



Work stress, work motivation and their effects on job satisfaction for community health workers in China

| | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| Journal: | <i>BMJ Open</i> |
| Manuscript ID: | bmjopen-2014-004897 |
| Article Type: | Research |
| Date Submitted by the Author: | 21-Jan-2014 |
| Complete List of Authors: | Li, Li; School of Public Health, Harbin Medical University, Department of Health Management Zhou, Hao; Center for Disease Control and Prevention, Department of Emergency Hu, Hongyan; The Second Affiliated Hospital, Harbin Medical University, Research Service Office He, Changzhi; School of Public Health, Harbin Medical University, Department of Health Management Fan, Lihua; School of Public Health, Harbin Medical University, Department of Health Management Liu, Xinyan; School of Public Health, Harbin Medical University, Department of Health Management Zhang, Zhong; School of Public Health, Harbin Medical University, Department of Health Management Li, Heng; School of Public Health, Harbin Medical University, Department of Health Management Sun, Tao; School of Public Health, Harbin Medical University, Department of Health Management |
| Primary Subject Heading: | Health services research |
| Secondary Subject Heading: | Public health |
| Keywords: | Human resource management < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Organisational development < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Organisation of health services < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT |
| | |

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Work stress, work motivation and their effects on job satisfaction for community health workers in China

Li Li*¹, Hao Zhou², Hongyan Hu³, Changzhi He¹, Lihua Fan¹, Xinyan Liu¹, Zhong Zhang, Heng Li¹, Tao Sun¹

¹ Department of Health Management, School of Public Health, Harbin Medical University, Harbin, China

² Department of Emergency, Center for Disease Control and Prevention, Harbin, China

³ Research Service Office, The Second Affiliated Hospital, Harbin Medical University, Harbin, China

Correspondence to Li Li: lilihmu@gmail.com

Abstract

Objective: It has been well documented that both work stress and work motivation are key determinants of job satisfaction. The aim of this study is to examine the level of work stress and work motivation and their contribution to job satisfaction among community health workers in Heilongjiang Province, China.

Methods: A cross-sectional survey of 930 community health workers from six cities in Heilongjiang province, China, was conducted from

1
2
3
4 October 01, 2012 to December 31, 2012. Multi-stage sampling
5
6 procedures were used to measure socio-economic and demographic status,
7
8 work stress, work motivation and job satisfaction. Logistic regression
9
10 analysis was performed to assess key determinants of job satisfaction.
11
12

13
14 **Results:** There were significant differences in some subscales of work
15
16 stress and work motivation by some of socio-economic characteristics.
17
18 Dissatisfied respondents had significant higher levels in overall
19
20 perception and five subscales of work stress than satisfied workers.
21
22 However, satisfied respondents had higher levels in overall perception
23
24 and five subscales of work motivation than dissatisfied respondents, with
25
26 the exception of finance motivation. The main determinants of job
27
28 satisfaction were occupation; age; title; income; the career development
29
30 and wages & benefits subscales of work stress; and the recognition,
31
32 responsibility and finance subscales of work motivation.
33
34
35
36
37

38
39 **Conclusion:** The finding of this study suggested that there is considerable
40
41 room for improvement in job satisfaction among community health
42
43 workers of Heilongjiang Province in China. Health care managers should
44
45 take both work stress and work motivation into consideration, since two
46
47 subscales of work stress and one subscale of work motivation negatively
48
49 influenced job satisfaction and two subscales of work motivation
50
51 positively influence job satisfaction.
52
53
54

55 56 57 **Article summary** 58 59 60

Article focus

- What is the mean value of overall perception and subscales of work stress and work motivation in respect to the level of job satisfaction?
- What is facet score of work stress and work motivation by socio-economic and demographic status?
- How can work stress and work motivation influence job satisfaction among community health workers?

Key message

There is considerable room for improvement in job satisfaction among community health workers and health care managers should take both work stress and work motivation into consideration.

Strength and limitations of this study

This study is one of the first of its kind to examine the combined effects of work stress and work motivation on job satisfaction among urban community workers in China since the implementation of new health system reform. The instrument used in this study was not an international commonly scale and the survey was conduct by self-administrated method.

Introduction

In 2009, the Chinese central government promulgated a new health system reform plan and called for the development of community health service. As the foundation of the three-tier health system in China,

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

CHCs played a very important role in improving access to health care service, enhancing equity and reducing hospitalization and costs.¹⁻²

From 2009 to 2012, the number of community health institutions increased 6254 and the number of visits in them increased 193.949 million person-times. So, community health centers and workers thereof, are very important in the process of health system reform.

Heilongjiang Province is located in Northeast China with population of about 38.1 million. There are 776 urban community health institutions with 13100 health workers as of December 31, 2012.³ However, limited resources, shortage of skilled health workers constituted a very important bottleneck to service and many of community health workers experienced work related stress and had low motivation.⁴⁻⁵ Lots of research has shown that work stress and work motivation can greatly affect the workers' job satisfaction and in turn the quality and delivery of health care. While, few studies have specifically evaluated the level of work stress and motivation and their effects on job satisfaction among Chinese community health workers after the implementation of the new health system reform policy.

Work stress can be defined as the harmful physical and emotional responses that occur when job requirements do not match the worker's capabilities, resources, and needs of the workers and Cooper believed that stress resulted from a misfit between individuals and their environment.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

⁶⁻⁷ A survey conducted by international survey research of Chicago reported that forty percent of these peoples said they had too much pressure at work.⁸ Kazufumi, et al identified major work stress factors in an organization.⁹⁻¹¹ Lots of research has been conducted on the relationship between work stress and job satisfaction and found kinds of work related stress lead to job dissatisfaction.^{10,12-15}

Work motivation can be defined as an individual's degree of willingness to exert and maintain an effort towards attaining organizational goals and Nahavandi and Malekzadeh believed that motivation was a driver of stable mind, aspiration or interest within the individual that can translate into action.¹⁶⁻¹⁸ It can be inferred from these definitions that to motivate workers is to stimulate them or cause them to desire to do something. Patrick and Wilbroad developed a tool to measure health worker motivation and revealed the major determinants of higher motivation.¹⁹⁻²⁰ Tribolet explored the relationship between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation.²¹ Pool found significant positive association between work motivation and job satisfaction, whereas Stringer revealed that intrinsic motivation was positively associated with job satisfaction and extrinsic motivation was negatively associated with job satisfaction.²²⁻²³

In China, Ge (2011) analyzed the relationship between work stress and job satisfaction among Chinese community health workers and

1
2
3
4 identified key predictors of job satisfaction.²⁴ Chen (2012) investigated
5
6 the relationship between work motivation, work stress and job
7
8 satisfaction toward cross-strait employees in Taiwan and mainland
9
10 China.²⁵
11

12
13
14 This study focused on the major factors of work stress and
15
16 motivation demonstrated in research findings and provided an overview
17
18 from community health workers' perspective of work stress and
19
20 motivation factors.^{11, 26-28} The purpose of this study was to assess the
21
22 determinants of job satisfaction among community health workers in one
23
24 Chinese province. A cross-sectional survey was conducted to measure the
25
26 level work stress, work motivation and job satisfaction. The key
27
28 determinants of job satisfaction for community health workers were
29
30 assessed with special attention devoted to work stress and work
31
32 motivation.
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 **Design and methods**

40 **Samples**

41
42 A cross-sectional survey was conducted aiming at community health
43
44 workers during March 1st and October 31, 2013 in Heilongjiang Province,
45
46 China. A multi-stage, stratified sampling design was employed to ensure
47
48 study data were provincially representative. First, 6 cities (Harbin,
49
50 Qiqihar, Suihua, Jiamusi, Qitaihe, Heihe) were selected based on GDP
51
52 figures in three levels. Second, 15 community health centers were
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 randomly selected from each city. The research team visited the selected
5
6 community health centers and invited all general practitioners, public
7
8 health physician, nurses and other health technical staff to participate in
9
10 the study with the exception of those who were sick and absent. The
11
12 survey questionnaires were completed by respondents themselves in order
13
14 to ensure confidentiality. The research staff stayed in a room of the
15
16 community health center for a whole day and was available to answer any
17
18 respondents' questions. Therefore, respondents can choose their
19
20 appreciate time to complete the questionnaire (such as, when they were
21
22 not busy or their office was quiet). Finally, 980 community health
23
24 workers participated in the survey and the self-administrative
25
26 questionnaire was completed by all study subjects, yielding a response
27
28 rate of 100%. In total, there were 930 respondents but of 50 (5.1%)
29
30 were incomplete. This study was approved by Medical Ethic Committee
31
32 of Harbin Medical University.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 **Assessment tools**

45
46 The study instrument was a self-administered questionnaire and was
47
48 composed of 4 sections. Section 1 focused on the socio-economic and
49
50 demographic status of respondents.
51
52

53
54 Section 2 was used to assess the value of work stress with a 30-item
55
56 instrument developed through qualitative intensive interviews with health
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 care managers and community health workers, review of literatures and
5
6 an initial pilot study.^{11,26} These items were divided into five subscales by
7
8 factor analysis, which didn't be discussed here. These five subscales of
9
10 work stress were named as work task & role stress, career development
11
12 stress, wages & benefits stress, working relationship stress, and
13
14 organizational structure & climate stress respectively. Respondents were
15
16 asked to rate their perception of work stress on each item based on a
17
18 5-point Likert scale, very less stressful (1), less stressful (2), average (3),
19
20 stressful (4) and very stressful (5). The Cronbach's alpha value for this
21
22 study was 0.87.
23
24
25
26
27

28
29 Section 3 was used to assess work motivation. The four subscales of
30
31 work motivation, as captured in previous research and identified by factor
32
33 analysis (factor analysis didn't be discussed here), were career
34
35 development motivation, recognition motivation, responsibility
36
37 motivation and finance motivation.²⁷⁻²⁹ In this study, we referred to career
38
39 development motivation and finance motivation as extrinsic motivation,
40
41 and recognition motivation and responsibility motivation as intrinsic
42
43 motivation.^{23,28} Respondents were asked to rate their motivation intensity
44
45 on each item based on a 5-point Likert scale, very less strong (1), less
46
47 strong (2), average (3), strong (4) and very strong (5). The Cronbach's
48
49 alpha value for this study was 0.75.
50
51
52
53
54

55
56 Section 4 was used to assess job satisfaction. In this study, a
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 single-item measure was adopted in measuring overall job satisfaction.³⁰

5
6 The respondents were asked to indicate their level of job satisfaction on a
7
8 4-point Likert scale, strongly dissatisfied (1), dissatisfied (2), satisfied (3)
9
10 and dissatisfied (4).
11

12 13 **Data analysis**

14
15 Survey results were analyzed using SPSS 17.0. Descriptive analyses
16
17 included frequencies and percentages for categorical variables, means and
18
19 standard deviations (SDs) for continuous variables. Mean differences
20
21 were examined using t-test and ANOVA for relevant subgroups. And,
22
23 logistic regression was used to measure key determinants of job
24
25 satisfaction.
26
27
28
29

30 31 **Results**

32 33 **Socio-economic and demographic status of respondents**

34
35 Socio-economic and demographic status of the sample were shown in
36
37 Table 1. A majority of the participants were female (74.6%). General
38
39 practitioners accounted for 36% of community health workers surveyed,
40
41 followed by nurses (28.8%), public health physician (19.1%). In this
42
43 survey, only 18.6% of them had senior professional titles and less than
44
45 half (40.2%) of them had bachelor degree or higher. Only 19.6% of them
46
47 had monthly incomes of more than 3,000 RMB (where
48
49 \$1.00US=6.23RMB in 2012). Nearly ninety percent of respondents
50
51 worked more than 40 hours per week.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Facet scores of work stress and work motivation by socio-economic and demographic status

Results of variance analysis and further multiple comparison t-test were showed in Table 1. It indicated that there was significant difference in all of the five subscales of work stress by occupation ($p < 0.01$) and sex ($p < 0.05$), with general practitioners and male having higher levels of work stress. The wages & benefits subscale of work stress showed significant difference by educational background ($p < 0.05$) and income ($p < 0.05$). Respondents with middle professional title had significant higher level of stress in work task & role subscale ($p < 0.01$) and in relationship subscribe ($p < 0.05$). Those who were aged 35-44 and 45-54 years had significant higher level of stress in task & role subscale ($p < 0.01$).

There was no significant difference in all of the four subscales of work motivation by educational background, professional title and income. The male had significant higher level recognition and financial motivation ($p < 0.05$). Younger workers (< 25) had significantly higher level of recognition motivation ($p < 0.05$) and responsibility motivation ($p < 0.05$). A higher level of recognition motivation was expressed by general practitioners ($p < 0.05$).

Level of work stress and work motivation in respect to the level of job satisfaction

1
2
3
4 Table 2 revealed mean score of overall perception of work stress was
5
6 3.11, which was only above the mid-point of 3. Wages & benefits (3.60)
7
8 subscale of work stress ranked in the highest position, followed by work
9
10 task & role (3.31), career development (2.96), organizational structure &
11
12 climate (2.90) and relationship (2.75) subscales of work stress. (F=154.9,
13
14 p<0.001). Statistically significant differences were noted in overall
15
16 perception and the five subscales of work stress between the satisfied and
17
18 dissatisfied groups of respondents, with those who were dissatisfied
19
20 having higher levels of work stress (p<0.001).
21
22
23
24
25

26
27 Career development motivation was rated the highest level, followed
28
29 by financial, recognition and responsibility motivation (F=202.6 ,
30
31 p<0.001). Levels of overall perception of work motivation and all
32
33 subscales with the exception of financial motivation were significantly
34
35 different between the satisfied and dissatisfied groups of respondents, and
36
37 the satisfied workers had higher levels of work motivation (p<0.01).
38
39
40

41 **Determinants of job satisfaction**

42
43
44 In our study, 61.3% of respondents were satisfied with job. Table 3
45
46 presented results from logistic regression model that examined key
47
48 determinants of job satisfaction with the special attention devoted to work
49
50 stress and work motivation.
51
52

53
54 Results demonstrated that only a few demographic characteristics were
55
56 determinants of job satisfaction. And we found that when career
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

development and wages & benefits subscales of work stress increased one grade, job satisfaction decreased 32% [odds ratio (OR) =0.68, $p<0.05$] and 37% (OR= 0.63, $p<0.01$) respectively. When finance motivation increased one grade, job satisfaction would decrease 28% (OR=0.72, $p<0.01$). Whereas, when recognition motivation and responsibility motivation increased one grade, job satisfaction would increase 1.86 timeshare (OR=2.86, $p<0.01$) and 0.36 times (OR=1.36, $p<0.05$) respectively. Compared with nurses, general practitioners (OR=0.56, $p<0.01$) and public health physician (OR=0.42, $p<0.05$) had lower job satisfaction, while other technical staff (OR=1.89) had higher level of job satisfaction. Workers with no title (OR=7.02, $p<0.05$) were more satisfied than workers with senior title.

Discussion

This study was one of the first of its kind to examine the level of work stress and work motivation and their combined effects on job satisfaction among urban community workers in China since the implementation of new health system reform. These findings have significant implications for managers in their efforts to improve workers' job satisfaction.

First, managers should pay more attention to reduce workers work stress. Many of previous research have focused on the relationship between overall work stress and job satisfaction, while this study examined the level of five subscales of work stress and their effects on

1
2
3
4 job satisfaction.³¹⁻³² The results indicated that mean scores of the five
5
6 subscales of work stress in dissatisfied respondents were significant
7
8 higher than those in satisfied respondents. And the career development
9
10 and wages & benefits subscales of work stress were negatively related
11
12 with job satisfaction. The findings were consisted with previous studies
13
14 that workers were likely to report low job satisfaction if they did not
15
16 receive promotion and advancement opportunities and did not get
17
18 adequate salary.³³⁻³⁴ But this was different from some other studies.
19
20 McGown found interpersonal relationships were major stressors reported
21
22 by workers, and Lee and Callaghan found work overload was the
23
24 commonest faced by most nurses.³⁵⁻³⁷ It should be concerned that in this
25
26 study these two negative determinants of job satisfaction were ranked
27
28 first and third highest level among five subscales respectively.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36
37 Second, managers should take measures to inspire workers intrinsic
38
39 motivation. In this study, we referred to career development and finance
40
41 motivation as extrinsic motivation, while recognition and responsibility
42
43 motivation as intrinsic motivation based on literatures.^{23,38} We found that
44
45 the recognition and responsibility subscales of work motivation were
46
47 positive determinants of job satisfaction and finance motivation was
48
49 negative determinant. This was consistent with Becchetti's argument
50
51 that when workers don't work for financial incentive, they may seek
52
53 satisfaction irrespectively of the level of pay, even if the financial
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

incentive is kept to a minimum, workers may be satisfied with their job.³⁸ The “crowding-in” effect also formulated that the intrinsic motivation increases job satisfaction, whereas extrinsic motivation decreases job satisfaction (Frey, 1997).³⁹ It should be noted that in this study the level of extrinsic motivation was higher than intrinsic motivation.⁴⁰ This finding was consistent with Dermer’s study, whereas contrary to Tribolet’s study.^{41, 21}

Several reasons might have contributed to these above findings. In Heilongjiang Province the average income of health service persons in urban units was 52,564 RMB (where \$1.00US=6.23RMB in 2012) as of 2012. But in this study 80.4% of respondents’ yearly income was less than 36,000 RMB. The poor salary increased their wages & benefits stress and finance motivation.⁴² In the meanwhile, it was difficult for community health workers to get title promotion, for there were limit promotion quotas for CHCs every year in Heilongjiang Province and our study found only 18.6% of respondents had senior professional title.

As some subscales of work stress and work motivation can positively or negatively influence job satisfaction, we examined the different level of work stress and work motivation by demographic characteristics and found that managers should pay more attention to three kinds of workers. The first group workers were those aged 35-44 and 45- 54 years, who had higher level of stress in work task & role subscale and lower level of

1
2
3
4 intrinsic motivation. Similar results have been reported in Uganda, where
5
6 the middle age groups was significantly more stressed than the youngest
7
8 age group.¹⁵ This could be related to workload, difficulties and
9
10 complexity of the duties, which was usually more for 35-54 years age
11
12 workers as they were the backbone of community health service. The
13
14 second group was males. In our study, mean scores of all work stress
15
16 subscales for males tended to be higher than that for females. Consistent
17
18 with Malik's study, males had higher level in finance motivation.⁴³ But a
19
20 British study of general practitioners indicated no differences in stress
21
22 rates between males and females and David found female has more stress
23
24 in financial rewards and role ambiguity.⁴⁴⁻⁴⁵ The third group workers
25
26 were general practitioners, who experienced highest stress in all of the
27
28 five subscales and had highest career development motivation. In
29
30 community health centers, general practitioners faced more difficult and
31
32 complicated tasks and kinds of medical risks than others, and they had
33
34 lower income and less promotion opportunities than those physicians in
35
36 general hospitals.

