The Family Satisfaction of Business-Owning Families*

Jong-Youn Rha, Kathryn Stafford*****

Doctoral Candidate, Consumer and Textile Sciences Department, The Ohio State University**
Associate Professor, Consumer and Textile Sciences Department, The Ohio State University***

Abstract : This paper expands empirical research on family satisfaction by introducing the family APGAR scale, developed and validated in the field of nursing, to measure the satisfaction of business-owning families and applying the Stafford et al.(1999) model of sustainable family businesses to the assessment of family satisfaction. More specifically, this study compares the differences in the effects of business- and family-related variables on family satisfaction for the families of lifestyle business owners and earner business owners. The sample was drawn from the 1997 National Family Business Survey. The family satisfaction was greater for the families of lifestyle business owners, but the family variables made a greater contribution to the explanation of variance in the satisfaction of families of earner business owners. The regression equation explained a higher percentage of the variance for the families of earner business owners. Nine family variables were significant in the satisfaction equation for earner business owners, in contrast to seven significant family variables in the equation for lifestyle business owners. Structured families had a significant positive effect on the satisfaction of lifestyle business owners. The family manager's education, putting the family first rather than the business, and the family management score had significant effects on the satisfaction of earner business owners.

Key Words : Business-owning family, satisfaction, lifestyle

* This study reports results from the Cooperative Regional Research Project, NE-167R, "Family Businesses: Interaction in Work and Family Spheres," partially supported by the Cooperative States Research, Education and Extension Services (CSREES); U.S. Department of Agriculture; the experiment stations at University of Hawaii at Manoa, University of Illinois, Purdue University (Indiana), Iowa State University, Michigan State University, University of Minnesota, Montana State University, University of Nebraska, Cornell University (New York), North Dakota State University, The Ohio State University, Pennsylvania State University, Texas A & M University, Utah State University, University of Vermont, and University of Wisconsin Madison; and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canata (for University of Manitoba).

I. INTRODUCTION

In the late 1990's, the Korean government announced its policy to support venture capital for small businesses as a new model for developing a sustainable economy (Kang, 1997), showing the growing importance of small businesses in Korea. However, the recent down turn in both the domestic and international economic conditions are reported to be having negative effects on the performance of small businesses in Korea (Lee, 2001). The close relationship between the owning family and its business makes it imperative to better understand the influences of one on the other, especially when businesses are operating in a hostile environment.

Emerging family business research documents the substantial economic contributions of family businesses to local, state, and national economies (Heck & Stafford, 2000; Rowe, Haynes, & Stafford, 1999; Shanker & Astrachan, 1996). Research on family businesses and their economic contributions further suggest major shortcomings of much of the previous business theory and empirical research. Although the *business* aspects of the family business have received increasing recognition, the *family* aspects of the family business have remained invisible and unrecognized by traditional business studies. Nonetheless, the possibility of family effects on the business and vice versa does exist. This has been shown in family business systems models, as well as in previous family systems research. The effects of the business on the family and the family on the business endure regardless of the myopic nature and limited number of previous investigations of the family business.

The business literature on business owners point out the importance of motive and personality in identifying entrepreneurs (Ibrahim and Ellis, 1994). However, the effects of these factors on business and family performances are under-explored in the study of family business. The purpose of this study is to incorporate these factors into the study of business-owning families and to compare the differences in the effects of business- and family-related variables on family satisfaction for the families of lifestyle business owners and earner business owners. The business-owning families are divided into two groups and analyzed separately. By doing so, this paper expands empirical research on family satisfaction by introducing the family APGAR scale, developed and validated in the field of nursing, to measure the satisfaction of business-owning families and by applying the Stafford *et al.* (1999) model of sustainable family businesses to the assessment of family satisfaction.

