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Abstract
Food is always viewed as an indispensable household necessity. Based on the 2009 Family Income and Expenditure Survey (FIES), 42.6% of the total expenditure of a typical Filipino household is solely being allocated for food (Limtingco, 2012). As the growing demand for food continues to escalate, fast food providers had proliferated both in the metro and rural provinces to help augment the need. In effect, the demand for human workforce for these companies had also escalated. However, at present, no available literature had yet explicated on the current psychological condition of the working personnel of these companies. Thus, this research is an exploratory attempt meant to delve on the various typologies and severity of stressors currently experienced by the food service personnel in the Philippines. Furthermore, this study statistically accounted for the coping mechanisms used by the fast food service personnel in treating their work related problems.

Keywords: Stress, occupational stress, fast food restaurant, coping strategies, food service industry
Literature Review
Philippine Fast Food Industries

According to Digal (2010), “Fast food” generally refers to the type of restaurants that sell quick and inexpensive take-out foods. In fact, at present, these fast foods are seen to be generally favored by the public and that companies of these nature are expected to experience a value growth of 46.9% on the year 2015 (International Market Bureau, 2012). Furthermore, the trend of urbanization and a general exodus of people living in rural areas to urban localities had propelled the growth of this economy (Euromonitor, 2011). As an effect, the demand for an increased workforce in these companies had also been continually on the rise. According to the National Statistics Office, the total employment in Hotel and Restaurant Industry in the Philippines were 90,101 (55,571 = male, 34,530 = female). Conversely, as the customers continue to demand for fast foods to be truly “fast”, service personnel are thus subjected to a rigorous, service oriented, quality driven and fast-faced service which at times could result to work anxiety. Job stress or occupational stress, if left untreated, could be highly disruptive and might result to employees being unproductive and exceedingly dissatisfied.

Occupational Stress

Though literature mostly points to occupational stress as a common problem in many organizations (Petrus, 2004; Ongori, 2007; MohdZukr, 2010), the real predicament of most researchers not only stems from accounting stress in various types of industries but also on the applicability and use of the term “stress” depending on the organization. Outten (2009) conceive that the definition of occupational stress is one of the most creatively ambiguous words, with as many interpretations as there are people who use the word. While Chen (2008) assert that there is no universally accepted definition of the term stress, Chamberlin and Green (2010) argue that stress is the by-product of modern life that results from our efforts of trying to balance the demands of the workplace and of family life. For example, several studies (Elwkai, 2003; Dewe, 2003; Caulfield 2004; Cope, 2003) posit that occupational stress is defined as the perception of a discrepancy between environmental demands stressors and individual capacities to fulfill these demands. Though Psychologists cannot agree on one definition for the word stress (Schonfeld, 1990; Thomas, 2012), the widely used definition of stress is psychological and physical reaction to certain life events or situations (Aamodt, 2010), while Kakkos (2011) defines stress as a person’s psychological and physiological response to the perception of demand and challenge.

Nonetheless, the usual causes of occupational stress were already identified in several researches. Shahid, 2006; Torkelson, 2007 for example,
argued that the causes of occupational stress include perceived loss of job and security, lack of safety, complexity of repetitiveness of work and lack of autonomy in the job. Furthermore, occupational stress is caused by poor work performance (Agolla, 2008), work overload (Wickramasinghe, 2010), bullying and harassment (Wallace, 2010), inadequate or poor quality training/management development (Palmer, 2004) and conflicting performance expectation (Buys, et al., 2010). The causes of stress at work were perceived as being predominantly organizational, but the impact of stress on an employee was observed to be more personal and that which extends beyond the expected and salient organizational outcomes (Kinman & Jones, 2005).

**Coping Mechanisms**

According to Hassim (2010), a direct negative impact of sources of occupational stress on mental health of an individual will elicit coping responses. Coping is defined as the cognitive and behavioral efforts made to master, tolerate, or reduce external and internal demands and the conflicts between them. However, researches that focus on coping strategies to reduce occupational stress were minimal. Folkman and Lazarus (1980) found eight scales of coping behaviors, and described the different coping scales. Problem solving and being confrontative are described as efforts to alter the situation and can therefore be characterized as problem-focused coping. Accepting and escape/avoidance are described as ways of managing a stressful situation through cognitive and emotional efforts without changing the situation itself.

Furthermore, coping responses or strategies refer to the specific efforts, both behavioral and psychological, that people employ to master, tolerate, reduce, or minimize stressful events (Hassim, 2010). On the other hand, Gbadamosi (2012) defines coping strategies as ways in which individuals choose to respond to stressful situations. Effectiveness of coping strategies may play an important role in reducing stress levels and increasing job performance (Wallace, 2010). Individuals need to possess the necessary coping strategies deriving from either their mental training to sustain positive thinking and/or the organization itself that helps stressed individuals to cope with the effects of stress.