37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 **Limitations of this study**

47
48 The findings in this study need to be viewed in light of three key
49
50 limitations. First, the instrument for assess the work stress and work
51
52 motivation was developed from earlier study and discussed with experts,
53
54 while not an international commonly scale. Second, we used a
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 cross-sectional survey, which may limit our ability to identify causal
5
6 relationships between work stress and motivation and job satisfaction.
7
8
9 Third, the measurements were conducted by self-administrated method
10
11 and respondents' cognition can be affected by emotions at that point in
12
13 time. So the common method bias and self-administrated bias might
14
15 affect the results.
16
17

18 **Conclusion**

19
20 It is important for health-care managers to improve job satisfaction of
21
22 health workers in low-resource settings. In this study, we
23
24 comprehensively examined the level of work stress and work motivation
25
26 by demographic characteristics and in respect to the level of job
27
28 satisfaction, and additionally, the key determinants of job satisfaction
29
30 were assessed using logistic regression analysis. The results indicated that
31
32 community health workers rated wages & benefits highest among five
33
34 subscales of work stress and workers extrinsic motivation were higher
35
36 than intrinsic motivation. The career development and wages & benefits
37
38 subscales of work stress and finance motivation were significant negative
39
40 determinants of job satisfaction, whereas the recognition and
41
42 responsibility subscales of motivation were significant positive
43
44 determinants.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53
54 The study findings suggested that there is considerable room for
55
56 improvement in job satisfaction in community health workers of
57
58
59
60

Heilongjiang Province in China and health care managers should take both work stress and work motivation into consideration. First they should pay more attention to three kinds of workers as they had higher work stress and extrinsic motivation. Second they should take a variety of measures to reduce career development and wages & benefits stress, as they were negative determinants of job satisfaction. Third, it is important for managers to inspire workers intrinsic motivation as it can positively influence job satisfaction.

Table 1 Facets of work stress and work motivation by socio-economic and demographic status for respondents

| | | | Work stress | | | | Work motivation | |
|-------------------------------|-----|------|------------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------|------------------------------------|-------------|
| | N | % | work task & role | career development | wages & benefits | relationship | organizational structure & climate | recognition |
| Occupation | | | | | | | | |
| General practitioner | 335 | 36.0 | 3.53 | 3.17 | 3.78 | 2.90 | 3.14 | 3.61 |
| Public health physician | 178 | 19.1 | 3.20 | 2.89 | 3.70 | 2.63 | 2.96 | 3.57 |
| Nurse | 267 | 28.8 | 3.24 | 2.95 | 3.54 | 2.76 | 2.78 | 3.53 |
| Other | 150 | 16.1 | 3.09 | 2.79 | 3.45 | 2.65 | 2.84 | 3.59 |
| F | | | 6.91** | 4.97** | 3.45** | 3.05** | 6.25** | 3.66 |
| Sex | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 236 | 25.4 | 3.44 | 3.10 | 3.77 | 2.88 | 3.12 | 3.71 |
| Female | 694 | 74.6 | 3.27 | 2.93 | 3.56 | 2.72 | 2.85 | 3.56 |
| F | | | 2.50* | 2.27* | 2.60* | 2.51* | 4.09* | 2.66* |
| Educational background | | | | | | | | |
| High school or below | 110 | 11.8 | 3.18 | 2.90 | 3.36 | 2.81 | 2.72 | 3.57 |
| Junior college | 446 | 48.0 | 3.28 | 2.94 | 3.61 | 2.74 | 2.86 | 3.57 |
| College and above | 374 | 40.2 | 3.36 | 3.00 | 3.65 | 2.73 | 3.16 | 3.60 |
| F | | | 2.30 | 0.66 | 4.21* | 0.45 | 4.02* | 3.13 |
| Age in years | | | | | | | | |
| <25 | 78 | 8.4 | 3.08 | 2.81 | 3.45 | 2.60 | 2.77 | 3.80 |
| 25-34 | 258 | 27.7 | 3.21 | 2.94 | 3.63 | 2.72 | 2.91 | 3.65 |
| 35-44 | 329 | 35.4 | 3.36 | 2.98 | 3.55 | 2.78 | 2.88 | 3.52 |
| 45-54 | 234 | 25.2 | 3.43 | 3.02 | 3.69 | 2.79 | 2.94 | 3.53 |
| ≥55 | 31 | 3.3 | 3.12 | 2.88 | 3.54 | 2.71 | 2.93 | 3.48 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-----|------|--------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| F | | | 4.71** | 1.01 | 1.36 | 1.12 | 0.83 | 2.09* |
| Title | | | | | | | | |
| Senior title | 42 | 4.5 | 3.12 | 3.11 | 3.38 | 2.69 | 2.73 | 3.37 |
| Vice-senior title | 131 | 14.1 | 3.32 | 2.92 | 3.65 | 2.63 | 2.93 | 3.46 |
| Middle title | 399 | 42.9 | 3.43 | 3.03 | 3.69 | 2.85 | 2.94 | 3.56 |
| Primary title | 299 | 32.2 | 3.20 | 2.93 | 3.54 | 2.72 | 2.87 | 3.62 |
| No title | 59 | 6.3 | 3.23 | 2.86 | 3.48 | 2.58 | 2.89 | 3.73 |
| F | | | 3.96** | 1.07 | 1.71 | 3.04* | 0.59 | 1.73 |
| Monthly income (RMB) | | | | | | | | |
| <2000 | 361 | 38.9 | 3.24 | 2.95 | 3.69 | 2.76 | 2.90 | 3.61 |
| 2000-2999 | 386 | 41.5 | 3.32 | 2.96 | 3.61 | 2.75 | 2.88 | 3.59 |
| 3000-3999 | 139 | 14.9 | 3.43 | 2.97 | 3.44 | 2.68 | 2.96 | 3.52 |
| ≥4000 | 44 | 4.7 | 3.39 | 3.03 | 3.21 | 2.93 | 2.78 | 3.44 |
| F | | | 2.11 | 0.99 | 3.14* | 2.11 | 0.99 | 0.54 |
| Working hours (per week) | | | | | | | | |
| <40 小时 | 110 | 11.8 | 3.27 | 2.82 | 3.52 | 2.82 | 2.94 | 3.96 |
| 40-47 小时 | 509 | 54.7 | 3.26 | 2.73 | 3.59 | 2.73 | 2.95 | 2.87 |
| 48-55 小时 | 250 | 26.9 | 3.36 | 2.71 | 3.62 | 2.71 | 2.93 | 2.89 |
| ≥56 小时 | 61 | 6.6 | 3.52 | 2.93 | 3.75 | 2.93 | 3.36 | 3.13 |
| F | | | 0.06 | 0.20 | 0.48 | 0.20 | 0.01* | 0.11 |

*p<0.05 **p<0.01

Table 2 Mean scores of the overall perception and subscales of work stress and work motivation in respect to the level of job satisfaction

| | Total (n=930) Mean ± SD | Level of job satisfaction | | P |
|--|----------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|
| | | Satisfied (n=570, 61.3%) | Dissatisfied (n=360, 38.7%) | |
| Work stress | | | | |
| Overall perception * | 3.11 ± 0.68 | 2.95 ± 0.68 | 3.37 ± 0.60 | P=0.000 |
| work task & role¶ | 3.31 ± 0.81 | 3.18 ± 0.82 | 3.52 ± 0.76 | P=0.000 |
| career development¶ | 2.96 ± 0.87 | 2.79 ± 0.85 | 3.22 ± 0.83 | P=0.000 |
| Wages & benefits ¶ | 3.60 ± 0.95 | 3.38 ± 0.94 | 3.95 ± 0.85 | P=0.000 |
| relationship¶ | 2.75 ± 0.79 | 2.61 ± 0.79 | 2.96 ± 0.74 | P=0.000 |
| organizational structure & climate¶ | 2.90 ± 0.79 | 2.74 ± 0.79 | 3.15 ± 0.71 | P=0.000 |
| Work motivation | | | | |
| Overall perception° | 3.80 ± 0.55 | 3.86 ± 0.55 | 3.70 ± 0.55 | P=0.000 |
| Career development† | 4.13 ± 0.57 | 4.24 ± 0.51 | 3.95 ± 0.62 | P=0.000 |
| Recognition† | 3.58 ± 0.77 | 3.66 ± 0.77 | 3.45 ± 0.77 | P=0.000 |
| Responsibility† | 3.45 ± 0.77 | 3.53 ± 0.77 | 3.32 ± 0.52 | P=0.000 |
| Finance† | 4.06 ± 0.79 | 4.02 ± 0.79 | 4.12 ± 0.80 | P=0.295 |

* Mean score of overall perception of work stress was calculated for each respondent by adding the value of each item of work stress and then divided by the numbers of all item.

°Mean score of overall perception of work motivation was calculated for each respondent by adding the value of each item of work motivation and then divided by the numbers of the item.

¶Mean score of each subscale of work stress was calculated for each respondent by adding the value of each item belongs to the subscale of work stress and then divided by the numbers of the item.

†Mean score of each subscale of work motivation was calculated for each respondent by adding the value of each item belongs to the subscale of work motivation and then divided by the numbers of the item.

Table 3 The logistic regression analysis for job satisfaction*

| | | B | Odds Ratio | 95% CI | P |
|--|--------------------------------------|-------|------------|------------|-------|
| Occupation (Reference : nurse) | General practitioner | -0.89 | 0.56 | 0.38-0.81 | 0.001 |
| | Public health physician | -1.24 | 0.42 | 0.20-0.87 | 0.021 |
| | Other technical staff | 1.48 | 1.89 | 1.04-3.44 | 0.030 |
| Sex (Reference :male) | Female | 0.36 | 1.27 | 0.83-1.95 | 0.268 |
| Educational background (Reference :High school or below) | Junior college | -0.26 | 0.76 | 0.43-1.34 | 0.342 |
| | College and above | -0.29 | 0.75 | 0.41-1.40 | 0.373 |
| Age in years (Reference : <25) | 25-34 | -0.50 | 0.60 | 0.30-1.21 | 0.151 |
| | 35-44 | 0.10 | 1.10 | 0.51-2.42 | 0.796 |
| | 45-54 | 0.03 | 1.04 | 0.45-2.35 | 0.926 |
| | ≥55 | 2.14 | 8.53 | 1.86-39.01 | 0.006 |
| Title (Reference : senior title) | Vice-senior title | 0.65 | 1.86 | 0.476-7.29 | 0.371 |
| | Middle title | 0.99 | 2.57 | 0.67-9.78 | 0.165 |
| | Primary title | 1.23 | 3.84 | 0.96-15.39 | 0.057 |
| | No title | 1.94 | 7.02 | 1.53-32.12 | 0.012 |
| Monthly income in RMB (Reference : <2000) | 2000-2999 | -0.68 | 0.50 | 0.26-0.98 | 0.051 |
| | 3000-3999 | -0.01 | 0.99 | 0.64-1.52 | 0.973 |
| | ≥4000 | 0.26 | 1.30 | 0.86-1.97 | 0.201 |
| Weekly hours worked (Reference : <40) | 40-47 | -0.10 | 0.90 | 0.59-1.37 | 0.630 |
| | 48-55 | 0.06 | 1.07 | 0.67-1.70 | 0.773 |
| | ≥56 | 0.18 | 1.20 | 0.62-2.33 | 0.582 |
| Work stress | work task & role | -0.04 | 0.98 | 0.74-1.300 | 0.915 |
| | career development | -0.36 | 0.68 | 0.49-0.94 | 0.020 |
| | wages & benefits | -0.52 | 0.63 | 0.50-0.79 | 0.000 |
| | relationship | -0.17 | 0.80 | 0.59-1.09 | 0.166 |
| | Organizational structure & climate r | -0.03 | 0.97 | 0.71-1.33 | 0.881 |

| | | | | | |
|------------------------|--------------------|-------|------|------------|-------|
| Work motivation | Career development | 0.17 | 1.13 | 0.85-1.505 | 0.399 |
| | Recognition | 1.03 | 2.86 | 2.02-4.04 | 0.000 |
| | Responsibility | 0.30 | 1.36 | 1.02-1.81 | 0.035 |
| | Finance | -0.29 | 0.72 | 0.56-0.92 | 0.009 |

*Strongly satisfied and satisfied coded as 1 vs. strongly dissatisfied and dissatisfied coded as 0.

Acknowledgements We are thankful to all the community health workers who participated in the study. We are also grateful to Yin Li, Xingsan Li, Zhuang Wang and Hongjuan Wei, who have worked closely with the team to ensure the field survey is successfully implemented.

Completing interests None.

Contributors

LL was responsible for the study design, data analysis and the drafting and revising of the manuscript. HH and CH, who contributed equally as the first author to this article, were responsible for study design, data collection and data analysis. HZ and ZZ provided statistical expertise. XL, TS and HL performed data collection and technical support. LF provided administrative support. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Funding This study was funded by the National Science Foundation of China (NSFC), Contract No.71203050/G0308; and was supported by Young Seed Foundation of Public Health College of Harbin Medical

1
2
3
4 University. The opinions expressed herein are the authors' and do not
5
6 necessarily reflect the views of NSFC and the survey was conducted
7
8 independently by researchers from Harbin Medical University.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60

References

1. Starfield B, Shi LY, Macinko J. Contribution of primary care to health systems and health. *Milbank Q* 2005;83: 457–502.
2. Hung LM, Rane S, Tsai J, et al. Advancing primary care to promote equitable health: implications for China. *Int J Equity Health* 2012;11:2.
3. Heilongjiang Provincial Bureau. Heilongjiang Health Statistical Yearbook 2012. Harbin, China: Heilongjiang Provincial Press 2013.
4. Zhou W, Dong YM, Lin XZ, et al. Community health service capacity in China: a survey in three municipalities. *J Eval Clin Pract* 2013;19:167–172.
5. Li L, Zhou H, Yao GF, et al. Analysis on working motivation of community health workers in Harbin, China. *Medicine and Society* 2013;7:40-43.
6. Park, Jungwee. Work stress and job performance. *Per Lab Inco*, 2008; 20:7-19.

- 1
2
3
4 7. Cooper CL, Cartwright S. Healthy mind; healthy organization.-A
5
6 proactive approach to occupational stress. *Human Rel*
7
8 1994;47(4):455.
9
- 10
11 8. Shellenbarger S. Are saner workloads the unexpected key to more
12
13 productivity. *Wall Str J* 1999;10.
14
- 15
16 9. Kazufumi M, Kumiko S, Hiroki F, et al. Stressor scale for clinical
17
18 research coordinators: development and psychometric testing. *J Adv*
19
20 *Nurs* 2012; 2:1636-1645.
21
- 22
23 10. Kwok BC, Gina L, Yiu CK, et al. Work stress among six
24
25 professional groups: the Singapore experience. *Soc Sci Med*
26
27 2000;50:1415-1432.
28
- 29
30 11. Cooper CL, Marshall J. Occupational sources of stress: a review of
31
32 the literature relating to coronary heart disease and mental ill health.
33
34 *J Occu Psychol* 1976;49:441-461.
35
36
- 37
38 12. Flanagan NA, Flanagan Timothy J. An analysis of the relationship
39
40 between job satisfaction and job stress in correctional nurses. *Res*
41
42 *Nurs Health* 2002;25(4):282–294.
43
44
- 45
46 13. Sveinsdottir H, Biering P, Ramel A. Occupational stress, job
47
48 satisfaction, and working environment Icelandic nurses: a
49
50 cross-sectional questionnaire survey. *Int J Nurs Stud* 2006;
51
52 43(7):875–889.
53
54
- 55
56 14. Zangaro GA, Soeken KL. A Meta-analysis of studies of nurses job
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 satisfaction. *Res Nurs Health* 2007;30, 445–458.
- 5
6 15. Nabiryephd RC, Brown KC, Pryor ER, et al. Occupational stress, job
7
8 satisfaction and job performance among hospital nurses in Kampala,
9
10 Uganda. *J Nurs Manag* 2011;19,760-768.
- 11
12
13 16. Franco LM, Bennett S, Kanfer R. Health sector reform and public
14
15 sector health worker motivation: a conceptual framework. *Soc Sci*
16
17 *Med* 2002;54:1255–1266.
- 18
19
20 17. Nahavandi, Afsaneh, Malekzadeh, et al. Organizational behavior:
21
22 The person-organization fit, Prentice Hall 1999.
- 23
24
25 18. Kanfer R. Measuring health worker motivation in developing
26
27 countries. Partnerships for Health Reform Project, Major Applied
28
29 Research Working Paper 1999.
- 30
31
32 19. Patrick MM, Duane B, Lucy G, et al. Developing a tool to measure
33
34 health worker motivation in district hospitals in Kenya. *Hum Resour*
35
36 *Health* 2009; 7:40.
- 37
38
39 20. Wilbroad M, Helen A, Virginia B, et al. Measuring health workers'
40
41 motivation in rural health facilities: baseline results from three study
42
43 districts in Zambia. *Hum Resour Health* 2013;11,8.
- 44
45
46 21. Tribolet WC. The relationship between intrinsic and extrinsic
47
48 motivation and organizational commitment: a study in a European
49
50 environment [D]. Nova Southeastern Univ 2004.
- 51
52
53 22. Pool SW. The relationship of job satisfaction with substitutes of
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 leadership, leadership behavior, and work motivation. *J Psychol*
5
6 1997;131(3):271-83.
7
8
9 23. Stringer C, Jeni D, Theivananthampillai. Motivation, pay satisfaction,
10 and job satisfaction of front-line employees. *Qual Res Acco Man*
11 2011; 8(2):161-179.
12
13
14 24. Ge C, Fu JL, Chang Y, et al. Factors associated with job satisfaction
15 among Chinese community health workers: a cross-sectional study.
16 *BMC Public Health*, 2011;11:884.
17
18
19 25. Chen TL, Huang MY, Su TH. Work motivation, work stress, and job
20 satisfaction in between Taiwan and China-An empirical study.
21 *World Acad Sci, Eng Tech* 2012; 68, 1446-1450.
22
23
24 26. Ajayi MP., Abimbola OH. Job satisfaction, organizational stress and
25 employee performance: a study of NAPIMS. *Ife Psychol*
26 2013;21:75-82.
27
28
29 27. Wayne SJ., Liden RC. Effects of impression management on
30 performance ratings: a longitudinal study. *Acad Manage J*
31 1995;38:232-260.
32
33
34 28. Gagne M, Deci EL. Self-determination theory and work motivation.
35 *J Organ Behav* 2005;26:331-362.
36
37
38 29. Dieleman M, Cuong PV, Anh, LV, et al. Identifying factors for job
39 motivation of rural health workers in North Vietnam. *Hum Resour*
40 *Health* 2003;1:10.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 30. Wanous JP, Reichers AE, Hudy MJ. Overall job satisfaction: how
5
6 good are single-item measures? *J Appl Psychol* 1997;82:247–52.
7
- 8
9 31. Blau JR, Light, SC, Chamlin M. Individual and contextual effects on
10
11 stress and job satisfaction: A study of prison staff. *Work Occup*
12
13 1986;13, 131-156.
14
- 15
16 32. Byrd TG, Cochran JK, Silverman IJ, et al. Behind bars: An
17
18 assessment of the effects of job satisfaction, job-related stress, and
19
20 anxiety on jail employees' inclinations to quit. *J Cri Justice* 2000;
21
22 23:69-89.
23
24
- 25
26 33. Lephalala RP. Factors influencing nurses job satisfaction in selected
27
28 private hospitals in England. *Curationis* 2008;31(3): 60–69.
29
30
- 31
32 34. Carr KK, Kazanowski MK. Factors affecting job satisfaction of
33
34 nurses who work in long-term care. *J Adv Nurs* 1994;19:878-883.
35
- 36
37 35. McGowan B. Self-reported stress and its effects on nurses. *Nurs*
38
39 *Stand* 2001;15(42):33–38.
40
- 41
42 36. Lee I. Wang HH. Perceived occupational stress and related factors in
43
44 public health nurses. *J Nurs Res* 2002;10(4):253–259.
45
- 46
47 37. Callaghan P, Tak-Ying SA, Wyatt PA. Factors related to stress and
48
49 coping among Chinese nurses in Hong Kong. *J Adv Nurs* 2000;31(6),
50
51 1518 –1527.
52
- 53
54 38. Becchetti L, Castriota S, Tortia EC. Productivity, wages and intrinsic
55
56 motivations. *Sma Bus Eco* 2012;41:379–399.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
39. Frey BS. On the relationship between intrinsic and extrinsic work motivation. *Int J Ind Organ* 1997;15(4),427-439.
40. Taylor FW. *Shop management*. New York: Harper 1911.
41. Dermer, Jerry. The interrelationship of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. *Acad Manage J* 1975;18(1):125-129.
42. National Bureau of Statistics. *China Statistic Yearbook 2013*. Beijing ,China: China Sta Press. 2013.
43. Malik AA, Yamamoto SS, Souares A, et al. Motivational determinants among physicians in Lahore Pakistan. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2010;10:201.
44. Rout U. Gender differences in stress, satisfaction and mental wellbeing among general practitioners in England. *Psychol Health Med*. 1999;4(4):345-354.
45. David PH, Srinika DJ. Gender differences in work stress among clinical social workers. *J Soc Serv Res* 2008;10:18.