This paper is structured as follows. First, literature on family satisfaction in the Korea and the United States are reviewed. Second, conceptual model and the analytical procedure for empirical analysis are described. Afterward, the empirical findings are reported. In the last section, conclusions and implications are discussed.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Measures of Family Life Satisfaction

Sabatelli and Bartle (1995) and Walsh (1994) have noted the lack of unified theory about the family and the proliferation of measures of family functioning. Family ecology theory (Bubolz & Sontag, 1993), family development theory (Rodgers & White, 1993), family resource management theory (Deacon & Firebaugh, 1988) and family systems theory (Broderick, 1993; Kantor & Lehr, 1975; Montgomery & Fewer, 1988; Rosenblatt, 1994; Whitchurch & Constantine, 1993) provide theoretical models of the functioning of family systems. All of these theories explicitly or implicitly acknowledge satisfaction as an important element of family system output, although there is disagreement about the construct of family functionality and whether satisfaction is a good measure of functionality . Walsh (1994) argued that functionality is a cultural construct and not universal. In contrast, micro economic theories of the family propose pursuit of satisfaction as the universal motive of individuals and households (Bryant, 1991). For that reason, in this paper the focus is family satisfaction rather than functionality.

The review article by Sabatelli & Bartle (1995) and the book *Measures of Family Functioning for Research and Practice* by Sawin and Harrigan (1995) identified and critiqued theories and measures of family functioning in the United States. Sawin and Harrigan (1995) identified the McMaster Family Assessment Device (FAD), the Family Adaptability and Cohesion Scale (FACES II, III, IV), the Family Environment Scale (FES), the Family APGAR, and the

Feetham Family Functioning Scale (FFS) as well-established self-report instruments for measuring family functioning. The FFS is based on family ecology theory. The FAD is based on the McMaster model of family functioning, which is a synthesis of systems, roles, and communications theories. The FES is based on an interactionist framework, which represents behavior as the result of the interaction of a person and the person's environment, and in this framework environmental factors are believed to generate a substantial portion of the variance in behavior. FACES is based on family systems theory, specifically the Circumplex model of family functioning (Sawin & Harrigan, 1995). The Family APGAR is based on a family systems model "incorporating stress and change /adaptation in one or more members" (Sawin & Harrigan, 1995, p. 34). The Family APGAR is valid and reliable and has been assessed on culturally diverse populations (Sawin & Harrigan, 1995). Further, it measures satisfaction of the respondent with five aspects or dimensions of family life; these are adaptation, partnership, growth, affection and resolution. Given the results of Sung and Stafford (1995), the multidimensional character of the Family APGAR is a desirable attribute.

2. Previous Empirical Results

In Korea, Cho and Im (1991) used 27 questions scale to measure the overall family life satisfaction of urban wives. The components of family life satisfaction were relationship with husband, relationship with children, relationship with in-law, communication, household work, leisure, family economy, residential condition, and level of living. They found that family life satisfaction was significantly affected by number of children, wives' education, family income, employment status of wives, and locus of control. Wives who practiced morphostatic management reported higher levels of satisfaction. Im, Cho and Lee (1995) reported that subjective variables had a greater effect on the family life satisfaction of rural wives than did objective variables. They also found communication skill and financial management skill had a significant, positive effect on family life satisfaction.

In the United States, Gritzmacher (1993) reported that the majority of household managers with home-based employment were satisfied with their quality of life. For families with children, how one's children were getting along had a significant effect on quality of life. Using a different analytical technique, Sung & Stafford (1995) also found that overall satisfaction with quality of life was determined primarily by how satisfied the respondents were with how well their children were doing. They reported that satisfaction with how well the children were doing was significantly affected by business resource management practices, the reallocation time management strategy, and the time management strategy of acquiring additional help.

Gritzmacher (1995) found that satisfaction with the adequacy of income was associated with educational attainment and actual income earned. Sung & Stafford (1995) reported that satisfaction with the adequacy of income and level of control did not have a significant effect on overall satisfaction. They questioned whether an overall quality of life index was the best measure of affective family output. They suggested that three separate measures of satisfaction might constitute a measure of functionality that is preferable to a measure of overall quality of life. For that reason they investigated both elements of family life satisfaction, such as income adequacy, control of everyday life, and children's well being, as well as the overall family life satisfaction. As predictors of these aspects of satisfaction, they found that family resource management practices and time management practices had a significant effect on satisfaction with adequacy of income. Business management practices and time management practices had a significant effect on satisfaction with children's well being. Time management practices and family resource management practices had a significant effect on satisfaction with level of control (Sung & Stafford, 1995).

