



CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The study was an analytical cross-sectional research to study about knowledge, attitudes, and practices of preventive behaviors of stress management in essential-mild hypertension OPD patients at BMA Health Center No.48. Total subjects were 300 pure hypertension patients (≥ 35 years old) from BMA health center No.48.

This chapter presents the findings from data analysis. The data analysis reports on the survey, outcomes, and results, in following orders:

1. General characteristics of the population
2. Knowledge about preventive behaviors regarding stress management
3. Attitudes about preventive behaviors regarding stress management
4. Practices about preventive behaviors regarding stress management
5. Associations between general characteristics with knowledge, with attitudes, and with practice of preventive behaviors regarding stress management
6. Associations between knowledge and attitudes of preventive behaviors regarding stress management
7. Associations between knowledge and practices of preventive behaviors regarding stress management
8. Associations between attitudes and practices of preventive behaviors regarding stress management

4.1 General characteristics of the study subjects

The description of general characteristics of the study subjects includes address, gender, age, nationality, marital status, educational level, occupation, family members, monthly household income, monthly household expenditure, family members with hypertension, cause (s) of subject's stress, subject's ability to relieve his/her stress, hours of sleep, height & weight (BMI), and measured blood pressure for the two most recent times of the subjects.

A total of 300 subjects were interviewed with structured questionnaire in the BMA health center No. 48. All subjects were Thai by nationality.

Table 4: Address distribution of the subjects

Characteristics	Number	Percentage
Bangkok	293	97.7
Outside	7	2.3
Total	300	100.0

The most of the subjects (97.7%) lived in Bangkok and 2.3% lived outside perhaps from Samutsakorn adjacent area (table 4).

Table 5: Gender distribution of the subjects

Characteristics	Number	Percentage
Male	95	31.7
Female	205	68.3
Total	300	100.0

As presented in table 5, 31.7% of the subjects were male and 68.3% were female.

Table 6: Age distribution of the subjects

Characteristics (years)	Number	Percentage
35- 44	15	5.0
45- 54	70	23.3
55- 64	96	32.0
65- 74	90	30.0
>74	29	9.7
Total	300	100.0
Mean=61.07 SD=10.311		

The age distribution of the study subjects were the highest in the age group from 55 to 64 (32%), followed with 30% in the bracket of 65-74, 23.3% between 45-54, 9.7% in over than 74 years old, and the least portion was 5% in the age 35-44, as shown table 6.

Table 7: Marital status distribution of the subjects

Characteristics	Number	Percentage
Single	17	5.7
Married	188	62.7
Widowed	77	25.7
Divorced/separate	18	6.0
Total	300	100.0

The majority of the subjects 62.7% were married, while 5.7% were single, 25.7% were widowed and 6% were divorced or separated respectively (table 7).

Table 8: Educational status distribution of the subjects

Characteristics	Number	Percentage
Less than Prathomsuksa	49	16.3
Prathomsuksa	182	60.7
Mathayom	42	14.0
Vocation	10	3.3
Over than Vocation	17	5.7
Total	300	100.0

Educational status of the subjects showed that 16.3% of subjects had less than Prathomsuksa while 60.7% had Prathomsuksa, 14% had Mathayom, 3.3% had Vocation and 5.7% had over than Vocation level (table 8).

Table 9: Occupation distribution of the subjects

Characteristics	Number	Percentage
Agricultural worker	22	7.3
General labor	45	15.0
Own small business	25	8.3
Business owner	12	4.0
Housekeeper	162	54.0
Retired person	12	4.0
Not working	17	5.7
Other	5	1.7
Total	300	100.0

Regarding the occupation of the subjects, housekeeper (54%) were the most, 15% were general labor, 8.3% owned their small business and 5.7% were not working. The rest were agricultural worker, business owner and retired person (table 9).

Table 10: Distribution of the family members of the subjects

Characteristics (person)	Number	Percentage
<4	88	29.3
4-5	130	43.3
>5	82	27.3
Total	300	100.0
Mean=4.73 SD=2.314		

As shown in table 10, subjects having less than 4 of the family members were 29.3%, between 4-5 were 43.3% and more than 5 were 27.3%. And the subjects had 4.73 of the family members on average.

Table 11: Monthly household income distribution of the subjects

Characteristics (Baht)	Number	Percentage
<= 9,000	119	39.7
9,001- 28,000	129	43.0
>28,000	52	17.3
Total	300	100.0
Minimum=500 Maximum=100000 Mean=15598.33 SD=13065.08		

On the issue of monthly household income, 39.7% of the subjects had income <=9,000 baht, 43% of them had income in the range of 9,001-28,000 baht, while 17.3% had income more than 28,000 baht. The subjects' monthly household income level was 15,600 Baht on average (table 11).

