

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

This chapter reports the responses of the RBSC employees to the parts of the questionnaire dealing with stress levels, causal factors and coping measures. It is divided into 5 parts: (1) Personal Data on Respondents, (2) Measurement of Stress Levels, (3) Measurement of Effects of Stress, (4) Measurement of Stress Coping Strategies, and (5) Hypothesis Testing. The collected data from this research study were processed by the Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS 11.5 for Windows) to calculate frequencies and percentages. The statistically significant testing of the hypothesis was analyzed by using Spearman's rho Correlation Coefficients.

4.1 PERSONAL DATA OF RESPONDENTS

Table 1. Number of Distributed and Returned Questionnaires

Divisions/Departments	Number of Distributed Questionnaires	Number of Returned Questionnaires
Facility (Grounds/House/Maintenance)	50	41
Finance	20	18
Sports/Communications/Events	20	13
Administration	10	4
Food & Beverage	20	12
Human Resources	5	5
Membership	10	7
Security	20	16
Racing	9	5
Totalisator	11	8
Total	175	129
Percentage returned		73.71%

The researcher distributed a total of 175 questionnaires to the sample group (the RBSC employees from 3 divisions and 7 departments). 129 completed copies were returned which equals 73.71% of all subjects.

Table 2. Background Variables of the Samples

Background Variables	Frequency	Percentage
Gender		
Male	81	62.8
Female	48	37.2
Total	129	100.0
Ages		
20-30	27	20.9
31-40	47	36.4
41-50	39	30.2
51-60	16	12.4
Total	129	100.0
Marital Status		
Single	46	35.7
Married	75	58.1
Separated	4	3.1
Divorced	4	3.1
Total	129	100.0
Education		
Below Bachelor's Degree	72	55.8
Bachelor's Degree	46	35.7
Master's Degree	2	1.6
Others	9	7.0
Total	129	100.0
Period of Employment (Years)		
1-5	42	32.6
6-10	18	14.0
11-15	23	17.8
16-20	18	14.0
21-25	14	10.9
26-30	7	5.4
>30	7	5.4
Total	129	100.0

(table continues)

Table 2. (continued)

Background Variables	Frequency	Percentage
Divisions/Departments		
Facility (Grounds/House/Maintenance)	41	31.8
Finance	18	14.0
Sports/Communications/Events	13	10.1
Administration	4	3.1
Food & Beverage	12	9.3
Human Resources	5	3.9
Membership	7	5.4
Security	16	12.4
Racing	5	3.9
Totalisator	8	6.2
Total	129	100.0

The results from Table 2 can be summarized as follows:

Gender: 62.8% of the respondents were male and 37.2% were female.

Respondents' Age: 36.4% of the respondents were at the age range of 31-40, 30.2% at the age range of 41-50, 20.9% at the age range of 20-30 and 12.4% at the age range of 51-60.

Marital Status: 58.1% of the respondents were married, 35.7% were single, and 3.1% were separated or divorced.

Education: 55.8% of the respondents held qualifications below bachelor's degree, 35.7% held a bachelor's degree, 7.0% held vocational degree and 1.6% held a master's degree.

Period of Employment: 32.6% of the respondents had been working for 1-5 years, 17.8% for 11-15 years, 14.0% for 6-10 years and 16-20 years, and 5.4% for 26-30 years and more than 30 years.

Divisions/Departments: 31.8% of the respondents worked for the Facility Division, 14.0% worked for the Finance Division, 12.4% worked for the Security Department, 10.1% worked for the Sports/Communications/Events Division, 9.3% worked for the Food & Beverage Department, 6.2% worked for the Totalisator Department, 5.4% worked for the Membership Department, 3.9% worked for the Human Resources and the Racing Departments, and 3.1% worked for the Administration Department.

4.2 MEASUREMENT OF STRESS LEVEL

Table 3. Stress Levels Caused by Supervisors

Factors	Never	Sometimes	Often	Regularly
1) No trust in work capability	48 (37.2%)	68 (52.7%)	11 (8.5%)	2 (1.6%)
2) Unfair distribution of work	63 (48.8%)	50 (38.8%)	11 (8.5%)	5 (3.9%)
3) Lack of training or guidelines for the work	67 (51.9%)	47 (36.4%)	10 (7.8%)	5 (3.9%)
4) Poor management of consultation	41 (31.8%)	65 (50.4%)	18 (14.0%)	5 (3.9%)
5) No opportunity to participate in decision-making	51 (39.5%)	56 (43.4%)	15 (11.6%)	7 (5.4%)
6) Not receiving recognition when doing a good job	48 (37.2%)	57 (44.2%)	15 (11.6%)	9 (7.0%)
7) Teamwork trouble	43 (33.3%)	54 (41.9%)	24 (18.6%)	8 (6.2%)
8) Lack of coordination	43 (33.3%)	59 (45.7%)	22 (17.1%)	5 (3.9%)
9) Discrimination	59 (45.7%)	49 (38.0%)	8 (6.2%)	13 (10.1%)
10) Harassment	77 (59.7%)	38 (29.5%)	9 (7.0%)	5 (3.9%)