One of the important sets of results that have been reported in the literature is that which provides evidence of equifinality, the family systems phenomenon by which diverse types of families use multiple processes to yield comparable results. In Korea, Cho and Im (1991), while studying urban wives, found different correlates of family life satisfaction from Im, Cho and Lee (1995), who studied rural wives. In the United States, Sung and Stafford (1995) found that determinants of satisfaction differed for childless couples and families with children. Boles (1996) found that determinants of life satisfaction differed for owners who employed family members and those who did not. Heck et. al (1995) reported that the relationship between behavior patterns and their outcomes differed for families with home-based employment depending on gender, business ownership, and rural location.

Clearly, families are not homogeneous. While business-owning families may differ from others, it is important to identify important sources of variation within business-owning families. Research needs to use analytical methods which permit subsamples to have different behavioral patterns rather than the more common practice of forcing behavioral homogeneity, allowing for differences in characteristics.

III. METHOD

1. Data

The source of data for this study was the 1997 National Family Business Survey (Refer to Heck & Stafford (1999) for more detailed information about the data collection). For the purpose of this research, a family business is defined as a business that is owned and managed by one or more family members (Hollander & Elman, 1988). To qualify as a family business, the owner-manager had to have been in business for at least a year; had to have worked at least 6 hours per week year round or a minimum of 312 hours a year in the business; had to be involved in its day-to-day management; and had to reside with another family member (Heck & Stafford, 1999). The 657 families who completed both the household and business interviews were studied in this research.

2. Model and Analysis

The sustainable family business model (Stafford *et al.*, 1999) that formed the basis for the 1997 National Family Business Survey also was used as the guide for development of the empirical research reported in this paper. An important feature of this model is the mutual influence of the business and the family on family functioning and business success. In accord with this model, the satisfaction of business-owning families was empirically modeled as a function of both business characteristics and family characteristics. Another distinctive feature of the sustainable family business model is that it acknowledges both subjective affective outcomes and objective monetary outcomes for the family and the business. The relative balance between the subjective and objective outcomes is left as an empirical question. In this analysis of the subjective outcome of family satisfaction, the relative importance of the subjective and objective outcomes to the respondents was included.

Ibrahim and Ellis (1994) point out the importance of motive and personality traits when categorizing business owners. Respondents answered questions in the survey concerning how the business owners viewed their businesses: whether they viewed business as a way of life or as a way to earn money. In this study, the former respondents are referred to as lifestyle business owners and the latter as earner business owners. It was hypothesized that satisfaction would be relatively more important to the lifestyle business owners and that income would be relatively more important to the earner business owners. Separate equations were estimated for lifestyle and earner business owners: 281 business owners viewed business as a way of life; the other 376 respondents viewed business as a way to earn money.

The variables were selected based on traditional inputs to business performance and characteristics of the owning family. The equation is

$$FS_i = f\text{ (business characteristics, family characteristics)}$$
$$\text{for every } i,\ i=1,2$$

The family satisfaction (FS) equation was estimated using ordinary least square regression analysis with family satisfaction as the dependent variable. Family satisfaction was measured by the family manager's self-reported Family APGAR score. (See Appendix A. For detailed description of this measure refer to Danes *et al*, 1999.) The Family APGAR scale was appropriate for several reasons. First, it was a validated scale that could be used for comparison purposes. Second, the survey could be administered over the telephone because the scale was brief and easy to understand. Third, the scale had been found valid and reliable for different types of families.

