

Job Stress and Job Satisfaction of Employeess in Family-Owned Businesses in Beijing China

XiaoyingYuan

University of the Cordilleras Baguio City 006374
YRon0517@163.com

ABSTRACT

Family businesses are essentially people businesses and are the backbone of the world economy. They generate wealth, offer jobs, and exist for longer periods of time. In any business organization, challenges will always occur. These challenges will bring forth stress not only to the employees but to management as well. Stressors hinder productivity as they negatively influence the satisfaction of the workers in performing their functions. Based on the findings of the study, the following are the derived conclusions. The level of stress experienced by employees in family-owned businesses experience is moderate. The employees have a moderate stress in terms of the demand, control and support dimensions of their job. The employees are generally satisfied with their jobs. They are satisfied with nature of the work itself, pay and other benefits, interpersonal relations, working environment and company policies. Control and Support as dimensions of stress are significantly correlated with job satisfaction and its dimensions. The relationship is negative. The negative impact of stress is felt more on satisfaction with pay and interpersonal relations. Demand is not significantly related to job satisfaction. This study intended to establish if there is a correlation between job stress and job satisfaction in a family-owned business enterprise in Beijing, China.

Keywords: *job stress; control; demand; support; job satisfaction;*

1. INTRODUCTION

This study looked into the job stress and job satisfaction of employees working for three (3) family-owned businesses in Beijing, China. Company A is a coating board paper production base founded in 2004. The company covers an area of 35,000 square meters, with domestic advanced equipment and senior technical personnel, has the right to import and export. It mainly produces specifications of single, double-sided coated whiteboard paper (flat paper, web), with an annual production capacity of more than 20,000 tons and an annual output value of about 50 million yuan. Company B is a salt chemical production base. The company as a number of advanced equipment assembly lines at home and abroad and a large number of senior technical personnel and experts research and development team. The company has the self-support import and export right, and set up an independent import and export trading company, products sold throughout the country and Japan, South Korea, Canada, Europe, the United States, the Middle East and other countries and regions. Company C is located in national economic and technological development zone. The company now has

a number of sets of advanced equipment lines at home and abroad and a large number of senior technical personnel and expert R & D team. The main research and development of sulfonate series of products, the comprehensive production capacity of more than 10,000 tons.

The importance of family businesses in the growth and development of any country cannot be overemphasized. According to Motwani (2015)[1], family business is considered as a significant source for economic growth and development in today's world. Family businesses have the potential to outperform any other form of business organization through their inherent synergies between capital and management. Family businesses are essentially people businesses and are the backbone of the world economy. They generate wealth, offer jobs, and exist for longer periods of time. A family business is a commercial organization in which management is a prime concern by multiple generations of a family. It is any type of business operation in which a group of relatives have controlling interest in the organization.

Simon and Hitt (2003)[2] said that family business enhances the prospects for firm survival by helping to create and sustain conditions of trust, identity, and norms of reciprocity and obligation. Typically, family members will hold key roles in terms of being decision makers, improving their skills and talents by hiring employees that are capable of managing other tasks. Family firms may also be viewed by family members as a source of socio-emotional wealth.

Family business is guided by the desire to build a healthy business that they want to pass on to their children. Scholars of family business argue that the firm succession is a vital part of the family business and succession can lead to an important infusion of entrepreneurial energy based on the potential of new owners and managers to rejuvenate their firms. However, the nature and degree of involvement will depend on the responsibilities that family members has within the organization (Habberson, William & McMillan, 2003)[3]. Family businesses represent the majority of firms around the world, and the research focusing on the implications of family involvement in business ventures is growing exponentially. According to Carlos, the field of family firms has been of interest to management researchers and writers as a topic of scholarly inquiry since the 1980s; however, the discipline has been largely ignored until the last decade. Also, according to Bhalla (2006)[4], research into family businesses is considered to be in an evolutionary phase and is not as voluminous as in other management areas.

Job stress and job satisfaction are important factors affecting workforce productivity. If the employees are stressed, they get sick and they are not motivated to work effectively. In the same manner, if the employees are not satisfied with their jobs, there is a high incidence of tardiness and absenteeism which has a negative impact on the work performance.

Work is a major part of life. A man needs to work in order to survive. At work however, sources of stress are inevitable and humans tend to react to these stressors leading to emotional and physical problems. Prolonged exposure to stress may lead to serious health problems.

Job stress is a condition of mental and physical exertion as a result of harassing events or dissatisfying elements of the working environment. It is caused by a multitude of demands such as inadequate fit between what we need and what we are capable of, what our environment offers and what it demands of us. It is an unpleasant emotion such as tension, frustration, anger, fear and depression resulting from aspects of the job. According to the Department of the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health in Cincinnati, USA (1999), stress is a harmful and emotional response that occurs when the requirements of the job do not match the capabilities, resources or needs of the worker. Job stress

can lead to poor health and even injury. Stress is a reaction people have to excessive pressures or other types of demand placed on them. Moreover, Allen (2002)[5] claimed that stress is a feeling that an individual experiences when he or she loses confidence in his or her capability to cope with a situation. It is a state characterized by high levels of arousal.

