

## CHAPTER FOUR

### RESULTS

The previous chapter explains the methodology of the research which consists of the subjects, the materials, the procedures, and the data analysis. This chapter reports the results of the study which is divided into 3 parts based on the data collected from the questionnaires as follows:

4.1 Personal Data of the respondents

4.2 Factors Contributing to the respondents' stress

4.3 Strategies for Coping with Stressful Situations Caused by Each Group

#### 4.1 PERSONAL DATA OF RESPONDENTS

Gender, age, working years, and working positions are asked in this part. The background information of the respondents is shown in Tables 1-4.

Table 1 shows that the majority of the respondents were female (77.2 percent), followed by male (22.8 percent)

***Table 1. Gender of the Respondents***

Sex	Frequency	Percent
Male	23	22.8
Female	78	77.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table 2 shows that the majority of the respondents were aged from 20 to 30 years (57.4 percent), followed by 31-40 years old (33.7 percent) and over 40 years old (8.9 percent)

**Table 2. Respondents' Ages**

Ages	Frequency	Percent
20-30 Years	58	57.4
31-40 Years	34	33.7
> 40 yrs	9	8.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table 3 shows that the majority of the respondents have been working at Canon Marketing (Thailand) Co., Ltd for 1-5 years (52.5 percent), followed by more than 10 years (22.8 percent), 0-1 years (12.9 percent), and 5-10 years (11.9 percent), respectively.

**Table 3. Respondents' Working Years at Canon Marketing (Thailand) Co. Ltd**

Number of years	Frequency	Percent
0-1 Years	13	12.9
1-5 Years	53	52.5
5-10 Years	12	11.9
> 10 Years	23	22.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table 4 shows that 46.5 percent of the respondents were officers, followed by 23.8 percent in the position of senior officers, 19.8 percent in the position of temporary staff, and 9.9 percent in the position of managers.

**Table 4. Position of the Respondents**

Position	Frequency	Percent
Temporary staff	20	19.8
Officer	47	46.5
Senior officer	24	23.8
Manager	10	9.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>100.0</b>

#### **4.2 FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO THE RESPONDENTS' STRESS**

This part composes of 21 questions to explore the respondents' level of stress caused by supervisors, colleagues, and customers. The results of the factors of stress caused by supervisors (question no.1-7), by colleagues (question no.8-15), and by customers (no.16-21) are presented in Tables 5-7 respectively as follows:

Table 5 shows that the results of factors of stress caused by supervisors contributing to the respondents' stress could be summarized as follows:

##### *Factor No.1: No trust in your work capability*

Most of the respondents had moderate stress levels when the supervisors didn't have trust in their work capability (32.7 percent), followed by having mild, no, and severe stress levels at 29.7 percent, 25.7 percent, and 11.9 percent, respectively.

##### *Factor No.2: Unfair distribution of work*

33.7 percent of the respondents experienced moderate stress level when their work was distributed unfairly, followed by 25.7 percent (mild stress level), 21.8 percent (no stress level), and 18.8 percent (severe stress level), respectively.

##### *Factor No.3: Lack of training, giving guidelines for your work*

The majority of the respondents had moderate stress level when they lacked training or work guidelines from their supervisors (28.7 percent), followed by having

mild, no, and severe stress levels at 26.7 percent, 24.8 percent, and 19.8 percent, respectively.

*Factor No.4: Poor management of consultation*

The respondents experienced mild stress level due to poor management of consultation the most (35.6 percent). However, 30.7 percent, 19.8 percent, and 13.9 percent of the respondents had moderate, severe, and no stress levels at the 2<sup>nd</sup>-4<sup>th</sup> rank, respectively.

*Factor No.5: Harassment / Discrimination*

30.7 percent of the respondents experienced no stress level in terms of harassment and discrimination, followed by 28.7 percent (mild stress level), 22.8 percent (moderate stress level), and 17.8 percent (severe stress level), respectively.

*Factor No.6: No opportunity to participate in decision making*

Most of the respondents had moderate stress level when they didn't have the opportunity to participate in decision-making (31.7 percent), followed by having mild, severe, and no stress levels at 25.7 percent, 23.8 percent, and 18.8 percent, respectively.

