WJSAM | World Journal of Sustainable Advances in Multidisciplinarity
RESEARCH | INNOVATION | INTERDISCIPLINARITY | SUSTAINABILITY

Work-Related Stress, Mental Well-Being, and Daily Functioning Among Corporate Employees: A Structured Literature Review

Mary Janica S. Villanueva-Santiago
Independent Researcher, Philippines

Email: villanuevamaryjanica@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This structured literature review examined how work-related stress relates to mental well-being and daily functioning among corporate employees and considered the role of organizational support. Drawing on scholarly studies and authoritative institutional publications, primarily from 2021 to 2026, the review adopted a qualitative thematic synthesis approach guided by Job Demands–Resources Theory and the challenge–hindrance stressor framework. The reviewed literature addressed occupational demands, psychological experiences, work and personal routines, and workplace resources. Across the discussed sources, recurring stressors included heavy workloads, time pressure, limited autonomy, insufficient supervisory support, and difficulties maintaining work–life boundaries. The literature associated these conditions with emotional exhaustion, negative emotions, psychological distress, and challenges in work performance and everyday functioning, although the patterns varied with employee appraisal, job resources, and organizational circumstances. The review indicates that occupational stress should be considered alongside both psychological health and the ability to manage responsibilities beyond work. Organizations may therefore consider workload management, supportive supervision, psychosocial risk prevention, and accessible mental health support rather than relying solely on individual coping measures. The synthesis is limited by differences in the designs, populations, settings, and measures of the discussed publications and by incomplete documentation of study-level screening and comparison. Its contribution is an integrated perspective on workplace demands, employee well-being, and daily functioning that may inform more sustainable corporate workplace practices.

Keywords: *Corporate Employees, Daily Functioning, Job Demands, Mental Well-Being, Organizational Support, Structured Literature Review, Work-Related Stress*

1. INTRODUCTION

Work-related stress remains an important concern in corporate workplaces, where employees must respond to performance expectations, changing organizational requirements, time pressures, and responsibilities beyond their jobs. Although occupational demands are part of professional life, their implications depend on the resources available to employees and how particular demands are experienced. Job Demands–Resources Theory explains that demanding work conditions and supportive resources jointly shape employee well-being, burnout, and engagement (Bakker et al., 2023). Similarly, the challenge–hindrance stressor framework recognizes that workplace pressures can be interpreted differently depending on whether they are viewed as opportunities for achievement or obstacles to important goals (Podsakoff et al., 2023).

1.1. Background and Context of the Study

Occupational stress is therefore not solely a matter of workload. Limited autonomy, inadequate supervisory support, difficulties maintaining work–life boundaries, and uncertainty about job responsibilities may also influence employees' experiences. The World Health Organization (WHO, 2022) recommends addressing psychosocial risks through organizational interventions and appropriate mental health support. The International Labour Organization (ILO, 2022) likewise identifies psychosocial hazards as concerns requiring preventive action in workplace settings. These perspectives place responsibility for healthier working conditions on organizations as well as individuals. The implications of workplace stress may extend beyond psychological discomfort or reduced productivity. Employee well-being includes emotional experiences and the ability to participate meaningfully in work and personal life. Sonnentag et al. (2023) emphasize the importance of considering occupational health beyond stressors and strain alone. For corporate employees, daily functioning may involve completing assigned tasks, maintaining routines, managing household responsibilities, and engaging in activities outside work. Although international research offers useful perspectives, its relevance to Philippine corporate environments requires careful interpretation because workplace conditions and organizational resources may differ. These considerations motivate an integrated examination of work-related stress, mental well-being, and daily functioning.

1.2. Research Problem

Corporate employees may encounter overlapping demands that affect their psychological experiences and their capacity to manage everyday responsibilities. Excessive workloads, time pressure, limited control over tasks, and insufficient organizational support are repeatedly discussed as occupational stressors. Yet these conditions do not necessarily produce identical outcomes across employees or workplaces. Job Demands–Resources Theory indicates that available resources matter alongside job demands (Bakker et al., 2023), while research on stressor appraisal suggests that employees' interpretations of demands may influence performance-related responses (Ma et al., 2021). An additional concern is that workplace stress may affect functioning beyond formal job performance. Studies examining morning routine disruption and work connectivity address particular aspects of employees' energy and work-related behavior (McClean et al., 2021; ten Brummelhuis et al., 2021). Such outcomes are relevant but do not individually capture the broader ability to maintain personal routines and responsibilities. The WHO (2022) also emphasizes workplace measures addressing psychosocial risks rather than relying exclusively on individual coping. Despite this evidence, research findings are distributed across studies with different populations, measures, and outcomes. Consequently, the combined implications of occupational stress for mental well-being and daily functioning remain insufficiently integrated within a corporate workplace perspective.