The effect of stress in the workplace cannot be overemphasized. According to Dendhart and Aristigueta (2016)[6], stress can lead to behavior that interferes with our relationships with others. We tend to become irritable, less patient, angry or withdrawn. We may lash out at others or react out of proportion to the situation. We are less able deal with situations calmly, effectively, and appropriately. Stress can also make us accident-prone. Furthermore, high stress levels are important elements in work-related accidents and in extreme cases, stress can also lead to workplace violence.

Job stress refers to harmful physical and emotional responses that occur when the requirements of the job do not match the capabilities, resources, or needs of the worker. Job stress matters to our health and our work. When we feel stressed, our bodies respond by raising the concentration of stress hormones in our blood. When our bodies continually respond to constant demands or threats, coping mechanisms stay in overdrive, which can be damaging to health over time. Research shows that excessive job stress can lead to many long-term health problems, including cardiovascular disease, diabetes, weakened immune function, high blood pressure, musculoskeletal disorders, substance abuse, depression and anxiety. Some short term signs of job stress are listed in the table to the right. Stressful working conditions can also impact health indirectly by limiting our ability or motivation to participate in other health promoting behaviors such as eating well and exercising. Alves, et al. (2004)[7] mentioned that Robert Karasek was one of the pioneers in the research of workplace social relations, stress-generating sources, and their repercussions on health. In the 1970's, Karasek proposed a bi-dimensional conceptual model, which related two aspects – demand and control in the workplace.

Demand refers to pressure of psychological nature, be it quantitative – e.g. time and speed in performing tasks – or qualitative – e.g. conflict between contradictory demands. Control refers to job decision latitude, the possibility a worker has of employing his or her intellectual abilities in performing job-related tasks, as well as the degree of authority the worker has for making decisions about how to perform such tasks. The Karasek model focuses on the work organization.

A third dimension, support in the workplace, was added to the model by Johnson, in 1988. This dimension is concerned with the level of social interaction between

worker and colleagues/superiors. Lack of support may also generate negative consequences to health.

One of the most widely used definitions in organizational research is that of Locke (1976)[8], who defines job satisfaction as "a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences. Others have defined it as simply how content an individual is with his or her job; whether he or she likes the job or not. It is assessed at both the global level (whether or not the individual is satisfied with the job overall), or at the facet level (whether or not the individual is satisfied with different aspects of the job (Spector (1997)[9]. Some common facets of the job satisfaction are nature of work, pay and other incentives, working environment, interpersonal relations and management policies.

Evans[10] (1999) defined job satisfaction as a state of mind encompassing all the feelings determined by the extent to which the individual perceives her or his job related needs are to be met. He proposed two concepts which are she claims could widen understanding of the job. The concept job fulfillment and job comfort correspond to his notion of what is satisfying which refers to something that gratifies or fulfills some needs and what is satisfactory which refers to a state in which one's needs are met and fulfilled.

According to Ollenbeck, Gerhart and Wright (2004), job satisfaction is a pleasant feeling resulting from the perception that one's job fulfills or allows for the fulfillment of his other needs. They asserted that job satisfaction is related to a person's values, which is defined as what a person consciously or unconsciously desires to obtain. One of the most widely used theories of motivation and satisfaction is Herzberg's two-factor theory. Also known called the motivation-hygiene theory, it relates intrinsic factors to job satisfaction and associates extrinsic factors with job dissatisfaction (Robbins and Judge, 2017). To Herzberg, the data suggest that the opposite of satisfaction is not dissatisfaction, as was traditionally believed. Removing dissatisfying characteristics from a job does not necessarily make the job satisfying. Herzberg proposed a dual continuum: The opposite of "satisfaction" is "no satisfaction," and the opposite of "dissatisfaction" is "no dissatisfaction".

Under two-factor theory, the factors that lead to job satisfaction are separate and distinct from those that lead to job dissatisfaction. Therefore, managers who seek to eliminate factors that can create job dissatisfaction may bring about peace, but not necessarily motivation. They will be placating rather than motivating their workers. The theory identified hygiene factors, which if not fulfilled, will make a person dissatisfied and if fulfilled make the person happy which leads to the absence of dissatisfaction. These hygiene factors include salary

which refers to wages, salaries and fringe benefits; job security which is reflected in the company's grievance procedures and privileges; working conditions as evidenced by adequate heat, light, ventilation and hours of work; status which is indicated by job title and their symbols of rank and position; company policies which refers to the policies of the organization and the fairness in administering policies; supervision and quality of interpersonal relationships.

If we want to motivate people on their jobs, we should emphasize factors associated with the work itself or with outcomes directly derived from it, such as promotional opportunities, personal growth opportunities, recognition, responsibility, and achievement. These are the characteristics people find intrinsically rewarding (Robbins & Judge, 2017).

Due to the importance of their presence into the economy, many researchers still consider family businesses as an increasing topic into the business management research. Family firm research has been growing over the last decade but is still an emerging field of study though it has experienced similar growth in recent years. Besides, families who have built sustainable businesses over generations are facing a problem in determining the contributing factors for meeting performance objectives. Hence, more effort is necessary to address the complexity of family companies and to understand the reasons of their excellent or poor performance.