STROBE Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cross-sectional studies*

| | Item No | Recommendation | Reported on page # |
|------------------------------|---------|---|--------------------|
| Title and abstract | 1 | (a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract | 2, 7 |
| | | (b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found | 2 |
| Introduction | | | |
| Background/rationale | 2 | Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported | 4, 5 |
| Objectives | 3 | State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses | 6 |
| Methods | | | |
| Study design | 4 | Present key elements of study design early in the paper | 7 |
| Setting | 5 | Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection | 7 |
| Participants | 6 | (a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants | 7,8 |
| Variables | 7 | Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable | 9-12 |
| Data sources/ measurement | 8* | For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group | |
| Bias | 9 | Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias | 7 |
| Study size | 10 | Explain how the study size was arrived at | 7 |
| Quantitative variables | 11 | Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why | 7-9 |
| Statistical methods | 12 | (a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding | 7-9 |
| | | (b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions | |
| | | (c) Explain how missing data were addressed | |
| | | (d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy | |
| | | (e) Describe any sensitivity analyses | |
| Results | | | |
| Participants | 13* | (a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed | |
| | | (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage | |
| | | (c) Consider use of a flow diagram | |
| Descriptive data | 14* | (a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders | |
| | | (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest | |
| Outcome data | 15* | Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures | |

| | | | |
|----|--------------------------|----|---|
| 1 | | | |
| 2 | Main results | 16 | (a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder- |
| 3 | | | adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence |
| 4 | | | interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why |
| 5 | | | they were included |
| 6 | | | <hr/> |
| 7 | | | (b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were |
| 8 | | | categorized |
| 9 | | | <hr/> |
| 10 | | | (c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into |
| 11 | | | absolute risk for a meaningful time period |
| 12 | Other analyses | 17 | Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and |
| 13 | | | interactions, and sensitivity analyses |
| 14 | | | <hr/> |
| 15 | Discussion | | |
| 16 | Key results | 18 | Summarise key results with reference to study objectives |
| 17 | Limitations | 19 | Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of |
| 18 | | | potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude |
| 19 | | | of any potential bias |
| 20 | | | <hr/> |
| 21 | Interpretation | 20 | Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering |
| 22 | | | objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar |
| 23 | | | studies, and other relevant evidence |
| 24 | | | <hr/> |
| 25 | Generalisability | 21 | Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results |
| 26 | | | <hr/> |
| 27 | Other information | | |
| 28 | Funding | 22 | Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the |
| 29 | | | present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the |
| 30 | | | present article is based |
| 31 | | | <hr/> |

*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.

BMJ Open

Work stress, work motivation and their effects on job satisfaction for community health workers: A cross-sectional survey in China

| | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| Journal: | <i>BMJ Open</i> |
| Manuscript ID: | bmjopen-2014-004897.R1 |
| Article Type: | Research |
| Date Submitted by the Author: | 13-May-2014 |
| Complete List of Authors: | Li, Li; School of Public Health, Harbin Medical University, Department of Health Management Hu, Hongyan; The Second Affiliated Hospital, Harbin Medical University, Research Service Office Zhou, Hao; Center for Disease Control and Prevention, Department of Emergency He, Changzhi; School of Public Health, Harbin Medical University, Department of Health Management Fan, Lihua; School of Public Health, Harbin Medical University, Department of Health Management Liu, Xinyan; School of Public Health, Harbin Medical University, Department of Health Management Zhang, Zhong; School of Public Health, Harbin Medical University, Department of Health Management Li, Heng; School of Public Health, Harbin Medical University, Department of Health Management Sun, Tao; School of Public Health, Harbin Medical University, Department of Health Management |
| Primary Subject Heading: | Health services research |
| Secondary Subject Heading: | Public health |
| Keywords: | Human resource management < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, PUBLIC HEALTH, Organisation of health services < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT |
| | |

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

**Work stress, work motivation and their effects on job
satisfaction for community health workers: A cross-sectional
survey in China**

Li Li*¹, Hongyan Hu², Hao Zhou³, Changzhi He¹, Lihua Fan¹, Xinyan
Liu¹, Zhong Zhang, Heng Li¹, Tao Sun¹

¹ Department of Health Management, School of Public Health, Harbin
Medical University, Harbin, China

² Research Service Office, The Second Affiliated Hospital, Harbin
Medical University, Harbin, China

³ Department of Emergency, Center for Disease Control and Prevention,
Harbin, China

Correspondence to Li Li: lilihmu@gmail.com

Abstract

Objective: It is well documented that both work stress and work motivation are key determinants of job satisfaction. The aim of this study was to examine levels of work stress and motivation and their contribution to job satisfaction among community health workers in Heilongjiang Province, China.

Design: Cross-sectional survey.

Setting: Heilongjiang Province, China.

Participants: The participants were 930 community health workers from six cities in Heilongjiang province.

Primary and secondary outcome measures: Multistage sampling procedures were used to measure socioeconomic and demographic status, work stress, work motivation, and job satisfaction. Logistic regression analysis was performed to assess key determinants of job satisfaction.

Results: There were significant differences in some subscales of work stress and work motivation by some of socioeconomic characteristics. Levels of overall stress perception and scores on all five work stress subscales were higher in dissatisfied workers relative to satisfied workers. However, levels of overall motivation perception and scores on the career development, responsibility, and recognition motivation subscales were higher in satisfied respondents relative to dissatisfied respondents. The main determinants of job satisfaction were occupation; age; title; income;

1
2
3
4 the career development, and wages and benefits subscales of work stress;
5
6 the recognition, responsibility and financial subscales of work motivation.
7

8
9 **Conclusion:** The findings indicated considerable room for improvement
10
11 in job satisfaction among community health workers of Heilongjiang
12
13 Province in China. Health care managers and policymakers should take
14
15 both work stress and motivation into consideration, as two subscales of
16
17 work stress and one subscale of work motivation negatively influenced
18
19 job satisfaction and two subscales of work motivation positively
20
21 influenced job satisfaction.
22
23

24
25
26 **Keywords:** work stress; work motivation; job satisfaction; community
27
28 health service
29

30 31 **ARTICLE SUMMARY**

32 33 **Article focus**

- 34
35 ▪How do the overall perception and subscales of work stress and
36
37 motivation relate to levels of job satisfaction?
38
- 39
40 ▪Which facets of work stress and motivation are affected by
41
42 socioeconomic and demographic status?
43
44
- 45
46 ▪How do work stress and motivation influence job satisfaction among
47
48 community health workers?
49

50
51 **Key message** There is considerable room for improvement in job
52
53 satisfaction among community health workers, and health care managers
54
55 and policymakers should take both work stress and motivation into
56
57

1
2
3
4 consideration.

5
6 **Strengths and limitations of this study**
7

8
9 This study is one of the first of its kind to examine the combined effects
10
11 of work stress and work motivation on job satisfaction among urban
12
13 community health workers in China since the implementation of new
14
15 health system reform. However, the instrument used in this study is not
16
17 a commonly used international scale, there may be an inherent bias in
18
19 self-report measures, and the small sample may limit the generalizability
20
21 of the research findings.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

INTRODUCTION

As the foundation of the three-tier health system in China, community health service institutions played a very important role in improving access to health care service, enhancing equity and improving health.¹⁻²

In 2009, the Chinese central government promulgated a new set of health system reforms and called for the development of community health services. The state established basic public health service goals, which focused on providing health education, chronic disease management, and disease prevention services for urban and rural residents. From 2009 to 2012, the number of community health service institutions increased by 6,254 and the number of visits increased by 193,949 million. Therefore, community health centers and workers thereof, are very important in the process of health system reform.

Heilongjiang Province is located in Northeast China with population of about 38.1 million. There were 410 urban community health centers (CHCs) and 366 community health stations with 13,100 health workers as of December 31, 2012.³ On average, there were 23 and 10 medical personnel in each community health center and community health station, respectively. Since the introduction of CHCs, difficulties concerning limited resources and insufficient and poorly trained staff have been present. There were 5,416 practitioners (including assistant practitioners) in community health institutions in Heilongjiang province.³ Based on the

1
2
3
4 province population and human resource planning ratios, there is an
5
6 approximate shortfall of 30% in the number of general practitioners
7
8 (5,416 vs. 7,620) in 2012.⁴ In addition, recent reforms have expanded
9
10 the scope of public health services and increased workload without
11
12 equivalent increases in staffing.^{5,6}
13
14

15
16 In some CHCs, general practitioners, public health physicians, and
17
18 nurses have been working in teams, providing medical and basic public
19
20 health services to community residents, both in the centers and during
21
22 home visits. With a late start, many of these practitioners were initially
23
24 hospital-based specialists, and majority of public health physicians did
25
26 not have a public health background. To improve skills and knowledge,
27
28 continuing medical education was compulsory and no fewer than 25
29
30 credit points were required per year. Other challenges found in the CHCs
31
32 were lower wages and fewer title promotion opportunities relative to
33
34 general hospitals. Limited resources and a shortage of skilled health
35
36 workers created very tight bottlenecks in the provision of services, which
37
38 led to many community health workers experiencing work-related stress
39
40 and low motivation for work, in addition to receiving low salaries and
41
42 restricted opportunities for promotion.⁷⁻⁸ Many studies have shown that
43
44 work stress and work motivation can greatly affect job satisfaction and, in
45
46 turn, the quality and delivery of health care. However, few studies have
47
48 focused on work stress and motivation and their effects on job
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 satisfaction among Chinese community health workers since the
5
6 implementation of the new health system reform policy.
7

8
9 Work stress is of great concern to managers, employees, and other
10
11 stakeholders in organizations. It is a complex phenomenon and has a
12
13 multitude of definitions in a variety of theoretical models.⁹ According to
14
15 Lazarus and Folkman's cognitive theory of stress and coping, work stress
16
17 was defined as the interaction between the individual and the
18
19 environment.¹⁰ This theory suggested that when demands from the
20
21 environment exceed the available resources, the result was either stress or
22
23 coping, depending on the individual's appraisal of the stressors. Karasek's
24
25 demand-control model assumed that psychological strain resulted from
26
27 the joint effects of work demands and the degree of decision-making
28
29 freedom available to workers facing the demands.¹¹ The effort-reward
30
31 imbalance model proposed that work stress resulted from a mismatch
32
33 between high commitment and effort at work and low rewards, including
34
35 salary, recognition, and career promotion.¹² Nakasis and Ouzouni defined
36
37 work stress as the harmful physical and emotional responses that occur
38
39 when job requirements do not match workers' capabilities, resources, and
40
41 needs.¹³ In general, a greater imbalance between demands and individual
42
43 abilities will result in greater stress.¹⁴ Riggio classified work stress into
44
45 work task stress and work role stress.¹⁵ Cooper and Marshall's model of
46
47 job stress proposed that intrinsic requirements of the job, role within the
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 organization, career development, organizational structure and climate,
5
6 and relationships at work constituted the domain of work-related stress
7
8 within an organization.¹⁶ In our study, five subscales of work stress were
9
10 named based on this model. Existing research has identified heavy
11
12 workload, insufficient resources, work relations, lack of professional
13
14 respect, and lack of promotion opportunities as possibly the most salient
15
16 work stressors for community health workers.¹⁷⁻¹⁹ Long-term stress may
17
18 not only be harmful to the health workers themselves but may also affect
19
20 community health service centers through employee dissatisfaction,
21
22 burnout, poor performance, or turnover intention.^{20,21-24} Therefore, it is
23
24 important to reduce work stress.
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 Work motivation can be defined as the degree of an individual's
32
33 willingness to exert and maintain an effort towards attaining
34
35 organizational goals.²⁵ It reflected the interactions between workers and
36
37 their work environments. Nahavandi and Malekzadeh believed that
38
39 motivation represented a stable mind, aspiration, or interest within the
40
41 individual and can translate into action.²⁶ Motivation theory examined the
42
43 process of motivation and explained why people at work behave the way
44
45 they do in terms of efforts. Building on Vroom's expectancy-valence
46
47 theory of motivation, Porter and Lawler proposed a model of intrinsic and
48
49 extrinsic work motivation.^{27,28} This model suggested that intrinsic and
50
51 extrinsic rewards were additive, and accounted for total job satisfaction.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Intrinsic motivation refers to doing something for the inherent satisfaction involved and is highly autonomous (i.e., self-regulated). In contrast, extrinsic motivation means doing something in order to obtain a separable outcome (i.e. tangible or verbal rewards).^{29,30} Peters identified job content and work environment, extrinsic benefits, autonomy and security, and transparency as factors in work motivation for health workers using factor analysis.³¹ Patrick and Wilbrod developed a tool to measure health worker motivation and revealed that organizational commitment, conscientiousness, intrinsic job satisfaction, timeliness and attendance were the major determinants of higher motivation.³²⁻³³ Tribolet explored the relationship between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation.³⁴ Hoonakker found that nurses appreciated challenges and opportunities for new learning and teamwork.³⁵ Pool explored the significant positive association between work motivation and job satisfaction, whereas Stringer found that intrinsic motivation was positively associated, and extrinsic motivation negatively associated with job satisfaction.³⁶⁻³⁷

In China, previous studies have reported that poor competency and excessive workload were key work stressors among community health workers.^{7,19} Shi suggested that policymakers should focus on training and educational opportunities for primary care workers and consider ways to reduce workload stress and improve salaries.³⁸ Hung identified professional development, training opportunities, living environment,

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
benefits, and working conditions as the most important motivating factors
for primary care providers in China.³⁹ Ge analyzed the relationship
between work stress and job satisfaction among Chinese community
health workers and reported that a degree of freedom in decision making
and good workplace relationships were positive predictors of job
satisfaction.⁴⁰ Chen investigated relationships between work motivation,
work stress and job satisfaction in cross-strait employees in Taiwan and
mainland China.⁴¹

24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
The present study focused on the major factors affecting work stress
and motivation identified in previous research and provided an overview
of community health workers' perspectives of work stress and motivation
factors.^{16, 42-44} The purpose of this study was to assess the predictors of
job satisfaction among community health workers in one Chinese
province. A cross-sectional survey was conducted to measure levels of
work stress, work motivation and job satisfaction. The key predictors of
job satisfaction for community health workers were assessed with special
attention devoted to work stress and motivation.

49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60

METHODS

Sample

A cross-sectional survey of community health workers was conducted
from March 1 to October 31, 2013 in Heilongjiang Province, China.