Table 12: Monthly household expenditure distribution of the subjects

Characteristics (Baht)	Number	Percentage
<= 9,000	143	47.7
9,001- 28,000	123	41.0
>28,000	34	11.3
Total	300	100.0
Minimum=500 Maximum=80000 Mean=13475 SD=11323.15		

For monthly household expenditure distribution, it was similar to the income range. It showed that 47.7% of the subjects had expenditure <=9,000 baht, 41% had expenditure in the range of 9,001-28,000 baht, while 11.3% had expenditure more than 28,000 baht, and mean of the expenditure was 13,475 Baht (table 12).

Table 13: Distribution of the family history who has hypertension of the subjects

Characteristics	Number	Percentage
Yes	141	47.0
No	159	53.0
Total	300	100.0

As shown in table 13, most of subjects (53%) did not have family history who has hypertension. 47% had family history with hypertension which from their understanding were their husbands, wives, and sons, in addition to fathers, mothers, siblings, and brothers, as asked in this questionnaire.

Table 14: Distribution of the main cause (s) of stress of the subjects

Characteristics	Number	Percentage
Financial problem	103	34.3
Social status	16	5.3
Social relation with others	7	2.3
Family problem/relation with life partner	74	24.7
Other	100	33.3
Total	300	100.0

For the distributions of main cause(s) of stress, it showed that their stress was due to financial problem for 34.3%, followed with 24.7% to family problem/relation with life partner, 5.3% to social status, and 2.3% to social relation to others. As a matter of fact, the subjects responded to having “other” problem at 33.3% which included health-related issues and stress from work (table 14).

Table 15: Distribution of the subject’s ability to relieve stress

Characteristics	Number	Percentage
Yes	245	81.7
No	55	18.3
Total	300	100.0

As presented in the table 15, the subjects who had an ability to relieve stress were 81.7% and for those who had no ability were 18.3% only.

Table 16: Distribution of the sleep hours per night of the subjects

Characteristics (hours)	Number	Percentage
1-5	89	29.7
6-8	205	68.3
>8	6	2.0
Total	300	100.0
Minimum=1 Maximum=12 Mean=6.42 SD=1.396		

For the distribution of sleep hours per night of the subjects, it showed that 29.7% of the subjects slept for less than 6 hours, 68.3% of them slept between 6-8 hours, while 2% of them slept for more than 8 hours per night.

Table 17: Distribution of the BMI of the subjects

Gender	BMI				Total
	<18.5	18.5-24.9	25-29.9	>=30	
Male	5(5.3)	40(42.1)	37(38.9)	13(13.7)	95(100)
Female	5(2.4)	93(45.4)	67(32.7)	40(19.5)	205(100)
Total	10(3.3)	133(44.3)	104(34.7)	53(17.7)	300(100)
Minimum=16.26 Maximum=46.67 Mean=25.862 SD=4.6679					

As presented in table 17, the subjects having BMI less than 18.5 were 3.3%, the subjects having range of 18.5-24.9 were 44.3%, 34.7% of the subjects had range of 25-29.9, and 17.7% of them were with BMI of 30 or over/ And the mean of the subjects' BMI was 25.862. In male, the subjects having BMI less than 18.5 were 5.3%, 18.5-24.9 were 42.1%, 25-29.9 were 38.9% and 30 or over were 13.7%. In female, proportion of BMI was 2.4%, 45.4%, 32.7% and 19.5%, respectively.

Table 18: Distribution of systolic blood pressure of subjects

Characteristics	Number	Percentage
<130	62	20.7
130-150	174	58.0
>150	64	21.3
Total	300	100.0
Mean=140.59 SD=19.84		

As shown in table 18, the subjects having blood pressure less than 130mmHg were 20.7%, 58.0% of them had blood pressure were in the range of 130-150mmHg, while 21.3% had blood pressure more than 150mmHg. The mean of the systolic blood pressure of the subjects was 140.59mmHg.

Table 19: Distribution of diastolic blood pressure of subjects

Characteristics	Number	Percentage
<80	88	29.3
80-89	119	39.7
>=90	93	31.0
Total	300	100.0
Mean=83.69 SD=9.64		

According to the diastolic blood pressure of the subjects, 29.3% of the subjects had blood pressure less than 80mmHg, 39.7% of them had blood pressure in the range of 80-89 mmHg and 31% had blood pressure 90mmHg and over. Mean was 83.69mmHg (table 19).