In any business organization, problems will always occur that would cause stress and impact on the job satisfaction of the employees. It is claimed that if employees are under stress, they will not be productive. They develop negative attitude towards their job which will have a negative impact on their performance. On the other hand, a satisfied employee is motivated to work hard, improve on his or performance because he likes his job and he or she enjoys performing his or her functions.

Spector (1997)[9] defined job satisfaction as a measure of workers' contentedness with their job, whether or not they like the job or individual aspects or facets of jobs, such as nature of work or supervision. Moreover, Hulin and Judge (2003)[11] claimed that job satisfaction can be measured in cognitive (evaluative), affective (or emotional), and behavioral components. Researchers have also noted that job satisfaction measures vary in the extent to which they measure feelings about the job (affective job satisfaction) or cognitions about the job (cognitive job satisfaction).

2. DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The descriptive-correlational research design was used in this study. This method was used because the main aim of the study was to determine if there is a relationship between job stress and job satisfaction.

According to Wallen and Fraenkel (2006)[12], the major characteristic of a correlational approach is seeking out relationship or association between or among variables.

2.1 Population and Locale of the Study

The study was conducted in Beijing, China. The research was conducted in three (3) selected family-owned business companies with 100 employees. Only the rank-and- file employees were the respondents and not the managers. Table 1 shows a profile of the respondents according to sex and years of service. As revealed, majority of the respondents are males (53%). In terms of years of service, most of them have worked in the company for 5 to 6 years (19.0 %) followed by those with 7 to 8 and those with less than one year of service with 17.0%. The least number of respondents have been working for 9 to 10 years (5%).

Table1 Profile of Respondents

Demographics	f	%
Sex		
Male	47	47.0
Female	53	53.0
Total	100	100.0
Years of Service		
Less than 1-year		
1-to-2-years	17	17.0
3-to-4-years	12	12.0
5-to-6-years	20	20.0
7-to-8-years	19	19.0
9-to-10-years	17	17.0
More than 10-years	5	5.0
Total	100	100.0

The Job Stress Questionnaire was used to measure the level of job stress of the respondents. It is an adopted questionnaire from Schermer and Frabonni (1999) that measures job stress along three (3) dimensions. These dimensions are demand, support and control. The response options are as follows: Never (1), Rarely (2), Sometimes (3), Often (4), and Always (5). The questionnaire was pre-tested to 10 respondents to determine its reliability. The reliability coefficients were determined using Cronbach’s Alpha. The following are the results:

Dimension	Reliability Coefficient	Level
Demand	0.502	Moderate
Control	0.517	Moderate
Support	0.769	High
Overall	0.725	High

On the other hand, the Job Satisfaction Questionnaire was used to determine the level of job satisfaction of the respondents. It is an adopted questionnaire from Spector (1997)[9] that measures satisfaction along five (5) dimensions namely nature of work, interpersonal relations, pay and other benefits, working environment and management policies. A composite score is also determined to measure overall job satisfaction. The response options with the corresponding scale values are

as follows: Very dissatisfied (1), Dissatisfied (2), Satisfied (3) and Very Satisfied (4).

2.2 Data Gathering Procedure

After permission was granted to conduct study, the researcher with the guidance of the adviser prepared and constructed the questionnaire. To establish content validity, the researcher referred to various theories and results of previous studies pertaining to work stress and job satisfaction. The researcher also adopted some items in the questionnaire of previous researchers. After the questionnaire was drafted, it was pre-tested for reliability testing. The questionnaire was then presented to the defense panel for approval. After the approval, the researcher sought the permission of the adviser to gather data online. The data were then gathered online during the month of February 2019. The ethics of research were adhered to during the data gathering. The identity of the respondents remained anonymous and that their responses were kept strictly confidential. The data were tabulated and statistically treated using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).

3. PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

3.1 Level of Job Stress

The level of job stress is presented and discussed according to the dimensions of

demand, control and support. Table 2 presents the level of job stress of the respondents according to the dimension of demand. As shown, the sub mean of 3.24 indicates that the respondents are experiencing moderate level of stress. This is because they “sometimes” have to work very fast (3.38) and intensively (3.22), and do not have enough time to do everything (2.93). However, they “often” feel that their jobs involve conflicting demands (3.06).

Table 2. Level of Job Stress as to Demand

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Level
1. Does your work demand too much effort?	3.59	High
2. Do you have to work very fast?	3.38	Moderate
3. Do you have to work very intensively?	3.22	Moderate
4. Does your work often involve conflicting demands?	3.06	Moderate

5. Do you have enough time to do everything?	Moderate
	2.93

These findings imply that the respondents are stressed by the demands of their job

because their job occasionally requires them to work quickly and intensely (3.59). The industrial manufacturing industry is known to require workers to quickly grasp the reaction time, temperature and other data of products in the production process. The respondents also have to do a lot of things and are frequently stressed by the numerous and conflicting demands of their job. All products on the production line have a definite response time, so all actions must be completed within the specified time.