Table 3 shows that the factors caused by supervisors at the “sometimes” level in descending order were as follows:

- 1) No trust in work capability (52.7%)
- 4) Poor management of consultation (50.4%)
- 8) Lack of coordination (45.7%)
- 6) Not receiving recognition when doing a good job (44.2%)
- 5) No opportunity to participate in decision making (43.4%)
- 7) Teamwork trouble (41.9%)

The factors caused by supervisors at the “never” level in descending order were as follows:

- 10) Harassment (59.7%)
- 3) Lack of training or guidelines for the work (51.9%)
- 2) Unfair distribution of work (48.8%)
- 9) Discrimination (45.7%)

Table 4. Stress Levels Caused by Co-workers in Different Functions

Factors	Never	Sometimes	Often	Regularly
11) Mistakes that happen regularly and have never been corrected	33 (25.6%)	76 (58.9%)	18 (14.0%)	2 (1.6%)
12) Involving personal discontent with work issues	26 (20.2%)	89 (69.0%)	10 (7.8%)	4 (3.1%)
13) Too rigid in work (must follow the flow step by step)	42 (32.6%)	71 (55.0%)	12 (9.3%)	4 (3.1%)
14) Poor management of planning, causing work-flow problems	17 (13.2%)	85 (65.9%)	22 (17.1%)	5 (3.9%)
15) Poor communication	21 (16.3%)	79 (61.2%)	24 (18.6%)	5 (3.9%)
16) No acceptance among team	56 (43.4%)	65 (50.4%)	6 (4.7%)	2 (1.6%)

(table continues)

Table 4. (continued)

Factors	Never	Sometimes	Often	Regularly
17) High level of work competition	55 (42.6%)	54 (41.9%)	14 (10.9%)	6 (4.7%)

Table 4 shows that the factors caused by co-workers in different functions at the “sometimes” level in descending order were as follows:

- 12) Involving personal discontent with work issues (69.0%)
- 14) Poor management of planning, causing work-flow problems (65.9%)
- 15) Poor communication (61.2%)
- 11) Mistakes that happen regularly and have never been corrected (58.9%)
- 13) Too rigid in work (must follow the flow step by step) (55.0%)
- 16) No acceptance among team (50.4%)

The only factor caused by co-workers in different functions at the “never” level was 17) High level of work competition (42.6%).

Table 5. Stress Levels Caused by General Factors

Factors	Never	Sometimes	Often	Regularly
18) Work overload	55 (42.6%)	59 (45.7%)	8 (6.2%)	7 (5.4%)
19) Lack of job security	95 (73.6%)	25 (19.4%)	5 (3.9%)	4 (3.1%)
20) Office politics	78 (60.5%)	39 (30.2%)	5 (3.9%)	7 (5.4%)
21) Roles and duties	54 (41.9%)	61 (47.3%)	11 (8.5%)	3 (2.3%)
22) Lack of career achievement and development	62 (48.1%)	56 (43.4%)	7 (5.4%)	4 (3.1%)

Table 5 shows that the stress levels caused by general factors at the “sometimes” level in descending order were as follows:

- 21) Roles and duties (47.3%)
- 18) Work overload (45.7%)
- 22) Lack of career achievement and development (43.4%)

The stress levels caused by general factors in “never” level in descending order were as follows:

- 19) Lack of job security (73.6%)
- 20) Office politics (60.5%)

