Job Demands-Resources model components through the lens of O*NET classifications

Alicia Stachowski[1], Renata Garcia Prieto Palacios Roji[2], & John Kulas[2]

[1] University of Wisconsin - Stout

[2] Montclair State University

Author Note

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Alicia Stachowski, Menomenie, WI. E-mail: stachowskia@uwstout.edu

Abstract

O*NET work characteristics were rated in terms of relevance, perception as a demand, and perception as a resource. All the results of this current study match the stress-appraisal stuff. Next steps: 1) discuss results within stress-appraisal framework (Lazarus & Bookman), 2) different literature on challenge and hindrance demands. Job Demands Resources theory that says resources and demands are relatively universal is NOT consistent with these findings. JDR neglects the other 2 literatures. Analytically pull O*Net descriptors that reflect universal demands/resources (e.g., autonomy) and see how much variability there is on those. Maybe forget about cross-walk thing. May actually want to start with this: https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1ck-72dQ_c-Pl4Xba9W0r___OYo0znlEnV/edit#gid=1041061499.

We want to also group items by O*NET categories so there's not so many (that makes ANOVAs more viable)

Keywords: keywords

Word count: X

Job Demands-Resources model components through the lens of O*NET classifications

Given the popularity of the Job Demands-Resources Theory [JD-R; Demerouti et al. (2001)] in exploring questions related to everything from motivation to job design, we aim to explore the intersection between *perceptions* of job demands and resources, and the broad set of job characteristics provided on O*Net. This project makes three contributions. We aim to first explore whether ratings of of O*Net item groupings align with the stated "resources" and "demands" presented in the job demands-resources theory. We then present evidence documenting whether O*Net job and task descriptors are similarly rated as resources, challenge- or hindrance demands, and lastly, whether such ratings differ across job categories/classifications. Across two studies, a series of evaluations were made that used: 1) direct O*Net terminology (both descriptor and response option), and 2) JD-R influenced ratings of demand, challenge, or hindrance of different types of workers. Prior to a description of results, a brief overview of both the JD-R theory, the stress appraisal process, and O*Net is provided.

The Job demands-Resources Theory

The overarching context for this study is that of the job demands-resources theory, which is an expansion of the well-studied job demands-resources model (Demerouti et al., 2001). One of the major advantages of the job demands-resources theory is that it allows us to model both work environment and job characteristics via job resources and demands. *Resources* include 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 et al., 2001). In contrast, *demands* include components of a job that require sustained effort, and as such, produce psychological or physiological strain (e.g., high work pressure is frequently cited as a common demand; Demerouti et al. (2001)). Cognitively, the perception of an element of ones job as a resource or demand

activates one of two distinct processes: either health impairment (resulting from demands) or motivation [resulting from resources; A. B. Bakker and Demerouti (2014)]. Pertinent to the current study, demanding job characteristics are frequently associated with negative outcomes (e.g., A. Bakker et al., 2003), whereas job characteristics deemed resources have been associated with positive organizational outcomes like engagement and motivation (A. B. Bakker et al., 2007).

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

Searle and Auton (2015) note that the majority of the research on workplace demands 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 assumption that individual appraisals of stressors/demands vary. Their transactional theory of stress and coping states that people continuously appraise stimuli in their environments. An appraisal is the cognitive process whereby meaning is assigned to a stimulus. If a stimulus is appraised as a stressor (threat, challenge, potentially harmful), emotional distress leads to coping of some kind. This action to cope is also associated with another appraisal about the outcome itself and the process continues if the outcomes is not appraised as favorable (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). The stress appraisal process suggests that classifying a job characteristic or environmental condition as an objective demand or resource might be in error.

We next consider the (limited) empirical evidence on this topic. First, some relatively recent research suggests that job demands and resources may not be universally appraised or assigned as such. Starting with job demands, Webster et al. (2011), for example, studied workload, role ambiguity, and role conflict demands, and found that while each could be appraised primarily as a challenge or hindrance demand, they could also simultaneously be perceived as being both a challenge and hindrance to different degrees. While their study

did include resources, it nonetheless points to individual differences on how people perceive stressors at work. Although part of a much larger study on retirement, Sonnega et al. (2018) compared self-reported (subjective) ratings of degree of physical demand, stress, and need for intense concentration from the Health and Retirement Study with objective ratings from O*Net. Correlations physical demand (r = .52), stress (r = .10), and need for intense concentration (r = .14), again suggesting perhaps that our objective ratings of job demands (and resources) may be subject to a greater level of individual difference than assumed. Next considering resources, Schmitz et al. (2019) also captured subjective and objective resources in their study of retirement. Correlations of composite variables for the resources of autonomy (r = .12. p > .01), recognition of work (r = .07, p > .01), and decision freedom (r = .08, p > .01), while significant, certainly do not reflect high levels of overlap.