Borg (1990)[13] asserts that stress is potentially harmful to workers. The key element

is the perception of threat based on the following aspects of job circumstances: the demand being made on the worker, the worker has difficulty meeting the demand and the failure to meet the demand threatens his physical and mental well-being.

Alves, et al. (2004)[7] cited Robert Karasek who proposed a bi-dimensional conceptual model of job stress in the workplace, which are demand and control. He said that demand is pressure of psychological nature. It can be quantitative such as time and speed in performing a task or qualitative such as conflict between contradicting demands.

Stress is a reaction people have to excessive pressures or other types of demand placed on them. Moreover, Allen (2002)[5] claimed that stress is a feeling that an individual experiences when he or she loses confidence in his or her capability to cope with a demand or situation. It is a state characterized by high levels of arousal partly due to demands in the workplace.

Control. Table 3 indicates the level of job stress of the respondents according to the control dimension. As shown, the sub mean is 2.82 which indicates that the respondents are experiencing moderate level of stress. This is because they “sometimes” perceived that their work demands a high level of skill (2.72) and their job requires them to take the initiative (2.61). However, they “often” perceived that they have to do things over and over again (3.56), and “often” have a choice in deciding how to do their jobs.

Table 3 Level of Job Stress as to Control

Indicators	Weighted Level Mean	Level
6. Do you have to do the same thing over and over again?	3.56	High
		Moderate

7. Does your work demand a high level of skill or expertise?	2.72	Moderate
8. Do you have a choice in deciding how you do your work?*	2.69	Moderate
9. Does your job require you to take the initiative?*	2.61	Moderate
10. Do you have the possibility of learning new things through your work?*	2.51	

Note: * = Reversed Scored

These findings imply that the routine and repetitive nature of work in the manufacturing industry highly influences the level of stress of the respondents (3.56). For instance, workers need to re-feed raw materials into the machine every day to meet and ensure the company's production capacity targets. There are limited avenues for workers to learn new things in their line of work (2.51). Each production line only produces the corresponding products, and different production lines have different operation modes. This requires employees to clearly master and learn the knowledge and skills of the production line they are only responsible for.

Robert Karasek, as cited by Alves (2004)[7], claimed that control refers to job decision latitude, the possibility a worker has of employing his or her intellectual abilities in performing job-related tasks, as well as the degree of authority the worker has for making decisions about how to perform such tasks.

Support. Table 4 shows the level of job stress of the respondents according to dimension of support. As shown, the sub mean is 2.98 indicating that the respondents are experiencing moderate level of stress. This is brought about by the fact that the respondents sometimes enjoy working with their co-workers (3.09), have the support of their co-employees (2.99), they get the support from their supervisors (2.96), and understanding co-workers (2.92).

Table 4 Level of Job Stress as to Support

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Level
11. I enjoy working with my co-workers.*	3.09	Moderate
12. My co-workers support me.*	2.99	Moderate
13. We get on well with each other where I work.*	2.97	Moderate
14. I get on well with my supervisors.*	2.96	Moderate
15. The others understand if I have a bad day.*	2.92	Moderate

control and lack of support. Strategies to alleviate job stress are therefore urgently needed.

Hoboubi, et al. (2017)[16] investigated the job stress, job satisfaction, and workforce productivity levels of workers. Based on his result, he claimed that job stress and job satisfaction are important factors affecting workforce productivity. Moreover, results of the study showed that the levels of employees' perceived job stress and job satisfaction were moderate to high. Lack of management support was also revealed to cause stress among employees.

Table 5 shows the level of job stress among the different dimensions. As revealed, all the dimensions have mean values indicating a moderate level of stress. This means that generally, the workers experience stress but not high enough that it would negatively affect their mental and physical health. In fact, moderate stress is necessary for us to be motivated to work hard and be successful in whatever endeavor we would like to pursue.

Table 5 Level of Job Stress along the Dimensions

Dimension	Sub Mean	Level
Demand	3.24	Moderate
Support	2.98	Moderate
Control	2.82	Moderate

Kawada and Otsuka (2011)[15] conducted a study to determine the relationship between job stress, occupational position and job satisfaction. Their findings revealed that there was a significant difference in the mean score among four groups divided by the job satisfaction and members who were dissatisfied with their job showed a high job demand, limited job control, and poor support.

3.2 Level of Job Satisfaction

The level of job satisfaction of the respondents is presented and discussed along five (5) dimensions – nature of work, interpersonal relations, pay and other benefits, working environment and management policies. Nature of Work. Table 6 reveals the mean values of the indicators with the corresponding level of satisfaction. As reflected, the overall mean is 2.70 indicating that the respondents are generally satisfied with their work. Specifically, they are satisfied with the encouragement given for their effort (2.74), they consider their job as challenging and interesting (2.72), and the job is able to improve their skill and knowledge (2.70). Lowest means, although still satisfactory, by suitability and interest in the job (2.69) and the provision of required information needed for the job (2.67).