4.3 MEASUREMENT OF EFFECTS OF STRESS

Table 6. Effects of Stress

Symptoms, Behavior or Feeling	Never	Sometimes	Often	Regularly
1) Cannot sleep due to worry or anxiety	36 (27.9%)	76 (58.9%)	12 (9.3%)	5 (3.9%)
2) Feel irritated or annoyed	22 (17.1%)	84 (65.1%)	19 (14.7%)	4 (3.1%)
3) Do not want to meet anybody	59 (45.7%)	58 (45.0%)	9 (7.0%)	3 (2.3%)
4) Have migraines/headaches	64 (49.6%)	51 (39.5%)	11 (8.5%)	3 (2.3%)
5) Feel unhappy and depressed	51 (39.5%)	69 (53.5%)	6 (4.7%)	3 (2.3%)
6) Feel hopeless in life	85 (65.9%)	37 (28.7%)	4 (3.1%)	3 (2.3%)
7) Feel worthless	91 (70.5%)	31 (24.0%)	2 (1.6%)	5 (3.9%)
8) Lack concentration	35 (27.1%)	80 (62.0%)	11 (8.5%)	3 (2.3%)

(table continues)

Table 6. (continued)

Symptoms, Behavior or Feeling	Never	Sometimes	Often	Regularly
9) Do not want to do anything	52 (40.3%)	64 (49.6%)	10 (7.8%)	3 (2.3%)
10) Have symptoms of increased heart rate	64 (49.6%)	56 (43.4%)	8 (6.2%)	1 (0.8%)
11) Have symptoms of shaking voice, trembling lips and shaking hands when feeling discontent	81 (62.8%)	42 (32.6%)	6 (4.7%)	0 (0%)
12) Fear of failure	70 (54.3%)	46 (35.7%)	8 (6.2%)	5 (3.9%)
13) Have symptoms of muscle tension in the back part of the skull, back or shoulder	43 (33.3%)	63 (48.8%)	19 (14.7%)	4 (3.1%)
14) Be nervous easily in unfamiliar situations	59 (45.7%)	63 (48.8%)	6 (4.7%)	1 (0.8%)
15) Feel too exhausted to do anything	52 (40.3%)	67 (51.9%)	7 (5.4%)	3 (2.3%)

Table 6 shows that the effects of stress at the “sometimes” level in descending order were as follows:

- 2) Feel irritated or annoyed (65.1%)
- 8) Lack concentration (62.0%)
- 1) Cannot sleep due to worry or anxiety (58.9%)
- 5) Feel unhappy and depressed (53.5%)
- 15) Feel too exhausted to do anything (51.9%)
- 9) Do not want to do anything (49.6%)
- 13) Have symptoms of muscle tension in the back part of the skull, back or shoulder, and 14) Be nervous easily in unfamiliar situations (48.8%)

The effects of stress in “never” level in descending order were as follows:

- 7) Feel worthless (70.5%)

- 6) Feel hopeless in life (65.9%)
- 11) Have symptoms of shaking voice, trembling lips and shaking hand when feeling discontent (62.8%)
- 12) Fear of failure (54.3%)
- 4) Have migraines/headaches, and 10) Have symptoms of increased heart rate (49.6%)
- 3) Do not want to meet anybody (45.7%)

4.4 MEASUREMENT OF STRESS COPING STRATEGIES

Table 7. Stress Coping Strategies

Strategies	Never	Sometimes	Often	Regularly
1) Use all efforts to find a solution and to figure out additional solutions	4 (3.1%)	56 (43.4%)	49 (38.0%)	20 (15.5%)
2) Face the problem and solve it directly at the root cause	4 (3.1%)	45 (34.9%)	53 (41.1%)	27 (20.9%)
3) Go to bed early, thinking that everything will get better the next day	26 (20.2%)	59 (45.7%)	25 (19.4%)	19 (14.7%)
4) Arrange the steps to solve the problem in an orderly manner and review the steps of managing stress	11 (8.5%)	55 (42.6%)	42 (32.6%)	21 (16.3%)
5) Seek encouragement from friends and people around them	13 (10.1%)	67 (51.9%)	33 (25.6%)	16 (12.4%)
6) Talk with a person who helps them see the problem more clearly	8 (6.2%)	85 (65.9%)	22 (17.1%)	14 (10.9%)
7) Drink liquor or use drugs to stop thinking of the problem, make them forget the problem, help them tolerate the problem or feel better	85 (65.9%)	38 (29.5%)	4 (3.1%)	2 (1.6%)
8) Learn to live with the problem	8 (6.2%)	47 (36.4%)	55 (42.6%)	19 (14.7%)

(table continues)

Table 7. (continued)