Independent variables consisted of 19 business characteristics and 11 family characteristics (Table 2). A stepwise procedure was employed to estimate the contribution of each group of

<Appendix A> Family APGAR Scale (Smilkstein, 1978)

Items	Score
You are satisfied that you can turn to your family for help when something is troubling you.	1-5
You are satisfied with the way your family talks over things with you and shares problems with you.	1-5
You are satisfied that your family accepts and supports your wishes to take on new activities or directions.	1-5
You are satisfied with the way your family expresses affection and responds to your emotions, such as anger, sorrow, or love.	1-5
You are satisfied with the way your family and you share time together.	1-5
Overall family life satisfaction	5-25

1=Never, 2=Hardly ever, 3=Some of the times, 4=Almost always, 5=Always

variables to the explanation in variance in the dependent variable and a partial F was calculated test the significance of the additional contribution of family variables. To allow the effects of independent variables to differ for the two subsamples (i = 1, 2) of business owners, separate equations were estimated for each subsample. Rau's F's were calculated to test for equality of regression coefficients between the two groups (Maddala, 1977, p.198).

IV. RESULTS

1. Profile of “Lifestyle Business Owner” vs. “Earner Business Owner”

The figures in Table 1 profile major characteristics of those who view business as a way of life (lifestyle business owners) and those who view business as a way to earn money (earner business owners). The results of t-tests for difference in means of the characteristics also are presented.

Business Characteristics: The average age for lifestyle business owners was 44.5 years, almost two years younger than the average age for earner business owners. Lifestyle business owners also were more satisfied with their role in the family business than were the earner business owners. Further more, lifestyle owners had more family employees, and had higher business management scores. The average gross income of lifestyle business

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics

	Business as way of life(n=281)		Business as way to earn money(n=376)	
	%	Mean (S.D)	%	Mean (S.D)
Dependent variable				
Family life satisfaction	—	—		
Independent variable				
Business				
Female business manager	32.4	—	30.8	—
Age of Business Manager (years)**	—	44.5 (10.7)	—	46.4 (11.0)
Education business manager (years)	—	14.4 (2.3)	—	14.5 (2.2)
Nonwhite business manager	6.4	—	5.0	—
Hours per week worked in business by BM	—	44.4 (15.2)	—	42.5 (15.7)
Number of years in business	—	14.9 (17.7)	—	15.8(15.3)
Likelihood of continued family owner	7.6	—	13.3	—
Home-based business	53.8	—	48.5	—
Rural location (10,000 town or less)	53.6	—	45.1	—
Survival index***	—	35.7 (6.8)	—	37.2 (6.9)
Number of nonfamily employees	—	6.3 (19.2)	—	6.9 (28.6)
Number of residential family employees*	—	1.3 (1.2)	—	1.1 (1.0)
Number of extended family employees*	—	0.5 (1.4)	—	0.4 (0.9)
Total assets (1000s)	—	838.3 (6059.1)	—	643.6 (5991.7)
Gross business income (1000s)	—	1145.1(5167.8)	—	922.5 (522.9)
Satisfaction with business role (1-5)****	—	4.6 (0.7)	—	4.2 (0.9)
Perceived business success (1-5)	—	4.1 (0.8)	—	4.0 (.76)
Business goal success (1-5)	—	3.8 (1.1)	—	3.8 (1.0)
Cash flow problems (yes/no)	50.9	—	55.2	—
Business management score (10-50)*	—	32.2 (8.8)	—	31.0 (8.3)
Family				
Education household manager (Years)	—	14.5 (2.3)	—	14.2 (2.1)
Number of children 6-17	—	0.8 (1.2)	—	0.8 (1.1)
Years in Community	—	20.1 (13.4)	—	20.5 (14.7)
Family first (1-5)***	—	3.6 (1.2)	—	3.8 (1.0)
Family goal success (1-5)**	—	3.9 (1.1)	—	3.7 (1.2)
Total nonbusiness income (1000s)	—	34.3 (57.3)	—	37.6 (41.0)
Family management score (10 -50)	—	38.6 (6.1)	—	38.8 (5.6)
Individualized family type (4 - 20)	—	15.0 (3.2)	—	14.7 (3.4)
Open family type (3 -15)	—	5.7 (2.5)	—	6.4 (2.9)
Structured family type (3 -15)***	—	10.0 (2.8)	—	9.8 (2.9)
Family stress score (0 - 296)	—	33.5 (45.5)	—	31.1 (49.2)

Data are weighted for national representativeness
* means at least .10 level of significance; **means at least .05 level of significance; ***means at least .01 level of significance; ****means at least .001 level of significance; *****means at least .000 level of significance.

owners was higher than that of earner business owners, although the difference was not statistically significant. The percentages of home-based business and rural-area-based businesses were higher and the survival index score was lower for lifestyle business owners than earner business owners.