Note: * = Reversed Scored

This finding implies that the respondents are able to cope with the stress generated by the extent of support provided by their co-workers and supervisors. They feel that they are not fully supported neither is lack of support. The support is just enough for them to withstand the pressures and difficulties they experience in the work place. Generally speaking, the working atmosphere is very friendly. But sometimes the noise of the machines will affect the normal work communication of employees. It is difficult for employees to communicate smoothly in a noisy environment. The respondents stated that their co-workers sometimes do not sense whether they are having a bad day or not. Everyone may feel uncomfortable or depressed for more or less personal reasons. Everyone is an individual in a group. No one else can relate to your emotions. This lack of understanding also leads to work stress that makes you feel like you do not fit in.

According to Johnson (1988), support is concerned with the level of social interaction between worker and colleagues or superiors. Lack of support may generate negative consequences to physical and psychological well-being of the workers.

In the study of Schermer and Fraboni (2009)[14], entrepreneurs were found to have higher levels of stress associated with workload than with role ambiguity and underutilization of skills. They claimed that the result may be due to the nature of entrepreneurial activity, which is often characterized by heavy workloads, long hours, and a self-established role in the organization. Moreover, the lack of support to employees may also aggravate the stress experienced by the workers.

Kawada and Otsuka (2011)[15] conducted a study to determine the relationship between job stress, occupational position and job satisfaction. Their findings revealed that there was a significant difference in the mean score among four groups divided by the job satisfaction and members who were dissatisfied with their job showed a high job demand, limited job control, and poor support. The mean score of support for managers were significantly higher (lower support) than that for general workers. The researchers concluded that worsening of job satisfaction was related to poor job

Table 6 Level of Satisfaction along Nature of Work

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Level
1. Respect and encouragement given for my effort	2.74	Satisfied
2. Job is interesting and challenging	2.72	Satisfied
3. Ability to improve skill and knowledge from my job	2.70	Satisfied
4. Suitability and interest in the job	2.69	Satisfied
5. Provision of required information for doing the work	2.67	Satisfied

These findings imply that management is able to address the needs of the employees in relation to the nature of the job itself. Management is apparently successful in advancing the employees' love and dedication to their jobs. Also, the workers' personal growth is enhanced because they find their job as meaningful and worthwhile. In relation with the indicator with the highest mean, some of the products produced by the company cannot meet the quality standards. Besides other uncontrollable factors, there are also operational errors of employees. However, the company also has a permissible scope for employees' mistakes, under which employees are given maximum respect, recognition and encouragement. As for the lowest mean of 2.67, unclear instructions issued by the management will lead to confusion among employees, who will often make mistakes and misunderstand when they cannot fully understand the company's intention.

Mcnergy and Herbert (1995)[17] believed that workers are driven by the sense of responsibility to perform their work with passion in order to improve their lives and make a difference in the success of the organization. Furthermore, Kron, as cited in Lopez (1996)[18], stressed that job satisfaction comes with being able to find good work and knowing that it is recognized and appreciated increase job satisfaction. He claimed that job satisfaction is more than just adequate pay. According to him, job satisfaction comes with being able to find good work and knowing that is valued and recognized.

Job satisfaction relate to the nature of work if it is based on how the workers' appraise the relevance of what they are doing and that their work is valued and appreciated by their superiors hence fulfilling their need for self-worth and self-esteem (Megginson &

Mosley,2012)[19]. Moreover, Evans (1999)[10] said that job satisfaction is a state of mind encompassing all the feelings determined by the extent to which the individual perceives the extent to which his or her related needs are met.

Interpersonal Relations. Table 7 reveals the mean values of the indicators with the corresponding level of satisfaction in terms of interpersonal relations. As shown, the overall mean is 2.70 indicating that the respondents are generally satisfied with their interpersonal relations in the job. Specifically, they are satisfied with there is mutual cooperation in the organization (2.71) and their superiors trust them (2.70), Lowest means, although still satisfactory, are reflected in the indicators, appreciation given for a good work (2.68) and the care shown by superiors(2.65).

Table 7 Level of Satisfaction along Interpersonal Relations

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Level
6. Freedom of expression of problems in a free and informal atmosphere.	2.74	Satisfied
7. Mutual cooperation among people in the organization	2.71	Satisfied
8. The trust imposed on me by my superiors	2.70	Satisfied
9. Care taken in the appreciation of good work done	2.68	Satisfied
10. Care shown by the superior in learning my job	2.65	Satisfied

These findings imply that workers are appreciated and are free to express their problems to their superiors. When disharmony of the working atmosphere is caused by the disagreement of the employees on the work assignment or the slackness of some employees, management is said to conduct an equal dialogue on both sides. The findings further imply that the organization is able to satisfy the needs of the workers in terms of interpersonal relations. The workers and managers work harmoniously, they respect each other and most importantly the organization does not restrict the workers in the performance of their functions. The findings also imply that relationship in the workplace of family-owned businesses is satisfactory as management is able to meet the needs of the workers in terms of interpersonal relationship. The workers perceive that management is after their well-being as they are taken care of and that each employee trusts and supports each other. Human

relations between superiors and subordinates is of great importance in any organization. If the employees and managers work harmoniously, the workers are more motivated to perform at their best and hence become more satisfied and productive.