1.3. Research Gap

Existing literature provides substantial but differently focused perspectives on occupational stress. Bakker et al. (2023) examine job demands and resources in relation to well-being, while Podsakoff et al. (2023) reconsider how challenge and hindrance stressors should be understood. Other studies address specific daily experiences, including disruptions to morning routines (McClean et al., 2021), or examine organizational practices associated with employee well-being (Bhoir & Sinha, 2024). These contributions illuminate important aspects of workplace stress, but their different conceptual emphases and outcomes limit direct comparison. The gap addressed here is therefore not an asserted absence of occupational stress research. Rather, it concerns the need for a focused synthesis connecting identified stressors with both psychological well-being and everyday functioning while considering organizational resources and differences in workplace contexts. A corporate-oriented review can clarify where the evidence converges, where interpretation remains uncertain, and which practical considerations emerge without claiming to establish causal effects or a uniform relationship across settings.

1.4. Purpose and Objectives of the Study

This study aims to review and synthesize existing scholarly literature concerning work-related stress, mental well-being, and daily functioning among corporate employees. Using a structured literature review and qualitative thematic synthesis, it examines published evidence rather than collecting primary responses from employees. Specifically, the review seeks to identify commonly reported occupational stressors; examine psychological and daily functioning outcomes discussed in previous studies; explore how these concepts are related across the literature; and identify organizational practices that may support employee well-being. It also considers differences in research approaches, occupational settings, and reported findings to clarify limitations of current knowledge and areas requiring further investigation. The intended contribution is an integrated interpretation of the available evidence.

1.5. Significance and Practical Contribution of the Study

This review may inform corporate leaders, human resource professionals, employees, and researchers by bringing together evidence that is often considered in separate discussions of stress, mental health, and performance. Its synthesis can help organizations consider workload distribution, job autonomy, supervisory relationships, work–life boundaries, and access to appropriate psychological support when examining employee welfare. Such considerations are consistent with the emphasis on organizational resources in employee well-being research (Bhoir & Sinha, 2024). The study does not test a workplace intervention or establish the effectiveness of a particular program. Instead, it offers an evidence-informed basis for discussing preventive workplace practices and identifying questions for future empirical research, including studies situated in Philippine corporate organizations.

1.6. Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) Alignment

The study aligns directly with Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 3, Good Health and Well-Being, because it examines occupational stress in relation to employees' psychological experiences and everyday functioning. By synthesizing evidence on workplace demands and support, it may inform efforts to protect mental health and recognize psychosocial risks in employment settings. It also supports SDG 8, Decent Work and Economic Growth, particularly its concern with safe and supportive working environments. The review's discussion of workload management, supervisory support, and organizational practices offers considerations relevant to decent work and sustained employee participation. These connections are practical rather than claims of measured SDG impact: the study reviews existing literature and does not directly evaluate health outcomes or economic change.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1. Research Design

The study was designed as a structured literature review employing qualitative thematic synthesis to examine published evidence on work-related stress, mental well-being, and daily functioning among corporate employees. This approach was selected because the research aims to integrate findings from existing studies rather than generate primary data through surveys, interviews, or experimental procedures. The review framework emphasizes the systematic identification, selection, evaluation, and interpretation of relevant scholarly publications. The methodological approach is informed by Snyder (2019), who discussed the importance of transparent and rigorous procedures in literature-based research.

2.2. Research Locale

The study does not have a single geographical locale because it examines secondary evidence from published research conducted across different organizational and geographical settings. Its primary context is the corporate workplace, including private-sector organizations in which employees experience occupational demands, performance expectations, and work-related responsibilities. Literature from international settings is considered to provide broader perspectives on occupational stress and employee well-being, while Philippine-based publications are prioritized when available and relevant. The geographical context of each included study will be considered during synthesis to distinguish internationally observed patterns from findings directly applicable to Philippine corporate environments. No employees were directly recruited because it used previously published research as its source of information. Instead, the units of analysis were scholarly publications discussing work-related stress, mental well-being, daily functioning, and related workplace factors. The populations represented in these publications included corporate employees, office-based personnel, administrative workers, and other private-sector employees whose working conditions were relevant to the research topic. Studies involving broader employee populations were also considered when their findings could provide useful information about occupational stress and workplace functioning. The participants reported in these publications were not treated as direct respondents of the present study.