4.2 Knowledge of preventive behaviors regarding stress management

Table 20: Distribution of knowledge level of preventive behaviors regarding stress management of the subjects

Level	Number	Percentage
Low	46	15.3
Moderate	95	31.7
High	159	53.0
Total	300	100.0
Minimum=1 Maximum=9 Mean=7.26 SD=1.703		

Distribution of knowledge of preventive behaviors regarding stress management of subjects showed that 53% of subjects had “good knowledge” 31.7% of them had “moderate knowledge” while 15.3% had “poor knowledge”, and within the range of knowledge score 1-9, the mean was 7.26, as presented in table 20.

4.3 Attitudes of preventive behaviors regarding stress management

Table 21: Distribution of attitudes level of preventive behaviors regarding stress management of the subjects

Level	Number	Percentage
Low	49	16.3
Moderate	133	44.3
High	118	39.3
Total	300	100.0
Minimum=16 Maximum=30 Mean=26.28 SD=2.844		

Distribution of attitudes of preventive behaviors regarding stress management of subjects is shown in table 21. There were 39.3% of subjects who had “good attitude”,

44.3% of them had “moderate attitude”, while 16.3% had “low attitude”, and within the range of attitudes score 16-30, the mean was 26.28, as shown above table 21.

4.4 Practices of preventive behaviors regarding stress management

Table 22: Distribution of practice of preventive behaviors regarding stress management of the subjects

Level	Number	Percentage
Low	73	24.3
Moderate	153	51.0
High	74	24.7
Total	300	100.0
Minimum=21 Maximum=39 Mean=29.99 SD=3.652		

As presented in table 22, about half of the subjects had “moderate practice” and 24.7% had “high practice”, while 24.3% had “low practice”, and within the range of subjects’ practices scores 21-39, the mean of the practices scores was 29.99.

4.5 Association between general characteristics with knowledge, with attitudes, and with practice of preventive behaviors regarding stress management

Most of general characteristics of the subjects had no significant association with knowledge, attitudes and practice of preventive behaviors regarding stress management, however, an ability to relieve stress of subjects had statistically significant association with knowledge and attitudes of preventive behaviors regarding stress management.

Table 23: Association between gender and practices of preventive behaviors regarding stress management

Gender	Practices status				Chi-Square	P value
	Low	Moderate	High	Total		
	No (%)	No (%)	No (%)	No (%)		
Male	26(27.4)	42(44.2)	27(28.4)	95(100)	2.577	0.276
Female	47(22.9)	111(54.2)	47(22.9)	205(100)		
Total	73(24.3)	153(51.0)	74(24.7)	300(100)		

There was no significant association between gender and practices of preventive behaviors regarding stress management (p-value 0.276) (table 23).

Table 24: Association between age and practices of preventive behaviors regarding stress management

Age	Practices status				Chi-Square	P value
	Low	Moderate	High	Total		
(years)	No (%)	No (%)	No (%)	No (%)		
35-44	8(53.3)	7(46.7)	0(0)	15(100)	13.204	0.105
45-54	13(18.6)	41(58.6)	16(22.8)	70(100)		
55-64	26(27.1)	43(44.8)	27(28.1)	96(100)		
65-74	20(22.2)	48(53.3)	22(24.4)	90(100)		
>74	6(20.7)	14(48.3)	9(31.0)	29(100)		
Total	73(24.3)	153(51.0)	74(24.7)	300(100)		

As presented in table 24, there was no significant association between age and practices of preventive behaviors regarding stress management (p-value 0.105).

Table 25: Association between marital status and practices of preventive behaviors regarding stress management

Marital status	Practices status				Chi-Square	P value
	Low	Moderate	High	Total		
	No (%)	No (%)	No (%)	No (%)		
Single	5(29.4)	10(58.8)	2(11.8)	17(100)	4.872	0.560
Married	44(23.4)	91(48.4)	53(28.2)	188(100)		
Widowed	19(24.7)	41(53.2)	17(22.1)	77(100)		
Divorced	5(27.8)	11(61.1)	2(11.1)	18(100)		
Total	73(24.3)	153(51.0)	74(24.7)	300(100)		

As shown in table 25, there was no significant association between marital status and practices of preventive behaviors regarding stress management (p-value 0.560).