Family Characteristics: Lifestyle business owners were less likely to feel that their family came first rather than their business; however, they had a higher family satisfaction score than earner business owners. But at the same time, the family stress score of lifestyle business owner households also was higher than that of earner business owner households. Lifestyle business owners were more likely to be in a structured type of family than earner business owners. Although not statistically significant, total non-business income was slightly higher for earner business owner households than for lifestyle business owner households.

2. Multivariate Regression Result

Lifestyle Business Owners: The family satisfaction equation explained 39.7% of the variance in family manager's family satisfaction for lifestyle business owners and was significant at the .0001 level ($F30, 250=7.155$, Table 2). Thirteen of the explanatory variables were statistically significant, four of them at the .01 level or higher. Firm characteristics and practices explained 16.1% of the variance, and family characteristics and practices explained 23.6% of the variance in family satisfaction. The F statistic indicates the contributions of the family variables were significant at the .0001 level (Table 2).

Characteristics of the business manager and the firm were associated with family satisfaction for the families of lifestyle business owners. The average family satisfaction score for female business owners was .77 units lower than that of male business owners. The average family satisfaction score of non-white business owners was 1.48 units higher than that of white business owners. The location of the business also had an effect; the average family satisfaction scores of business owners of businesses located in rural areas was .75 units higher than their urban counterparts. The level of education and age of business manager were not significant.

The business manager's subjective assessment of business role was significantly and

Table 2. Regression Results for Family Performance Model

	Business as way of life(n=281)	Business as way to earn money(n=376)
Dependent variable: Family life satisfaction		
Independent variables		
Business		
Female business manager	-.771*	-.040
Age of business manager (years)	.030	-.020
Education business manager (years)	.115	-.024
Nonwhite business manager	1.488**	-1.685***
Hours per week worked in business by BM	-.004	-.025*
Number of years in business	.007	.002
Likelihood of continued family owner	.517	.981**
Home-based business	-.083	-.234
Rural location	.745*	-.456
Survival index	-.028	.046**
Number of nonfamily employees	.013	.003
Number of residential family employees	.077	-.021
Number of extended family employees	.098	-.020
Total assets (ln)	-.149**	-.123**
Satisfaction with business role (1-5)	.758***	1.400*****
Perceived business success (1-5)	.391	.328
Business goal success (1-5)	-.703*****	.255
Cash flow problems (yes/no)	.228	.403
Business management score (10-50)	-.014	-.006
Family		
Education household manager (years)	-.022	.181*
Number of children 6-17	-.323**	-.461****
Years in community	.024*	.021**
Family first (1-5)	.093	.309**
Family goal success (1-5)	.367**	.764*****
Total nonbusiness income (ln)	-.094*	-.123****
Family management score (10-50)	.032	-.068**
Individualized family type (4-20)	.312*****	.196*****
Open family type (3-15)	-.192**	-.149**
Structured family type (3-15)	.257*****	.024
Family stress score (0-296)	-.002	.003
Constant	9.928***	9.183*****
Summary statistics		
Adjusted R^2 (business variable only)	.161	.305
Adjusted r^2 (overall model)	.397	.488
F-test for overall model	7.155*****	12.895*****
F-test for family variable contribution	10.316*****	12.513*****
Rau's F	2.879*****	

* means at least .10 level of significance; **means at least .05 level of significance; ***means at least .01 level of significance; ****means at least .001 level of significance; *****means at least .000 level of significance

positively associated with family satisfaction. A unit increase in the business manager's role satisfaction increased the family manager's family satisfaction score by .76. However, the business manager's subjective assessment of the level of business goal achievement was significantly and negatively correlated with family satisfaction. Each additional unit increase in business goal achievement was associated with .70 unit reduction in the family satisfaction score.