Strategies	Never	Sometimes	Often	Regularly
9) Make merit	14 (10.9%)	55 (42.6%)	37 (28.7%)	23 (17.8%)
10) Do meditation	67 (51.9%)	39 (30.2%)	16 (12.4%)	7 (5.4%)
11) Self-development (e.g. take some training course)	28 (21.7%)	75 (58.1%)	17 (13.2%)	9 (7.0%)
12) Entertain themselves after work (e.g. exercise, karaoke, etc.)	13 (10.1%)	60 (46.5%)	33 (25.6%)	23 (17.8%)
13) Take pain and stress relief medicines	82 (63.6%)	39 (30.2%)	5 (3.9%)	3 (2.3%)
14) Eat food more than usual	60 (46.5%)	57 (44.2%)	8 (6.2%)	4 (3.1%)
15) Ask for suggestions from others on how they should solve the problem	20 (15.5%)	90 (69.8%)	13 (10.1%)	6 (4.7%)

Table 7 shows that the employees' stress coping strategies at the "sometimes" level in descending order were as follows:

- 15) Ask for suggestions from others on how they should solve the problem (69.8%)
- 6) Talk with a person who helps them see the problem more clearly (65.9%)
- 11) Self-development (e.g. take some training course) (58.1%)
- 5) Seek encouragement from friends and people around them (51.9%)
- 12) Entertain themselves after work (e.g. exercise, karaoke, etc.) (46.5%)
- 3) Go to bed early, thinking that everything will get better the next day (45.7%)
- 1) Use all effort to find the solution and try to figure out additional solutions (43.4%)
- 4) Arrange the steps to solve the problem in an orderly manner and review the steps of managing stress, and make merit (42.6%)

The RBSC employees' stress coping strategies at the "never" level in descending order were as follows:

- 7) Drink liquor or use drugs to stop thinking of the problem, make them forget the problem, help them tolerate the problem or feel better (65.9%)
- 13) Take pain and stress relief medicines (63.6%)
- 10) Do meditation (51.9%)
- 14) Eat food more than usual (46.5%)

The RBSC employees' stress coping strategies at the "often" level in descending order were as follows:

- ✓ 8) Learn to live with the problem (42.6%)
- ✓ 2) Face the problem and solve it directly at the root cause (41.1%)

4.5 HYPOTHESIS TESTING

Table 8. Correlation between Stress Level and Staff in Each Division/Department

Factors	Division/Department	Gender	Correlation Coefficients	Sig. (2-tailed)
1) No trust in work capability	Finance	Male	-.174*	.048
	Totalisator	Male	.203*	.021
2) Unfair distribution of work	Sports/Communications/Events	Male	.202*	.022
3) Lack of training or guidelines for the work	Membership	Female	-.186*	.035
4) Poor management of consultation	-	-	-	-
5) No opportunity to participate in decision making	Sports/Communications/Events	Male	.213*	.015

(table continues)

Table 8. (continued)

Factors	Division/Department	Gender	Correlation Coefficients	Sig. (2-tailed)
6) Not receiving recognition when doing a good job	Sports/Communications/Events	Male	.218*	.013
	Security	Male	-.194*	.027
7) Teamwork trouble	Food & Beverage	Male	.190*	.031
	Food & Beverage	Female	-.191*	.030
8) Lack of coordination	Sports/Communications/Events	Male	.218*	.013
	Racing	Male	.201*	.023
9) Discrimination	Sports/Communications/Events	Male	.176*	.046
10) Harassment	Sports/Communications/Events	Male	.230**	.009
11) Mistakes that happen regularly and have never been corrected	-	-	-	-
12) Involving personal discontent with work issues	Sports/Communications/Events	Female	.181*	.040
	Totalisator	Female	-.213*	.015
13) Too strict in work (must follow the flow step by step)	Facility	Male	-.174*	.048
	Sports/Communications/Events	Male	.183*	.038
14) Poor management of planning, causing work-flow problem	-	-	-	-
15) Poor communication	-	-	-	-

(table continues)

Table 8. (continued)

Factors	Division/Department	Gender	Correlation Coefficients	Sig. (2-tailed)
16) No acceptance among team	Sports/Communications/Events	Male	.212*	.016
	Membership	Female	-.221*	.012
17) High level of work competition	Membership	Female	-.217*	.014
18) Work overload	-	-	-	-
19) Lack of job security	Sports/Communications/Events	Male	.193*	.029
20) Office politics	Sports/Communications/Events	Male	.325**	.000
21) Roles and duties	-	-	-	-
22) Lack of career achievement and development	Sports/Communications/Events	Male	.197*	.025

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

The results of the relationship between stress levels and the staff in each division/department could be summarized as follows:

- Factor No. 1:** There was a significantly negative relationship between factor No. 1 (No trust in work capability) and male staff in the Finance Division ($r = -.17$) at the .05 level. Factor No. 1 also had a significantly positive relationship with male staff in the Totalisator Department ($r = .20$) at the .05 level.
- Factor No. 2:** There was a significantly positive relationship between factor No. 2 (Unfair distribution of work) and male staff in the Sports/Communications/Events Division ($r = .20$) at the .05 level.

