beheshtifar, M. & Nazarian, R. (2013). Role of Occupational Stress in organizations. *Institute of Interdisciplinary Business Research*, *4*(9), pp. 648-657.
- Berghe, V., & Hyung, J. (2011). Job satisfaction and job performance at the work place.
- Boswell, W. R., Olson-Buchanan, J. B., & LePine, M. A. (2004). The relationship between work-related stress and work outcomes. The role of felt-challenge, job control, and psychological strain. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *64*, 165-181.
- Boyd, N. G., Lewin, J. E., & Sager, J. K. (2009). A model of stress and coping and their influence on individual and organizational outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *75*(2), 197-211.
- 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. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, *85*, 65-74
- Chiu, S. F., & Chen, H. L. (2005). Relationship between job characteristics and organizational citizenship behavior: The mediational role of job satisfaction. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, *33*(6), 523-540.
- Clarke, S. (2012). The effect of challenge and hindrance stressors on safety behavior and safety outcomes: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*. *17*(4), 387-397,
- Cooper, C. L., Dewe, P. J., & O'Driscoll, M. P. (2001). Organizational stress: A review and critique of theory, research, and applications. *Sage Publications*, Inc.
- Crede, M., Chernyshenko, O. S., Stark, S., Dalal, R. S., & Bashshur, M. (2007). Job satisfaction as mediator: An assessment of job satisfaction's position within the nomological network. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *80* (3), 515-538.
- Dewe, P., Cox, T., & Ferguson, E. (1993). Individual strategies for coping with stress at work: A review. *Work & Stress*, *7*(1), 5-15.
- Emerson, R. M. (1976). Social Exchange Theory. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *2*, 335-362.
- Eysenck, M. W., & Calvo, M. G. (1992). Anxiety and performance: The processing efficiency theory. *Cognition & Emotion*, *6*(6), 409-434.

- Fox, S., & Spector, P. E. (1999). A model of work frustration-aggression. *Journal of organizational behavior*, 915-931.
- French, J. R., Caplan, R. D., & Van Harrison, R. (1982). The mechanisms of job stress and strain (Vol. 7). Chichester [Sussex]; New York: J. Wiley.
- Gerbing, D. W., & Anderson, J. C. (1988). An updated paradigm for scale development incorporating unidimensionality and its assessment. *Journal of marketing research*, 186-192.
- Gilboa, S., Shirom, A., Fried, Y., & Cooper, C. (2008). A meta-analysis of work demand stressors and job performance: examining main and moderating effects. *Personnel Psychology*, 61(2), 227-271.
- Hair, J.F., Black, W.C., Babin, B.J., Anderson, R.E. and Tatham, R.L. (2006). *Multivariate Data Analysis*, Vol. 6, Pearson Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.
- Heider F (1958) .The psychology of interpersonal relations. New York: Wiley.
- Hulin, C. L., & Judge, T. A. (2003). Job attitudes. *Handbook of psychology*.
- Jelavic, M., & Ogilvie, K. (2010). Knowledge Management Views in Eastern and Western Cultures: An Integrative Analysis. *Journal of Knowledge Globalization*, 3(2), 51-69.
- Jex, S. M., & Yankelevich, M. (2008). Work stress. *The SAGE handbook of organizational behavior*, 1, 498-518.
- Jex, S. M. (1998). Stress and job performance: Theory, research, and implications for managerial practice. Sage Publications Ltd.
- Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Bono, J. E., & Patton, G. K. (2001). The job satisfaction–job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127(3), 376-407.
- Kalbers, L. P., & Cenker, W. J. (2007). Organizational commitment and auditors in public accounting. *Managerial Auditing Journal*, 22(4), 354-375.
- Khan, K., Abbas, M., Gul, A., & Raja, U. (2015). Organizational justice and job outcomes: Moderating role of Islamic work ethic. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 126(2), 235-246.
- Kirk-Brown, A., & Wallace, D. (2004). Predicting burnout and job satisfaction in workplace counselors: The influence of role stressors, job challenge, and organizational knowledge. *Journal of Employment Counseling*, 41(1), 29-37.
- Kofman, O., Meiran, N., Greenberg, E., Balas, M., & Cohen, H. (2006). Enhanced performance on executive functions associated with examination stress: Evidence from task-switching and Stroop paradigms. *Cognition & Emotion*, 20(5), 577-595.
- Kushnir, T., & Melamed, S. (1991). Work-load, perceived control and psychological distress in Type A/B industrial workers. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 12(2), 155-168.
- Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. New York: Springer.
- Lee, H., Huh, E., Kim, S. Kim, K., & Seo, M. (2015). Comparison of job performance, job satisfaction and job stress of child health nurse practitioners by roles in the work place. *Child Health Nursing Research*, 21(3), 253-260.
- LePine, J. A., LePine, M. A., & Jackson, C. L. (2004). Challenge and hindrance stress: relationships with exhaustion, motivation to learn, and learning performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(5), 883-891.
- LePine, J. A., Podsakoff, N. P., & LePine, M. A. (2005). A meta-analytic test of the challenge stressor-hindrance stressor framework: An explanation for inconsistent relationships among stressors and performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48, 764-775.
- Levesque-Côté, J., Fernet, C., Austin, S., & Morin, A. J. (2018). New wine in a new bottle: Refining the assessment of authentic leadership using exploratory structural equation modeling (ESEM). *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 33(5), 611-628.
- MacKinnon, D. P., Fairchild, A. J., & Fritz, M. S. (2007). Mediation analysis. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.*, 58, 593-614.