2.3. Sampling Technique

The selection of literature was guided by purposive sampling based on the relevance of publications to the research objectives. The review prioritized studies published from 2021 to 2026 to reflect recent discussions and developments in occupational stress and workplace mental health. Earlier publications were considered when necessary to explain established theories, methodological approaches, or important conceptual foundations. Eligible sources included peer-reviewed empirical studies, scholarly reviews, and authoritative institutional publications addressing occupational stress, psychological well-being, daily functioning, and organizational support. Publications unrelated to the research objectives, lacking sufficient methodological information, or focusing on populations without clear relevance to corporate workplace conditions were excluded from consideration. The planned selection process involved examining publication titles and abstracts, reviewing potentially relevant full texts, and removing duplicate or ineligible records. The final number of included publications and the reasons for exclusion must be documented using the completed screening records. The main research instrument was a structured literature extraction matrix intended to organize information from the selected publications. The matrix was designed to record the authors, publication year, geographical setting, research objectives, research design, participant characteristics, workplace stressors, mental well-being indicators, daily functioning outcomes, major findings, and reported limitations. Information concerning organizational support and relevant theoretical frameworks was also included. The extraction matrix was guided by Job

Demands–Resources Theory (Bakker et al., 2023) and the challenge–hindrance stressor framework (LePine, 2022; Podsakoff et al., 2023). These frameworks provided a basis for organizing the literature according to workplace demands, available resources, employee perceptions, and reported psychological and functional outcomes.

2.4. Data Gathering Procedure

The literature gathering procedure was designed to identify relevant publications through academic search platforms and scholarly databases, including Google Scholar, PubMed, and other accessible multidisciplinary research databases. Search terms included "work-related stress," "occupational stress," "mental well-being," "psychological well-being," "daily functioning," "employee performance," "corporate employees," and "workplace mental health." Appropriate combinations of these terms using Boolean operators were considered to identify publications relevant to the research objectives. The planned search focused primarily on literature published from 2021 to 2026, while allowing earlier foundational sources when necessary. Potentially relevant publications were to be examined through title and abstract screening, followed by full-text review. Publications meeting the eligibility criteria were to be organized using the literature extraction matrix. To support transparency, the completed review should document the actual databases used, search dates, search expressions, number of records identified, screening decisions, and reasons for excluding publications. The review procedures were informed by Snyder (2019) and relevant reporting principles discussed by Page et al. (2021).

2.5. Data Analysis

The study used qualitative thematic synthesis as its intended approach to analyzing the selected literature. This approach involved organizing information according to recurring concepts and comparing findings across publications. The main areas of analysis were occupational stressors, mental well-being, daily functioning, organizational support, and sustainable workplace practices. The analysis framework focused on identifying similarities and differences in reported findings, considering how occupational conditions relate to psychological and functional outcomes, and examining the influence of organizational resources. Attention was also given to differences in research designs, participant characteristics, measurement approaches, and workplace settings.

2.6. Ethical Considerations

This study adhered to the principles of research integrity, transparency, and responsible scholarly practice. As a structured literature review based exclusively on previously published sources, no human participants were directly involved, and informed consent was not applicable. Formal ethical approval was not required under the general principles governing research using publicly available literature, subject to applicable institutional and journal policies. All sources were appropriately acknowledged in accordance with APA 7th edition guidelines, and the findings were synthesized without fabrication, falsification, or misrepresentation. Any conflicts of interest and sources of funding will be disclosed in accordance with the journal's requirements.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Sources and Characteristics of Work-Related Stress