1
2
3
4 Based on the literature about community health services in China, a
5
6 multistage, stratified sampling design was employed to ensure that study
7
8 data were provincially representative.^{7,40} First, six cities (Harbin,
9
10 Qiqihar, Suihua, Jiamusi, Qitaihe, and Heihe) were selected based on
11
12 GDP figures and three levels of the development of the community health
13
14 service. Second, 15 community health centers were randomly selected
15
16 from each city. On average, there were 22 medical personnel in each of
17
18 the selected community health centers. Third, 60% of general
19
20 practitioners, public health physicians, nurses and other health technical
21
22 staff in each center were chosen randomly, with the exception of those
23
24 who were absent. The research team invited all the selected staff
25
26 members to participate in the study. The questionnaire included a cover
27
28 page explaining the purposes and procedures of the study. The data were
29
30 collected anonymously and the respondents completed the survey
31
32 questionnaires privately to ensure confidentiality. Respondents were
33
34 assured that participation in the survey was voluntary, and the return of
35
36 questionnaires represented informed consent. The research staff stayed at
37
38 the community health center and answered respondents' questions during
39
40 the process of survey completion. Respondents were able to choose the
41
42 best time to complete the questionnaire, such as when they were not busy
43
44 or their offices were quiet. Most completed questionnaires were collected
45
46 on site by the investigator on the day of the visit. If some respondents did
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 not finish that day, investigators set a date to retrieve the questionnaires.
5
6 Respondents were asked to seal the completed questionnaires into
7
8 individual envelopes provided by the research team. The questionnaire
9
10 was relatively brief and no private personal information was collected.
11
12 There were 980 questionnaires delivered to community health workers,
13
14 all of which were returned. However, 50 (5.1%) were incomplete or even
15
16 blank, which left 930 valid questionnaires. This study was approved by
17
18 Medical Ethic Committee of Harbin Medical University.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 **Assessment tools**

27
28 In the present study, Porter and Lawler's intrinsic and extrinsic
29
30 motivation model, and Vroom's expectancy-valence motivation theory
31
32 were used to analyze the relationship between work motivation and job
33
34 satisfaction. Lazarus and Folkman's cognitive theory of stress and
35
36 coping, and Karasek's demand-control model were used to analyze the
37
38 relationship between work stress and job satisfaction.¹⁰⁻¹¹
39
40
41
42
43

44 The study instrument was part of a self-administered questionnaire
45
46 composed of four sections. Section 1 focused on respondents'
47
48 socioeconomic and demographic status.
49
50

51 Section 2 assessed work stress. Thirty items related to work stress
52
53 were developed through intensive qualitative interviews with
54
55 policymakers, health care managers and community health workers, a
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 review of the literature, and an initial pilot study.^{16,42} Then factor analysis,
5
6 which was not discussed in this paper, yielded a five-subscale structure
7
8 that comprised a total of 26 items. The five-subscale solution accounted
9
10 for 69.43% of the overall variance, and was found to be internally
11
12 consistent (overall Cronbach's $\alpha=0.87$). Based on Cooper and Marshall's
13
14 model of job stress, these five subscales of work stress were named work
15
16 task and role, career development, wages and benefits, workplace
17
18 relationships, and organizational structure and climate stress.¹⁶ They
19
20 individually accounted for 16.05%, 25.10%, 12.00%, 9.08% and 7.20%
21
22 of the overall variance, respectively, and the Cronbach's Alpha within
23
24 individual subscale ranged from 0.85 to 0.90. Respondents were asked to
25
26 rate their perception of work stress on each item based on a 5-point Likert
27
28 scale, very less stressful (1), less stressful (2), average (3), stressful (4)
29
30 and very stressful (5). The Cronbach's alpha value for this study was
31
32 0.87.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 Section 3 assessed work motivation. Twenty-one items were
42
43 developed based on previous research, panel discussions, and an initial
44
45 pilot study.⁴³⁻⁴⁵ Then 3 items were deleted and the 18 retained items were
46
47 divided into four subscales by factor analysis, which was not discussed in
48
49 this paper. The four-subscale solution accounted for 65.10% of the overall
50
51 variance, and was found to be internally consistent (overall Cronbach's
52
53 $\alpha=0.75$). The subscales were renamed based on the conceptual meaning
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 of the items and comprised: career development, recognition,
5
6 responsibility, and financial motivation. They individually accounted for
7
8 21.20%, 19.40%, 14.60% and 9.90% of the overall variance, and the
9
10 Cronbach's Alpha within individual subscale ranged from 0.82 to 0.89.
11
12 According to Porter and Lawler's intrinsic and extrinsic motivation
13
14 model, we defined career development and financial motivation as
15
16 extrinsic motivation, and recognition and responsibility motivation as
17
18 intrinsic motivation.^{28,44} Respondents were asked to rate their motivation
19
20 intensity on each item based on a 5-point Likert scale, very less strong (1),
21
22 less strong (2), average (3), strong (4) and very strong (5).
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 Section 4 assessed job satisfaction. In this study, a single-item
30
31 measure was used to measure overall job satisfaction.⁴⁶ Respondents
32
33 were asked to indicate their level of job satisfaction on a 4-point Likert
34
35 scale, strongly dissatisfied (1), dissatisfied (2), satisfied (3) and
36
37 dissatisfied (4). During the process of data analysis, strongly satisfied and
38
39 satisfied were coded as 1, while strongly dissatisfied and dissatisfied were
40
41 coded as 0.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 **Data analysis**

50
51 Survey results were analyzed using SPSS 17.0. Descriptive analyses
52
53 included frequencies and percentages for categorical variables and means
54
55 and standard deviations (SDs) for continuous variables. Mean differences
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 were examined using t-tests and ANOVAs for relevant subgroups. We
5
6 used logistic regression to measure the key predictors of job satisfaction
7
8 because the dependent variable (job satisfaction) was a binary variable,
9
10 which made linear regression unsuitable.
11
12

13 14 15 16 **RESULTS**

17 18 **Socioeconomic and demographic status of respondents**

19
20 Socioeconomic and demographic status of the sample were shown in
21
22 Table 1. A majority of the participants were female (74.6%). General
23
24 practitioners accounted for 36% of community health workers surveyed,
25
26 followed by nurses (28.8%), public health physician (19.1%). In this
27
28 survey, only 18.6% of them had senior professional titles and less than
29
30 half (40.2%) of them had bachelor degree or higher. Only 19.6% of them
31
32 had monthly incomes of more than 3,000 RMB (where
33
34 \$1.00US=6.23RMB in 2012). Nearly ninety percent of respondents
35
36 worked more than 40 hours per week.
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 44 **Work stress and motivation according to socioeconomic and** 45 46 **demographic factors**

47
48 Results of variance analysis and further multiple comparison t-tests were
49
50 shown in Table 1. There were significant differences in scores for all of
51
52 the five subscales of work stress according to occupation ($p < 0.01$) and
53
54 gender ($p < 0.05$), with general practitioners and men showing higher
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 levels of work stress.

5
6 Scores for the wages and benefits subscale of work stress differed
7
8 significantly according to educational background ($p < 0.05$) and income
9
10 ($p < 0.05$). Mid-level professionals reported significantly higher levels of
11
12 stress on the work task and role subscale ($p < 0.01$) and in workplace
13
14 relationships ($p < 0.05$). Participants aged 35–44 and 45–54 years
15
16 reported significantly higher levels of stress on the work task and role
17
18 subscale ($p < 0.01$).
19

20
21 The male had significant higher level recognition and financial
22
23 motivation ($p < 0.05$). Younger workers (< 25) had significantly higher
24
25 level of recognition motivation ($p < 0.05$) and responsibility motivation
26
27 ($p < 0.05$). A higher level of recognition motivation was expressed by
28
29 general practitioners ($p < 0.05$).
30
31
32
33
34
35

36
37 There were no significant differences in any of the four work
38
39 motivation subscale scores according to educational background,
40
41 professional title, or income. Men reported significantly higher levels of
42
43 recognition and financial motivation ($p < 0.05$). Younger workers (< 25)
44
45 reported significantly higher levels of recognition ($p < 0.05$) and
46
47 responsibility motivation ($p < 0.05$). General practitioners reported higher
48
49 levels of recognition motivation ($p < 0.05$).
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 **Insert Table 1 here**
57
58
59
60

Levels of work stress, work motivation, and job satisfaction

The mean score for overall perception of work stress was 3.11, which is slightly higher than the mid-point of 3 (Table 2). Wages and benefits (3.60) subscale of work stress ranked in the highest position, followed by work task and role (3.31), career development (2.96), organizational structure and climate (2.90), and relationships (2.75) ($F=154.9$, $p<0.001$). Statistically significant differences were noted in overall perception of stress and scores on all five work stress subscales between satisfied and dissatisfied respondents; those who were dissatisfied reported higher levels of work stress ($p < 0.001$).

Career development motivation was rated the highest level, followed by financial, recognition and responsibility motivation ($F=202.6$, $p<0.001$). Levels of overall perception of work motivation and all subscales with the exception of financial motivation were significantly different between the satisfied and dissatisfied groups of respondents, and the satisfied workers had higher levels of work motivation ($p<0.01$).

In respect to motivation, career development was rated highest, followed by financial, recognition, and responsibility motivation ($F = 202.6$, $p < 0.001$). Levels of overall perception of motivation and scores on all work motivation subscales, with the exception of financial motivation, differed significantly between the satisfied and dissatisfied

respondents, and the satisfied workers reported higher levels of work motivation ($p < 0.01$).

Insert Table 2 here

Predictors of job satisfaction

In this study, 61.3% of respondents were satisfied with their jobs. Table 3 presented results of a logistic regression model that examined the key predictors of job satisfaction, with special attention devoted to work stress and work motivation.

Only a few demographic characteristics were predictors of job satisfaction. We found that when scores on the career development and wages and benefits subscales of work stress increased by one grade, job satisfaction decreased by 32% (odds ratio [OR] = 0.68, $p < 0.05$) and 37% (OR = 0.63, $p < 0.01$), respectively. When financial motivation increased by one grade, job satisfaction decreased by 28% (OR = 0.72, $p < 0.01$), and when recognition motivation and responsibility motivation increased by one grade, job satisfaction increased 1.86 (OR = 2.86, $p < 0.01$) and 0.36 times (OR = 1.36, $p < 0.05$), respectively. Compared with nurses, general practitioners (OR = 0.56, $p < 0.01$) and public health physicians (OR = 0.42, $p < 0.05$) reported lower job satisfaction, while other technical staff (OR = 1.89) reported higher job satisfaction. Workers

1
2
3
4 with no title (OR = 7.02, $p < 0.05$) were more satisfied than workers with
5
6 a senior title.
7
8
9

10
11 **Insert Table 3 here**
12

13 14 15 16 **Discussion** 17

18
19 Job satisfaction in community health workers is important for the
20 sustainable development of basic healthcare in China, but health
21 policymakers and managers have neglected it for a long time.⁴⁷ This study
22 was one of the first of its kind to examine the level of work stress and
23 work motivation and their combined effects on job satisfaction among
24 urban community health workers in China since the implementation of
25 new health system reform.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36
37 Results indicated that the wages and benefits subscale of stress
38 ranked highest, followed by the work task and role subscale. Similarly,
39 previous research related to work stress found that low salary, heavy
40 workload, and few promotion opportunities were the most frequently
41 cited workplace stressors.^{49,50} Several reasons may have contributed to
42 these findings. In Heilongjiang Province, the average annual income of
43 health service personnel in urban hospitals was 52,564 RMB (\$1.00US =
44 6.23RMB) in 2012. In this study, 80.4% of the respondents' annual
45 incomes were lower than 36,000 RMB. These low salaries for community
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 health workers increased their wages and benefits stress.⁴⁸ In the
5
6 meanwhile, based on the province population and human resource
7
8 planning ratios, there is an approximate shortfall of 30% in the number of
9
10 general practitioners in 2012.⁴ And the recent reforms have expanded
11
12 the scope of public health services and increased workload without
13
14 equivalent increases in staffing.^{5,6}
15
16
17
18

19
20 Unfortunately, the present study found that scores on the career
21
22 development, and wages and benefits subscales of work stress were
23
24 negatively associated with job satisfaction. These findings were
25
26 consistent with previous studies in which workers were likely to report
27
28 low job satisfaction if they did not receive promotion and advancement
29
30 opportunities or adequate salaries.^{22,33,52}
31
32
33

34
35 With regard to work motivation, results showed the career
36
37 development and financial subscales of work motivation ranked first and
38
39 second respectively. Consistent with Hung and Hou's study, which found
40
41 income, benefits, and professional development were the most important
42
43 motivating factors among community health workers in China.^{39,51}
44
45

46
47 In this study, we defined career development and financial
48
49 motivation as extrinsic motivation and recognition and responsibility
50
51 motivation as intrinsic motivation based on the literature.^{37,53} Results
52
53 reported that the recognition and responsibility subscales of work
54
55 motivation were positive predictors of job satisfaction, and financial
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 motivation was a negative predictor. This was consistent with the
5
6 “crowding-in” effect, which proposes that intrinsic motivation increases
7
8 job satisfaction, whereas extrinsic motivation decreases job satisfaction.⁵⁴
9
10
11 It should be noted that in this study, the level of extrinsic motivation was
12
13 higher than that of intrinsic motivation.
14

15
16 These findings have significant implications for managers of
17
18 community health centers and policymakers in their efforts to improve
19
20 workers’ job satisfaction. First, policymakers should take measures to
21
22 improve community health workers’ salaries. In China, basic public
23
24 health services are funded by the government and provided by
25
26 community health workers without cost to residents. If health workers are
27
28 dissatisfied with their salaries, they may prefer to work for profit-making
29
30 medical services instead of nonprofit public health services. In the
31
32 meanwhile, managers should implement appropriate performance salary
33
34 distribution system to arouse the enthusiasms of the staff and reduce their
35
36 financial stress. Second, policymakers should focus on appropriate
37
38 promotion policies for community health workers. At present, it was
39
40 difficult for community health workers to get title promotion, for there
41
42 were limit promotion quotas for CHCs every year in Heilongjiang
43
44 Province and our study found only 18.6% of respondents had senior
45
46 professional title. Third, the managers should provide and support their
47
48 workers to attend training or continuing education. Fourth, managers and
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

policymakers should take measures to inspire intrinsic motivation in workers. Becchetti proposed that when workers do not work for financial incentives, they may find satisfaction irrespective of their salaries, even if the financial incentive is kept to a minimum, and may therefore be satisfied with their jobs.⁵³ Therefore, managers and policymakers should introduce more incentives to encourage community health workers to work for responsibility or recognition.

As some subscales of work stress and work motivation can influence job satisfaction either positively or negatively, we examined levels of work stress and motivation according to demographic characteristics and found that policymakers and managers should pay more attention to three types of workers. The first group of workers included those aged between 35 and 54 years (35–44 and 45–54 age groups), who reported higher levels of stress on the work task and role subscale and lower levels of intrinsic motivation. Similar results have been reported; in Qu's study, community health workers in mid-level age groups were significantly more stressed than those in the youngest age group in one province of China.⁵⁵ This could be related to workload or difficulty and complexity of the work task, which is usually greater for 35- to 54-year-old workers, as they are the backbone of community health services. Men form the second group that requires attention. In our study, men's scores on all of the work stress subscales tended to be higher than women's, and men

1
2
3 reported higher levels of financial motivation.⁵⁶ However, another
4
5 Chinese study of primary health workers found no differences in financial
6
7 motivation.⁵¹ David found that women reported more stress in the
8
9 financial rewards and role ambiguity subscales.⁵⁷ The final group of
10
11 workers identified as requiring attention consists of general practitioners,
12
13 who experienced the highest stress according to all five work stress
14
15 subscales and reported the highest career development motivation.
16
17 General practitioners in community health centers face more difficult and
18
19 complicated tasks and types of medical risk than other health care
20
21 workers do, and they receive lower salaries and fewer promotion
22
23 opportunities than their counterparts in general hospitals.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 **Limitations of this study**

35
36 The findings in this study should be viewed in light of four key
37
38 limitations. First, this study was based on a small sample of community
39
40 health workers, which may limit the generalizability of the research
41
42 findings. Based on the literature about community health services in
43
44 China, a multistage, stratified sampling design was employed to ensure
45
46 that study data were provincially representative.^{7,40} A multistage,
47
48 stratified sampling design was used to ensure that study data were
49
50 provincially representative. Six sample cities were selected to account for
51
52 the variability in regional per capita gross domestic product, and the
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 levels of healthcare development and 15 CHCs in each city were selected
5
6 randomly. On average, there are 23 medical technical personnel in a
7
8 community health center in Heilongjiang province and there were
9
10 approximately 22 health workers in each of the community health centers
11
12 in our study. In addition, the proportions of general practitioners, public
13
14 health physicians, nurses, and other medical technical personnel in this
15
16 study were close to the proportions found in the province as a whole.³
17
18
19 Consequently, this sample was representative of Heilongjiang community
20
21 health service providers, thereby enhancing the potential for
22
23 generalization of the study findings. Second, the instrument for assess the
24
25 work stress and work motivation was developed from earlier study and
26
27 discussed with experts, while not an international commonly scale. Third,
28
29 we used a cross-sectional survey, which may limit our ability to identify
30
31 causal relationships between work stress and motivation and job
32
33 satisfaction. Fourth, the measurements were conducted by
34
35 self-administrated method and respondents' cognition can be affected by
36
37 emotions at that point in time. So the common method bias and
38
39 self-administrated bias might affect the results.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 **Conclusion**

52
53 It is important for healthcare managers to improve the job satisfaction of
54
55 health workers in low-resource settings. In this study, we examined levels
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 of work stress and motivation according to demographic characteristics
5
6 and in respect to levels of job satisfaction; additionally, the key predictors
7
8 of job satisfaction were identified using logistic regression analysis. The
9
10 results indicated that community health workers rated wages and benefits
11
12 highest among five subscales of work stress, and workers' extrinsic
13
14 motivation was higher than their intrinsic motivation. The career
15
16 development, and wages and benefits subscales of work stress and
17
18 financial motivation were significant negative predictors of job
19
20 satisfaction, whereas the recognition and responsibility subscales of work
21
22 motivation were significant positive determinants.
23
24
25
26
27

28
29 Our findings suggest that there is considerable room for improvement in
30
31 the job satisfaction of community health workers in Heilongjiang
32
33 Province, and health care managers and policymakers should take both
34
35 work stress and work motivation into consideration. First, they should
36
37 pay more attention to three types of worker, as these particular groups
38
39 reported higher work stress and extrinsic motivation. Second, they should
40
41 take a variety of measures to reduce career development, and wage and
42
43 benefits stress, as they were negative determinants of job satisfaction.
44
45
46
47
48 Third, it is important for managers and policymakers to inspire workers'
49
50 intrinsic motivation, as it can have a positive influence on job
51
52 satisfaction.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 **Acknowledgements** We are thankful to all the community health workers who participated in the study. We are also
8 grateful to Yin Li, Xingsan Li, Zhuang Wang and Hongjuan Wei, who have worked closely with the team to ensure the field
9 survey is successfully implemented.
10
11

12
13
14 **Funding** This study was funded by the National Science Foundation of China (NSFC), Contract No.71203050/G0308,
15 Contract No.71073034 and was supported by Young Seed Foundation of Public Health College of Harbin Medical
16 University. The opinions expressed herein are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect the views of NSFC and the survey
17 was conducted independently by researchers from Harbin Medical University.
18
19

20 21 22 23 24 **Contributors**

25
26
27 LiLi was responsible for the study design, data analysis and the drafting and revising of the manuscript. HongyanHu and
28 ChangzhiHe, who contributed equally as the first author to this article, were responsible for study design, data collection
29 and data analysis. HaoZzhou and ZhongZ hang provided statistical expertise. XinyanLiu, TaoSun and HengLi performed
30 data collection and technical support. LihuaFan provided administrative support. All authors read and approved the final
31 manuscript.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

Competing interests None.

Data Sharing Statement: The factor analysis of work stress and work motivation are available to Li Li at lilihmu@gmail.com.

For peer review only

References

1. Starfield B, Shi LY, Macinko J. Contribution of primary care to health systems and health. *Milbank Q* 2005;83: 457–502.
2. Hung LM, Rane S, Tsai J, et al. Advancing primary care to promote equitable health: implications for China. *Int J Equity Health* 2012;11:2.
3. Heilongjiang Provincial Bureau. Heilongjiang Health Statistical Yearbook 2012. Harbin, China: Heilongjiang Provincial Press 2013.
4. State Commission Office for Public Sector Reform. (2006). Notice on Issuing the Instruction Opinions on Organization Structure and Staffing of Urban Community Health Service. Beijing, China. http://www.gov.cn/zwggk/2006-09/04/content_377067.htm (accessed on 4 September 2006).
5. MOH (Ministry of Health of China) Chinese Health statistics in 2010. Peking Union Medical College Press 2010.
6. MOH (Ministry of Health of China) (2012) Chinese Health statistics in 2010. Peking Union Medical College Press.