We do acknowledge as well, that demands and resources are not necessarily consistent across days, or seasons, for many employees. Downes et al. (2021) meta-analysis addresses this reality in depth, although it is beyond the scope of this project.

O*Net Resource

Originally, the Advisory Panel for the Dictionary of Occupational Titles recommended a system that would "...promote the effective education, training, counseling, and employment of the American workforce. It should accomplish its purpose by providing a database system that identifies, defines, classifies, and describes occupations in the economy in an accessible and flexible manner" (Dictionary of Occupational Titles (US) and Service (1993), p. 6). The result was the now commonly used O*NET. The Occupational Information Network (O*NET; onetonline.org) contains a comprehensive description of occupations (Peterson et al., 2001). This widely accessed database houses hundreds of standardized and occupation-specific descriptors most occupations in the US and these descriptions are continually updated. In fact, there was a call to work with experienced I/O psychologists over the summer to update the content for the Industrial

and Organizational Psychologist listing on O*Net. These data, and the tools provided for free on the website (e.g., Career Exploration Tools, "My Next Move for Veterans," "My Next Move," Toolkit for Business) are frequently used by counselors, students, human resources departments, and researchers to assist potential applicants discover the skills and training they need for the job of their choice. It is also useful to employers by providing them with information with which to craft job descriptions and help employees determine what skills are needed for promotion.

Of greatest interest here are statements taken from O*NET "activity" and "context" classifications (e.g., items related to information input, interacting with others, physical work conditions, structural job characteristics). One of the first and basic questions is whether or not the categorical examples of "resources" and "demands" described in the Job Demands-Resources Theory (Demerouti et al., 2001), for example, are generally deemed resources or demands as we objectively define them. The next logical question surrounds how "universal" such ratings are. For instance, it is quite possible, given the theoretical and empirical evidence presented above, that there is wide variability in individual appraisal of work activities and context such that some people may rate a given activity as a resource and others a hindrance. A second study extends the findings from Study 1 to a potentially key moderator - job categories/classifications, examining whether ratings of resources, challenge- and hindrance demands differ by job classification.

Study 1

Look at the google sheet and document the extent to which job characteristics that have been consistently cited in the literature as demands or resources end up being consistently or variably experienced as demands or resources. Study 1 aims to provide an integration of the theory and practical occupations-focused data on O*Net. Several broad research questions are examined across jobs:

Research Question 1: Are literature-implicated resources consistently rated as job resources?

Research Question 2: Are literature-implicated challenges consistently rated as job challenges?

Research Question 3: Are literature-implicated hiderances consistently rated as job hinderances?

Participants

Of the 785 Prolific panel individuals who initially accessed the survey link, 112 indicated that they were not interested, had more than 200 missing responses, or had 20 or more identical consecutive sequential responses (Yentes & Wilhelm, 2021). Applying a further screen regarding attention checks (there were four attention checks embedded throughout, asking respondents to indicate a specific answer) resulted in the retention of 568 respondents who constitute the current SIOP sample. 13.57% had been in their referent job less than 6 months, 19.20% between 6 months and a year, 49.12% between one and five years, 13.27% between 5 and 10 years, and 4.87% more than 10 years.

Ages ranged from 18 to 65 with an average of 28.18 years old (SD = 7.53). The survey offered a free-field gender identity category, although the sample predominantly self-identified as female (52.58%) or male (46.83%).

Materials

Looked through

Study 2

While Study 1 explored the above questions across jobs, Study 2 considers a potentially important moderator: job classification. There is a distinct possibility we

expect we may observe is wide variability in the assignment of some job characteristics within the JD-R framework depending on *job classification.* In fact, a growing body of evidence suggests people may not universally experience job characteristics as challenges or hinderances (e.g., (A. B. Bakker & Sanz-Vergel, 2013); (Cavanaugh et al., 2000); (Gerich, 2017); (Podsakoff et al., 2007); (Webster et al., 2011)). Thus, Study 2 focuses on a fourth question of interest.