The literature identifies several workplace conditions that are relevant to employees' experiences of stress. These include heavy workloads, time pressure, emotional demands, limited control over work, and insufficient organizational support. Bakker et al. (2023) explained how job demands and available resources are connected with employee well-being through Job Demands–Resources Theory. Similarly, Podsakoff et al. (2023) discussed the differences

between challenge and hindrance stressors, while Ma et al. (2021) examined how employees' appraisal of workplace demands relates to performance. The International Labour Organization (ILO, 2022) also identified excessive workloads, limited job control, and inadequate workplace support as important psychosocial risks. These sources suggest that workplace stress involves several related factors rather than a single working condition. An important point from the literature is that employees may respond differently to similar workplace demands. For example, a demanding task may be viewed as an opportunity for professional growth by one employee but as a difficulty by another, depending on the situation and available resources. LePine (2022) discussed the complexity of distinguishing challenge and hindrance stressors, while Podsakoff et al. (2023) emphasized the need for a clearer understanding of these concepts. This suggests that organizations should not focus only on reducing workloads when addressing employee stress. They should also consider job autonomy, supervisory relationships, available resources, and the overall working environment. This interpretation is consistent with Bakker et al. (2023), who emphasized the importance of considering job demands and resources together.

3.2. Mental Well-Being and Psychological Responses

Mental well-being is another important area discussed in the literature on occupational stress. Kelloway et al. (2023) examined mental health in workplace settings, while Sonnentag et al. (2023) reviewed employee health and well-being beyond the traditional focus on stress and strain. Abdel Hadi et al. (2021) investigated leisure crafting and emotional exhaustion during telework, showing the relevance of recovery-related activities to employees' psychological experiences. The World Health Organization (WHO, 2022a) also emphasized the importance of preventing psychosocial risks and providing appropriate mental health support in the workplace. These publications highlight why psychological well-being needs to be considered when examining occupational stress. The literature also shows the importance of understanding mental well-being as more than the absence of stress or psychological distress. Employees' well-being involves their emotional experiences and their ability to participate in work and personal activities. Sonnentag et al. (2023) discussed broader aspects of occupational health and well-being, while Kelloway et al. (2023) emphasized the importance of mental health within organizational research. These perspectives suggest that workplace mental health programs should not focus only on helping employees cope with stress. Organizations also need to consider the working conditions that may contribute to psychological difficulties. This supports the recommendations of the WHO and ILO (2022), which emphasize prevention, organizational support, and healthier workplace environments.

3.3. Daily Functioning and Work–Life Interactions

The literature also discusses how workplace experiences are connected with employees' daily routines and activities. McClean et al. (2021) examined the implications of morning routine disruptions for employees' energy, while ten Brummelhuis et al. (2021) investigated constant work connectivity and its relationship with performance. Cho and Kim (2022) explored daily lifestyle behaviors and workplace outcomes. Meanwhile, Pindek et al. (2024) reviewed daily diary studies involving challenge and hindrance stressors. These publications provide different perspectives on how occupational demands and everyday experiences may be related. These studies suggest that daily functioning should not be understood only in terms of employees' ability to complete assigned tasks. It also includes maintaining routines, managing personal responsibilities, and balancing activities inside and outside the workplace. However, the publications examine different aspects of functioning, so their findings should not be treated as

directly equivalent. Pindek et al. (2024) highlighted the changing nature of daily stress experiences, while McClean et al. (2021) and ten Brummelhuis et al. (2021) examined specific aspects of daily routines and work connectivity. Taken together, these perspectives show why the relationship between occupational stress and daily functioning deserves attention beyond traditional measures of job performance.

3.4. Challenges Affecting Employee Well-Being

Several challenges discussed in the literature may make it difficult for employees to manage occupational stress and maintain their well-being. These include excessive job demands, limited workplace resources, inadequate supervisory support, and difficulties separating work responsibilities from personal life. The WHO and ILO (2022) emphasized that workplace mental health requires organizational measures and should not depend only on individual coping strategies. Bhoir and Sinha (2024) reviewed human resource practices related to employee well-being, while Ong and Johnson (2023) examined different combinations of job demands and resources. Pindek et al. (2022) also investigated workload in relation to rumination and negative emotions. These publications suggest that workplace stress management involves both organizational conditions and employees' psychological experiences. One important challenge is that organizations may introduce wellness activities without fully addressing the workplace conditions associated with stress. For example, employee wellness programs may offer support, but concerns about workload, job autonomy, and supervisory practices may still remain. From the perspective of Job Demands–Resources Theory, both occupational demands and available resources need to be considered when examining employee well-being (Bakker et al., 2023). The WHO (2022a) similarly recommended organizational interventions that address psychosocial risks. These perspectives suggest that workplace stress management should include preventive measures and improvements in working conditions alongside employee support activities.