Seven of eleven family-related variables had a significant relationship with family satisfaction. Number of children and total non-business income were significantly and negatively associated with family satisfaction. Each additional child decreased the family satisfaction score by .32 units, and each additional one percent increase in non-business income decreased the family satisfaction score by .01 units. The duration of residency in the community and the subjective assessment of family goal achievement were significantly and positively associated with family satisfaction. Each additional year of residency in the community increased the family satisfaction score by .024, and a one unit increase in family goal achievement score increased the family satisfaction score by .37 unit. Family type also had significant effects on the family satisfaction score. Individualized family type score and structured family type score were significantly and positively related with family satisfaction score, while open family type score was significantly and negatively related with family satisfaction.

Earner Business Owners: The family satisfaction equation explained 48.8% of the variance in family satisfaction and was significant at the .0001 level ($F_{30, 345}$=12.9) for earner business owners. Fifteen of the explanatory variables were statistically significant, six of them at .01 level or higher. Business characteristics contributed more than family-related variables did. Firm characteristics and practices explained 30.5% of the variance while family characteristics and practices explained 18.3% of the variance in family satisfaction. The contributions of the family variables were significant at .001 level.

Total assets, business manager's satisfaction with business role, number of children between ages 6 and 17, duration of residency in community, subjectively assessed level of family goal achievement, total non-business income, individualized family type score, and open family type score had similar relationships with the family satisfaction scores for the families of both lifestyle and earner business owners.

Being a non-white business manager, contrary to lifestyle business owners, was significantly and negatively associated with family satisfaction. If the ownership of the business was likely to continue, the family satisfaction score was .98 higher than that of the counterpart. Although the sign of the coefficient was opposite for the lifestyle business owners it was not significant. The family management score was significantly and negatively associated with family satisfaction score.

Being female, pursuing business goal achievement, and being located in a rural area were significantly associated with family satisfaction for the families of lifestyle business owners, but these factors did not significantly affect family satisfaction for earner business owners. On the other hand, weekly hours worked by the business manager, likelihood of continued ownership, and the state small business survival index were significantly associated with the family satisfaction of earner business owners but not lifestyle owners.

The null hypothesis of the Chow test, based on a Rau's F, is that the coefficients for the two linear regressions are equal, indicating that the two samples can be pooled together. The result of the Chow test indicates that the null hypothesis is rejected at .0001 level of significance ($F_{32, 593}$=2.879). The regression coefficients are not equal in the two equations.

V. DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSION

This study examined lifestyle business owners by looking at their characteristics in comparison with earner business owners, and by analyzing family satisfaction separately for the families of lifestyle and earner business owners.

The results have demonstrated a very interesting finding; it appears that the lifestyle business owners are more serious about the family business than those who view business as a way to earn money. Even though not statistically significant, lifestyle business owners earn a higher gross income and work more hours on average. They are less likely to have experienced cash flow problems and their business management score was significantly higher. Also, their subjective assessment of business role satisfaction was significantly higher.

The pattern is not quite as obvious in family life, though. The subjective assessment of family goal achievement and family satisfaction score of lifestyle business owners are significantly higher than those of earner business owner families. However, lifestyle business owners are more likely than their counterparts to put business before family.

The results of the multivariate analysis indicated that the business characteristics have a much larger influence on family satisfaction for lifestyle business owners than family characteristics. The high percentage of variance explained by the business characteristics supports the need to control for family income source when analyzing family satisfaction. However, the opposite is true for earner business owners. The mixed results indicate that in future research business characteristics and attitudes toward the business should be controlled for; business-owning families are not homogeneous.

Families of earner owners are more affected by the owners' business role satisfaction, while families of lifestyle owners are more affected by the achievement of business goals. When the business owner views the business as a way of life and is female, satisfaction with family life suffers more than when she perceives the business as a way to earn money. Interestingly, keeping the business in the family significantly increases family life satisfaction for earner owning families but not for families of lifestyle owners.

