CHAPTER FOUR
RESULTS

The results of the questionnaire are divided into 3 sections as follows:

4.1   Demographic Information

4.1.1   Sex

Most of the subjects were female (n=52, 66.7%)

4.1.2   Age

53.8% of the subjects were less than 30 years of age, while 46.2% were older.

4.1.3   Marital status

70.5% of the subjects were single, 28.2% were married, and only one subject was divorced.

4.1.4   Education

84.6% of the subjects had bachelor's degree, while 15.4% had higher education.

4.1.5   Position

51.3% of the subjects were newly recruited, while 48.7% were R.E.C. cabin attendants.

4.1.6   Years of experience as cabin attendant

Percentage of the subjects who had working experience as cabin attendant 1-6 years and those of more than 12 years were equal at 26.9%. Those who had no experience were 30.8%, while 15.4% had 7-12 years of experience.

TABLE 1:   *Demographic Information*

Sex	Frequency	Percent
Male	26	33.3
Female	52	66.7
Total	78	100.0

Age	Frequency	Percent
Less Than 30 yrs	42	53.8
More than 30 yrs	36	46.2
Total	78	100.0

Marital Status	Frequency	Percent
Single	55	70.5
Married	22	28.2
Divorced	1	1.3
Total	78	100.0

Education	Frequency	Percent
Bachelor Degree	66	84.6
Over Bachelor	12	15.4
Total	78	100.0

Position	Frequency	Percent
Newly Recruited	40	51.3
R.E.C.	38	48.7
Total	78	100.0

(table continues)

TABLE 1:   *(continued)*

Experience	Frequency	Percent
0 year	24	30.8
1 – 6 years	21	26.9
7 – 12 years	12	15.4
More than 12 years	21	26.9
Total	78	100.0

4.2   EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE COMMUNICATION

Refer to table 2, most of the subjects (64.1%) had high to highest level of EI communication, while about one third of the subjects had a moderate level and a small group of the subjects (6.4%) had a lower level.

TABLE 2:   *Emotional Intelligence Communication Levels*

Level of agreement	Least Agree (%)	Somewhat Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Much Agree (%)	Most Agree (%)	Mean	S.D.
Emotional Intelligence Communication Levels	0	5	23	47	3	3.62	0.669
	0.0	6.4	29.5	60.3	3.8		

4.2.1   Intrapersonal Intelligence Communication

Table 3 shows that more than half of the subjects (59%) had high levels of Intrapersonal communication skills, while 34.6% had a moderate level and a small group (6.4%) had less skill. The area that the subjects, in average, had higher skills ($\overline{X}$= 3.83 – 3.97) are items 1.1 (Know to identify changes in physiological arousal), 1.2 (Be able to associate different physical cues with different emotions), 1.5 (Know when you are getting angry), 1.10 (Know when you express unsuitably to the situation), and 3.6 (Self improve one's ineffective habits). The area that the subjects had low skill ($\overline{X}$= 2.97) is item 2.4 (Be enthusiastic even when doing uninteresting task).

TABLE 3: *Intrapersonal Intelligence Communication Levels*

Level of agreement	Least Agree (%)	Somewhat Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Much Agree (%)	Most Agree (%)	Mean	S.D.
Intrapersonal Intelligence Communication Levels	0	5	27	44	2	3.55	0.658
	0.0	6.4	34.6	56.4	2.6		
1. Knowing emotions of oneself							
1.1 Know to identify changes in physiological arousal	1	6	15	35	21	3.88	0.939
	1.3	7.7	19.2	44.9	26.9		
1.2 Be able to associate different physical cues with different emotions	0	6	8	46	18	3.97	0.805
	0.0	7.7	10.3	59.0	23.1		
1.3 Know when you are thinking negatively	2	7	15	41	13	3.72	0.938
	2.6	9.0	19.2	52.6	16.7		
1.4 Know when your "self-talk" is relieving	6	5	27	26	14	3.47	1.102
	7.7	6.4	34.6	33.3	17.9		
1.5 Know when you are getting angry	2	7	12	33	24	3.90	1.027
	2.6	9.0	15.4	42.3	30.8		
1.6 Know what senses you are currently using	1	5	17	42	13	3.78	0.847
	1.3	6.4	21.8	53.8	16.7		
1.7 Be able to identify when your mood is shifting	1	8	15	39	15	3.76	0.928
	1.3	10.3	19.2	50.0	19.2		
1.8 Know when you become defensive	1	9	16	42	10	3.65	0.895
	1.3	11.5	20.5	53.8	12.8		
1.9 Know the impact of your behavior on others	0	6	23	38	11	3.69	0.811
	0.0	7.7	29.5	48.7	14.1		
1.10 Know when you express unsuitably to the situation	0	5	19	36	18	3.86	0.849
	0.0	6.4	24.4	46.2	23.1		

(table continues)