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7 7. Zhou W, Dong YM, Lin XZ, et al. Community health service capacity in China: a survey in three municipalities. *J Eval*
- 8
- 9 *Clin Pract* 2013;19(1):167–17.
- 10
- 11 8. Li L, Zhou H, Yao GF, et al. Analysis on working motivation of community health workers in Harbin, China. *Medicine*
- 12 *and Society (in Chinese)* 2013;7:40-43.
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17 9. Clegg A. Occupational stress in nursing: a review of the literature. *J Nurs Manage* 2001; 9:101–106.
- 18
- 19
- 20 10. Lazarus RS. & Folkman S. *Stress, Appraisal and Coping*. Springer, New York, NY.1984.
- 21
- 22 11. Karasek RA. Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: implications for job re-design. *Administrative*
- 23 *Science Quarterly* 1979; 24(2): 285–308.
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27 12. Siegrist J. Adverse health effects of high-effort/low-reward conditions. *J Occup Health Psychol* 1996; 1:27–41.
- 28
- 29
- 30 13. Nakasis K., Ouzouni C. Factors influencing stress and job satisfaction of nurses working in psychiatric units: a research
- 31 *review*. *Heal Sci J* 2008;2 (4): 183–195.
- 32
- 33
- 34
- 35 14. Jamal M. Burnout among Canadian and Chinese employees: a cross-cultural study. *European Management Review*
- 36 *2005;2(3):224–230*.
- 37
- 38
- 39
- 40
- 41
- 42
- 43
- 44
- 45

15. Riggio R. Introduction to industrial organizational psychology. New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc. 2003.
16. Cooper CL, Marshall J. Occupational sources of stress: a review of the literature relating to coronary heart disease and mental ill health. *J Occup Psychol* 1976; 49:11-28.
17. Kim HJ. Work Stress and Job Satisfaction of Community Mental Health Nurses in South Korea: A Qualitative Content Analysis. *J Korean Acad Psychiatr Ment Health Nurs* 2013;22(4):295-306.
18. Johnson SJ, O'Connor EM, Jacobs S, et al. The relationships among work stress, strain and self-reported errors in UK community pharmacy. *Research in Social and Administrative Pharmacy*. 2014;1.
19. Qu NQ, Zhou H, Fan LH, et al. Analysis on work stress and occupational burnout among community health service staff in Harbin. *Medicine and Society* 2013;26(9):87-89.
20. Chen XJ, Tan XR, Li LP. Health Problem and Occupational Stress among Chinese Doctors. *Chinese Medicine* 2013;4: 1-6.
21. Nabirye RC, Brown KC, Pryor ER et al. Occupational stress, job satisfaction and job performance among hospital nurses in Kampala, Uganda. *J Nurs Manage* 2011; 19:760–768.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7 22. Voltmer E, Rosta J, Johannes Siegrist, et al. Job stress and job satisfaction of physicians in private practice: comparison
8 of German and Norwegian physicians. *Int Arch Occ Env Hea* 2012;85, (7):819-828.
9
10
11 23. Saijo Y, Chiba S, Yoshioka E, et al. Job stress and burnout among urban and rural hospital physicians in Japan. *Aust J*
12 *Rural Health* 2013;21(4): 225–231.
13
14
15 24. Sun Y, Luo ZN, Fang PQ. Factors Influencing the Turnover Intention of Chinese Community Health Service Workers
16 Based on the Investigation Results of Five Provinces. *J Commun Health* 2013;38(6):1058-1066.
17
18
19 25. Franco LM, Bennett S, Kanfer R, et al. Determinants and consequences of health worker motivation in hospitals in
20 Jordan and Georgia. *Soc Sci Med* 2004;58:343-355
21
22 26. Kanfer R. Measuring health worker motivation in developing countries. Partnerships for Health Reform Project, Major
23 Applied Research Working Paper 1999.
24
25
26
27 27. Vroom, V. H. *Work and motivation*. New York: Wiley.1964.
28
29
30
31
32
33 28. Porter LW, Lawler EE. *Managerial attitudes and performance*. Homewood, IL: Irwin-Dorsey 1968.
34
35
36
37 29. Ryan RM, Deci EL. Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 wellbeing. *Am Psychol* 2000; 55(1): 68–77.

- 8
9 30. Ryan RM, Deci EL. Self-regulation and the problem of human autonomy: Does psychology need choice,
10 self-determination, and will? *J Pers* 2006; 74(6):1558–1585.
- 11
12
13 31. Peters DH, Chakraborty S, Mahapatra P, et al. Job satisfaction and motivation of health workers in public and private
14 sectors: cross-sectional analysis from two Indian states. *Hum Resour Health*. 2010;8:27.
- 15
16
17 32. Patrick MM, Duane B, Lucy G, et al. Developing a tool to measure health worker motivation in district hospitals in
18 Kenya. *Hum Resour Health* 2009; 7:40.
- 19
20
21 33. Wilbroad M, Helen A, Virginia B, et al. Measuring health workers' motivation in rural health facilities: baseline results
22 from three study districts in Zambia. *Hum Resour Health* 2013;11:8.
- 23
24
25 34. Tribolet WC. The relationship between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and organizational commitment: a study in a
26 European environment [D]. Nova Southeastern Univ 2004.
- 27
28
29 35. Hoonakker PL, Carayon P, McGuire K, et al. Motivation and job satisfaction of Tele-ICU nurses. *J Crit Care*
30 2013;28:315.e13 -315.e21.
- 31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7 36. Pool SW. The relationship of job satisfaction with substitutes of leadership, leadership behavior, and work motivation. *J*
8
9 *Psychol* 1997;131(3):271-83.
10
11 37. Stringer C, Jeni D, Theivananthampillai. Motivation, pay satisfaction, and job satisfaction of front-line employees. *Qual*
12
13 *Res Acco Man* 2011; 8(2):161-179.
14
15
16
17 38. Shi L, Hung LM, Song K, et al. Chinese primary care physicians and work attitudes. *Int J Health Serv*
18
19 2013;43(1):167–181.
20
21
22 39. Hung LM, Shi L, Wang H, et al. Chinese primary care providers and motivating factors on performance. *Fam Prac* 2013;
23
24 30:576–586.
25
26
27 40. Ge C, Fu J, Chang Y, et al. Factors associated with job satisfaction among Chinese community health workers: a
28
29 cross-sectional study. *BMC Public Health*, 2011;24(11):884.
30
31
32 41. Chen TL, Huang MY, Su TH. Work motivation, work stress, and job satisfaction in between Taiwan and China-An
33
34 empirical study. *World Acad Sci, Eng Tech* 2012; 68:1446-1450.
35
36
37 42. Ajayi MP., Abimbola OH. Job satisfaction, organizational stress and employee performance: a study of NAPIMS. *Ife*
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

Psychol 2013;21:75-82.

43. Wayne SJ, Liden RC. Effects of impression management on performance ratings: a longitudinal study. *Acad Manage J* 1995;38:232-260.
44. Gagne M, Deci EL. Self-determination theory and work motivation. *J Organ Behav* 2005;26:331-362.
45. Dieleman M, Cuong PV, Anh, LV, et al. Identifying factors for job motivation of rural health workers in North Vietnam. *Hum Resour Health* 2003;1:10.
46. Wanous JP, Reichers AE, Hudy MJ. Overall job satisfaction: how good are single-item measures? *J Appl Psychol* 1997;82:247-52.
47. Chen J, Dong JQ, Ding J, et al. Analysis on satisfaction of professionals in community health service institutions held by different levels of hospital. *Chin Gen Pract* 2008;4(11): 631-634. (In Chinese)
48. National Bureau of Statistics. *China Statistic Yearbook 2013*. Beijing ,China: China Sta Press. 2013.
49. Ding H, Sun X, Chang WW, et al. A comparison of job satisfaction of community health workers before and after local comprehensive medical care reform: a typical field investigation in central China. *Plos One* 2013;8(9):1-5.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7 50. Han JF, Li XH. An analysis on the job stressors of community health nurses. Chinese Nursing Management.
8
9 2007;7(5):45-48. (in Chinese)
10
11 51. Hou ZH, Meng QY, Yuan BB et al. Motivation preferences of general practices in rural China. Chinese Journal of
12 Health Policy, 2010;13(10):18-22.
13
14
15
16
17 52. Lephalala RP. Factors influencing nurses job satisfaction in selected private hospitals in England. Curationis 2008;31(3):
18 60–69.
19
20
21
22 53. Becchetti L, Castriota S, Tortia EC. Productivity, wages and intrinsic motivations. Sma Bus Eco 2012;41:379–399.
23
24
25 54. Frey BS. On the relationship between intrinsic and extrinsic work motivation. Int J Ind Organ 1997;15(4),427-439.
26
27
28 55. Qu JW. Investigation and research on job stress and degree of loyalty in community health workers in Liaoning
29 Province (M). Shenyang: Chinese Medical University 2013.
30
31
32 56. Malik AA, Yamamoto SS, Souares A, et al. Motivational determinants among physicians in Lahore Pakistan. BMC
33 Health Serv Res 2010;10:201.
34
35
36
37 57. David PH, Srinika DJ. Gender differences in work stress among clinical social workers. J Soc Serv Res 2008;10:18.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

Table 1 Facets of work stress and work motivation by socio-economic and demographic status for respondents

| | N | % | Work stress | | | | Work motivation | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----|------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------|--------------------|----------------|---------|
| | | | work task and role | career development | wages and benefits | Workplace relationships | organizational structure and climate | recognition | career development | responsibility | Finance |
| Occupation | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General practitioner | 335 | 36.0 | 3.53 | 3.17 | 3.78 | 2.90 | 3.14 | 3.61 | 4.20 | 3.44 | 4.15 |
| Public health physician | 178 | 19.1 | 3.20 | 2.89 | 3.70 | 2.63 | 2.96 | 3.57 | 4.11 | 3.67 | 4.06 |
| Nurse | 267 | 28.8 | 3.24 | 2.95 | 3.54 | 2.76 | 2.78 | 3.53 | 4.05 | 3.39 | 4.01 |
| Other | 150 | 16.1 | 3.09 | 2.79 | 3.45 | 2.65 | 2.84 | 3.59 | 4.11 | 3.40 | 4.03 |
| F | | | 6.91** | 4.97** | 3.45** | 3.05** | 6.25** | 0.66 | 2.31* | 1.96 | 0.99 |
| Sex | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 236 | 25.4 | 3.44 | 3.10 | 3.77 | 2.88 | 3.12 | 3.71 | 4.18 | 3.50 | 4.19 |
| Female | 694 | 74.6 | 3.27 | 2.93 | 3.56 | 2.72 | 2.85 | 3.56 | 4.12 | 3.43 | 4.03 |
| F | | | 2.50* | 2.27* | 2.60* | 2.51* | 4.09* | 2.36* | 1.23 | 1.04 | 2.39* |
| Educational background | | | | | | | | | | | |
| High school or below | 110 | 11.8 | 3.18 | 2.90 | 3.36 | 2.81 | 2.72 | 3.57 | 4.13 | 3.42 | 4.05 |
| Junior college | 446 | 48.0 | 3.28 | 2.94 | 3.61 | 2.74 | 2.86 | 3.57 | 4.14 | 3.49 | 4.02 |
| College and above | 374 | 40.2 | 3.36 | 3.00 | 3.65 | 2.73 | 3.16 | 3.60 | 4.11 | 3.39 | 4.11 |
| F | | | 2.30 | 0.66 | 4.21* | 0.45 | 4.02* | 0.13 | 0.24 | 1.53 | 1.33 |
| Age in years | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <25 | 78 | 8.4 | 3.08 | 2.81 | 3.45 | 2.60 | 2.77 | 3.80 | 4.23 | 3.60 | 3.92 |
| 25-34 | 258 | 27.7 | 3.21 | 2.94 | 3.63 | 2.72 | 2.91 | 3.65 | 4.11 | 3.48 | 4.17 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-----|------|--------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|-------|------|
| 35-44 | 329 | 35.4 | 3.36 | 2.98 | 3.55 | 2.78 | 2.88 | 3.52 | 4.13 | 3.35 | 4.03 |
| 45-54 | 234 | 25.2 | 3.43 | 3.02 | 3.69 | 2.79 | 2.94 | 3.53 | 4.13 | 3.51 | 4.04 |
| ≥55 | 31 | 3.3 | 3.12 | 2.88 | 3.54 | 2.71 | 2.93 | 3.48 | 3.98 | 3.28 | 3.91 |
| F | | | 4.71** | 1.01 | 1.36 | 1.12 | 0.83 | 2.89* | 1.83 | 2.86* | 2.39 |
| Title | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Senior title | 42 | 4.5 | 3.12 | 3.11 | 3.38 | 2.69 | 2.73 | 3.37 | 3.97 | 3.55 | 3.96 |
| Vice-senior title | 131 | 14.1 | 3.32 | 2.92 | 3.65 | 2.63 | 2.93 | 3.46 | 4.05 | 3.25 | 4.03 |
| Middle title | 399 | 42.9 | 3.43 | 3.03 | 3.69 | 2.85 | 2.94 | 3.56 | 4.16 | 3.44 | 4.06 |
| Primary title | 299 | 32.2 | 3.20 | 2.93 | 3.54 | 2.72 | 2.87 | 3.62 | 4.12 | 3.49 | 4.08 |
| No title | 59 | 6.3 | 3.23 | 2.86 | 3.48 | 2.58 | 2.89 | 3.73 | 4.16 | 3.49 | 4.04 |
| F | | | 3.96** | 1.07 | 1.71 | 3.04* | 0.59 | 1.73 | 0.98 | 2.13 | 0.16 |
| Monthly income (RMB) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <2000 | 361 | 38.9 | 3.24 | 2.95 | 3.69 | 2.76 | 2.90 | 3.61 | 4.15 | 3.49 | 4.09 |
| 2000-2999 | 386 | 41.5 | 3.32 | 2.96 | 3.61 | 2.75 | 2.88 | 3.59 | 4.13 | 3.40 | 4.06 |
| 3000-3999 | 139 | 14.9 | 3.43 | 2.97 | 3.44 | 2.68 | 2.96 | 3.52 | 4.02 | 3.43 | 3.97 |
| ≥4000 | 44 | 4.7 | 3.39 | 3.03 | 3.21 | 2.93 | 2.78 | 3.44 | 4.27 | 3.53 | 4.28 |
| F | | | 2.11 | 0.99 | 3.14* | 2.11 | 0.99 | 0.54 | 1.87 | 0.86 | 1.36 |
| Working hours (per week) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <40 小时 | 110 | 11.8 | 3.27 | 2.82 | 3.52 | 2.82 | 2.94 | 2.96 | 4.14 | 3.56 | 3.91 |
| 40-47 小时 | 509 | 54.7 | 3.26 | 2.73 | 3.59 | 2.73 | 2.95 | 2.87 | 4.10 | 3.42 | 4.06 |
| 48-55 小时 | 250 | 26.9 | 3.36 | 2.71 | 3.62 | 2.71 | 2.93 | 2.89 | 4.19 | 3.46 | 4.12 |
| ≥56 小时 | 61 | 6.6 | 3.52 | 2.93 | 3.75 | 2.93 | 3.36 | 3.13 | 4.16 | 3.43 | 4.14 |
| F | | | 0.06 | 0.20 | 0.48 | 0.20 | 0.01* | 0.11 | 0.39 | 0.44 | 0.13 |

*p<0.05 **p<0.01

Table 2 Mean scores of the overall perception and subscales of work stress and work motivation in respect to the level of job satisfaction

| | Mean \pm SD Total (n=930) | Level of job satisfaction | | P |
|--|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|
| | | Satisfied (n=570, 61.3%) | Dissatisfied (n=360, 38.7%) | |
| Work stress | | | | |
| Overall perception* | 3.11 \pm 0.68 | 2.95 \pm 0.68 | 3.37 \pm 0.60 | P=0.000 |
| work task and role¶ | 3.31 \pm 0.81 | 3.18 \pm 0.82 | 3.52 \pm 0.76 | P=0.000 |
| career development¶ | 2.96 \pm 0.87 | 2.79 \pm 0.85 | 3.22 \pm 0.83 | P=0.000 |
| Wages and benefits ¶ | 3.60 \pm 0.95 | 3.38 \pm 0.94 | 3.95 \pm 0.85 | P=0.000 |
| Workplace relationships¶ | 2.75 \pm 0.79 | 2.61 \pm 0.79 | 2.96 \pm 0.74 | P=0.000 |
| organizational structure and climate¶ | 2.90 \pm 0.79 | 2.74 \pm 0.79 | 3.15 \pm 0.71 | P=0.000 |
| Work motivation | | | | |
| Overall perception° | 3.80 \pm 0.55 | 3.86 \pm 0.55 | 3.70 \pm 0.55 | P=0.000 |
| Career development† | 4.13 \pm 0.57 | 4.24 \pm 0.51 | 3.95 \pm 0.62 | P=0.000 |
| Recognition† | 3.58 \pm 0.77 | 3.66 \pm 0.77 | 3.45 \pm 0.77 | P=0.000 |
| Responsibility† | 3.45 \pm 0.77 | 3.53 \pm 0.77 | 3.32 \pm 0.52 | P=0.000 |
| Financial† | 4.06 \pm 0.79 | 4.02 \pm 0.79 | 4.12 \pm 0.80 | P=0.295 |

* Mean score of overall perception of work stress was calculated for each respondent by adding the value of each item of work stress and then divided by the numbers of all item.

°Mean score of overall perception of work motivation was calculated for each respondent by adding the value of each item of work motivation and then divided by the numbers of the item.

¶Mean score of each subscale of work stress was calculated for each respondent by adding the value of each item belongs to the subscale of work stress and then divided by the numbers of the item.

†Mean score of each subscale of work motivation was calculated for each respondent by adding the value of each item belongs to the subscale of work motivation and then divided by the numbers of the item.

