Role of human resource management, share leadership, work team, and performance of health food restaurant in Beijing, China

Ruiqing Zhan, Panyada Chantakit

Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University, Thailand
Email: s65567810016@ssru.ac.th; panyada.ch@ssru.ac.th

ABSTRACT

The research investigated the role of human resource management, share leadership, work team, and performance of health food restaurant in Beijing, China. The conceptual framework was developed from the literature review, survey, and other contemporary research in human resource management. Accordingly, the researchers consider the importance of human resource management, share leadership, work team, and performance of of health food restaurant in Beijing, China. In this, the researchers employed the quantitative research approaches. The instruments of research were the steps of a questionnaire. Data were collected from 272 people who are entrepreneurs of health food restaurant in Beijing. The data collected were analyzed using descriptive statistics as mean, standard deviation, and percentage on the basis of observing the actual performance of health food restaurant in Beijing, China studied through all operational links in management. Findings are applications of human resource management, share leadership, work team, and performance are mostly-level.

INTRODUCTION

The rapid growth of health foods in China, together with increasing consumer purchasing power, represents a massive opportunity for international health food manufacturers with existing R&D, production and marketing capacity, as well as the financial means to invest. The domestic market is highly fragmented. As of 2016 there were 2320 domestic health foods manufacturers, mostly concentrated in the coastal provinces and cities of Beijing, Guangdong,Sandong, Shanghai, Yiangsu and Zhejiang. The majority of these are relatively small players; only 2% have total investment over RMB 100m. Many lack funds to conduct R&D to take advantage of evolving consumer needs, and lack of competition between the larger players means there is little incentive for innovation.

Meanwhile, as a result of repeated food safety candals and a history of false and misleading claims, counterfeit products and poor post-market regulatory supervision in the health foods sector, Chinese consumers tend to view foreign brands favourably. The two leading sources of health food imports into China are the United States (23.4% of imports) and Australia (15.8%). The US is particularly well-regarded for its sports nutrition products; while Australia, which has a free trade agreement with China, is perceived as having clean water and pollution-free food. Europe is also seen as a source of clean and safe food, if more industrial than Australia.

Despite these opportunities, breaking into the Chinese health foods market is not easy. The main barrier is regulatory: China's regulations are strict and have recently undergone a major overhaul. A manufacturer wishing to launch a finished product bearing a health claim in China must first conduct a battery of scientific trials and submit dossier to the CFDA. As of July 2017, China Food and Drug Administration (CFDA) had approved 16,631 health foods,

of which just 752 were imported. The new Food Safety Law and its attendant regulations and administrative measures has sought to make the process less onerous — whilst, at the same time, ensuring substantiation of efficacy and safety. The jury is still out on whether the changes will make a material difference, with a number of commentators doubting that international market entrants will find China much easier to crack in the future.

What is more, despite the appetite for foreign products and desire for scientific substantiation, the traditional culture of Chinese medicinal food and therapeutic cuisine still has a strong influence. Health food products need to be culturally appropriate and to bear in mind local taste and texture preferences, which can be very different from elsewhere in the world.

In this research, the researcher aims to find various factors. Relevant factors that will make the health food business have good business performance include Human resource management, share leadership, work team, and performance. The researcher aims to find the factors affecting on performance of health food restaurant in Beijing, China. To create success for the health food business in Beijing China.

Research objective is to study role of human resource management, share leadership, work team, and performance of health food restaurant in Beijing, China

METHODOLOGY

The study role of human resource management, share leadership, work team, and performance of health food restaurant in Beijing, China, the researcher has studied documents, textbooks, concepts, theories, and related research consistent with the study's objectives. This research is quantitative research in the format is survey research. The research tool was a questionnaire. Data was collected by instrument-based interviews. The population is entrepreneurs of health food restaurant in Beijing, the total number of entrepreneurs is 855 people in Beijing, China. All residents are health food restaurant business operators located in Beijing, China. All health food restaurants are those that have been in business for more than three years and have consistently high turnover. The survey sample was 272 residents from entrepreneurs of health food restaurant in Beijing, China. The researchers used a simple random sampling method to conduct a random sample size, as determined according to the Taro Yamane formula (Yamane, 1973). The researchers conducted a simple random sampling calculation using the Taro Yamane formula, and based on the calculation results, the number of samples was 272. The confidence level is 95%. The tolerance of the sample is at the level of 0.05. Descriptive statistics analysis to test the variables between human resource management, share leadership, work team and performance.