TABLE 3: *(continued)*

Level of agreement	Least Agree (%)	Somewhat Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Much Agree (%)	Most Agree (%)	Mean	S.D.
2. Motivating oneself							
2.1 Be able to use "internal talk"	5	5	31	25	12	3.44	1.039
to affect your emotional states	6.4	6.4	39.7	32.1	15.4		
2.2 Use "positive thinking" with	3	4	17	38	16	3.77	0.966
personal need	3.8	5.1	21.8	48.7	20.5		
2.3 Regroup oneself quickly after	1	11	29	25	12	3.46	0.963
a setback	1.3	14.1	37.2	32.1	15.4		
2.4 Be enthusiastic even when	6	13	38	19	2	2.97	0.911
doing uninteresting task	7.7	16.7	48.7	24.4	2.6		
2.5 Develop new and more	0	4	33	30	11	3.62	0.793
productive patterns	0.0	5.1	42.3	38.5	14.1		
3. Managing emotions							
3.1 Be able to relax when under	0	8	34	28	8	3.46	0.817
pressure	0.0	10.3	43.6	35.9	10.3		
3.2 Act sensibly when getting	0	9	29	27	13	3.56	0.906
angry	0.0	11.5	37.2	34.6	16.7		
3.3 Stay calm when you are the	1	7	26	34	10	3.58	0.876
target of anger from others	1.3	9.0	33.3	43.6	12.8		
3.4 Reflect on negative feeling	8	23	32	13	2	2.72	0.952
without being distressed	10.3	29.5	41.0	16.7	2.6		
3.5 Act productively in situations	1	6	38	30	3	3.36	0.738
that arouse anxiety	1.3	7.7	48.7	38.5	3.8		
3.6 Self improve one's ineffective	20	8	16	37	17	3.81	0.898
habits	25.6	10.3	20.5	47.4	21.8		

4.2.2 Interpersonal Intelligence Communication

Table 4 shows that more than half of the subjects (68%) had high levels of Interpersonal communication skills, while 26.9% had a moderate level and a small group (5.1%) had a lower skill. The area that the subjects, in average, had higher skills ($\overline{X}$= 3.81 – 3.94) are items 4.3 (Know the impact of your service on others), 4.10 (Be able to make others feel good), 4.11 (Be able to engage in friendly conversations with others), 5.1 (Provide support to others when needed), 5.3 (Recognize when others are distressed) and 5.6 (Have empathy with people).

TABLE 4:   *Interpersonal Intelligence Communication Levels*

Level of agreement	Least Agree (%)	Somewhat Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Much Agree (%)	Most Agree (%)	Mean	S.D.
Interpersonal Intelligence Communication Levels	0	4	21	45	8	3.73	0.715
	0.0	5.1	26.9	57.7	10.3		
4. Handling relationship							
4.1 Communicate your feelings effectively	0	7	25	31	15	3.69	0.887
	0.0	9.0	32.1	39.7	19.2		
4.2 Accurately communicate what you have experienced	0	7	19	41	11	3.72	0.820
	0.0	9.0	24.4	52.6	14.1		
4.3 Know the impact of your service on others	1	6	11	39	21	3.94	0.917
	1.3	7.7	14.1	50.0	26.9		
4.4 Be able to solve conflicts	0	6	27	36	9	3.62	0.793
	0.0	7.7	34.6	46.2	11.5		
4.5 Be able to develop consensus with others	1	7	16	40	14	3.76	0.900
	1.3	9.0	20.5	51.3	17.9		
4.6 Be able to mediate conflicts between others	1	7	28	32	10	3.55	0.878
	1.3	9.0	35.9	41.0	12.8		

(table continues)

TABLE 4: *(continued)*

Level of agreement	Least Agree (%)	Somewhat Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Much Agree (%)	Most Agree (%)	Mean	S.D.
4.7 Be able to exhibit effective interpersonal communication skills	1 1.3	4 5.1	23 29.5	38 48.7	12 15.4	3.72	0.836
4.8 Be able to accept and speak the thought of a working group	0 0.0	7 9.0	18 23.1	40 51.3	13 16.7	3.76	0.840
4.9 Be able to build trust with others	1 1.3	7 9.0	18 23.1	37 47.4	15 19.2	3.74	0.918
4.10 Be able to make others feel good	2 2.6	4 5.1	12 15.4	42 53.8	18 23.1	3.90	0.906
4.11 Be able to engage in friendly conversations with others	0 0.0	3 3.8	24 30.8	33 42.3	18 23.1	3.85	0.823
4.12 Be able to decrease tensions within a working group	0 0.0	5 6.4	19 24.4	46 59.0	8 10.3	3.73	0.733
5. Recognizing emotions in others							
5.1 Provide support to others when needed	0 0.0	3 3.8	14 17.9	48 61.5	13 16.7	3.91	0.706
5.2 Reflect people's feeling back to them accurately	0 0.0	8 10.3	28 35.9	35 44.9	7 9.0	3.53	0.801
5.3 Recognize when others are distressed	0 0.0	2 2.6	23 29.5	35 44.9	18 23.1	3.88	0.789
5.4 Help others in managing their emotions	0 0.0	6 7.7	28 35.9	39 50.0	5 6.4	3.55	0.732

(table continues)

**TABLE 4:** _(continued)_

Level of agreement	Least Agree (%)	Somewhat Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Much Agree (%)	Most Agree (%)	Mean	S.D.
5.5 Detect incongruence between	0	7	38	29	4	3.38	0.725
emotions or feeling of others	0.0	9.0	48.7	37.2	5.1		
and their behaviors							
5.6 Have empathy with people	0	5	19	40	14	3.81	0.807
	0.0	6.4	24.4	51.3	17.9		

4.3 HYPOTHESES TESTING

The study is constructed upon two main hypotheses, the second hypothesis having five minor hypotheses as follows:

1. The state of Emotional Intelligence Communication of the newly recruited and the experienced THAI cabin attendants is different.