*Factor No.7: Not receiving recognition when doing a good job*

Unlike other factors, not receiving recognition when doing a good job caused the respondents severe stress level the most (32.7 percent), followed by having moderate, mild, and no stress levels at 29.7 percent, 28.7 percent, and 8.9 percent, respectively.

**Table 5. Stress Level Caused by Supervisors**

Factors of Stress Caused by Supervisors	Stress Levels				Levels
	None	Mild	Moderate	Severe	
1. No trust in your work capability	26 (25.7%)	30 (29.7%)	<b>33</b> <b>(32.7%)</b>	12 (11.9%)	<b>Moderate Stress</b>
2. Unfair distribution of work	22 (21.8%)	26 (25.7%)	<b>34</b> <b>(33.7%)</b>	19 (18.8%)	<b>Moderate Stress</b>

(Table continues)

**Table 5. (continued)**

3. Lack of training, giving guidelines for your work	25 (24.8%)	27 (26.7%)	<b>29 (28.7%)</b>	20 (19.8%)	<b>Moderate Stress</b>
4. Poor management of consultation	14 (13.9%)	<b>36 (35.6%)</b>	31 (30.7%)	20 (19.8%)	<b>Mild Stress</b>
5. Harassment / Discrimination	<b>31 (30.7%)</b>	29 (28.7%)	23 (22.8%)	18 (17.8%)	<b>No Stress</b>
6. No opportunity to participate in decision making	19 (18.8%)	26 (25.7%)	<b>32 (31.7%)</b>	24 (23.8%)	<b>Moderate Stress</b>
7. Not receiving recognition when doing a good job	9 (8.9%)	29 (28.7%)	30 (29.7%)	<b>33 (32.7%)</b>	<b>Severe Stress</b>

n = 101.

Table 6 shows the summary of the factors of stress caused by colleagues contributing to the respondents' stress divided by each factor as follows:

*Factor No.8: Lack of coordination*

33.7 percent of the respondents had moderate stress due to lack of coordination among colleagues, followed by having severe, mild, and no stress levels at 27.7 percent, 20.8 percent, and 17.8 percent, respectively.

*Factor No.9: Mistakes that always happen*

The same percentage of respondents experienced mild and moderate stress level when their colleagues always made mistakes (35.6 percent), whereas 17.8 percent of the respondents experienced severe stress level and 10.9 percent of the respondents experienced no stress levels with this factor.

*Factor No.10: Involving personal discontent with work issues*

The majority of the respondents had mild stress when they were involved with personal discontent with work issues (38.6 percent), followed by having moderate,

severe, and no stress levels at 29.7 percent, 16.8 percent, and 14.9 percent, respectively.

*Factor No.11: Too serious about work process (must follow the work flow step by step)*

Most of the respondents had mild stress levels when their colleagues were too serious about following the work process (40.6 percent). However, 28.7 percent, 22.8 percent, and 7.9 percent had moderate, no, and severe stress levels in terms of this factor, respectively.

*Factor No.12: Poor management of planning, making an overdue problem*

35.6 percent of the respondents experienced mild stress level because of poor management of planning and making an overdue problem, followed by experiencing moderate, severe, and no stress levels at 30.7 percent, 21.8 percent, and 11.9 percent, respectively.

*Factor No.13: No cooperation when urgent orders are made*

In terms of no cooperation when urgent orders are made, the majority of the respondents had mild stress level (37.6 percent), whereas 33.7 percent, 20.8 percent, and 7.9 percent of the respondents had moderate, severe, and none stress levels, respectively.

*Factor No.14: Poor communication*

The respondents experienced moderate stress level the most due to poor communication (35.6 percent), followed by experiencing mild, no, and severe stress levels at 34.7 percent, 18.8 percent, and 10.9 percent, respectively.