- Factor No. 3:** There was a significantly negative relationship between factor No. 3 (Lack of training or guidelines for the work) and female staff in the Membership Department ($r = -.19$) at the .05 level.
- Factor No. 4:** There was no relationship between factor No. 4 (Poor management of consultation) and the staff in any Divisions/Departments.
- Factor No. 5:** There was a significantly positive relationship between factor No. 5 (No opportunity to participate in decision making) and male staff in the Sports/Communications/Events Division ($r = .21$) at the .05 level.
- Factor No. 6:** There was a significantly positive relationship between factor No. 6 (Not receiving recognition when doing a good job) and male staff in the Sports/Communications/Events Division ($r = .22$) at the .05 level. Factor No. 6 also had a significantly negative relationship with male staff in the Security Department ($r = -.19$) at the .05 level.
- Factor No. 7:** There was a significantly positive relationship between factor No. 7 (Teamwork trouble) and male staff in the Food & Beverage Department ($r = .19$) at the .05 level. Factor No. 7 also had a significantly negative relationship with female staff in the Food & Beverage Department ($r = -.19$) at the .05 level.
- Factor No. 8:** There was a significantly positive relationship between factor No. 8 (Lack of coordination) and male staff in the Sports/Communications/Events Division ($r = .22$) at the .05 level. Factor No. 8 also had a significantly positive relationship with male staff in the Racing Department ($r = .20$) at the .05 level.
- Factor No. 9:** There was a significantly positive relationship between factor No. 9 (Discrimination) and male staff in the Sports/Communications/Events Division ($r = .18$) at the .05 level.
- Factor No. 10:** There was a very significantly positive relationship between factor No. 10 (Harassment) and male staff in the Sports/Communications/Events Division ($r = .23$) at the .01 level.

- Factor No. 11:** There was no relationship between factor No. 11 (Mistakes that happen regularly and have never been corrected) and the staff in any Divisions/Departments.
- Factor No. 12:** There was a significantly positive relationship between factor No. 12 (Involving personal discontent with work issues) and female staff in the Sports/Communications/Events Division ($r = .18$) at the .05 level. Factor No. 12 also had a significantly negative relationship with female staff in the Totalisator Department ($r = -.21$) at the .05 level.
- Factor No. 13:** There was a significantly negative relationship between factor No. 13 (Too strict in work [must follow the flow step by step]) and female staff in the Facility Division ($r = -.17$) at the .05 level. Factor No. 13 also had a significantly positive relationship with male staff in the Sports/Communications/Events Division ($r = .18$) at the .05 level.
- Factor No. 14:** There was no relationship between factor No. 14 (Poor management of planning, making an overdue problem) and the staff in any Divisions/Departments.
- Factor No. 15:** There was no relationship between factor No. 15 (Poor communication) and the staff in any Divisions/Departments.
- Factor No. 16:** There was a significantly positive relationship between factor No. 16 and male staff in the Sports/Communications/Events Division ($r = .21$) at the .05 level. Factor 16 also had a significantly negative relationship with female staff in the Membership Department ($r = -.22$) at the .05 level.
- Factor No. 17:** There was a significantly negative relationship between factor No. 17 (High level of work competition) and female staff in the Membership Department ($r = -.22$) at the .05 level.
- Factor No. 18:** There was no relationship between factor No. 18 (Work overload) and the staff in any Divisions/Departments.

- Factor No. 19:** There was a significantly positive relationship between factor No. 19 (Lack of job security) and male staff in the Sports/Communications/Events Division ($r = .19$) at the .05 level.
- Factor No. 20:** There was a very significantly positive relationship between factor No. 20 (Office politics) and male staff in the Sports/Communications/Events Division ($r = .33$) at the .01 level.
- Factor No. 21:** There was no relationship between factor No. 21 (Roles and duties) and the staff in any Divisions/Departments.
- Factor No. 22:** There was a significantly positive relationship between factor No. 22 (Lack of career achievement and development) and male staff in the Sports/Communications/Events Division ($r = .20$) at the .05 level.

From the above reports, the hypothesis that the degree of stress level of the employees in each division/department would be different was confirmed as the findings showed significant relationships between stress levels and the employees in each division/department. However, the study did not find a large amount of stress in any division/department.