3.5. Relationships Among Stress, Well-Being, and Functioning

The literature provides different perspectives on the relationships among work-related stress, mental well-being, and daily functioning. Bakker et al. (2023) discussed the relationship of job demands and resources with burnout and work engagement, while Ma et al. (2021) examined stressor–performance relationships in relation to cognitive appraisal and goal orientation. Pindek et al. (2024) reviewed daily experiences involving workplace stressors, and Sonnentag et al. (2023) discussed broader aspects of employee health and well-being. Black and Britt (2023) also examined employees' perceptions of stress in relation to performance, health, and well-being. Although these publications address related topics, they differ in their research approaches, occupational populations, and outcomes. Their findings therefore need to be interpreted according to the specific conditions examined in each study. The relationship among these concepts appears complex because employees do not experience occupational demands in the same way. The challenge–hindrance stressor framework suggests that employees' interpretations of workplace demands are important when examining psychological and performance-related outcomes (LePine, 2022; Podsakoff et al., 2023). Job Demands–Resources Theory also emphasizes the role of organizational resources in understanding employee well-being (Bakker et al., 2023). These frameworks help explain why mental well-being and daily functioning may be connected while remaining different aspects of employee experience. However, the literature discussed in this manuscript does not yet provide a documented comparison of study-level findings sufficient to establish the overall strength, direction, or

consistency of these relationships. A more detailed extraction and comparison of empirical findings would be needed to support stronger conclusions.

3.6. Organizational Support and Sustainable Workplace Practices

Organizational support is an important consideration in the literature on employee well-being. Bhoir and Sinha (2024) reviewed human resource practices associated with employee well-being, while Kelloway et al. (2023) discussed workplace mental health from an organizational perspective. The WHO (2022a) and WHO and ILO (2022) recommended workplace approaches that address psychosocial risks, promote mental health, and provide appropriate support for employees. The ILO (2026) also discussed developments in psychosocial working environments and possible directions for organizational action. These publications suggest that employee well-being is connected with workplace policies, available resources, and organizational practices. The discussion also highlights the importance of considering employee mental health as part of sustainable workplace management. Organizations may benefit from examining workload distribution, job autonomy, supervisory support, and access to mental health services when developing employee-centered policies. These considerations are related to Sustainable Development Goal 3, Good Health and Well-Being, and Sustainable Development Goal 8, Decent Work and Economic Growth. However, the effectiveness of specific workplace programs cannot be established from theoretical discussions or policy recommendations alone. Further empirical research is needed to determine which practices are most appropriate and effective in different corporate settings. Overall, the literature supports considering occupational health, human resource management, and organizational sustainability together when developing healthier working environments (Bhoir & Sinha, 2024; WHO & ILO, 2022).

4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study reviewed existing literature on work-related stress, mental well-being, and daily functioning among corporate employees. The literature discussed suggests that work-related stress is connected with several workplace conditions, including heavy workloads, time pressure, limited job autonomy, inadequate organizational support, and difficulties maintaining work–life balance. Previous studies also examined how occupational stress relates to emotional exhaustion, psychological distress, work performance, and employees' ability to manage everyday responsibilities. However, these relationships may differ depending on employees' perceptions, available resources, and working environments. Job Demands–Resources Theory and the challenge–hindrance stressor framework provide useful explanations for understanding these differences. The discussion highlights the importance of addressing occupational stress through both individual support and improvements in workplace conditions. Overall, the study emphasizes that employee mental well-being and daily functioning are important considerations in developing healthier and more sustainable corporate workplaces.

Based on the literature discussed, corporate organizations are encouraged to strengthen their efforts to address occupational stress and support employee mental well-being. Human resource managers and organizational leaders may consider reviewing workload distribution, improving supervisory support, promoting reasonable work–life boundaries, and providing access to appropriate mental health services. Workplace wellness programs may also be considered alongside organizational measures that address psychosocial risks. Employees should be given opportunities to communicate workplace concerns and participate in discussions about improving their working conditions. Organizations may also assess their existing policies and support programs to determine whether these respond to employees' needs. Future researchers are encouraged to conduct empirical studies involving corporate

employees in different organizational settings, particularly in the Philippines, to examine the relationships among work-related stress, mental well-being, and daily functioning. Further research may also evaluate the effectiveness of specific workplace support practices and identify approaches that are appropriate for different employee populations.