**Table 6. Stress Level Caused by Colleagues**

Factors of Stress caused by Colleagues	Stress Levels				Levels
	None	Mild	Moderate	Severe	
8. Lack of coordination	18 (17.8%)	21 (20.8%)	<b>34</b> <b>(33.7%)</b>	28 (27.7%)	<b>Moderate Stress</b>

(Table continues)

*Table 6. (continued)*

9. Mistakes that always happen and have never been corrected	11 (10.9%)	<b>36</b> <b>(35.6%)</b>	<b>36</b> <b>(35.6%)</b>	18 (17.8%)	<b>Mild and Moderate Stress</b>
10. Involving personal discontent with work issues	15 (14.9%)	<b>39</b> <b>(38.6%)</b>	30 (29.7%)	17 (16.8%)	<b>Mild Stress</b>
11. Too serious about work process (must follow the work flow step by step)	23 (22.8%)	<b>41</b> <b>(40.6%)</b>	29 (28.7%)	8 (7.9%)	<b>Mild Stress</b>
12. Poor management of planning, making an overdue problem	12 (11.9%)	<b>36</b> <b>(35.6%)</b>	31 (30.7%)	22 (21.8%)	<b>Mild Stress</b>
13. No cooperation when urgent orders are made	8 (7.9%)	<b>38</b> <b>(37.6%)</b>	34 (33.7%)	21 (20.8%)	<b>Mild Stress</b>
14. Poor communication	19 (18.8%)	35 (34.7%)	<b>36</b> <b>(35.6%)</b>	11 (10.9%)	<b>Moderate Stress</b>

n = 101.

Table 7 presents that the factors of stress caused by customers contributing to the respondents' stress could be summarized as follows:

*Factor No.15: Contact with unreasonable customers*

37.6 percent of the respondents had moderate stress level when contacting with unreasonable customers. However, 30.7 percent, 18.8 percent, and 12.9 percent of the respondents had severe, mild, and no stress levels, respectively.

*Factor No.16: Always want urgent orders, refusing to accept the lead time of production*

The respondents experienced mild stress level the most when their customers wanted an urgent order and refused to accept the lead time of production (31.7 percent), followed by experiencing moderate, no, and severe stress levels at 27.7 percent, 21.8 percent, and 18.8 percent, respectively.

*Factor No.17: Do not consent to price adjustment*

Most of the respondents had no stress level when their customers didn't consent to price adjustment (31.7 percent), while 27.7 percent, 25.7 percent, and 14.9 percent of the respondents had mild, moderate, and severe stress levels, respectively.

*Factor No.18: Giving incomplete details of products, making a mistake*

The majority of the respondents experienced moderate stress levels when their customers gave incomplete details of the products and made a mistake (34.7 percent), followed by experiencing mild, no, and severe stress levels at 33.7 percent, 19.8 percent, and 11.9 percent, respectively.

*Factor No.19: Deal with rude customers*

40.6 percent of the respondents had moderate stress level when dealing with rude customers, followed by 22.8 percent (severe stress level), 21.8 percent (mild stress level), and 14.9 percent (no stress level), respectively.

*Factor No.20: Do not follow the rules and regulations of the company*

The respondents experienced mild stress level the most when their customers didn't follow the rules and regulations of the company (32.7 percent). However, the rest of the respondents experienced moderate, no, and severe stress levels at 30.7 percent, 24.8 percent, and 11.9 percent, respectively.

*Factor No.21: Do not accept after-sales condition of the company*

Most of the respondents had mild stress level when their customers didn't accept after-sales condition of the company (37.6 percent), followed by having moderate stress level (31.7 percent), no stress level (21.8 percent), and severe stress level (8.9 percent), respectively.

**Table 7. Stress Level Caused by Customers**

Factors of Stress Caused by Customers	Stress Levels				Levels
	None	Mild	Moderate	Severe	
15. Contact with unreasonable customers	13 (12.9%)	19 (18.8%)	<b>38 (37.6%)</b>	31 (30.7%)	<b>Moderate Stress</b>

(Table continues)



**Table 7. (continued)**

16. Always want urgent orders, refusing to accept lead time of production	22 (21.8%)	<b>32</b> <b>(31.7%)</b>	28 (27.7%)	19 (18.8%)	<b>Mild Stress</b>
17. Do not consent to price adjustment	<b>32</b> <b>(31.7%)</b>	28 (27.7%)	26 (25.7%)	15 (14.9%)	<b>No Stress</b>
18. Giving incomplete details of products, making a mistake	20 (19.8%)	34 (33.7%)	<b>35</b> <b>(34.7%)</b>	12 (11.9%)	<b>Moderate Stress</b>
19. Deal with rude customers	15 (14.9%)	22 (21.8%)	<b>41</b> <b>(40.6%)</b>	23 (22.8%)	<b>Moderate Stress</b>
20. Do not follow the rules and regulations of the company	25 (24.8%)	<b>33</b> <b>(32.7%)</b>	31 (30.7%)	12 (11.9%)	<b>Mild Stress</b>
21. Do not accept after-sales condition of the company	22 (21.8%)	<b>38</b> <b>(37.6%)</b>	32 (31.7%)	9 (8.9%)	<b>Mild Stress</b>

n = 101.