RESULTS

Opinion level results on role of human resource management, share leadership, work team, and performance of health food restaurant in Beijing, China

The details as follows:

Table 1 Personal characteristics of entrepreneurs of health food restaurant

Characteristics of entrepreneurs	number (n=272)	Percentage
1. Gender		
- Male	148	54.41
- Female	124	45.59
2. Age		
- 18 - 25 Year	74	27.21
- 26 – 35 year	52	19.12
- 36 – 45 year	89	32.72
- More than 46 year	57	20.95
3. Marital status		
- single	106	38.97
- married	96	35.29
- divorced	70	25.74
4. Degree of education		
- lower than bachelor's degree		
- Bachelor's degree	59	21.69
- Graduated	101	37.13
	112	41.18
5. Working time		
- 1-3 years	97	35.66
- 4-6 years	110	40.44
- More than 7 years	65	23.90
6. Monthly income	-	
- 1000-3000 Yuan	94	34.56
- 3001-5000 Yuan	99	36.40
- 5001-8000 Yuan	79	29.04

From the table 4.1, the perspective of gender, male are significantly higher than female, accounting for 54.41 percentage, and female 44.59 percentage.

Regarding the age of entrepreneurs, the mostly proportion was 36-45 years old, accounting for 32.72%, followed by entrepreneurs aged 18-25 years and entrepreneurs of SME aged 26-35 years, accounting for 27.21% and 19.12%, respectively, and entrepreneurs over 46 years old. Representing 20.95% said that entrepreneurs of SME who responded to the survey were generally middle age.

Regarding marital status, 38.97% were single, 35.29% were divorced, and 25.74% were related to the age distribution. The company had many young entrepreneurs.

From the perspective of educational background, entrepreneurs in Beijing generally have lower than bachelor's degree, Bachelor's degree, and postgraduate accounting for 21.69, 37.13 and 41.18% respectively.

From the perspective of working years, the entrepreneurs in Beijing are generally in the range of 1-3 years, 4-6 years of entrepreneurs, accounting for 35.66 and 40.44 respectively, and an entrepreneurs who have worked for more than 7 years also account for a certain proportion, 23.90%.

In terms of monthly income, 36.40% of entrepreneurs have a monthly income of 3000-5000 Yuan, 29.04% of entrepreneurs have a monthly income of 5000-8000 Yuan, and only 34.56% of entrepreneurs have a monthly income of 1000-3000 Yuan, indicating that the average monthly income of entrepreneurs has basically reached the middle-income level.

Opinion level results on factors influencing performance of health food restaurant in Beijing, China.

To study human resource management, share leaderships, work team and performance of health food restaurant in Beijing, Thailand

1. Human resource management

Table 2 the level of opinion about human resource management

Human resource management	Mean	S.D.	Level	Rank
1. The organization has a process for selecting staff who are knowledgeable in product design.	4.378	.702	mostly	2
2. All staff of the organization must work according to their own expertise.	4.433	.690	mostly	1
3. The organization has training in specific fields as appropriate for staff.	4.218	.666	most	3
4. Staff are proficient in product design and can design well.	4.199	.689	most	4
5. The organization has a fixed salary and high returns.	4.102	.712	most	6
6. All staff can work for each other when necessary.	4.113	.705	most	5
7. The organization has a welfare system as appropriate.	3.811	.712	most	8
8. All staff receive family care such as medical expenses, children's tuition fees	3.889	.668	most	7
Total	4.143	.693	most	

From Table 4.2, the mean and standard deviation of the opinion level of the human resource management variable is at a most level, with the mean value at a higher level being 4.143. Comprehensive from all aspects, the average of the mostly side is " All staff of the organization must work according to their own expertise.", mostly level average of 4.433, followed by "The organization has a process for selecting staff who are knowledgeable in

product design" mostly level of average of 4.378, "The organization has training in specific fields as appropriate for staff", mostly level average of 4.218, "Staff are proficient in product design and can design well", most level average of 4.199, "All staff can work for each other when necessary", most level average of 4.113, "The organization has a fixed salary and high returns", most level average of 4.102, "All staff receive family care such as medical expenses, children's tuition fees", most level average of 3.889, "the last is "The organization has a welfare system as appropriate", the average is 3.811, in the most level.

2. Share leadership

Table 3 the level of opinion about Share leadership

Share leadership	Mean	S.D.	Level	Rank
1. Providing creative input and idea suggestion to staff.	4.118	.678	mostly	4
2. The staff have the potential to play a role in innovative thinking.	4.221	.721	mostly	3
3. There is establishing a supportive climate for creativity within the organization.	4.335	.688	mostly	1
4. There are building trust and confidence is essential for long-term relationships	4.305	.711	most	2
5. Encourage all stakeholders to understand the organization's aims as a guide for collaboration.	4.101	.688	Mostly	5
6. There is ability to inspire trust and confidence to provide better service to customers.	3.921	.671	most	7
7. The most important idea of organization are the ability to provide reliable and collaborative.	3.997	.657	most	6
Total	4.143	.688	mostly	

From Table 4.3, both the mean value and the standard deviation regarding the opinion level affecting the share leadership are at a mostly overall level, with the mean value at a mostly level being 4.143. From the various aspects of the variables involved, we found that the mostly average is "There is establishing a supportive climate for creativity within the organization" (4.335), at a mostly level, followed by "There are building trust and confidence is essential for long-term relationships" (4.305), at a mostly level, "The staff have the potential to play a role in innovative thinking" (4.221), at a mostly level, "Providing creative input and idea suggestion to staff" (4.118), at a mostly level, "Encourage all stakeholders to understand the organization's aims as a guide for collaboration" (4.101), at a most level, "The most important idea of organization are the ability to provide reliable and collaborative" (3.997), at a most level, the lowest is "There is ability to inspire trust and confidence to provide better service to customers" the average of 3.921, in the same most level.