This study is limited to the analysis and synthesis of previously published literature concerning work-related stress, mental well-being, and daily functioning among corporate employees. Variations in research designs, participant characteristics, geographical settings, measurement instruments, and organizational contexts may affect the consistency and comparability of the reviewed findings. The emphasis on publications from 2021 to 2026 may also limit the inclusion of relevant earlier studies, although essential foundational literature was retained where appropriate. Furthermore, differences in workplace environments, organizational policies, and employee experiences may influence the applicability of findings across corporate sectors and geographical locations. The availability, methodological quality, and scope of the selected publications may also affect the comprehensiveness of the literature synthesis. Despite these limitations, the study provides a foundation for understanding occupational stress in relation to employee well-being and daily functioning and identifies relevant considerations for future research and sustainable workplace practices.

5. REFERENCES

Abdel Hadi, S., Bakker, A. B., & Häusser, J. A. (2021). The role of leisure crafting for emotional exhaustion in telework during the COVID-19 pandemic. Anxiety, Stress, & Coping, 34(5), 530–544. https://doi.org/10.1080/10615806.2021.1903447

Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Sanz-Vergel, A. (2023). Job demands–resources theory: Ten years later. Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 10, 25–53. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-120920-053933

Bhoir, M., & Sinha, V. (2024). Employee well-being human resource practices: A systematic literature review and directions for future research. Future Business Journal, 10, Article 95. https://doi.org/10.1186/s43093-024-00382-w

Black, K. J., & Britt, T. W. (2023). Stress as a badge of honour: Relationships with performance, health, and well-being. Work & Stress, 37(2), 222–247. https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2022.2129511

Brummelhuis, L. L., ter Hoeven, C. L., & Toniolo-Barrios, M. (2021). Staying in the loop: Is constant connectivity to work good or bad for work performance? Journal of Vocational Behavior, 128, Article 103589. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2021.103589

Cho, S., & Kim, S. (2022). Does a healthy lifestyle matter? A daily diary study of unhealthy eating at home and behavioral outcomes at work. Journal of Applied Psychology, 107(1), 23–39. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000890

International Labour Organization. (2022). Psychosocial risks and stress at work. https://www.ilo.org/resource/psychosocial-risks-and-stress-work

International Labour Organization. (2026). The psychosocial working environment: Global developments and pathways for action. https://doi.org/10.54394/00033223

Kelloway, E. K., Dimoff, J. K., & Gilbert, S. (2023). Mental health in the workplace. Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 10, 363–387. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-120920-050527

LePine, M. A. (2022). The challenge-hindrance stressor framework: An integrative conceptual review and path forward. Group & Organization Management. https://doi.org/10.1177/10596011221079970

Ma, J., Peng, Y., & Wu, B. (2021). Challenging or hindering? The roles of goal orientation and cognitive appraisal in stressor-performance relationships. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 42(3), 388–406. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2503

McClean, S. T., Koopman, J., Yim, J., & Klotz, A. C. (2021). Stumbling out of the gate: The energy-based implications of morning routine disruption. Personnel Psychology, 74(3), 411–448. https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12419

Ong, W. J., & Johnson, M. D. (2023). Toward a configural theory of job demands and resources. Academy of Management Journal. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2020.0493

Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J. M., Akl, E. A., Brennan, S. E., Chou, R., Glanville, J., Grimshaw, J. M., Hróbjartsson, A., Lalu, M. M., Li, T., Loder, E. W., Mayo-Wilson, E., McDonald, S., … Moher, D. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ, 372, Article n71. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71

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, 1107–1125. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-024-09933-y

Pindek, S., Zhou, Z. E., Kessler, S. R., Krajcevska, A., & Spector, P. E. (2022). The lingering curvilinear effect of workload on employee rumination and negative emotions: A diary study. Work & Stress, 36(3), 292–311. https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2021.2009055

Podsakoff, N. P., Freiburger, K. J., Podsakoff, P. M., & Rosen, C. C. (2023). Laying the foundation for the challenge–hindrance stressor framework 2.0. Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 10, 165–199. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-080422-052147

Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. Journal of Business Research, 104, 333–339. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039

Sonnentag, S., Tay, L., & Nesher Shoshan, H. (2023). A review on health and well-being at work: More than stressors and strains. Personnel Psychology, 76(2), 473–510. https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12572

World Health Organization, & International Labour Organization. (2022). Mental health at work: Policy brief. https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240057944

World Health Organization. (2022a). WHO guidelines on mental health at work. https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240053052

World Health Organization. (2022b). World mental health report: Transforming mental health for all. https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240049338