### **4.3 STRATEGIES FOR COPING WITH STRESSFUL SITUATIONS CAUSED BY EACH GROUP**

This part is composed of 3 coping strategies for coping with stressful situations caused by supervisors, colleagues, and customers. The results of coping strategies of stress caused by each group are presented in Tables 8-10 respectively as follows:

Table 8 shows the respondents' levels of coping strategies when facing stressful situations caused by supervisors which could be summarized as follows:

#### *Coping Strategy No.1: Problem-focused coping strategy*

##### *1.1 Active coping strategy*

44.6 percent of the respondents sometimes used active coping strategy when encountering stressful situations caused by the supervisors, followed by rarely, often, and never at 34.7 percent, 17.8 percent, and 3.0 percent, respectively.

### *1.2 Planning Strategy*

Most of the respondents sometimes used planning strategy to cope with stressful situations caused by the supervisors (47.5 percent). However, the rest of the respondents rarely, often, and never used planning strategy at 29.7 percent, 16.8 percent, and 5.9 percent, respectively.

### *1.3 Suppression of competing activities strategy*

The majority of the respondents rarely used suppression of competing activities strategy when encountering stressful situations caused by the supervisors (51.5 percent), followed by sometimes, never, and often levels at 21.8 percent, 18.8 percent, and 7.9 percent, respectively.

### *1.4 Restraint coping strategy*

More than half of the respondent sometimes used restraint coping strategy to cope with stressful situations caused by the supervisors (53.5 percent). Nevertheless, the rest of the respondents rarely, often, and never used this coping strategy at 28.7 percent, 12.9 percent, and 4.9 percent, respectively.

### *1.5 Positive reinterpretation and growth strategy*

The respondents sometimes used positive reinterpretation and growth strategy the most when facing stressful situations caused by the supervisor (46.5 percent), followed by rarely, often, and never levels at 38.6 percent, 8.9 percent, and 5.9 percent, respectively.

### *1.6 Acceptance strategy*

32.7 percent of the respondents rarely used acceptance strategy to cope with stressful situations caused by the supervisors. However, 30.7 percent, 24.8 percent, and 11.9 percent of the respondents sometimes, never, and often used this strategy, respectively.

## *Coping Strategy No.2: Social Support Coping Strategy*

### *2.1 Seeking social support for instrumental reasons strategy*

Most of the respondents sometimes used seeking social support for instrumental reasons strategy when encountering stressful situations caused by the supervisors (39.6 percent), followed by rarely, often, and never at 35.6 percent, 15.8 percent, and 8.9 percent, respectively.

## *2.2 Seeking social support for emotional reasons strategy*

Also, the respondents sometimes used seeking social support for emotional reasons strategy to cope with stressful situations caused by the supervisors the most (42.6 percent), followed by rarely level at 39.6 percent. However, the respondents never and often used this strategy at the same percentage which is 8.9 percent.

## *Coping Strategy No.3: Avoidance Coping Strategy*

### *3.1 Denial strategy*

48.5 percent of the respondents rarely used denial strategy when encountering stressful situations caused by supervisors, followed by 43.6 percent, 6.9 percent, and 1.0 percent of the respondents never, sometimes, and often used this strategy, respectively.

### *3.2 Behavioral disengagement strategy*

Half of the respondents never used behavioral disengagement strategy to cope with stressful situations caused by the supervisors (50.5 percent). However, the rest of the respondents rarely, sometimes, and often used this strategy at 39.6 percent, 7.9 percent, and 2.0 percent, respectively.