Salda (2009) claimed that workers are happy and perform effectively if there is a good interpersonal relationship between and among colleagues and superiors. The pleasant atmosphere keeps them open to each other resulting in closer relationship and better working conditions.

Aquino (2003)[20] states that a workplace is one in which you trust the people you work for and enjoy the company of the people you are working with. A workplace is defined by relationships. This means that to a certain extent, relationships are more important than structure. He further stressed that a workplace should provide a sense of community. It should not only be intrinsically rewarding, but it must create an environment where employees are willing to take risks that are necessary for innovation and are willing to exchange ideas and promote cooperation.

Pay and Other Benefits. Table 8 indicates the mean values of the indicators with the corresponding level of satisfaction along pay and other benefits. As shown, the overall mean is 2.84 which means that the workers are generally satisfied with the pay and other benefits provided by the organization. Specifically, they are satisfied with the sufficiency of their pay (2.93), salary that commensurate to their job (2.92), and provision of non-financial incentives (2.87). Lowest means, although still considered satisfactory, are obtained by the indicators, salary is paid on time (2.74) and clarity of the incentive system of the organization (2.73).

Table 8 Level of Satisfaction along Pay and Other Benefits

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Level
11. Sufficiency of pay to meet my expense	2.93	Satisfied
12. I am paid well enough for the job I perform	2.92	Satisfied
13. Provision for non-financial incentives or rewards	2.87	Satisfied

14. Salary is paid on time	2.74	Satisfied
15. Clarity and ability to understand the pay and incentive system of management	2.73	Satisfied

These findings imply that the organization is able to satisfactorily fulfill the financial needs of their employees. They also provide non-financial incentives that are acceptable to the workers. The companies where the respondents are employed in provide good salary and benefits package such as paid holidays and overseas travel, commission bonuses and so on. The lowest rated indicator (2.73) implies that workers do not fully understand the compensation system employed by the companies. The transparency of how salaries are given and benefits are awarded is apparently low, as management does not completely disclose the nuances of their system.

According to Mertler (2002)[21], the level of satisfaction of individuals with certain aspects of their work context may affect their willingness to respond to enrich their work. Those who are relatively satisfied with job security, supervision, pay and other benefits tend to respond more positively.

Punzalan (1997) claimed that there are factors that cause dissatisfaction in the job. One of these factors is salary. He said that if there is inadequate wage and fringe benefits, the workers are more likely to be dissatisfied. However, in one study, it was revealed that some employees are satisfied despite low benefits that they receive.

According to Seyfarth (2005)[22], the idea of merit pay, bonuses and other benefits attract talented people and motivate them once they have joined the organization. A good reward system fosters personal growth and development and keep talented people from leaving. Hoy and Miskel (2004)[23] explained that motivation to work harder is related to pay. The more employees receive a pay for performance, the more they are satisfied and produce higher quality and quantity of work.

Working Environment. Table 9 shows the mean values of the indicators with the corresponding level of satisfaction along work environment. As revealed, the overall mean is 2.52 indicating that the workers are generally satisfied with this aspect of their job. Specifically, they are satisfied with the availability of a pleasant working environment (2.59), lighting and ventilation (2.55) and adequacy of working space or area (2.51). However, they are dissatisfied the efficiency of

the tools and equipment that they use in their job (2.44) and implementation of safety standard in the organization(2.49).

Table 9 Level of Satisfaction along Working Environment

Indicators	Weighted Level Mean	
16. Availability of pleasant physical environment	2.59	Satisfied
17. Provision of lighting and ventilation facilities at the work place	2.55	Satisfied
18. Adequacy of working (floor) area to work efficiently	2.51	Satisfied
19. Implementation of safety standard in the organization	2.49	Dissatisfied
20. Efficiency of the equipment and tools at the work place	2.44	Dissatisfied

These findings imply that all the needs of the workers with regard to the working conditions in the workplace are not fully provided by the organization. The working environment is said to be clean, spacious and bright. However, the tools and equipment they are using are apparently not in good condition and are malfunctioning. Moreover, the workers do not feel safe in the workplace because safety standards are not well met. Apart from old equipment used in production, there is poor utilization and maintenance of tools and machinery.

Environmental conditions in the work place are important in enhancing job satisfaction. Employees who work in a comfortable environment with enough space and amenities tend to like their jobs and hence, more likely to be satisfied and productive. According to Ivancevich, Konopaske and Matteon (2008)[24], the Herzberg’s theory identified some factors, the presence of which results in the absence of dissatisfaction. Herzberg called these factors as hygiene factors. The hygiene factors include status and security, money and working conditions among others. Hilgert and Leonard (2004) that hygiene factors such as working conditions are important as they serve primarily to maintain

reasonable level of job motivation. Good working conditions must be maintained so that business organizations will remain to be competitive.

