

The subjective experience of O*NET work experiences as demands and resources

Alicia Stachowski¹, Renata Garcia Prieto Palacios Roji², & John Kulas²

¹ University of Wisconsin - Stout

² Montclair State University

Author Note

Add complete departmental affiliations for each author here. Each new line herein must be indented, like this line.

Enter author note here.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Alicia Stachowski, Menomenie, WI. E-mail: my@email.com

Abstract

11

12 O*NET work characteristics were rated in terms of relevance, perception of demand, and
13 perception as resource.

14 *Keywords:* keywords

15 Word count: X

The subjective experience of O*NET work experiences as demands and resources

The job demands-resources model (Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner, and Schaufeli (2001)) and later job demands-resources theory (Bakker and Demerouti (2017)) have inspired a plethora a study on the process and experience of job stress and burnout in recent decades. In this project, we draw attention to a basic question regarding a key assumption we make regarding this process - that of the objective nature of job demands.

The purpose of this project is to expand on our small body of research on whether job demands can accurately be assigned as a challenge or hinderance demand, or whether, as the literature argues, there is much more individual difference in the appraisal of job demands. Further, we document whether job demands can simultaneously be classified as a resource and a demand.

The Stress Process and Challenge-Hinderance Framework

Resources, on the other hand, are physical, psychological, social, or organizational aspects of the job that may help an employee achieve work goals, reduce job demands, or promote personal growth and development (Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner, and Schaufeli (2001)). Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner, and Schaufeli (2001) define job demands broadly as components of a job that require sustained effort, and as such, produce psychological or physiological strain. Cavanaugh, Boswell, Roehling, and Boudreau (2000) delineated two forms of demands – that of challenge and hinderance demands. Challenge demands promote mastery, personal growth, and future gains. Hinderance demands, in contrast, inhibit growth, learning and goal achievement. This particular distinction has been of value in determining what demands are related to various outcomes, whereby challenge stressors are typically associated with positive outcomes, and hinderance stressors, negative outcomes (e.g., cite). However, one of the key questions we need to ask as researchers pertains to the very basic

consideration of appraisals.

Objective vs. Subjective Nature of Demands and Resources: The Role of Appraisal

Searle and Auton (2015) note that the majority of the research on challenge and hinderance framework is based on apriori classifications of demands. However, the stress experience or process described early on by Lazarus and Folkman (1984) is grounded in the notion that individual appraisals of stressors/demands vary. This suggests that classifying a job demand as a challenge, or as a hinderance, might be subject to individual differences in appraisal. Some more recent research, in fact, points to that conclusion. Webster, Beehr, and Love (2011), for example, studied workload, role ambiguity, and role conflict demands, and found while that each could be appraised primarily as challenges or hindrances, they could also simultaneously be perceived as being both a challenge and hinderance to different degrees.

Add empirical findings paragraph (1/2 to 1 page): LIST OF ARTICLES

Sonnega, Helppie-McFall, Hudomiet, Willis, and Fisher (2018) Hess, Smith, and Sharifian (2016) Schmitz, McCluney, Sonnega, and Hicken (2019) Downes, Reeves, McCormick, Boswell, and Butts (2021) Bakker and Demerouti (2014) Bakker and Demerouti (2018) LePine, Podsakoff, and LePine (2005)

##Current Study and Research Questions

Study 1 (1/2 page) Study 2 (1/2 page) Study 3 (1/2 page) ===== Bakker and Demerouti (2017)

and Cavanaugh, Boswell, Roehling, and Boudreau (2000)

and Sonnegga, Helppie-McFall, Hudomiet, Willis, and Fisher (2018)

Bakker and Demerouti (2017) state that, "...research has shown that challenge demands may be experienced as hindrance demands (and vice versa) depending on the context" (p. 278). We extend this acknowledgement by investigating whether some characteristics of work may also vacillate between demand and *resource*. »»»>
1a8b1622f7e6e904629adfff00c9ce9df1533ca0

Methods

##Study 1 top 15 demands and resources, divided by skilled versus knowledge workers, ##Study 2 burnout and stress components (correlations), ##Study 3 integration of JDR with O*Net categories (morphs into descriptives).

We report how we determined our sample size, all data exclusions (if any), all manipulations, and all measures in the study.

Participants

Material

Procedure

Data analysis

We used R [Version 4.0.3; R Core Team (2020)] and the R-package *papaja* [Version 0.1.0.9997; Aust and Barth (2020)] for all our analyses.

80

Results

81

Discussion

References

Aust, F., & Barth, M. (2020). *papaja: Create APA manuscripts with R Markdown*.

Retrieved from <https://github.com/crsh/papaja>

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2014). Job demands–resources theory. *Wellbeing: A Complete Reference Guide*, 1–28.

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands–resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(3), 273.

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2018). Multiple levels in job demands-resources theory: Implications for employee well-being and performance. *Handbook of Well-Being*.

Cavanaugh, M. A., Boswell, W. R., Roehling, M. V., & Boudreau, J. W. (2000). An empirical examination of self-reported work stress among US managers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(1), 65.

Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 499.

Downes, P. E., Reeves, C. J., McCormick, B. W., Boswell, W. R., & Butts, M. M. (2021). Incorporating job demand variability into job demands theory: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Management*, 47(6), 1630–1656.

Hess, T. M., Smith, B. T., & Sharifian, N. (2016). Aging and effort expenditure: The impact of subjective perceptions of task demands. *Psychology and Aging*, 31(7), 653–660. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pag0000127>

103 Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. Springer
104 publishing company.

105 LePine, J. A., Podsakoff, N. P., & LePine, M. A. (2005). A meta-analytic test of the
106 challenge stressor–hindrance stressor framework: An explanation for inconsistent
107 relationships among stressors and performance. *Academy of Management Journal*,
108 48(5), 764–775.

109 R Core Team. (2020). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*.
110 Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Retrieved from
111 <https://www.R-project.org/>

112 Schmitz, L. L., McCluney, C. L., Sonnegga, A., & Hicken, M. T. (2019). Interpreting
113 Subjective and Objective Measures of Job Resources: The Importance of
114 Sociodemographic Context. *International Journal of Environmental Research and*
115 *Public Health*, 16(17), 3058. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16173058>

116 Searle, B. J., & Auton, J. C. (2015). The merits of measuring challenge and
117 hindrance appraisals. *Anxiety, Stress, & Coping*, 28(2), 121–143.

118 Sonnegga, A., Helppie-McFall, B., Hudomiet, P., Willis, R. J., & Fisher, G. G. (2018).
119 A Comparison of Subjective and Objective Job Demands and Fit With Personal
120 Resources as Predictors of Retirement Timing in a National U.S. Sample. *Work,*
121 *Aging and Retirement*, 4(1), 37–51. <https://doi.org/10.1093/workar/wax016>

122 Webster, J. R., Beehr, T. A., & Love, K. (2011). Extending the challenge-hindrance
123 model of occupational stress: The role of appraisal. *Journal of Vocational*
124 *Behavior*, 79(2), 505–516.