### *3.3 Mental disengagement strategy*

The respondents rarely used mental disengagement strategy to cope with stressful situations caused by the supervisors (41.6 percent), followed by sometimes, often, and never at 31.7 percent, 13.9 percent, and 12.9 percent, respectively.

### *3.4 Alcohol and/or drug use strategy*

Half of the respondents rarely used alcohol and/or drug use strategy when facing stressful situations caused by the supervisors (50.5 percent), followed by sometimes and never at 29.7 percent and 19.8 percent, respectively. However, no respondents often used this strategy (0.0 percent).

**Table 8. Levels of Coping Strategies When Encountering Stressful Situations Caused by Supervisors**

Coping Strategies	Levels of Coping Strategies				Levels
	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	
1. Problem-focused coping strategy					
1.1 Active coping strategy	3.0%	34.7%	44.6%	17.8%	Sometimes
1.2 Planning strategy	5.9%	29.7%	47.5%	16.8%	Sometimes
1.3 Suppression of competing activities strategy	18.8%	51.5%	21.8%	7.9%	Rarely
1.4 Restraint coping strategy	4.9%	28.7%	53.5%	12.9%	Sometimes
1.5 Positive reinterpretation and growth strategy	5.9%	38.6%	46.5%	8.9%	Sometimes
1.6 Acceptance strategy	24.8%	32.7%	30.7%	11.9%	Rarely
2. Social support coping strategy					
2.1 Seeking social support for instrumental reasons strategy	8.9%	35.6%	39.6%	15.8%	Sometimes
2.2 Seeking social support for emotional reasons strategy	8.9%	39.6%	42.6%	8.9%	Sometimes
3. Avoidance coping strategy					
3.1 Denial strategy	43.6%	48.5%	6.9%	1.0%	Rarely
3.2 Behavioral disengagement strategy	50.5%	39.6%	7.9%	2.0%	Never
3.3 Mental disengagement strategy	12.9%	41.6%	31.7%	13.9%	Rarely
3.4 Alcohol and/or drug use strategy	19.8%	50.5%	29.7%	-	Rarely

n = 101.

Table 9 shows the respondents' levels of coping strategies when encountering stressful situations caused by colleagues which could be summarized as follows:

*Coping Strategy No.1: Problem-focused coping strategy*

*1.1 Active coping strategy*

42.6 percent of the respondents sometimes used active coping strategy when encountering stressful situations caused by colleagues, followed by rarely, often, and never at 36.6 percent, 11.9 percent, and 8.9 percent, respectively.

*1.2 Planning Strategy*

Most of the respondents sometimes used planning strategy to cope with stressful situations caused by colleagues (46.5 percent). However, the rest of the respondents rarely, never, and often used planning strategy at 39.6 percent, 8.9 percent, and 5.0 percent, respectively.

*1.3 Suppression of competing activities strategy*

The majority of the respondents rarely used suppression of competing activities strategy when encountering stressful situations caused by colleagues (54.5 percent), followed by never, sometimes, and often at 25.7 percent, 18.8 percent, and 1.0 percent, respectively.

*1.4 Restraint coping strategy*

More than half of the respondent rarely used restraint coping strategy to cope with stressful situations caused by colleagues (63.4 percent). Nevertheless, the rest of the respondents never, sometimes, and often used this coping strategy at 17.8 percent, 16.8 percent, and 2.0 percent, respectively.

*1.5 Positive reinterpretation and growth strategy*

The respondents sometimes used positive reinterpretation and growth strategy the most when facing stressful situations caused by colleagues (52.5 percent), followed by rarely, never, and often at 28.7 percent, 12.9 percent, and 5.9 percent, respectively.

*1.6 Acceptance strategy*

42.6 percent of the respondents sometimes used acceptance strategy to cope with stressful situations caused by colleagues. However, 35.6 percent, 11.9 percent,

and 9.9 percent of the respondents rarely, often, and never used this strategy, respectively.

### *Coping Strategy No.2: Social Support Coping Strategy*

#### *2.1 Seeking social support for instrumental reasons strategy*

Most of the respondents sometimes used seeking social support for instrumental reasons strategy when encountering stressful situations caused by colleagues (39.6 percent), followed by rarely, often, and never at 34.7 percent, 15.8 percent, and 9.9 percent, respectively.