Management Policies. Table 10 shows the mean values of the indicators with the corresponding level of satisfaction in terms of management policies. As reflected, the overall mean is 2.64 indicating that the respondents are generally satisfied with the policies, rules and regulations of the organization. Specifically, they are satisfied with policies on career growth and opportunities (2.71), evaluation policies (2.69) and that companies are the fair and just to the employees (2.66). The lowest means, although still satisfactory, are reflected in the indicators, focus on organizational development (2.57)and on policies that create conducive working environment (2.55).

Table 10 Level of Satisfaction along Management Policies

Indicators	Weighted Level Mean	
20. Career opportunities and growth of employees are considered in the company policies	2.71	Satisfied
21. Implementation of policies on periodic measurements of individual efficiency	2.69	Satisfied
22. Company policies are generally fair and just to the employees	2.66	Satisfied
23. Organizational development is the main focus of the policies	2.57	Satisfied
24. The policies of management create conducive work environment	2.55	Satisfied

The above findings imply that the company considers and respects employees’ personal development plans (22.71). Management encourages employees to participate in vocational skills training, as well-trained workers are known to positively contribute to productivity. The workers perceive that the implementation of company policies are within the bounds of law as fair and just. Company policies are claimed by the theory of Herzberg as one of the dissatisfiers. Just and fair company policies increase the absence of job dissatisfaction. If there is absence of dissatisfaction, employees are happy which can make

them more productive. The indicator with the lowest weighted mean (2.55) implies that the working atmosphere created by the company's policies is not good enough to fully achieve employee satisfaction.

It was revealed that factors that employees complain about include work environment and poor company policies and human relations. In the theory of Herzberg, these factors tend to dissatisfy rather than to motivate.

Table 11 shows a summary of the level of satisfaction of the respondents along the different respondents. Although, the respondents are satisfied with all the dimensions of job satisfaction, they are most satisfied with pay and other benefits, the nature of their work and the interpersonal relationships prevailing in the workplace. They are satisfied with management policies but least satisfaction is felt in working conditions.

Table 11 Level of Satisfaction according to Dimension

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Level
Pay and Other Benefit	2.84	Satisfied
Nature of Work	2.70	Satisfied
Interpersonal Relations	2.70	Satisfied
Management Policies	2.64	Satisfied
Working conditions	2.52	

These findings imply that the needs of the workers in the company are well provided by the management. The

Table 12 Correlation between Job Stress and Job Satisfaction

Job Stress	Job Satisfaction					
	Nature of Work	Inter-Personal Relation	Pay and Other Benefits	Working Environment	Management Policies	Overall
Demand	.050	.044	.049	.121	.049	.035
Control	-.458**	-.663**	-.713**	-.303**	-.523**	-.649**
Support	-.564**	-.711**	-.932**	-.405**	-.621**	-.784**

These findings imply that stress in terms of control and support has an adverse impact on job satisfaction

companies are after the physical and psychological well-being of their employees as reflected by the positive feedback of the respondents in terms of their satisfaction in the different aspects of their job. Job creation and higher living standards have long been key objectives for the Chinese government, and the past decade has seen a steady rise in the minimum wage of workers (China Labour Bulletin, 2019). Labor costs have risen rapidly in China's manufacturing sector. Chinese factory workers are now getting paid more than ever, more than the hourly manufacturing wages in India, and is more on par with countries such as Portugal and South Africa.

3.3 Relationship between Job Stress and Job Satisfaction

The relationship between job stress and job satisfaction is presented and discussed according to its various dimensions. Table 12 presents the computed correlation coefficients. As indicated, the correlation coefficients between job stress along demand and job satisfaction in terms of the dimensions, nature of work (.050), interpersonal relations (.044), pay and other benefits (.049), working environment (.121), management policies (.049), and overall satisfaction (.035) are not significant. These findings mean that there is no significant relationship between these variables.

In terms of the relationship between job stress along control and job satisfaction and its dimensions, nature of work (-.458), interpersonal relations (-.663), pay and other benefits (-.713), working environment (-.303), management policies (-.523) and overall satisfaction (-.649), it is revealed that the computed correlations are all significant at the .01 level. All the correlation coefficients are negative which implies that there is an inverse relationship between the variables. As stress level along control increases there is a corresponding decrease in job satisfaction and vice versa.

among workers in family-owned businesses. That is, the higher the level of stress experienced by the workers, the

lower is their job satisfaction. The negative impact of stress brought about by control and support is detected more in pay and other benefits followed by interpersonal relations. In the study of Kawada and Otsuka (2011)[15], a logistic regression was conducted to find out the contribution of job stress to job satisfaction. Their analysis revealed that job control and support contributed significantly to job satisfaction. In addition, unskilled manual workers showed significantly higher job dissatisfaction compared with clerical workers. The researchers concluded that worsening of job satisfaction was related to poor job control and lack of support.

The study of Barkdoll (1991)[26] found a differential connection between stress and job satisfaction. He reported that the most satisfied workers have low stress levels while the least satisfied workers have higher levels of stress. Bemana, et al (2003)[25] conducted a study to determine the relationship between job stress and job satisfaction. The results of their study revealed that there is a significant negative relationship between job stress and job satisfaction. The result also shows that there is no significant difference between two genders in job stress and job satisfaction.