> *Research Question 4*: Does the **type of work** reported explain variability in the categorization of work characteristics into challenges, hindrances, and resources?

Materials

Each free-field job title was placed into one of 14 possible O*NET job families classifications. 60 of these ratings were performed by all 3 author raters, with a resulting Kappa of 0.53 (Landis & Koch, 1977). We then further collapsed these 14 categories into 8 essentially equal frequency job categories.

Characteristics, Demands, and Resources. We used 98 statements taken from O*NET "activity" and "context" classifications. We retained 41 "work activity" classifications which O*NET groups into categories of "Information Input" (5 statements), "Interacting with Others" (17 statements), "Mental Processes" (10 statements) and "Work Output" (9 statements). 57 "work context" statements grouped into "Interpersonal Relationships" (14 statements), "Physical Work Conditions" (30 statements), and "Structural Job Characteristics" (13 statements).

These "descriptors" often have unique response categories (see here for example). We retained the O*NET wording to capture characteristics of relevance for each respondent. Subsequent to these self evaluations, each respondent who agreed that the element had *at least some relevance* to their job was also asked to rate that element in terms of, 1) . . . this

aspect of your job is a resource that can be functional in achieving work goals, reduce job

demands, or stimulate personal growth/development, 2) . . . this aspect of your job is a

challenge that can promote mastery, personal growth, or future gains, and 3) . . . this aspect

of your job is a hindrance that can inhibit personal growth, learning, and work goal

attainment.

Results

Low Variability Demands and Resources

The below graphs present the resources, challenges, and hindrances that are *largely*

agreed on as indexed by (relatively) low standard deviations.

Note. The "zero" standard deviations are likely one person, n's should also go

on these graphs if they're retained.

Most Agreed Upon as a Challenge

As can be seen by the graphs, there is considerable disagreement regarding the degree to which job elements are considered *hindrances*, with the 10 elements showing the greatest agreement still ranging in standard deviations from 0 to 1.18. What is widely seen as a resource and challenge tends to be more universally agreed upon (range of lowest 10 resource standard deviations is 0 to 0.88 and the range of lowest 10 challenge standard deviations is 0 to 0.87.

High Variability Demands and Resources

The below graphs present the resources, challenges, and hindrances that are *largely disagreed on* as indexed by (relatively) high standard deviations (these are the 10 characteristics with the greatest variability in rating).

Least Agreed Upon as a Resource

Least Agreed Upon as a Challenge

Least Agreed upon as a Hindrance

References

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

Bakker, A. B., Hakanen, J. J., Demerouti, E., & Xanthopoulou, D. (2007). Job resources boost work engagement, particularly when job demands are high. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *99*(2), 274.

Bakker, A. B., & Sanz-Vergel, A. I. (2013). Weekly work engagement and flourishing: The role of hindrance and challenge job demands. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *83*(3), 397–409.

Bakker, A., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. (2003). Dual processes at work in a call centre: An application of the job demands–resources model. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *12*(4), 393–417.

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.

Dictionary of Occupational Titles (US), A. P. for the, & Service, U. S. E. (1993). *The new DOT: A database of occupational titles for the twenty-first century*. US Department of Labor, Employment; Training Administration, US . . . .

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.

Gerich, J. (2017). The relevance of challenge and hindrance appraisals of working conditions for employees' health. *International Journal of Stress Management*,

24(3), 270.

Landis, J. R., & Koch, G. G. (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for
    categorical data. *Biometrics*, 159–174.

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

Peterson, N. G., Mumford, M. D., Borman, W. C., Jeanneret, P. R., Fleishman, E.
    A., Levin, K. Y., Campion, M. A., Mayfield, M. S., Morgeson, F. P., Pearlman,
    K., & others. (2001). Understanding work using the occupational information
    network (o* NET): Implications for practice and research. *Personnel Psychology*,
    54(2), 451–492.

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. *Journal of Applied
    Psychology*, *92*(2), 438.

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

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

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

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.

Yentes, R. D., & Wilhelm, F. (2021). *Careless: Procedures for computing indices of careless responding.*

Figure 1. Average and standard deviation of O*Net characteristics retained as indicators of Autonomy, Cohesion, Control, Participation, and Supervisor Support.