#### *2.2 Seeking social support for emotional reasons strategy*

The respondents rarely used seeking social support for emotional reasons strategy to cope with stressful situations caused by colleagues the most (42.6 percent), followed by sometimes at 36.6 percent, often at 12.9 percent, and never at 7.9 percent.

### *Coping Strategy No.3: Avoidance Coping Strategy*

#### *3.1 Denial strategy*

46.5 percent of the respondents rarely used denial strategy when encountering stressful situations caused by colleagues, followed by 40.6 percent, 11.9 percent, and 1.0 percent of the respondents never, sometimes, and often used this strategy, respectively.

#### *3.2 Behavioral disengagement strategy*

Half of the respondents rarely used behavioral disengagement strategy to cope with stressful situations caused by colleagues (50.5 percent), followed by never and sometimes at 42.6 percent and 6.9 percent, respectively. However, no respondents often used this strategy (0.0 percent).

#### *3.3 Mental disengagement strategy*

The respondents rarely used mental disengagement strategy to cope with stressful situations caused by colleagues (38.6 percent), followed by sometimes, often, and never at 34.7 percent, 15.8 percent, and 10.9 percent, respectively.

#### *3.4 Alcohol and/or drug use strategy*

Half of the respondents rarely used alcohol and/or drug use strategy when facing stressful situations caused by colleagues (50.5 percent), followed by

sometimes, never, and often at 29.7 percent, 17.8 percent, and 2.0 percent, respectively.

**Table 9. Levels of Coping Strategies When Encountering Stressful Situations Caused by Colleagues**

Coping Strategy	Levels of Coping Strategies				Levels
	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	
1. Problem-focused coping strategy					
1.1 Active coping strategy	8.9%	36.6%	42.6%	11.9%	Sometimes
1.2 Planning strategy	8.9%	39.6%	46.5%	5.0%	Sometimes
1.3 Suppression of competing activities strategy	25.7%	54.5%	18.8%	1.0%	Rarely
1.4 Restraint coping strategy	17.8%	63.4%	16.8%	2.0%	Rarely
1.5 Positive reinterpretation and growth strategy	12.9%	28.7%	52.5%	5.9%	Sometimes
1.6 Acceptance strategy	9.9%	35.6%	42.6%	11.9%	Sometimes
2. Social support coping strategy					
2.1 Seeking social support for instrumental reasons strategy	9.9%	34.7%	39.6%	15.8%	Sometimes
2.2 Seeking social support for emotional reasons strategy	7.9%	42.6%	36.6%	12.9%	Rarely
3. Avoidance coping strategy					
3.1 Denial strategy	40.6%	46.5%	11.9%	1.0%	Rarely
3.2 Behavioral disengagement strategy	42.6%	50.5%	6.9%	-	Rarely
3.3 Mental disengagement strategy	10.9%	38.6%	34.7%	15.8%	Rarely
3.4 Alcohol and/or drug use strategy	17.8%	50.5%	29.7%	2.0%	Rarely

n = 101.

Table 10 shows the respondents' levels of coping strategies when encountering stressful situations caused by customers which could be summarized as follows:

*Coping Strategy No.1: Problem-focused coping strategy*

*1.1 Active coping strategy*

43.6 percent of the respondents sometimes used active coping strategy when encountering stressful situations caused by customers, followed by rarely, often, and never at 23.8 percent, 20.8 percent, and 11.9 percent, respectively.

*1.2 Planning Strategy*

Most of the respondents sometimes used planning strategy to cope with stressful situations caused by customers (45.5 percent). However, the rest of the respondents rarely, often, and never used planning strategy at 27.7 percent, 13.9 percent, and 12.9 percent, respectively.

*1.3 Suppression of competing activities strategy*

The majority of the respondents rarely used suppression of competing activities strategy when encountering stressful situations caused by customers (39.6 percent), followed by never, sometimes, and often at 27.7 percent, 25.7 percent, and 6.9 percent, respectively.

*1.4 Restraint coping strategy*

Almost half of the respondents rarely used restraint coping strategy to cope with stressful situations caused by the customers (44.6 percent). Nevertheless, the rest of the respondents sometimes, never, and often used this coping strategy at 24.8 percent, 22.8 percent, and 7.9 percent, respectively.