4. STRATEGIES TO COMBAT JOB STRESS AND IMPROVE JOB SATISFACTION

4.1 Occupational Health and Safety

Management should ensure strict and full implementation of occupational safety and health standards. A health and safety committee should be organized to administer and enforce safety rules and provisions, as well as inspect, investigate and review matters pertaining to safety and health.

4.2 Relaxation Training

Encourage employees to practice relaxation techniques such as exercises or yoga.

The company must give attention to leisure and recreational activities in the workplace.

4.3 Attitude Adjustment

Encourage employees to adopt healthy attitude to increase their tolerance to stress.

Develop resilience and optimism.

4.4 Social support

People are social beings. The company must design some socialization activities that would encourage the employees to interact with each other. Social and emotional support may come in the form of

understanding and sympathetic listening, which in turn reduce anxiety. Tangible support may take the form of helping with a task or providing resources to assist someone in distress.

4.5. Time Management

Time pressures coupled with too much demand are a major source of stress. Employees and management must establish and reaffirm priorities. Management may come up with detailed scheduling for employees. Draw a chart to monitor what has been accomplished as well as target dates for accomplishment so that specific tasks are delegated at a designated time.

5. CONCLUSION

This chapter presents the conclusions inferred from the findings as offshoot of the issues identified and the recommendations drawn from the implications of the results of the study.

Based on the findings of the study, the following are the derived conclusions: The employees of family-owned businesses are resilient in dealing with stress generated in their workplace. Family-owned businesses are able to adequately satisfy the needs of their employees.

REFERENCES

- [1] Motwani, B. (2015) Impact of Factors of Family Business on the Performance: A PLS-SEM Study. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Organization Management*, 5: 183.
- [2] Sirmon DG, Hitt MA (2003) Managing resources: Linking unique resources, management, and wealth creation in family firms. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice* 27: 339-358.
- [3] Habbershon TG, Williams M, MacMillan IC (2003) A unified system perspective of family firm performance. *Journal of Business Venturing* 18: 451-465.
- [4] Bhalla A, Henderson S, Watkins D (2006) A multi-paradigmatic perspective of strategy: A case study of an ethnic family firm. *International Small Business Journal* 24: 515-537.
- [5] Allen, D. (2002). *Promoting resilience in your child*. Washington D.C. Heldref Publications.
- [6] Denhardt, R. & Aristigueta, M. (2016). *Managing human behavior in public and non-profit organizations*. Sage Publications.
- [7] Alves, M., Chor, D., Faerstein, E. Lopes, C., & Werneck, G. (2004). Short version of the "job stress scale": A Portuguese-language adaptation. *Rev Saude Publica*. 38(2).

- [8]Locke, E.A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M.D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp.1297-1349). Chicago: Rand McNally.
- [9]Spector, P.E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes and consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- [10]Evans, L. (1999). *Managing to motivate*. London: Taylor and Francis.
- [11]Hulin, C. L., & Judge, T. A. (2003). Job attitudes. In W. C. Borman, D. R. Liden, & R. J. Klimoski (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology: Industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 255-276). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- [12]Frankel, J. & Wallen, N. (2006). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- [13]Borg, J. (1990), *Stress and patient safety*. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill Books.
- [14]Schermmer, & Fraboni (1999). An evaluation of job stress of the Job Stress Questionnaire with a sample of entrepreneurs. *Journal of Business and Psychology*. 13 (3).
- [15]Kawada, T. & Otsuka, T. (2011). Relationship between job stress, occupational position and job satisfaction. *PubMed*, 40(4).
- [16]Hoboubi, N., Choobineh, A. Ghanavati, F., Kesharvarzi, S, & Hosseini, A. (2017). The impact of job stress and job satisfaction on workforce productivity in an Iranian Petrochemical Industry. *Saf Health Work*. 2017 Mar; 8(1): 67–71.
- [17]Mcnergy, R.F. & Herbert, J.M. (1995). *Foundations of Education*. New York: Alvin and Bacon.
- [18]Lopez, E. (1996). *Job satisfaction and work values of teachers*. Master's thesis. Philippines.
- [19]Megginson. L.C. & Mosley, D.C. (2012). *Management: Concepts and applications*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- [20]Aquino, G.V. (2003). *Effective management*. Manila: National Bookstore.
- [21]Mertler, C. (2002). *Management of secondary education*. New Delhi: Sage.
- [22]Seyfarth, J. (2005). *Human resources management for effective schools*. Virginia Commonwealth university. Pearson Educational Inc.
- [23]Miskel, c.G. & Hoy, w.K. (2004). *Educational administration*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- [24]Pearson AW, Carr JC, Shaw JC (2008) Toward a theory of familiness: A social capital perspective. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 32: 949-69.
- [25]Bemana, S., Moradi, H., Ghasemi, M., Taghavi, S. & Ghayoor, M. (2013). The relationship among job stress and job satisfaction in Municipality Personnel in Iran. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 22 (2).
- [26]Barkdoll, S.L.(1991). Positive affect, self-management and stress in job satisfaction. *Educational Research*. University of Tennessee