One result that needs further explanation is the insignificance of the family stress score variable. The variable was included in the equation as an environmental control. It measured the amount of change in the respondents' environment within the last twelve months based on Holmes and Rahe (1967). As such, it was an objective measure of environmental change, rather than perceived stressfulness of the changes. One possible explanation for the insignificant and small result is that not all the respondents perceived the changes as equally stressful. The other possible explanation is that these are major changes in life which may not have occurred to the respondents in the last twelve months. Also, one can argue that stress in the sense of change is not always negatively related to satisfaction. For example, marriage was one of the stressors included in this study, and it can be anticipated that satisfaction would not decrease with the experience of marriage.

Previous research has demonstrated a correlation between financial resources or income and family or life satisfaction. This research has examined another aspect of that relationship.

Because the respondents were members of business-owning families, the analyses incorporated extensive measures of the business rather than simply the amount of income derived or job satisfaction. We believe that the substantial contribution of business characteristics to the explanation of variance in family satisfaction is further evidence of the correlation between financial well-being and family satisfaction. Further, the results reported in this research reinforce the interactions among subjective and objective outputs of families.

The implications for professionals working with families are two-fold. First, results in this paper also reinforce the need to analyze satisfaction for many types of families and to compare the results. Second, the results suggest the need to consider both the family and business when assessing and advising the performance of either or both.

The implications for scholars are also two fold. First, as they are motivated by the desire to improve families' satisfaction and well being, empirical research should be conducted in a manner that facilitates comparison of different types of families to enable assessment of correlates and their effects of family life satisfaction for each type of family. Second, scholars need to consider the way family earns its income as manifested by business ownership and the way business is conducted, because it also affects family satisfaction. Obviously, family satisfaction is not just related to the adequacy or the amount of the income as has been suggested in previous studies.

The implication for business owners is that they need to recognize that family life is affected by more than just the income. For example, the significant and relatively large negative effect of business goal on family satisfaction for the lifestyle owners indicate that family might suffer for the pursuit of business goals. However, such was not the case for earner owning families. This finding could be used to provide guidance for business owners illustrating that how they conduct business can affect the functionality of their family. It may or may not be possible to change one's attitude toward business ownership. However, it is possible to anticipate or foresee the potential for family dissatisfaction and engage in ameliorative actions.

From theoretical perspective, these results also demonstrate the usefulness of the family system models. The sustainable family business model, which is a systems model, indicated the importance of controlling for business ownership and business characteristics when analyzing family satisfaction. Also, it would be of interest to find out what factors contribute to the development of attitudes toward the business.

We believe our study can provide some insights into the future study of Korean business-owning families. For example, the use of validated scales such as the family APGAR would provide a basis for cross-cultural comparison. Also, this study provides empirical evidence of the importance of recognizing that business-owning families are not homogeneous. In Korea, as well as in the United States, we need to continue to identify the appropriate categories of business-owning families and the key differences among those groups. Furthermore, we believe that an exchange of findings between the United States and Korea would allow us to investigate to what extent the culture is an important element of the environment that affects the family's level of satisfaction.

REFERENCES

Boles, J. S. (1996). Influences of work-family conflict on job satisfaction, life satisfaction and quitting intentions among business owners: the case of family-operated businesses. *Family Business Review, 9 (1)*, 61-74.

Bryant, W. K. (1990). *The Economic Organization of the Household*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Broderick, C. B. (1993). *Understanding family process: Basics of family systems theory*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications, Inc.

Bubolz, M. M., & Sontag, M. S. (1993). Human ecology theory. In P. G. Boss, W. J. Doherty, R. LaRossa, W. R. Schumm, & S. K. Steinmetz (Eds.), *Sourcebook of family theories and methods: A contextual approach* (pp. 419-450). New York: Plenum Press.

Cho, M. W., & Im, J. B. (1991). Family satisfaction and home management behavior patterns: for urban household wives. *Journal of Korean Home Economics Associations, 29(2)*, 169-184.

Danes, S. M., Zuiker, V., Kean, R. & Arbuthnot, J. (1999). Predictors of family business tensions and goal achievement, *Family Business Review, 12 (3)*, 241-252.

Deacon, R. E., & Firebaugh, F. M. (1988). *Family resource management: Principles and* *applications*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Heck, R. K. Z., Owen, A. J. & Rowe, B. R. (1995). *Home-based employment and family life*. Westport, CT : Auburn House.