- Malik, O. F., & Waheed, A. (2010). The mediating effects of job satisfaction on role stressors and affective commitment. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(11), 223-235.
- Muse, L. A., Harris, S. G., & Feild, H. S. (2003). Has the inverted-U theory of stress and job performance had a fair test?. *Human Performance*, 16(4), 349-364.
- Naqvi, S. M. H., Khan, M. A., Kant, A., & Khan, S. N. (2013). Job Stress and Employees' Productivity: Case of Azad Kashmir Public Health Sector. *Interdisciplinary journal of contemporary research in business*, 5(3), 525-542.
- Noesgaard, M. S., & Hansen, J. R. (2018). Work engagement in the public service context: The dual perceptions of job characteristics. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 41(13), 1047-1060.
- Peter, J. P. (1981). Construct validity: A review of basic issues and marketing practices. *Journal of marketing research*, 133-145.
- Podsakoff, N. P., LePine, J. A., & LePine, M. A. (2007). Differential challenge stressor-hindrance stressor relationships with job attitudes, turnover intentions, turnover, and withdrawal behavior: A meta-analysis. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 438-454.
- Politics, J. D. (2006). Self-leadership behavioral-focused strategies and team performance: The mediating influence of job satisfaction. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 27(3), 203-216.
- Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2004). SPSS and SAS procedures for estimating indirect effects in simple mediation models. *Behavior research methods*, 36(4), 717-731.
- Raja, U., Johns, G. & Ntalianis, F. (2004). The impact of personality on psychological contracts. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(3), 350–367.
- Rattray, J., & Jones, M. C. (2007). Essential elements of questionnaire design and development. *Journal of clinical nursing*, 16(2), 234-243.
- Schmidt, K. H. (2007). Organizational commitment: A further moderator in the relationship between work stress and strain?. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 14(1), 26-40.
- Seeber, A., & Iregren, A. (1992). Behavioural effects of contaminated air: Applying psychology in neurotoxicology [Special issue]. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 41(3).
- Selye, H. (1976). Forty years of stress research: principal remaining problems and misconceptions. *Canadian Medical Association Journal*, 115(1), 53-56.
- Selye, H. (1982). History and present status of the stress concept. *Handbook of stress*, 7-17.
- Semmer, N. K., McGrath, J. E., & Beehr, T. A. (2005). Conceptual issues in research on stress and health. In C. L. Cooper (Ed.), *Handbook of stress medicine and health* (pp. 1-43). (Second ed.). London: CRC Press.
- Shirom, A., Toker, S., Berliner, S., & Shapira, I. (2008). The Job Demand-Control-Support Model and stress-related low-grade inflammatory responses among healthy employees: A longitudinal study. *Work & Stress*, 22(2), 138-152.
- Simmons, B. L., & Nelson, D. L. (2001). Eustress at work: The relationship between hope and health in hospital nurses. *Health Care Management Review*, 26(4), 7-18.
- Simona, G., Shirom, A., Fried, Y., & Cooper, C. (2008). A meta-analysis of work demand stressors and job performance: Examining main and moderating effects. *Personnel Psychology*, 61, 227-271.
- Spector, P. E., & Jex, S. M. (1998). Development of four self-report measures of job stressors and strain: interpersonal conflict at work scale, organizational constraints scale, quantitative workload inventory, and physical symptoms inventory. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, 3(4), 356-367.
- Spector, P. E., Fox, S., Penney, L. M., Bruursema, K., Goh, A., & Kessler, S. (2006). The dimensionality of counter productivity: Are all counterproductive behaviors created equal?. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 68(3), 446-460.