In a study by Folkman and Lazarus (1980), the standard model for research on coping comprises of two main coping dimensions: Problem-focused coping strategies which involve efforts to solve a problem or change a difficult situation in an active way, and Emotion- focused coping strategies which do not change the problem or situation directly but helps develop new meanings to be assigned or serve to regulate the emotions that are aroused.
Though in general, the study of Folkman & Lazarus (1984) indicates that people use both types of strategies to combat most stressful events.

Moreover, one of the most important contributions made by the cognitive theory of stress and coping developed by Lazarus & Folkman is that they have determined that the consequences of stressful events are not a direct result of the stressful circumstances but are determined by the individuals’ appraisals of both the circumstances and their options for coping with stress. The above mentioned researchers argued that stress consists of three processes; Primary appraisal is the process of perceiving a threat to oneself, Secondary appraisal is the process of bringing to mind a potential response to the threat, while Coping, as the third process, is the executing of the responses.

Anyhow, Lazarus and Folkman (1980) found that in some situations, problem-focused coping even increases rather than decreases stress. Further researches (Lazarus & Folkman, 1980; Carver, Scheier, & Weintraub, 1989; Dewe, Cox, & Ferguson, 1993) also argue that coping strategies should not be grouped into two broad categories, but regarded separately. In this regard, this study would likewise endeavor to test the applicability of the problem-focused coping and emotion-focused model of coping strategies in mitigating occupational stress in the fast food service personnel in the Philippines.

**Methodology**

The goal of this study is to determine the occupational stressors among Filipino service personnel employed in a leading fast food restaurant in the Philippines. It further identifies the coping strategies used by these service personnel to reduce their occupational stress levels. The research is descriptive-predictive in nature. The research will account for the best coping strategies in reducing the various work stressors.

**Participants**

The subjects (N= 200, 100 males and 100 females) were food service personnel from a well-known fast food restaurant in Manila, working as full time employees, with an age range of 18 to 25 years old (M= 21.75 years, SD= 1.75). Respondents were randomly selected and were provided with written informed consent prior to participation.

**Instruments**

The study made use of two psychological tools in the study; HSE Management Standard Indicator Tool was used to gather data regarding the occupational stressors of the fast food service personnel while COPE Inventory was used to identify their coping strategies.
The HSE Management Standard Indicator Tool, developed by the UK government’s health and safety arm, the Health & Safety Executive (HSE), is a 35-item questionnaire relating to six primary stressors identified in the Management Standards for Work Related Stress. The Management Standards represent a set of conditions that reflect high levels of health, well-being and organizational performance. These conditions are split into six discrete but related areas, or potential stressors: Demands, Control, Support, Relationships, Role and Change.

The “Demands” condition includes issues like workload, work patterns and the work environment. “Control” covers how much say the person has in the way they do their work. “Peer Support” includes the encouragement, sponsorship and resources provided by colleagues, “Managerial Support” is similar but focused on the support provided by the organization and line management. “Relationships” includes promoting positive working environment to avoid conflict and dealing with unacceptable behavior. “Role” includes whether people understand their role within the organization and whether the organization ensures they do not have conflicting roles. “Change” includes how organizational change (large or small) is managed and communicated in the organization.

On the other hand, COPE Inventory by Carver et al. (1989) was a 60-item questionnaire developed to assess a broad range of coping responses. COPE inventory has 15 scales, namely, positive reinterpretation and growth, mental disengagement, focus on and venting of emotions, use of instrumental social support, active coping, denial, religious coping, humor, behavioral disengagement, restraint, use of emotional social support, substance use, acceptance, suppression of competing activities and planning. For the detailed psychometric properties, see the work of Carver, C. S. (1997) and Bucanli, Surucu, and Ilhan (2013).

**Data Analysis**

For the analysis of data, STATISTICA version 10 software was used. For the descriptive analysis, mean scores and standard deviations were presented. For the inferential statistics, multiple regression analysis was used to determine the impact of the various coping mechanisms to each stressor.

**Results and Discussions**

Despite the technological advances made to better the operations of restaurants and hotels, fast food service personnel, as the front liners, remain to be the most important agent of quality service to the customers. As such the demand for them to perform better remained crucial. With this expectation also comes an increased job anxiety. In fact, the results of HSE survey indicated that all job stress indicators are above the threshold level
except for control (M=2.84, SD=0.42). Likewise, religious coping was observed to be the most used coping strategy (M=3.19, SD=0.59).