*1.5 Positive reinterpretation and growth strategy*

The respondents sometimes used positive reinterpretation and growth strategy the most when facing stressful situations caused by customers (43.6 percent), followed by often, rarely, and never at 28.7 percent, 15.8 percent, and 11.9 percent, respectively.

*1.6 Acceptance strategy*

38.6 percent of the respondents sometimes used acceptance strategy to cope with stressful situations caused by customers. However, 27.7 percent, 18.8 percent,



and 14.9 percent of the respondents rarely, often, and never used this strategy, respectively.

### *Coping Strategy No.2: Social Support Coping Strategy*

#### *2.1 Seeking social support for instrumental reasons strategy*

Most of the respondents rarely used seeking social support for instrumental reasons strategy when encountering stressful situations caused by customers (30.7 percent), followed by often, sometimes, and never levels at 29.7 percent, 27.7 percent, and 11.9 percent, respectively.

#### *2.2 Seeking social support for emotional reasons strategy*

Also, the respondents rarely used seeking social support for emotional reasons strategy to cope with stressful situations caused by customers the most (35.6 percent), followed by sometimes at 28.7 percent, never at 19.8 percent, and often at 15.8 percent, respectively.

### *Coping Strategy No.3: Avoidance Coping Strategy*

#### *3.1 Denial strategy*

54.5 percent of the respondents never used denial strategy when encountering stressful situations caused by customers, followed by rarely and sometimes at 41.6 percent and 4.0 percent, respectively. However, no respondents often used this strategy (0.0 percent).

#### *3.2 Behavioral disengagement strategy*

More than half of the respondents never used behavioral disengagement strategy to cope with stressful situations caused by customers (60.4 percent), followed by rarely and sometimes at 36.6 percent and 3.0 percent, respectively. However, no respondents often used this strategy (0.0 percent).

#### *3.3 Mental disengagement strategy*

The respondents rarely used mental disengagement strategy the most to cope with stressful situations caused by customers (32.7 percent), followed by sometimes, never, and often at 29.7 percent, 24.8 percent, and 12.9 percent, respectively.

### 3.4 Alcohol and/or drug use strategy

Almost half of the respondents rarely used alcohol and/or drug use strategy when facing stressful situations caused by customers (47.5 percent), followed by never and sometimes at 26.7 percent and 25.7 percent, respectively. However, no respondents often used this strategy (0.0 percent).

**Table 10. Levels of Coping Strategies When Encountering Stressful Situations Caused by Customers**

Coping Strategy	Levels of Coping Strategies				Levels
	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	
1. Problem-focused coping strategy					
1.1 Active coping strategy	11.9%	23.8%	43.6%	20.8%	Sometimes
1.2 Planning strategy	12.9%	27.7%	45.5%	13.9%	Sometimes
1.3 Suppression of competing activities strategy	27.7%	39.6%	25.7%	6.9%	Rarely
1.4 Restraint coping strategy	22.8%	44.6%	24.8%	7.9%	Rarely
1.5 Positive reinterpretation and growth strategy	11.9%	15.8%	43.6%	28.7%	Sometimes
1.6 Acceptance strategy	14.9%	27.7%	38.6%	18.8%	Sometimes
2. Social support coping strategy					
2.1 Seeking social support for instrumental reasons strategy	11.9%	30.7%	27.7%	29.7%	Rarely
2.2 Seeking social support for emotional reasons strategy	19.8%	35.6%	28.7%	15.8%	Rarely

(Table continues)

*Table 10. (continued)*

<b>3. Avoidance coping strategy</b>					
3.1 Denial strategy	<b>54.5%</b>	41.6%	4.0%	-	<b>Never</b>
3.2 Behavioral disengagement strategy	<b>60.4%</b>	36.6%	3.0%	-	<b>Never</b>
3.3 Mental disengagement strategy	24.8%	<b>32.7%</b>	29.7%	12.9%	<b>Rarely</b>
3.4 Alcohol and/or drug use strategy	26.7%	<b>47.5%</b>	25.7%	-	<b>Rarely</b>

n = 101.

The findings of the study will be summarized and discussed in the next chapter.