- Tongco, M. D. C. (2007). Purposive sampling as a tool for informant selection. *Ethnobotany Research and applications*, 5, 147-158.
- Tufail, M., Shahzad, K., Gul, A., & Khan, K. (2017). The Impact of Challenge and Hindrance Stressors on Job Satisfaction: Moderating Role of Islamic Work Ethics. *Journal of Islamic and Business and management*, 7(1), 100-113.
- Tufail, M., Hussain, S., Shahzad, K & Anum. (2018). Combined effects of Job Insecurity and Islamic Work Ethics on Job Satisfaction and Job Performance. *Journal of Business and Economics*, 10(2), 1-24.
- Van Loon, N., Kjeldsen, A. M., Andersen, L. B., Vandenabeele, W., & Leisink, P. (2018). Only when the societal impact potential is high? A panel study of the relationship between public service motivation and perceived performance. *Review of public personnel administration*, 38(2), 139-166.
- Vandenabeele, W. (2009). The mediating effect of job satisfaction and organizational commitment on self-reported performance: more robust evidence of the PSM—performance relationship. *International review of administrative sciences*, 75(1), 11-34.
- Varela González, J., & García Garazo, T. (2006). Structural relationships between organizational service orientation, contact employee job satisfaction and citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 17(1), 23-50.
- Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. 1964. NY: John Wiley & sons, 45.
- Webster, J. R., Beehr, T. A., & Christiansen, N. D. (2010). Towards a better understanding of the effects of hindrance and challenge stressors on work behavior. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 76, 68-77.
- Webster, J. R., Beehr, T. A., & Love, K. (2011). Extending the challenge-hindrance model of occupational stress: The role of appraisal. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 79(2), 505-516.
- Weiss, D. J., Dawis, R. V., & England, G. W. (1967). *Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire*. *Minnesota studies in vocational rehabilitation*.
- Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of management*, 17(3), 601-617.
- Wright, P. M., Snell, S. A., & Dyer, L. (2005). New models of strategic HRM in a global context. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 16(6), 875-881.
- Wu, L. Z., Birtch, T. A., Chiang, F. F., & Zhang, H. (2018). Perceptions of negative workplace gossip: A self-consistency theory framework. *Journal of Management*, 44(5), 1873-1898.
- Yan, X., Yang, K., Su, J., Luo, Z., & Wen, Z. (2018). Mediating role of emotional intelligence on the associations between core self-evaluations and job satisfaction, work engagement as indices of work-related well-being. *Current Psychology*, 37(3), 552-558.
- Yerkes, R. M., & Dodson, J. D. (1908). The relation of strength of stimulus to rapidity of habit-formation. *Journal of Comparative Neurology and Psychology*, 18, 459–482.
- Yousef, D. A. (2000). The Islamic work ethic as a mediator of the relationship between locus of control, role conflict and role ambiguity-A study in an Islamic country setting. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 15(4), 283-298.
- Yousef, D. A. (2002). Job satisfaction as a mediator of the relationship between role stressors and organizational commitment: A study from an Arabic cultural perspective. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 17(4), 250-266.
- Zivnuska, S., Kiewitz, C., Hochwarter, W. A., Perrewé, P. L., & Zellars, K. L. (2002). What is too much or too little? The curvilinear effects of job tension on turnover intent, value attainment, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 32(7), 1344-1360.

Received: June 15, 2018

Revisions Received: April 2, 2019

Annexure**Table: Confirmatory Factor Analysis**

Questionnaires and their Respective Items	Factor loadings	AVE	CR
<u>Challenge Stressors</u>		0.66	.92
I feel stress with the number of projects and or assignments I have.	0.71		
I feel stress with the amount of time I spend at work.	0.78		
I feel stress with the volume of work that must be accomplished in the allotted time.	0.82		
I feel stress with time pressures I experience.	0.88		
I feel stress with the amount of responsibility I have.	0.83		
I feel stress with the scope of responsibility my position entails.	0.84		
<u>Hindrance Stressors</u>		0.68	.91
I feel stress with the degree to which politics rather than performance affects organizational decisions.	0.67		
I feel stress with the inability to clearly understand what is expected of me on the job.	0.73		
I feel stress with the amount of red tape I need to go through to get my job done.	0.89		
I feel stress with the lack of job security I have.	0.87		
I feel stress with the degree to which my career seems "stalled."	0.92		
Job Satisfaction (Weiss, Davis, England, & Lofquist (1967))		0.69	0.98
The chance to work alone on the job	0.76		
The chance to do different things from time to time	0.81		
The chance to be "somebody" in the community	0.80		
The way my boss handles his men	0.88		
The competence of my supervisor in making decisions	0.82		
Being able to do things that don't go against my conscience	0.91		
The way my job provides for steady employment	0.87		

The chance to do things for other people	0.84		
The chance to tell people what to do	0.82		
The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities	0.90		
The way the company policies are put into practice	0.91		
The pay and the amount of work that I do	0.83		
The chance of advancement on this job	0.81		
The freedom to use my own judgment	0.89		
The chance to try my own methods of doing the job	0.83		
The working conditions	0.79		
The way my co-workers get along with each other	0.80		
The praise I get for doing a good job	0.73		
The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job	0.77		
Being able to keep busy all the time	0.76		
Job Performance (Williams & Anderson, 1991)		0.79	0.96
This employee adequately completes assigned duties.	0.81		
This employee fulfills responsibilities specified in job description.	0.87		
This employee performs tasks that are expected of him/her.	0.89		
This employee meets formal performance requirements of the job.	0.97		
This employee engages in activities that will directly affect his/her performance evaluation.	0.98		
This employee neglects aspects of the job he/she is obligated to perform.	0.82		
This employee fails to perform essential duties.	0.87		