2. There is relationship between the demographic background and the state of Emotional Intelligence Communication of THAI cabin attendants.

    2.1   Sex has a relationship with level of EI Communication.

    2.2   Age has a relationship with level of EI Communication.

    2.3   Marital status has a relationship with level of EI Communication.

    2.4   Education has a relationship with level of EI Communication.

    2.5   Experience has a relationship with level of EI Communication.

Hypothesis 1   **The state of Emotional Intelligence Communication of the newly recruited and the experienced THAI cabin attendants is different.**

    H_0:   Newly recruited and experienced cabin attendants has no difference in the level of emotional intelligence communication

    H_1:   Newly recruited and experienced cabin attendants have different levels of emotional intelligence communication.

According to the t-test statistical analysis results in table 5, it was found that there was a significant difference in the level of emotional intelligence communication between newly recruited and experienced cabin attendants. The newly recruited subjects had higher emotional intelligence communication level than the experienced ones.

TABLE 5: Result of Hypothesis 1

Group of Cabin Attendants	Mean	S.D	t-test	Sig.
Newly Recruited	3.90	0.545	4.242	0.000
R.E.C.	3.32	0.662		

* Significant at the .05 level.

Hypothesis 2   There is relationship between the demographic background and the state of Emotional Intelligence Communication of THAI cabin attendants.

Hypothesis 2.1   Sex has a relationship with the level of emotional intelligence communication.

Refer to table 6, there was no significant statistical relationship found between sex and emotional intelligence communication. ($t = 1.82$, $p = 0.29$) It showed that sex has no impact on level of EI communication.

TABLE 6: Relationship of sex and emotional intelligence communication

SEX	Mean	S.D	t-test	Sig.
Male	3.81	0.634	1.822	0.288
Female	3.52	0.671		

Hypothesis 2.2   Age has a relationship with the level of emotional intelligence communication.

Refer to table 7, there was a significant statistical relationship found between age and   emotional intelligence communication. (t = 4.11, p = 0.00)

TABLE 7:   Relationship of age and emotional intelligence communication

Groups of age	Mean	S.D	t-test	Sig.
Less than 30 yrs	3.88	0.550	4.108	0.000
More than 30 yrs	3.31	0.668		

* Significant at the .05 level.

Hypothesis 2.3   Marital status has a relationship with the level of emotional intelligence communication.

Refer to table 8, there was a significant statistical relationship found between marital status and emotional intelligence communication. (t = 2.21, p = 0.03)

TABLE 8:   Relationship of marital status and emotional intelligence communication

Marital Status	Mean	S.D	t-test	Sig.
Single	3.73	0.651	2.207	0.030
Married	3.36	0.658		

* Significant at the .05 level.

Hypothesis 2.4   Education has a relationship with the level of emotional intelligence communication.

Refer to table 9, there was no significant statistical relationship found between education and emotional intelligence communication. (t = -0.29, p = 0.77)

TABLE 9: *Relationship of education and emotional intelligence communication*

Education	Mean	S.D	t-test	Sig.
Bachelor's Degree	3.61	0.653	-0.287	0.775
Higher Degree	3.67	0.778		

Hypothesis 2.5 **Experience has a relationship with the level of emotional intelligence communication**

Refer to table 10, there was a significant statistical relationship found between education and emotional intelligence communication. (f = 8.14, p = 0.00) Then a least-significant different test was used to analyze the data and the result was shown in table 11. It was found that the cabin attendants who have experience from 7 – 12 years have a lower level of emotional intelligence communication compared to other groups.

TABLE 10: *Relationship of experience and emotional intelligence communication*

Groups of experience	Mean	S.D	F-test	Sig.
0 years	3.96	0.550	8.140	0.000
1 – 6 years	3.76	0.625		
7 – 12 years	3.00	0.426		
More than 12 years	3.43	0.676		

* Significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 11: _Least –significant Different Test between groups of Experience_

Groups of experience		0 years	1-6 years	7-12 years	More than 12 years
	Mean	3.96	3.76	3.00	3.43
0 years	3.96	-	0.20	0.96*	0.53*
1 – 6 years	3.76		-	0.76*	0.33
7 – 12 years	3.00			-	-0.43
More than 12 years	3.43				**-**

* The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

In the next chapter, the major findings and results will be discussed.