3. Work team

Table 4 the level of opinion about work team

Work team	Mean	S.D.	Level	Rank
1. Developing connections, partnerships, and networks as alternative options for operation	4.235	.738	most	4
2. There are creating opportunities to increase group team work	4.411	.695	mostly	1
3. There are optimum use of existing capacities	4.278	.691	mostly	3
4. Team has established a supportive climate for creativity within the organization	4.389	.689	mostly	2
5. To provide prioritize customer satisfaction and continuous improvement.	4.118	.694	most	5
6. We develop team composition as putting together teams with specific skill sets needed for innovative thinking	4.104	.766	most	6
7. Team have strong leadership and allocating organizational resources i.e. research and development spending; manpower.	3.992	.712	most	7
Total	4.218	.712	most	

From Table 4.4, the mean and standard deviation of the opinion level of the work team variable is at a most level, with the mean value at a most level being 4.218. Comprehensive from all aspects, the average of the mostly side is "There are creating opportunities to increase group team work" mostly level average of 4.411, followed by "Team has established a supportive climate for creativity within the organization", mostly level of average of 4.389, "There are optimum use of existing capacities", mostly level of average of 4.278, "Developing connections, partnerships, and networks as alternative options for operation", most level of average of 4.235, "To provide prioritize customer satisfaction and continuous improvement", most level of average of 4.118, "We develop team composition as putting together teams with specific skill sets needed for innovative thinking", most level of average of 4.104, the last is "Team have strong leadership and allocating organizational resources i.e. research and development spending; manpower" the average is 3.992, in the most level

4. Performance

Table 5 the level of opinion about performance

Performance	Mean	S.D.	Level	Rank
1. Having upgraded human resources in terms of regular staff and temporary staff.	4.218	.723	mostly	3
2. Having good infrastructure to absorb more customer	4.111	.765	mostly	5
3. Having updated educational and training programs	4.347	.751	most	1
4. Increase use of information technology and recent advances of technological achievements for improving staff skills	4.299	.699	mostly	2
5. Educating skilled people who are create jobs and opportunities.	4.146	.731	most	4
Total	4.224	.734	mostly	

From Table 4.5, the mean and standard deviation of the opinion level of the performance variable is at a mostly level, with the mean value at a mostly level being 4.224. Comprehensive from all aspects, the average of the mostly side is "Having updated educational and training programs", mostly level average of 4.347, "Increase use of information technology and recent advances of technological achievements for improving staff skills", mostly level average of 4.299, "Having upgraded human resources in terms of regular staff and temporary staff", mostly level average of 4.218, "Educating skilled people who are create jobs and opportunities", mostly level average of 4.146, the last is " Having good infrastructure to absorb more customer ", the average is 4.111, in the most level

CONCLUSION

The mean and standard deviation of opinion levels regarding factors affecting performance are at a most overall level, with a most-level mean at 4.182. From each variable, we found that the mostly average was performance (4.224), at a mostly level, followed by work team (4.218), share leadership (4.143), at a most level, and the lowest was human resource management, with an average of 4.143.

REFERENCES

Cronbach, L. J. (1990). Essentials of psychological testing (5th ed.). New York: Harper Collins. Publishers.(pp.202-204)

Liu, W., & Gumah, B. (2020). Leadership style and self-efficacy: The influences of feedback. Journal of psychology in Africa, 30(4), 289-294**.**

Malik, F. A., Akhtar, S., Khurshid, S., & Javed, M. U. (2023). Unveiling the Dynamics of Ethical Leadership: Empirical Insights and Impact on Organizational Outcomes. International Journal of Business and Economic Affairs, 8(3), 75-87.

Rigby, C. S., & Ryan, R. M. (2018). Self-determination theory in human resource development: New directions and practical considerations. Advances in Developing Human Resources, 20(2), 133-147.

Taro Yamane. (1973). Statistics: an introductory analysis. New York: New York: Harper & Row.

Wu, Q., Cormican, K., & Chen, G. (2020). A meta-analysis of shared leadership: Antecedents, consequences, and moderators. Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 27(1), 49-64

Yi, J. (2015). A measure of knowledge sharing behavior: Scale development and validation. In The Essentials of Knowledge Management (pp. 213-245). London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.