Table 3 The logistic regression analysis for job satisfaction*

| | | Odds Ratio | 95% CI |
|---|--------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| Occupation (Reference : nurse) | General practitioner | 0.56** | 0.38-0.81 |
| | Public health physician | 0.42* | 0.20-0.87 |
| | Other technical staff | 1.89* | 1.04-3.44 |
| Sex (Reference : male) | Female | 1.27 | 0.83-1.95 |
| Educational background (Reference : High school or below) | Junior college | 0.76 | 0.43-1.34 |
| | College and above | 0.75 | 0.41-1.40 |
| Age in years (Reference : <25) | 25-34 | 0.60 | 0.30-1.21 |
| | 35-44 | 1.10 | 0.51-2.42 |
| | 45-54 | 1.04 | 0.45-2.35 |
| | ≥55 | 8.53** | 1.86-39.01 |
| Title (Reference : senior title) | Vice-senior title | 1.86 | 0.476-7.29 |
| | Middle title | 2.57 | 0.67-9.78 |
| | Primary title | 3.84 | 0.96-15.39 |
| | No title | 7.02* | 1.53-32.12 |
| Monthly income in RMB (Reference : <2000) | 2000-2999 | 0.50 | 0.26-0.98 |
| | 3000-3999 | 0.99 | 0.64-1.52 |
| | ≥4000 | 1.30 | 0.86-1.97 |
| Weekly hours worked (Reference : <40) | 40-47 | 0.90 | 0.59-1.37 |
| | 48-55 | 1.07 | 0.67-1.70 |
| | ≥56 | 1.20 | 0.62-2.33 |
| Work stress | work task and role | 0.98 | 0.74-1.300 |
| | career development | 0.68* | 0.49-0.94 |
| | wages and benefits | 0.63** | 0.50-0.79 |
| | Workplace relationships | 0.80 | 0.59-1.09 |
| | Organizational structure and climate | 0.97 | 0.71-1.33 |
| Work motivation | Career development | 1.13 | 0.85-1.505 |
| | Recognition | 2.86** | 2.02-4.04 |
| | Responsibility | 1.36* | 1.02-1.81 |
| | Finance | 0.72** | 0.56-0.92 |

*Strongly satisfied and satisfied coded as 1 vs. strongly dissatisfied and dissatisfied coded as 0.

*p<0.05, **p<0.01

For peer review only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

**Work stress, work motivation and their effects on job
satisfaction for community health workers: A cross-sectional
survey in China**

Li Li*¹, Hongyan Hu², Hao Zhou³, Changzhi He¹, Lihua Fan¹, Xinyan
Liu¹, Zhong Zhang, Heng Li¹, Tao Sun¹

¹ Department of Health Management, School of Public Health, Harbin
Medical University, Harbin, China

² Research Service Office, The Second Affiliated Hospital, Harbin
Medical University, Harbin, China

³ Department of Emergency, Center for Disease Control and Prevention,
Harbin, China

Correspondence to Li Li: lilihmu@gmail.com

Abstract

Objective: It is well documented that both work stress and work
motivation are key determinants of job satisfaction. The aim of this study
was to examine levels of work stress and motivation and their
contribution to job satisfaction among community health workers in
Heilongjiang Province, China.

Design: Cross-sectional survey.

Setting: Heilongjiang Province, China.

Participants: The participants were 930 community health workers from

1
2
3
4 six cities in Heilongjiang province.

5
6 **Primary and secondary outcome measures:** Multistage sampling
7
8 procedures were used to measure socioeconomic and demographic status,
9
10 work stress, work motivation, and job satisfaction. Logistic regression
11
12 analysis was performed to assess key determinants of job satisfaction.
13
14

15
16 **Results:** There were significant differences in some subscales of work
17
18 stress and work motivation by some of socioeconomic characteristics.
19
20 Levels of overall stress perception and scores on all five work stress
21
22 subscales were higher in dissatisfied workers relative to satisfied workers.
23
24 However, levels of overall motivation perception and scores on the career
25
26 development, responsibility, and recognition motivation subscales were
27
28 higher in satisfied respondents relative to dissatisfied respondents. The
29
30 main determinants of job satisfaction were occupation; age; title; income;
31
32 the career development, and wages and benefits subscales of work stress;
33
34 the recognition, responsibility and financial subscales of work motivation.
35
36

37
38
39
40
41 **Conclusion:** The findings indicated considerable room for improvement
42
43 in job satisfaction among community health workers of Heilongjiang
44
45 Province in China. Health care managers and policymakers should take
46
47 both work stress and motivation into consideration, as two subscales of
48
49 work stress and one subscale of work motivation negatively influenced
50
51 job satisfaction and two subscales of work motivation positively
52
53 influenced job satisfaction.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 **Keywords:** work stress; work motivation; job satisfaction; community
5
6 health service
7

8 **ARTICLE SUMMARY**

9 **Article focus**

- 10
11
12
13
14 ▪How do the overall perception and subscales of work stress and
15
16 motivation relate to levels of job satisfaction?
17
18 ▪Which facets of work stress and motivation are affected by
19
20 socioeconomic and demographic status?
21
22
23
24 ▪How do work stress and motivation influence job satisfaction among
25
26 community health workers?
27

28
29 **Key message** There is considerable room for improvement in job
30
31 satisfaction among community health workers, and health care managers
32
33 and policymakers should take both work stress and motivation into
34
35 consideration.
36
37

38 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

39
40 This study is one of the first of its kind to examine the combined effects
41
42 of work stress and work motivation on job satisfaction among urban
43
44 community health workers in China since the implementation of new
45
46 health system reform. However, the instrument used in this study is not
47
48 a commonly used international scale, there may be an inherent bias in
49
50 self-report measures, and the small sample may limit the generalizability
51
52 of the research findings.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

INTRODUCTION

As the foundation of the three-tier health system in China, community health service institutions played a very important role in improving access to health care service, enhancing equity and improving health.¹⁻²

In 2009, the Chinese central government promulgated a new set of health system reforms and called for the development of community health services. The state established basic public health service goals, which focused on providing health education, chronic disease management, and disease prevention services for urban and rural residents. From 2009 to 2012, the number of community health service institutions increased by 6,254 and the number of visits increased by 193,949 million. Therefore, community health centers and workers thereof, are very important in the process of health system reform.

Heilongjiang Province is located in Northeast China with population of about 38.1 million. There were 410 urban community health centers (CHCs) and 366 community health stations with 13,100 health workers as of December 31, 2012.³ On average, there were 23 and 10 medical personnel in each community health center and community health station, respectively. Since the introduction of CHCs, difficulties concerning limited resources and insufficient and poorly trained staff have been present. There were 5,416 practitioners (including assistant practitioners) in community health institutions in Heilongjiang province.³ Based on the

1
2
3
4 province population and human resource planning ratios, there is an
5
6 approximate shortfall of 30% in the number of general practitioners
7
8 (5,416 vs. 7,620) in 2012.⁴ In addition, recent reforms have expanded
9
10 the scope of public health services and increased workload without
11
12 equivalent increases in staffing.^{5,6}
13
14

15
16 In some CHCs, general practitioners, public health physicians, and
17
18 nurses have been working in teams, providing medical and basic public
19
20 health services to community residents, both in the centers and during
21
22 home visits. With a late start, many of these practitioners were initially
23
24 hospital-based specialists, and majority of public health physicians did
25
26 not have a public health background. To improve skills and knowledge,
27
28 continuing medical education was compulsory and no fewer than 25
29
30 credit points were required per year. Other challenges found in the CHCs
31
32 were lower wages and fewer title promotion opportunities relative to
33
34 general hospitals. Limited resources and a shortage of skilled health
35
36 workers created very tight bottlenecks in the provision of services, which
37
38 led to many community health workers experiencing work-related stress
39
40 and low motivation for work, in addition to receiving low salaries and
41
42 restricted opportunities for promotion.⁷⁻⁸ Many studies have shown that
43
44 work stress and work motivation can greatly affect job satisfaction and, in
45
46 turn, the quality and delivery of health care. However, few studies have
47
48 focused on work stress and motivation and their effects on job
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 satisfaction among Chinese community health workers since the
5
6 implementation of the new health system reform policy.
7

8
9 Work stress is of great concern to managers, employees, and other
10 stakeholders in organizations. It is a complex phenomenon and has a
11 multitude of definitions in a variety of theoretical models.⁹ According to
12 Lazarus and Folkman's cognitive theory of stress and coping, work stress
13 was defined as the interaction between the individual and the
14 environment.¹⁰ This theory suggested that when demands from the
15 environment exceed the available resources, the result was either stress or
16 coping, depending on the individual's appraisal of the stressors. Karasek's
17 demand-control model assumed that psychological strain resulted from
18 the joint effects of work demands and the degree of decision-making
19 freedom available to workers facing the demands.¹¹ The effort-reward
20 imbalance model proposed that work stress resulted from a mismatch
21 between high commitment and effort at work and low rewards, including
22 salary, recognition, and career promotion.¹² Nakasis and Ouzouni defined
23 work stress as the harmful physical and emotional responses that occur
24 when job requirements do not match workers' capabilities, resources, and
25 needs.¹³ In general, a greater imbalance between demands and individual
26 abilities will result in greater stress.¹⁴ Riggio classified work stress into
27 work task stress and work role stress.¹⁵ Cooper and Marshall's model of
28 job stress proposed that intrinsic requirements of the job, role within the
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 organization, career development, organizational structure and climate,
5
6 and relationships at work constituted the domain of work-related stress
7
8 within an organization.¹⁶ In our study, five subscales of work stress were
9
10 named based on this model. Existing research has identified heavy
11
12 workload, insufficient resources, work relations, lack of professional
13
14 respect, and lack of promotion opportunities as possibly the most salient
15
16 work stressors for community health workers.¹⁷⁻¹⁹ Long-term stress may
17
18 not only be harmful to the health workers themselves but may also affect
19
20 community health service centers through employee dissatisfaction,
21
22 burnout, poor performance, or turnover intention.^{20,21-24} Therefore, it is
23
24 important to reduce work stress.
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 Work motivation can be defined as the degree of an individual's
32
33 willingness to exert and maintain an effort towards attaining
34
35 organizational goals.²⁵ It reflected the interactions between workers and
36
37 their work environments. Nahavandi and Malekzadeh believed that
38
39 motivation represented a stable mind, aspiration, or interest within the
40
41 individual and can translate into action.²⁶ Motivation theory examined the
42
43 process of motivation and explained why people at work behave the way
44
45 they do in terms of efforts. Building on Vroom's expectancy-valence
46
47 theory of motivation, Porter and Lawler proposed a model of intrinsic and
48
49 extrinsic work motivation.^{27,28} This model suggested that intrinsic and
50
51 extrinsic rewards were additive, and accounted for total job satisfaction.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Intrinsic motivation refers to doing something for the inherent satisfaction involved and is highly autonomous (i.e., self-regulated). In contrast, extrinsic motivation means doing something in order to obtain a separable outcome (i.e. tangible or verbal rewards).^{29,30} Peters identified job content and work environment, extrinsic benefits, autonomy and security, and transparency as factors in work motivation for health workers using factor analysis.³¹ Patrick and Wilbrod developed a tool to measure health worker motivation and revealed that organizational commitment, conscientiousness, intrinsic job satisfaction, timeliness and attendance were the major determinants of higher motivation.³²⁻³³ Tribolet explored the relationship between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation.³⁴ Hoonakker found that nurses appreciated challenges and opportunities for new learning and teamwork.³⁵ Pool explored the significant positive association between work motivation and job satisfaction, whereas Stringer found that intrinsic motivation was positively associated, and extrinsic motivation negatively associated with job satisfaction.³⁶⁻³⁷

In China, previous studies have reported that poor competency and excessive workload were key work stressors among community health workers.^{7,19} Shi suggested that policymakers should focus on training and educational opportunities for primary care workers and consider ways to reduce workload stress and improve salaries.³⁸ Hung identified professional development, training opportunities, living environment,

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

benefits, and working conditions as the most important motivating factors for primary care providers in China.³⁹ Ge analyzed the relationship between work stress and job satisfaction among Chinese community health workers and reported that a degree of freedom in decision making and good workplace relationships were positive predictors of job satisfaction.⁴⁰ Chen investigated relationships between work motivation, work stress and job satisfaction in cross-strait employees in Taiwan and mainland China.⁴¹

The present study focused on the major factors affecting work stress and motivation identified in previous research and provided an overview of community health workers' perspectives of work stress and motivation factors.^{16, 42-44} The purpose of this study was to assess the predictors of job satisfaction among community health workers in one Chinese province. A cross-sectional survey was conducted to measure levels of work stress, work motivation and job satisfaction. The key predictors of job satisfaction for community health workers were assessed with special attention devoted to work stress and motivation.

METHODS

Sample

A cross-sectional survey of community health workers was conducted from March 1 to October 31, 2013 in Heilongjiang Province, China.

1
2
3
4 Based on the literature about community health services in China, a
5
6 multi-stage, stratified sampling design was employed to ensure that study
7
8 data were provincially representative.^{7,40} First, six cities (Harbin,
9
10 Qiqihar, Suihua, Jiamusi, Qitaihe, and Heihe) were selected based on
11
12 GDP figures and three levels of the development of the community health
13
14 service. Second, 15 community health centers were randomly selected
15
16 from each city. On average, there were 22 medical personnel in each of
17
18 the selected community health centers. Third, 60% of general
19
20 practitioners, public health physicians, nurses and other health technical
21
22 staff in each center were chosen randomly, with the exception of those
23
24 who were absent. The research team invited all the selected staff
25
26 members to participate in the study. The questionnaire included a cover
27
28 page explaining the purposes and procedures of the study. The data were
29
30 collected anonymously and the respondents completed the survey
31
32 questionnaires privately to ensure confidentiality. Respondents were
33
34 assured that participation in the survey was voluntary, and the return of
35
36 questionnaires represented informed consent. The research staff stayed at
37
38 the community health center and answered respondents' questions during
39
40 the process of survey completion. Respondents were able to choose the
41
42 best time to complete the questionnaire, such as when they were not busy
43
44 or their offices were quiet. Most completed questionnaires were collected
45
46 on site by the investigator on the day of the visit. If some respondents did
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 not finish that day, investigators set a date to retrieve the questionnaires.
5
6 Respondents were asked to seal the completed questionnaires into
7
8 individual envelopes provided by the research team. The questionnaire
9
10 was relatively brief and no private personal information was collected.
11
12
13 There were 980 questionnaires delivered to community health workers,
14
15 all of which were returned. However, 50 (5.1%) were incomplete or even
16
17 blank, which left 930 valid questionnaires. This study was approved by
18
19 Medical Ethic Committee of Harbin Medical University.
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 **Assessment tools**

27
28
29 In the present study, Porter and Lawler's intrinsic and extrinsic
30
31 motivation model, and Vroom's expectancy-valence motivation theory
32
33 were used to analyze the relationship between work motivation and job
34
35 satisfaction. Lazarus and Folkman's cognitive theory of stress and
36
37 coping, and Karasek's demand-control model were used to analyze the
38
39 relationship between work stress and job satisfaction.¹⁰⁻¹¹
40
41
42
43

44 The study instrument was part of a self-administered questionnaire
45
46 composed of four sections. Section 1 focused on respondents'
47
48 socioeconomic and demographic status.
49

50
51 Section 2 assessed work stress. Thirty items related to work stress
52
53 were developed through intensive qualitative interviews with
54
55 policymakers, health care managers and community health workers, a
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 review of the literature, and an initial pilot study.^{16,42} Then factor analysis,
5
6 which was not discussed in this paper, yielded a five-subscale structure
7
8 that comprised a total of 26 items. The five-subscale solution accounted
9
10 for 69.43% of the overall variance, and was found to be internally
11
12 consistent (overall Cronbach's $\alpha=0.87$). Based on Cooper and Marshall's
13
14 model of job stress, these five subscales of work stress were named work
15
16 task and role, career development, wages and benefits, workplace
17
18 relationships, and organizational structure and climate stress.¹⁶ They
19
20 individually accounted for 16.05%, 25.10%, 12.00%, 9.08% and 7.20%
21
22 of the overall variance, respectively, and the Cronbach's Alpha within
23
24 individual subscale ranged from 0.85 to 0.90. Respondents were asked to
25
26 rate their perception of work stress on each item based on a 5-point Likert
27
28 scale, very less stressful (1), less stressful (2), average (3), stressful (4)
29
30 and very stressful (5). The Cronbach's alpha value for this study was
31
32 0.87.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 Section 3 assessed work motivation. Twenty-one items were
42
43 developed based on previous research, panel discussions, and an initial
44
45 pilot study.⁴³⁻⁴⁵ Then 3 items were deleted and the 18 retained items were
46
47 divided into four subscales by factor analysis, which was not discussed in
48
49 this paper. The four-subscale solution accounted for 65.10% of the overall
50
51 variance, and was found to be internally consistent (overall Cronbach's
52
53 $\alpha=0.75$). The subscales were renamed based on the conceptual meaning
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 of the items and comprised: career development, recognition,
5
6 responsibility, and financial motivation. They individually accounted for
7
8 21.20%, 19.40%, 14.60% and 9.90% of the overall variance, and the
9
10 Cronbach's Alpha within individual subscale ranged from 0.82 to 0.89.
11
12 According to Porter and Lawler's intrinsic and extrinsic motivation
13
14 model, we defined career development and financial motivation as
15
16 extrinsic motivation, and recognition and responsibility motivation as
17
18 intrinsic motivation.^{28,44} Respondents were asked to rate their motivation
19
20 intensity on each item based on a 5-point Likert scale, very less strong (1),
21
22 less strong (2), average (3), strong (4) and very strong (5).
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 Section 4 assessed job satisfaction. In this study, a single-item
30
31 measure was used to measure overall job satisfaction.⁴⁶ Respondents
32
33 were asked to indicate their level of job satisfaction on a 4-point Likert
34
35 scale, strongly dissatisfied (1), dissatisfied (2), satisfied (3) and
36
37 dissatisfied (4). During the process of data analysis, strongly satisfied and
38
39 satisfied were coded as 1, while strongly dissatisfied and dissatisfied were
40
41 coded as 0.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 Data analysis

50
51 Survey results were analyzed using SPSS 17.0. Descriptive analyses
52
53 included frequencies and percentages for categorical variables and means
54
55 and standard deviations (SDs) for continuous variables. Mean differences
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 were examined using t-tests and ANOVAs for relevant subgroups. We
5
6 used logistic regression to measure the key predictors of job satisfaction
7
8 because the dependent variable (job satisfaction) was a binary variable,
9
10 which made linear regression unsuitable.
11
12

13 14 15 16 **RESULTS**

17 18 **Socioeconomic and demographic status of respondents**

19
20 Socioeconomic and demographic status of the sample were shown in
21
22 Table 1. A majority of the participants were female (74.6%). General
23
24 practitioners accounted for 36% of community health workers surveyed,
25
26 followed by nurses (28.8%), public health physician (19.1%). In this
27
28 survey, only 18.6% of them had senior professional titles and less than
29
30 half (40.2%) of them had bachelor degree or higher. Only 19.6% of them
31
32 had monthly incomes of more than 3,000 RMB (where
33
34 \$1.00US=6.23RMB in 2012). Nearly ninety percent of respondents
35
36 worked more than 40 hours per week.
37
38

39 40 41 42 43 **Work stress and motivation according to socioeconomic and** 44 45 46 47 **demographic factors**

48
49 Results of variance analysis and further multiple comparison t-tests were
50
51 shown in Table 1. There were significant differences in scores for all of
52
53 the five subscales of work stress according to occupation ($p < 0.01$) and
54
55 gender ($p < 0.05$), with general practitioners and men showing higher
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 levels of work stress.