Table 1. Correlation Matrix of Occupational Stress and Coping Mechanism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coping Mechanisms</th>
<th>Passive</th>
<th>Mental</th>
<th>Venting</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Active</th>
<th>Religious</th>
<th>Behavioral</th>
<th>Emotional</th>
<th>Substance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reinforcement</td>
<td>Disengagement</td>
<td>Emotion</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Coping</td>
<td>Denial</td>
<td>Coping</td>
<td>Humor</td>
<td>Disengagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demands</td>
<td>0.483</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>0.498</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>0.540</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>0.020*</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Managers' Support</td>
<td>0.177</td>
<td>0.603</td>
<td>0.609</td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>0.014*</td>
<td>0.799</td>
<td>0.334</td>
<td>0.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Support</td>
<td>0.344</td>
<td>0.651</td>
<td>0.394</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
<td>0.356</td>
<td>0.393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>0.468</td>
<td>0.501</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.701</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>0.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>0.247</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td>0.406</td>
<td>0.551</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
<td>0.738</td>
<td>0.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.759</td>
<td>0.942</td>
<td>0.221</td>
<td>0.35*</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
<td>0.380</td>
<td>0.118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * significant at 0.05, ** significant at 0.01

Table 2. Regression Summary of the Occupational Stressors as Criterion and Coping Mechanisms as Predictors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable and Predictor</th>
<th>Unstandardised Coefficient</th>
<th>Standardised Coefficient</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demand (Constant)</td>
<td>3.318</td>
<td>0.715</td>
<td>18.84</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand: Religious Coping</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>&lt;0.14</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man Support (Constant)</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>0.321</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>0.321</td>
<td>0.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man Support: Emo_Support</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>-0.128</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-1.79</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man Support: Restraint</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man Support: Rel_Cope</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man Support: Suppression</td>
<td>-0.188</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>-0.174</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-2.25</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>9.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Support (Constant)</td>
<td>2.467</td>
<td>0.313</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9.96</td>
<td>0.411</td>
<td>0.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Support: Denial</td>
<td>0.355</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Support: Rel_Cope</td>
<td>0.248</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Support: Emo_Support</td>
<td>-0.260</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>-0.220</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-3.21</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rel (Constant)</td>
<td>2.609</td>
<td>0.345</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>11.60</td>
<td>0.388</td>
<td>0.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rel: Denial</td>
<td>0.372</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.342</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rel: Rel_Cope</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rel: Emo_Support</td>
<td>-0.238</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>-0.188</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-2.73</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role (Constant)</td>
<td>1.972</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>16.33</td>
<td>0.377</td>
<td>0.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role: Denial</td>
<td>0.339</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.338</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role: Rel_Cope</td>
<td>0.240</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.198</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change (Constant)</td>
<td>2.033</td>
<td>0.388</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>0.351</td>
<td>0.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change: Planning</td>
<td>-0.303</td>
<td>-0.247</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>&lt;0.10</td>
<td>-3.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Furthermore, the findings of the study suggest that Filipino service personnel are more likely to use emotion-based coping mechanisms than those that are problem-based. Rather than solving the problem, they are more inclined to change their affect towards the stressor. As presented in table 2, the results show that Religious Coping and Denial significantly decreases the presence of all stressors. This can be explained by Filipinos’ extreme religiosity, with which they use as their source for strength and courage (Licuanan,1994). Filipinos are normally described as being a religious people. Religious coping strategies are readily available for many Filipinos from mostly religious familial backgrounds (Nakonz, Shik, 2009). Supported by this statement, Filipino service personnel can always tend to resort to their religious coping strategies to lessen their stress at work. They usually find solidarity in their religion that can help them find inner peace or a newer and more meaningful perception of the stress they are experiencing.

On the other hand, contradictory to Tunas’s research in 2003, the results of the study also opine that food service personnel would use distancing coping strategies more often such as denial most especially if the cause of stress is the lack of peer support, $\beta=.17$, $t(5.16)=9.96$, $p=.00$, problems in relationships with co-employees, $\beta=.15$, $t(5.03)=11.60$, $p=.00$, and Role Ambiguity $\beta=.16$, $t(-3.13)=5.47$, $p=.00$. Denial is the refusal of a person to believe that he/she is being stressed (Carver, et al. 1989). Through denial, the personnel can get away from stresses that are not serious enough to affect their work performance. When an individual has no control over the stressful event, a distancing response like denial may be the most adaptive approach possible (Bjorck et al., 2001). Carver et al. (1993) supported that denial was consistently related to higher levels of concurrent distress. Filipinos always find a way to forget and ignore the stress that they are currently experiencing.

The results also suggest that Restraint decreases stresses related to Manager Support $\beta=.10$, $t(3.32)=5.61$, $p=.00$. Restraint means waiting until an appropriate opportunity to act presents itself, holding oneself back, and not acting prematurely (Carver, et al. 1989).

Moreover, the results show that Behavioral Disengagement and Humor significantly reduce job stress related to role ambiguity and role and peer support. Although the two coping mechanisms vary greatly because one is positive and the other negative, both decrease role and peer support related stress meaningfully. Behavioral Disengagement can be translated as ‘helplessness’ of a person to do something about the problem. This leads him to delaying or suspending a goal that is affected by a stressor (Carver, et al. 1989). On the other hand, Filipinos are also known for their capacity to laugh even in the most trying times. They can joke about the challenges they go through in life.
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