Heck, R. K. Z., & Scannell, E. (1999). *The prevalence of family business from a household sample*. Manuscript under review.

Heck, R. K. Z. & Stafford, K. (1999). *Reconceptualizing business performance theory within the family business context: Helping high growth firms remain competitive in global markets*. Paper presented at Babson College-Kauffman Foundation Entrepreneurship Research Conference.

Heck, R. K. Z. & Stafford, K. (2001). The vital institution of family business: Economic benefits hidden in plain sight. In G. McCann, (Ed.), *Family Business Myths and Reality*. (In Press)

Hollander, B. S., & Elman, N. S. (1988). Family-owned businesses: An emerging field of inquiry. *Family Business Review, 1*, 145-164.

Holmes. T. H. & Rahe, R. H. (1967). The social adjustment rating scale. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 11(2)*, 213-218.

Ibrahim, A.B. & Ellis, W. H. (1994). *Family business management: Concepts and practice*. Dubuque, Iowa : Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.

Im, J.B., Cho, M.W. & Lee, Y. H. (1995). Communication, financial management and life satisfaction of rural family: Application of Deacon and Firebaugh's model. *Journal of Korean Home Management Association, 13(3)*, 156-169.

Kang, K. H. (2001, March 31). The sustainability of Economy lies on venture capital and small businesses. *Chosun Ilbo*. Retrieved from Chosun Ilbo: http://chosun.com.

Kantor, D., & Lehr, W. (1975). *Inside the family*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Kim, J. H., Duncan, K. A., & Stafford, K. (in review). Family Resource Management Practices by Business-owning Families in Canada, Korea, and the United States. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*.

Lee, Y. Y. (2001, May 7). "The outlook of small business performance in the year 2001 worsens". Yonhap news. Retrieved from Chosun Ilbo: http://www.chosun.com.

Maddala, G. S. (1977). *Econometrics*. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Montgomery, J., & Fewer W. (1988). *Family systems and beyond*. New York: Human Sciences

Press.

Rodgers, R. H., & White, J. M. (1993). Family development theory. In P. G. Boss, W. J. Doherty, R. LaRossa, W. R. Schumm, & S. K. Steinmetz, (Eds.), *Sourcebook of family theories and methods: A contextual approach* (pp. 225-254). New York: Plenum Press.

Rosenblatt, P. C. (1994). *Metaphors of family systems theory: Toward new constructions*. New York: Guilford Press.

Rowe, B. R., Haynes, G. W., & Stafford, K. (1999). The contribution of home-based business income to rural and urban economies. *Economic Development Quarterly, 13(1)*, 66-77.

Sabatelli, R. M., & Bartle, S. E. (1995). Survey approaches to the assessment of family functioning: Conceptual, operational, and analytical issues. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 57*, 1025-1039.

Sawin, K. J., & Harrigan, M. P. (1995). *Measures of family functioning for research and practice*. New York: Springer.

Shanker, M. C., & Astrachan, J. H. (1996). Myths and realities: Family businesses' contribution to the US economy- A framework for assessing family business statistics. *Family Business Review, 9(2)*, 107-123.

Smilkstein, G. (1978). The family APGAR: A proposal for a family function test and its use by physicians. *The Journal of Family Practice, 6(6)*, 1231-1239.

Stafford, K., Duncan, K. A., Dane, S., & Winter, M. (1999). A research model of sustainable family business. *Family Business Review, 12(3)*, 197-208.

Sung, J. & Stafford, K. (1995). The effect of managerial behavior on household satisfaction. *Family Economics and Resource Management Biennial: The Journal of the FERM Division of the American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences, 1*, 95-96.

Walsh, F. (1994). Healthy family functioning: Conceptual and research developments. *Family Business Review, 7(2)*, 175-198.

Whitchurch, G. G., & Constantine, L. L. (1993). Systems theory. In P. G. Boss, W. J. Doherty, R. LaRossa, W. R. Schumm, & S. K. Steinmetz, (Eds.), *Sourcebook of family theories and methods: A contextual approach* (pp. 325-352). New York: Plenum Press.