5
6 Scores for the wages and benefits subscale of work stress differed
7
8 significantly according to educational background ($p < 0.05$) and income
9
10 ($p < 0.05$). Mid-level professionals reported significantly higher levels of
11
12 stress on the work task and role subscale ($p < 0.01$) and in workplace
13
14 relationships ($p < 0.05$). Participants aged 35–44 and 45–54 years
15
16 reported significantly higher levels of stress on the work task and role
17
18 subscale ($p < 0.01$).
19

20
21 The male had significant higher level recognition and financial
22
23 motivation ($p < 0.05$). Younger workers (< 25) had significantly higher
24
25 level of recognition motivation ($p < 0.05$) and responsibility motivation
26
27 ($p < 0.05$). A higher level of recognition motivation was expressed by
28
29 general practitioners ($p < 0.05$).
30
31
32
33
34
35

36
37 There were no significant differences in any of the four work
38
39 motivation subscale scores according to educational background,
40
41 professional title, or income. Men reported significantly higher levels of
42
43 recognition and financial motivation ($p < 0.05$). Younger workers (< 25)
44
45 reported significantly higher levels of recognition ($p < 0.05$) and
46
47 responsibility motivation ($p < 0.05$). General practitioners reported higher
48
49 levels of recognition motivation ($p < 0.05$).
50
51
52
53
54
55

56
57 **Insert Table 1 here**
58
59
60

Levels of work stress, work motivation, and job satisfaction

The mean score for overall perception of work stress was 3.11, which is slightly higher than the mid-point of 3 (Table 2). Wages and benefits (3.60) subscale of work stress ranked in the highest position, followed by work task and role (3.31), career development (2.96), organizational structure and climate (2.90), and relationships (2.75) ($F=154.9$, $p<0.001$). Statistically significant differences were noted in overall perception of stress and scores on all five work stress subscales between satisfied and dissatisfied respondents; those who were dissatisfied reported higher levels of work stress ($p < 0.001$).

Career development motivation was rated the highest level, followed by financial, recognition and responsibility motivation ($F=202.6$, $p<0.001$). Levels of overall perception of work motivation and all subscales with the exception of financial motivation were significantly different between the satisfied and dissatisfied groups of respondents, and the satisfied workers had higher levels of work motivation ($p<0.01$).

In respect to motivation, career development was rated highest, followed by financial, recognition, and responsibility motivation ($F = 202.6$, $p < 0.001$). Levels of overall perception of motivation and scores on all work motivation subscales, with the exception of financial motivation, differed significantly between the satisfied and dissatisfied

respondents, and the satisfied workers reported higher levels of work motivation ($p < 0.01$).

Insert Table 2 here

Predictors of job satisfaction

In this study, 61.3% of respondents were satisfied with their jobs. Table 3 presented results of a logistic regression model that examined the key predictors of job satisfaction, with special attention devoted to work stress and work motivation.

Only a few demographic characteristics were predictors of job satisfaction. We found that when scores on the career development and wages and benefits subscales of work stress increased by one grade, job satisfaction decreased by 32% (odds ratio [OR] = 0.68, $p < 0.05$) and 37% (OR = 0.63, $p < 0.01$), respectively. When financial motivation increased by one grade, job satisfaction decreased by 28% (OR = 0.72, $p < 0.01$), and when recognition motivation and responsibility motivation increased by one grade, job satisfaction increased 1.86 (OR = 2.86, $p < 0.01$) and 0.36 times (OR = 1.36, $p < 0.05$), respectively. Compared with nurses, general practitioners (OR = 0.56, $p < 0.01$) and public health physicians (OR = 0.42, $p < 0.05$) reported lower job satisfaction, while other technical staff (OR = 1.89) reported higher job satisfaction. Workers

1
2
3
4 with no title (OR = 7.02, $p < 0.05$) were more satisfied than workers with
5
6 a senior title.
7
8

9
10
11 **Insert Table 3 here**
12

13 14 15 16 **Discussion** 17

18
19 Job satisfaction in community health workers is important for the
20
21 sustainable development of basic healthcare in China, but health
22
23 policymakers and managers have neglected it for a long time.⁴⁷ This study
24
25 was one of the first of its kind to examine the level of work stress and
26
27 work motivation and their combined effects on job satisfaction among
28
29 urban community health workers in China since the implementation of
30
31 new health system reform.
32
33
34

35
36 Results indicated that the wages and benefits subscale of stress
37
38 ranked highest, followed by the work task and role subscale. Similarly,
39
40 previous research related to work stress found that low salary, heavy
41
42 workload, and few promotion opportunities were the most frequently
43
44 cited workplace stressors.^{49,50} Several reasons may have contributed to
45
46 these findings. In Heilongjiang Province, the average annual income of
47
48 health service personnel in urban hospitals was 52,564 RMB (\$1.00US =
49
50 6.23RMB) in 2012. In this study, 80.4% of the respondents' annual
51
52 incomes were lower than 36,000 RMB. These low salaries for community
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 health workers increased their wages and benefits stress.⁴⁸ In the
5
6 meanwhile, based on the province population and human resource
7
8 planning ratios, there is an approximate shortfall of 30% in the number of
9
10 general practitioners in 2012.⁴ And the recent reforms have expanded
11
12 the scope of public health services and increased workload without
13
14 equivalent increases in staffing.^{5,6}
15
16
17
18

19
20 Unfortunately, the present study found that scores on the career
21
22 development, and wages and benefits subscales of work stress were
23
24 negatively associated with job satisfaction. These findings were
25
26 consistent with previous studies in which workers were likely to report
27
28 low job satisfaction if they did not receive promotion and advancement
29
30 opportunities or adequate salaries.^{22,33,52}
31
32
33

34
35 With regard to work motivation, results showed the career
36
37 development and financial subscales of work motivation ranked first and
38
39 second respectively. Consistent with Hung and Hou's study, which found
40
41 income, benefits, and professional development were the most important
42
43 motivating factors among community health workers in China.^{39,51}
44
45

46
47 In this study, we defined career development and financial
48
49 motivation as extrinsic motivation and recognition and responsibility
50
51 motivation as intrinsic motivation based on the literature.^{37,53} Results
52
53 reported that the recognition and responsibility subscales of work
54
55 motivation were positive predictors of job satisfaction, and financial
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 motivation was a negative predictor. This was consistent with the
5
6 “crowding-in” effect, which proposes that intrinsic motivation increases
7
8 job satisfaction, whereas extrinsic motivation decreases job satisfaction.⁵⁴
9
10
11 It should be noted that in this study, the level of extrinsic motivation was
12
13 higher than that of intrinsic motivation.
14

15
16 These findings have significant implications for managers of
17
18 community health centers and policymakers in their efforts to improve
19
20 workers’ job satisfaction. First, policymakers should take measures to
21
22 improve community health workers’ salaries. In China, basic public
23
24 health services are funded by the government and provided by
25
26 community health workers without cost to residents. If health workers are
27
28 dissatisfied with their salaries, they may prefer to work for profit-making
29
30 medical services instead of nonprofit public health services. In the
31
32 meanwhile, managers should implement appropriate performance salary
33
34 distribution system to arouse the enthusiasms of the staff and reduce their
35
36 financial stress. Second, policymakers should focus on appropriate
37
38 promotion policies for community health workers. At present, it was
39
40 difficult for community health workers to get title promotion, for there
41
42 were limit promotion quotas for CHCs every year in Heilongjiang
43
44 Province and our study found only 18.6% of respondents had senior
45
46 professional title. Third, the managers should provide and support their
47
48 workers to attend training or continuing education. Fourth, managers and
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 policymakers should take measures to inspire intrinsic motivation in
5
6 workers. Becchetti proposed that when workers do not work for financial
7
8 incentives, they may find satisfaction irrespective of their salaries, even if
9
10 the financial incentive is kept to a minimum, and may therefore be
11
12 satisfied with their jobs.⁵³ Therefore, managers and policymakers should
13
14 introduce more incentives to encourage community health workers to
15
16 work for responsibility or recognition.
17
18
19
20

21
22 As some subscales of work stress and work motivation can influence
23
24 job satisfaction either positively or negatively, we examined levels of
25
26 work stress and motivation according to demographic characteristics and
27
28 found that policymakers and managers should pay more attention to three
29
30 types of workers. The first group of workers included those aged between
31
32 35 and 54 years (35–44 and 45–54 age groups), who reported higher
33
34 levels of stress on the work task and role subscale and lower levels of
35
36 intrinsic motivation. Similar results have been reported; in Qu's study,
37
38 community health workers in mid-level age groups were significantly
39
40 more stressed than those in the youngest age group in one province of
41
42 China.⁵⁵ This could be related to workload or difficulty and complexity of
43
44 the work task, which is usually greater for 35- to 54-year-old workers, as
45
46 they are the backbone of community health services. Men form the
47
48 second group that requires attention. In our study, men's scores on all of
49
50 the work stress subscales tended to be higher than women's, and men
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 reported higher levels of financial motivation.⁵⁶ However, another
5
6 Chinese study of primary health workers found no differences in financial
7
8 motivation.⁵¹ David found that women reported more stress in the
9
10 financial rewards and role ambiguity subscales.⁵⁷ The final group of
11
12 workers identified as requiring attention consists of general practitioners,
13
14 who experienced the highest stress according to all five work stress
15
16 subscales and reported the highest career development motivation.
17
18 General practitioners in community health centers face more difficult and
19
20 complicated tasks and types of medical risk than other health care
21
22 workers do, and they receive lower salaries and fewer promotion
23
24 opportunities than their counterparts in general hospitals.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 **Limitations of this study**

35
36 The findings in this study should be viewed in light of four key
37
38 limitations. First, this study was based on a small sample of community
39
40 health workers, which may limit the generalizability of the research
41
42 findings. Based on the literature about community health services in
43
44 China, a multistage, stratified sampling design was employed to ensure
45
46 that study data were provincially representative.^{7,40} A multistage,
47
48 stratified sampling design was used to ensure that study data were
49
50 provincially representative. Six sample cities were selected to account for
51
52 the variability in regional per capita gross domestic product, and the
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 levels of healthcare development and 15 CHCs in each city were selected
5
6 randomly. On average, there are 23 medical technical personnel in a
7
8 community health center in Heilongjiang province and there were
9
10 approximately 22 health workers in each of the community health centers
11
12 in our study. In addition, the proportions of general practitioners, public
13
14 health physicians, nurses, and other medical technical personnel in this
15
16 study were close to the proportions found in the province as a whole.³
17
18 Consequently, this sample was representative of Heilongjiang community
19
20 health service providers, thereby enhancing the potential for
21
22 generalization of the study findings. Second, the instrument for assess the
23
24 work stress and work motivation was developed from earlier study and
25
26 discussed with experts, while not an international commonly scale. Third,
27
28 we used a cross-sectional survey, which may limit our ability to identify
29
30 causal relationships between work stress and motivation and job
31
32 satisfaction. Fourth, the measurements were conducted by
33
34 self-administrated method and respondents' cognition can be affected by
35
36 emotions at that point in time. So the common method bias and
37
38 self-administrated bias might affect the results.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 **Conclusion**

52
53
54 It is important for healthcare managers to improve the job satisfaction of
55
56 health workers in low-resource settings. In this study, we examined levels
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 of work stress and motivation according to demographic characteristics
5
6 and in respect to levels of job satisfaction; additionally, the key predictors
7
8 of job satisfaction were identified using logistic regression analysis. The
9
10 results indicated that community health workers rated wages and benefits
11
12 highest among five subscales of work stress, and workers' extrinsic
13
14 motivation was higher than their intrinsic motivation. The career
15
16 development, and wages and benefits subscales of work stress and
17
18 financial motivation were significant negative predictors of job
19
20 satisfaction, whereas the recognition and responsibility subscales of work
21
22 motivation were significant positive determinants.
23
24
25
26
27

28
29 Our findings suggest that there is considerable room for improvement in
30
31 the job satisfaction of community health workers in Heilongjiang
32
33 Province, and health care managers and policymakers should take both
34
35 work stress and work motivation into consideration. First, they should
36
37 pay more attention to three types of worker, as these particular groups
38
39 reported higher work stress and extrinsic motivation. Second, they should
40
41 take a variety of measures to reduce career development, and wage and
42
43 benefits stress, as they were negative determinants of job satisfaction.
44
45
46
47
48 Third, it is important for managers and policymakers to inspire workers'
49
50 intrinsic motivation, as it can have a positive influence on job
51
52 satisfaction.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1 Facets of work stress and work motivation by socio-economic and demographic status for respondents

| | | | Work stress | | | | Work motivation | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----|------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------|--------------------|----------------|---------|
| | N | % | work task and role | career development | wages and benefits | Workplace relationships | organizational structure and climate | recognition | career development | responsibility | Finance |
| Occupation | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General practitioner | 335 | 36.0 | 3.53 | 3.17 | 3.78 | 2.90 | 3.14 | 3.61 | 4.20 | 3.44 | 4.15 |
| Public health physician | 178 | 19.1 | 3.20 | 2.89 | 3.70 | 2.63 | 2.96 | 3.57 | 4.11 | 3.67 | 4.06 |
| Nurse | 267 | 28.8 | 3.24 | 2.95 | 3.54 | 2.76 | 2.78 | 3.53 | 4.05 | 3.39 | 4.01 |
| Other | 150 | 16.1 | 3.09 | 2.79 | 3.45 | 2.65 | 2.84 | 3.59 | 4.11 | 3.40 | 4.03 |
| F | | | 6.91** | 4.97** | 3.45** | 3.05** | 6.25** | 0.66 | 2.31* | 1.96 | 0.99 |
| Sex | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 236 | 25.4 | 3.44 | 3.10 | 3.77 | 2.88 | 3.12 | 3.71 | 4.18 | 3.50 | 4.19 |
| Female | 694 | 74.6 | 3.27 | 2.93 | 3.56 | 2.72 | 2.85 | 3.56 | 4.12 | 3.43 | 4.03 |
| F | | | 2.50* | 2.27* | 2.60* | 2.51* | 4.09* | 2.36* | 1.23 | 1.04 | 2.39* |
| Educational background | | | | | | | | | | | |
| High school or below | 110 | 11.8 | 3.18 | 2.90 | 3.36 | 2.81 | 2.72 | 3.57 | 4.13 | 3.42 | 4.05 |
| Junior college | 446 | 48.0 | 3.28 | 2.94 | 3.61 | 2.74 | 2.86 | 3.57 | 4.14 | 3.49 | 4.02 |
| College and above | 374 | 40.2 | 3.36 | 3.00 | 3.65 | 2.73 | 3.16 | 3.60 | 4.11 | 3.39 | 4.11 |
| F | | | 2.30 | 0.66 | 4.21* | 0.45 | 4.02* | 0.13 | 0.24 | 1.53 | 1.33 |
| Age in years | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <25 | 78 | 8.4 | 3.08 | 2.81 | 3.45 | 2.60 | 2.77 | 3.80 | 4.23 | 3.60 | 3.92 |
| 25-34 | 258 | 27.7 | 3.21 | 2.94 | 3.63 | 2.72 | 2.91 | 3.65 | 4.11 | 3.48 | 4.17 |
| 35-44 | 329 | 35.4 | 3.36 | 2.98 | 3.55 | 2.78 | 2.88 | 3.52 | 4.13 | 3.35 | 4.03 |
| 45-54 | 234 | 25.2 | 3.43 | 3.02 | 3.69 | 2.79 | 2.94 | 3.53 | 4.13 | 3.51 | 4.04 |
| ≥55 | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-----|------|--------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|-------|------|
| F | 31 | 3.3 | 3.12 | 2.88 | 3.54 | 2.71 | 2.93 | 3.48 | 3.98 | 3.28 | 3.91 |
| | | | 4.71** | 1.01 | 1.36 | 1.12 | 0.83 | 2.89* | 1.83 | 2.86* | 2.39 |
| Title | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Senior title | 42 | 4.5 | 3.12 | 3.11 | 3.38 | 2.69 | 2.73 | 3.37 | 3.97 | 3.55 | 3.96 |
| Vice-senior title | 131 | 14.1 | 3.32 | 2.92 | 3.65 | 2.63 | 2.93 | 3.46 | 4.05 | 3.25 | 4.03 |
| Middle title | 399 | 42.9 | 3.43 | 3.03 | 3.69 | 2.85 | 2.94 | 3.56 | 4.16 | 3.44 | 4.06 |
| Primary title | 299 | 32.2 | 3.20 | 2.93 | 3.54 | 2.72 | 2.87 | 3.62 | 4.12 | 3.49 | 4.08 |
| No title | 59 | 6.3 | 3.23 | 2.86 | 3.48 | 2.58 | 2.89 | 3.73 | 4.16 | 3.49 | 4.04 |
| F | | | 3.96** | 1.07 | 1.71 | 3.04* | 0.59 | 1.73 | 0.98 | 2.13 | 0.16 |
| Monthly income (RMB) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <2000 | 361 | 38.9 | 3.24 | 2.95 | 3.69 | 2.76 | 2.90 | 3.61 | 4.15 | 3.49 | 4.09 |
| 2000-2999 | 386 | 41.5 | 3.32 | 2.96 | 3.61 | 2.75 | 2.88 | 3.59 | 4.13 | 3.40 | 4.06 |
| 3000-3999 | 139 | 14.9 | 3.43 | 2.97 | 3.44 | 2.68 | 2.96 | 3.52 | 4.02 | 3.43 | 3.97 |
| ≥4000 | 44 | 4.7 | 3.39 | 3.03 | 3.21 | 2.93 | 2.78 | 3.44 | 4.27 | 3.53 | 4.28 |
| F | | | 2.11 | 0.99 | 3.14* | 2.11 | 0.99 | 0.54 | 1.87 | 0.86 | 1.36 |
| Working hours (per week) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <40 小时 | 110 | 11.8 | 3.27 | 2.82 | 3.52 | 2.82 | 2.94 | 2.96 | 4.14 | 3.56 | 3.91 |
| 40-47 小时 | 509 | 54.7 | 3.26 | 2.73 | 3.59 | 2.73 | 2.95 | 2.87 | 4.10 | 3.42 | 4.06 |
| 48-55 小时 | 250 | 26.9 | 3.36 | 2.71 | 3.62 | 2.71 | 2.93 | 2.89 | 4.19 | 3.46 | 4.12 |
| ≥56 小时 | 61 | 6.6 | 3.52 | 2.93 | 3.75 | 2.93 | 3.36 | 3.13 | 4.16 | 3.43 | 4.14 |
| F | | | 0.06 | 0.20 | 0.48 | 0.20 | 0.01* | 0.11 | 0.39 | 0.44 | 0.13 |

*p<0.05 **p<0.01

Table 2 Mean scores of the overall perception and subscales of work stress and work motivation in respect to the level of job satisfaction

| | Mean \pm SD Total (n=930) | Level of job satisfaction | | P |
|--|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|
| | | Satisfied (n=570, 61.3%) | Dissatisfied (n=360, 38.7%) | |
| Work stress | | | | |
| Overall perception* | 3.11 \pm 0.68 | 2.95 \pm 0.68 | 3.37 \pm 0.60 | P=0.000 |
| work task and role¶ | 3.31 \pm 0.81 | 3.18 \pm 0.82 | 3.52 \pm 0.76 | P=0.000 |
| career development¶ | 2.96 \pm 0.87 | 2.79 \pm 0.85 | 3.22 \pm 0.83 | P=0.000 |
| Wages and benefits ¶ | 3.60 \pm 0.95 | 3.38 \pm 0.94 | 3.95 \pm 0.85 | P=0.000 |
| Workplace relationships¶ | 2.75 \pm 0.79 | 2.61 \pm 0.79 | 2.96 \pm 0.74 | P=0.000 |
| organizational structure and climate¶ | 2.90 \pm 0.79 | 2.74 \pm 0.79 | 3.15 \pm 0.71 | P=0.000 |
| Work motivation | | | | |
| Overall perception° | 3.80 \pm 0.55 | 3.86 \pm 0.55 | 3.70 \pm 0.55 | P=0.000 |
| Career development† | 4.13 \pm 0.57 | 4.24 \pm 0.51 | 3.95 \pm 0.62 | P=0.000 |
| Recognition† | 3.58 \pm 0.77 | 3.66 \pm 0.77 | 3.45 \pm 0.77 | P=0.000 |
| Responsibility† | 3.45 \pm 0.77 | 3.53 \pm 0.77 | 3.32 \pm 0.52 | P=0.000 |
| Financial† | 4.06 \pm 0.79 | 4.02 \pm 0.79 | 4.12 \pm 0.80 | P=0.295 |

* Mean score of overall perception of work stress was calculated for each respondent by adding the value of each item of work stress and then divided by the numbers of all item.

°Mean score of overall perception of work motivation was calculated for each respondent by adding the value of each item of work motivation and then divided by the numbers of the item.

¶Mean score of each subscale of work stress was calculated for each respondent by adding the value of each item belongs to the subscale of work stress and then divided by the numbers of the item.

†Mean score of each subscale of work motivation was calculated for each respondent by adding the value of each item belongs to the subscale of work motivation and then divided by the numbers of the item.

Table 3 The logistic regression analysis for job satisfaction*

| | | Odds Ratio | 95% CI |
|---|--------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| Occupation (Reference : nurse) | General practitioner | 0.56** | 0.38-0.81 |
| | Public health physician | 0.42* | 0.20-0.87 |
| | Other technical staff | 1.89* | 1.04-3.44 |
| Sex (Reference : male) | Female | 1.27 | 0.83-1.95 |
| Educational background (Reference : High school or below) | Junior college | 0.76 | 0.43-1.34 |
| | College and above | 0.75 | 0.41-1.40 |
| Age in years (Reference : <25) | 25-34 | 0.60 | 0.30-1.21 |
| | 35-44 | 1.10 | 0.51-2.42 |
| | 45-54 | 1.04 | 0.45-2.35 |
| | ≥55 | 8.53** | 1.86-39.01 |
| Title (Reference : senior title) | Vice-senior title | 1.86 | 0.476-7.29 |
| | Middle title | 2.57 | 0.67-9.78 |
| | Primary title | 3.84 | 0.96-15.39 |
| | No title | 7.02* | 1.53-32.12 |
| Monthly income in RMB (Reference : <2000) | 2000-2999 | 0.50 | 0.26-0.98 |
| | 3000-3999 | 0.99 | 0.64-1.52 |
| | ≥4000 | 1.30 | 0.86-1.97 |
| Weekly hours worked (Reference : <40) | 40-47 | 0.90 | 0.59-1.37 |
| | 48-55 | 1.07 | 0.67-1.70 |
| | ≥56 | 1.20 | 0.62-2.33 |
| Work stress | work task and role | 0.98 | 0.74-1.300 |
| | career development | 0.68* | 0.49-0.94 |
| | wages and benefits | 0.63** | 0.50-0.79 |
| | Workplace relationships | 0.80 | 0.59-1.09 |
| | Organizational structure and climate | 0.97 | 0.71-1.33 |
| Work motivation | Career development | 1.13 | 0.85-1.505 |
| | Recognition | 2.86** | 2.02-4.04 |
| | Responsibility | 1.36* | 1.02-1.81 |
| | Finance | 0.72** | 0.56-0.92 |

*Strongly satisfied and satisfied coded as 1 vs. strongly dissatisfied and dissatisfied coded as 0.

*p<0.05, **p<0.01

Acknowledgements We are thankful to all the community health workers who participated in the study. We are also grateful to Yin Li, Xingsan Li, Zhuang Wang and Hongjuan Wei, who have worked closely with the team to ensure the field survey is successfully implemented.

Completing interests None.

Contributors

LiLi was responsible for the study design, data analysis and the drafting and revising of the manuscript. HongyanHu and ChangzhiHe, who contributed equally as the first author to this article, were responsible for study design, data collection and data analysis. HaoZzhou and ZhongZhang provided statistical expertise. XinyanLiu, TaoSun and HengLi performed data collection and technical support. LihuaFan provided administrative support. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Funding This study was funded by the National Science Foundation of China (NSFC), Contract No.71203050/G0308, Contract No.71073034 and was supported by Young Seed Foundation of Public Health College of Harbin Medical University. The opinions expressed herein are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect the views of NSFC and the survey was conducted independently by researchers from Harbin Medical University.

References

1. Starfield B, Shi LY, Macinko J. Contribution of primary care to health systems and health. *Milbank Q* 2005;83: 457–502.
2. Hung LM, Rane S, Tsai J, et al. Advancing primary care to promote equitable health: implications for China. *Int J Equity Health* 2012;11:2.
3. Heilongjiang Provincial Bureau. Heilongjiang Health Statistical Yearbook 2012. Harbin, China: Heilongjiang Provincial Press 2013.
4. State Commission Office for Public Sector Reform. (2006). Notice on Issuing the Instruction Opinions on Organization Structure and Staffing of Urban Community Health Service. Beijing, China. http://www.gov.cn/zwggk/2006-09/04/content_377067.htm (accessed on 4 September 2006).
5. MOH (Ministry of Health of China) Chinese Health statistics in 2010. Peking Union Medical College Press 2010.
6. MOH (Ministry of Health of China) (2012) Chinese Health statistics in 2010. Peking Union Medical College Press.
7. Zhou W, Dong YM, Lin XZ, et al. Community health service capacity in China: a survey in three municipalities. *J Eval Clin Pract* 2013;19(1):167–17.
8. Li L, Zhou H, Yao GF, et al. Analysis on working motivation of community health workers in Harbin, China. *Medicine and Society (in Chinese)* 2013;7:40-43.

- 1
2
3 9. Clegg A. Occupational stress in nursing: a review of the literature. *J*
4
5 *Nurs Manage* 2001; 9:101–106.
6
7
- 8
9 10. Lazarus RS. & Folkman S. *Stress, Appraisal and Coping*. Springer,
10
11 New York, NY.1984.
12
- 13 11. Karasek RA. Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain:
14
15 implications for job re-design. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 1979;
16
17 24(2): 285–308.
18
19
- 20 12. Siegrist J. Adverse health effects of high-effort/low-reward conditions.
21
22 *J Occup Health Psychol* 1996; 1:27–41.
23
- 24 13. Nakasis K., Ouzouni C. Factors influencing stress and job satisfaction
25
26 of nurses working in psychiatric units: a research review. *Heal Sci J*
27
28 2008;2 (4): 183–195.
29
30
- 31 14. Jamal M. Burnout among Canadian and Chinese employees: a
32
33 cross-cultural study. *European Management Review*
34
35 2005;2(3):224–230.
36
37
- 38 15. Riggio R. *Introduction to industrial organizational psychology*. New
39
40 Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc. 2003.
41
- 42 16. Cooper CL, Marshall J. Occupational sources of stress: a review of
43
44 the literature relating to coronary heart disease and mental ill health. *J*
45
46 *Occup Psychol* 1976; 49:11-28.
47
48
- 49 17. Kim HJ. Work Stress and Job Satisfaction of Community Mental
50
51 Health Nurses in South Korea: A Qualitative Content Analysis. *J*
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Korean Acad Psychiatr Ment Health Nurs 2013;22(4):295-306.
4
5
6 18. Johnson SJ, O'Connor EM, Jacobs S, et al. The relationships among
7
8 work stress, strain and self-reported errors in UK community
9
10 pharmacy. *Research in Social and Administrative Pharmacy*. 2014;1.
11
12
13 19. Qu NQ, Zhou H, Fan LH, et al. Analysis on work stress and
14
15 occupational burnout among community health service staff in Harbin.
16
17 *Medicine and Society* 2013;26(9):87-89.
18
19
20
21 20. Chen XJ, Tan XR, Li LP. Health Problem and Occupational Stress
22
23 among Chinese Doctors. *Chinese Medicine* 2013;4: 1-6.
24
25
26 21. Nabirye RC, Brown KC, Pryor ER et al. Occupational stress, job
27
28 satisfaction and job performance among hospital nurses in Kampala,
29
30 Uganda. *J Nurs Manage* 2011; 19:760–768.
31
32
33
34 22. Voltmer E, Rosta J, Johannes Siegrist, et al. Job stress and job
35
36 satisfaction of physicians in private practice: comparison of German
37
38 and Norwegian physicians. *Int Arch Occ Env Hea* 2012;85,
39
40 (7):819-828.
41
42
43
44 23. Saijo Y, Chiba S, Yoshioka E, et al. Job stress and burnout among
45
46 urban and rural hospital physicians in Japan. *Aust J Rural Health*
47
48 2013;21(4): 225–231.
49
50
51
52 24. Sun Y, Luo ZN, Fang PQ. Factors Influencing the Turnover Intention
53
54 of Chinese Community Health Service Workers Based on the
55
56 Investigation Results of Five Provinces. *J Commun Health*
57
58
59
60

- 2013;38(6):1058-1066.
25. Franco LM, Bennett S, Kanfer R, et al. Determinants and consequences of health worker motivation in hospitals in Jordan and Georgia. *Soc Sci Med* 2004;58:343-355
26. Kanfer R. Measuring health worker motivation in developing countries. Partnerships for Health Reform Project, Major Applied Research Working Paper 1999.
27. Vroom, V. H. *Work and motivation*. New York: Wiley.1964.
28. Porter LW, Lawler EE. *Managerial attitudes and performance*. Homewood, IL: Irwin-Dorsey 1968.
29. Ryan RM, Deci EL. Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and wellbeing. *Am Psychol* 2000; 55(1): 68–77.
30. Ryan RM, Deci EL. Self-regulation and the problem of human autonomy: Does psychology need choice, self-determination, and will? *J Pers* 2006; 74(6):1558–1585.
31. Peters DH, Chakraborty S, Mahapatra P, et al. Job satisfaction and motivation of health workers in public and private sectors: cross-sectional analysis from two Indian states. *Hum Resour Health*. 2010;8:27.
32. Patrick MM, Duane B, Lucy G, et al. Developing a tool to measure health worker motivation in district hospitals in Kenya. *Hum Resour*

- 1
2
3 Health 2009; 7:40.
- 4
5
6 33. Wilbroad M, Helen A, Virginia B, et al. Measuring health workers'
7
8 motivation in rural health facilities: baseline results from three study
9
10 districts in Zambia. *Hum Resour Health* 2013;11:8.
- 11
12
13 34. Tribolet WC. The relationship between intrinsic and extrinsic
14
15 motivation and organizational commitment: a study in a European
16
17 environment [D]. Nova Southeastern Univ 2004.
- 18
19
20
21 35. Hoonakker PL, Carayon P, McGuire K, et al. Motivation and job
22
23 satisfaction of Tele-ICU nurses. *J Crit Care* 2013;28:315.e13
24
25 -315.e21.
- 26
27
28
29 36. Pool SW. The relationship of job satisfaction with substitutes of
30
31 leadership, leadership behavior, and work motivation. *J Psychol*
32
33 1997;131(3):271-83.
- 34
35
36
37 37. Stringer C, Jeni D, Theivananthampillai. Motivation, pay satisfaction,
38
39 and job satisfaction of front-line employees. *Qual Res Acco Man*
40
41 2011; 8(2):161-179.
- 42
43
44 38. Shi L, Hung LM, Song K, et al. Chinese primary care physicians and
45
46 work attitudes. *Int J Health Serv* 2013;43(1):167–181.
- 47
48
49
50 39. Hung LM, Shi L, Wang H, et al. Chinese primary care providers and
51
52 motivating factors on performance. *Fam Prac* 2013; 30:576–586.
- 53
54
55 40. Ge C, Fu J, Chang Y, et al. Factors associated with job satisfaction
56
57 among Chinese community health workers: a cross-sectional study.
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 BMC Public Health, 2011;24(11):884.
4
5
6 41. Chen TL, Huang MY, Su TH. Work motivation, work stress, and job
7
8 satisfaction in between Taiwan and China-An empirical study. World
9
10 Acad Sci, Eng Tech 2012; 68:1446-1450.
11
12
13 42. Ajayi MP., Abimbola OH. Job satisfaction, organizational stress and
14
15 employee performance: a study of NAPIMS. Ife Psychol
16
17 2013;21:75-82.
18
19
20
21 43. Wayne SJ, Liden RC. Effects of impression management on
22
23 performance ratings: a longitudinal study. Acad Manage J
24
25 1995;38:232-260.
26
27
28
29 44. Gagne M, Deci EL. Self-determination theory and work motivation. J
30
31 Organ Behav 2005;26:331-362.
32
33
34 45. Dieleman M, Cuong PV, Anh, LV, et al. Identifying factors for job
35
36 motivation of rural health workers in North Vietnam. Hum Resour
37
38 Health 2003;1:10.
39
40
41
42 46. Wanous JP, Reichers AE, Hudy MJ. Overall job satisfaction: how
43
44 good are single-item measures? J Appl Psychol 1997;82:247-52.
45
46
47 47. Chen J, Dong JQ, Ding J, Du XP. Analysis on satisfaction of
48
49 professionals in community health service institutions held by
50
51 different levels of hospital. Chin Gen Pract 2008;4(11): 631-634. (In
52
53 Chinese)
54
55
56
57 48. National Bureau of Statistics. China Statistic Yearbook 2013.
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Beijing ,China: China Sta Press. 2013.
- 4
5
6 49. Ding H, Sun X, Chang WW, et al. A comparison of job satisfaction of
7
8 community health workers before and after local comprehensive
9
10 medical care reform: a typical field investigation in central China.
11
12 Plos One 2013;8(9):1-5.
- 13
14
15 50. Han JF, Li XH. An analysis on the job stressors of community health
16
17 nurses.Chinese Nursing Management. 2007;7(5):45-48. (in Chinese)
- 18
19
20 51. Hou ZH, Meng QY, Yuan BB et al. Motivation preferences of general
21
22 practices in rural China. Chinese Journal of Health Policy,
23
24 2010;13(10):18-22.
- 25
26
27
28 52. Lephalala RP. Factors influencing nurses job satisfaction in selected
29
30 private hospitals in England. Curationis 2008;31(3): 60–69.
- 31
32
33 53. Becchetti L, Castriota S, Tortia EC. Productivity, wages and intrinsic
34
35 motivations. Sma Bus Eco 2012;41:379–399.
- 36
37
38 54. Frey BS. On the relationship between intrinsic and extrinsic work
39
40 motivation. Int J Ind Organ 1997;15(4),427-439.
- 41
42
43 55. Qu JW. Investigation and research on job stress and degree of loyalty
44
45 in community health workers in Liaoning Province (M). Shenyang:
46
47 Chinese Medical University 2013.
- 48
49
50 56. Malik AA, Yamamoto SS, Souares A, et al. Motivational
51
52 determinants among physicians in Lahore Pakistan. BMC Health Serv
53
54 Res 2010;10:201.
- 55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 57. David PH, Srinika DJ. Gender differences in work stress among
4
5
6 clinical social workers. J Soc Serv Res 2008;10:18.
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

STROBE Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cross-sectional studies*

| | Item No | Recommendation | Reported on page # |
|------------------------------|---------|---|--------------------|
| Title and abstract | 1 | (a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract | 2, 7 |
| | | (b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found | 2 |
| Introduction | | | |
| Background/rationale | 2 | Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported | 4, 5 |
| Objectives | 3 | State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses | 9 |
| Methods | | | |
| Study design | 4 | Present key elements of study design early in the paper | 9 |
| Setting | 5 | Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection | 10 |
| Participants | 6 | (a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants | 10, 11 |
| Variables | 7 | Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable | 11-13 |
| Data sources/ measurement | 8* | For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group | |
| Bias | 9 | Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias | 10 |
| Study size | 10 | Explain how the study size was arrived at | 10 |
| Quantitative variables | 11 | Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why | 10, 11 |
| Statistical methods | 12 | (a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding | 13, 14 |
| | | (b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions | |
| | | (c) Explain how missing data were addressed | |
| | | (d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy | |
| | | (e) Describe any sensitivity analyses | |
| Results | | | |
| Participants | 13* | (a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed | |
| | | (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage | |
| | | (c) Consider use of a flow diagram | |
| Descriptive data | 14* | (a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders | |
| | | (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest | |
| Outcome data | 15* | Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures | |

| | | | |
|----|--------------------------|----|--|
| 1 | | | |
| 2 | Main results | 16 | (a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included |
| 3 | | | |
| 4 | | | |
| 5 | | | |
| 6 | | | |
| 7 | | | (b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized |
| 8 | | | |
| 9 | | | (c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period |
| 10 | | | |
| 11 | Other analyses | 17 | Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses |
| 12 | | | |
| 13 | | | |
| 14 | Discussion | | |
| 15 | Key results | 18 | Summarise key results with reference to study objectives |
| 16 | Limitations | 19 | Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias |
| 17 | | | |
| 18 | | | |
| 19 | | | |
| 20 | Interpretation | 20 | Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence |
| 21 | | | |
| 22 | | | |
| 23 | | | |
| 24 | Generalisability | 21 | Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results |
| 25 | | | |
| 26 | Other information | | |
| 27 | Funding | 22 | Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based |
| 28 | | | |
| 29 | | | |
| 30 | | | |

*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.