Table 26: Association between educational status and practices of preventive behaviors regarding stress management

Educational status	Practices status				Chi-value	P Square
	Low	Moderate	High	Total		
	No (%)	No (%)	No (%)	No (%)		
<Primary	16(32.7)	25(51.0)	8(16.3)	49(100)	7.661	0.467
Primary	40(22.0)	95(52.2)	47(25.8)	182(100)		
Secondary	11(26.2)	19(45.2)	12(28.6)	42(100)		
Vocation	4(40.0)	3(30.0)	3(30.0)	10(100)		
>Vocation	2(11.8)	11(64.7)	4(23.5)	17(100)		
Total	73(24.3)	153(51.0)	74(24.7)	300(100)		

There was no relationship between educational status and practices of preventive behaviors regarding stress management (p-value 0.467), as presented in table 26.

Table 27: Association between occupation and practices of preventive behaviors regarding stress management

Occupation	Practices status				Chi-Square	P value
	Low	Moderate	High	Total		
	No (%)	No (%)	No (%)	No (%)		
Agricultural worker	3(20.0)	10(40.0)	9(40.0)	22(100)	13.758	0.468
General labor	13(28.9)	25(55.6)	7(15.5)	45(100)		
Own small business	7(28.0)	12(48.0)	6(24.0)	25(100)		
Business owner	4(33.3)	5(41.7)	3(25.0)	12(100)		
Housekeeper	38(23.4)	85(52.5)	39(24.1)	162(100)		
Retired person	1(8.3)	5(41.7)	6(50.0)	12(100)		
Not working	6(35.3)	9(52.9)	2(11.8)	17(100)		
Other	1(20.0)	2(40.0)	2(40.0)	5(100)		
Total	73(24.3)	153(51.0)	74(24.7)	300(100)		

As presented above table, there was no significant association between occupation and practices of preventive behaviors regarding stress management (p-value 0.468).

Table 28: Association between numbers of family member and practices of preventive behaviors regarding stress management

Family member (person)	Practices status				Chi-Square	P value
	Low	Moderate	High	Total		
	No (%)	No (%)	No (%)	No (%)		
<4	20(22.7)	44(50.0)	24(27.3)	88(100)	2.143	0.710
4-5	35(26.9)	68(52.3)	27(20.8)	130(100)		
>5	18(21.9)	41(50.0)	23(28.1)	82(100)		
Total	73(24.3)	153(51.0)	74(24.7)	300(100)		

There was no relationship between numbers of family member and practices of preventive behaviors regarding stress management (p-value 0.710), as shown in table 28.

Table 29: Association between monthly household income and practices of preventive behaviors regarding stress management

Monthly income (Baht)	Practices status				Chi- Square	P value
	Low	Moderate	High	Total		
	No (%)	No (%)	No (%)	No (%)		
<=9000	24(20.2)	72(60.5)	23(19.3)	119(100)	8.442	0.077
9001- 28000	34(26.4)	61(47.2)	34(26.4)	129(100)		
>28000	15(28.8)	20(38.5)	17(32.7)	52(100)		
Total	73(24.3)	153(51.0)	74(24.7)	300(100)		

As shown in table 29, there was no significant association between monthly household income and practices of preventive behaviors regarding stress management (p-value 0.077).

Table 30: Association between monthly household expenditure and practices of preventive behaviors regarding stress management

Monthly expenditure (Baht)	Practices status				Chi- value	P Square
	Low	Moderate	High	Total		
	No (%)	No (%)	No (%)	No (%)		
<= 9,000	30(21.0)	82(57.3)	31(21.7)	143(100)	7.332	0.119
9,001- 28,000	34(27.6)	59(48.0)	30(24.4)	123(100)		
>28,000	9(26.5)	12(35.3)	13(38.2)	34(100)		
Total	73(24.3)	153(51.0)	74(24.7)	300(100)		

As presented in table 30, there was no significant association between monthly household expenditure and practices of preventive behaviors regarding stress management (p-value 0.119).

Table 31: Association between family history who has hypertension and practices of preventive behaviors regarding stress management

Family history	Practices status				Chi-Square	P value
	Low	Moderate	High	Total		
	No (%)	No (%)	No (%)	No (%)		
Yes	31(22.0)	75(53.2)	35(24.8)	141(100)	0.856	0.652
No	42(26.4)	78(49.1)	39(24.5)	159(100)		
Total	73(24.3)	153(51.0)	74(24.7)	300(100)		

There was no significant association between family history with hypertension and practices of preventive behaviors regarding stress management (p-value 0.652), as presented in table 31.

Table 32: Association between cause (s) of stress and practices of preventive behaviors regarding stress management

Cause of stress	Practices status				Chi-value	P Square
	Low	Moderate	High	Total		
	No (%)	No (%)	No (%)	No (%)		
Financial	31(30.1)	52(50.5)	20(19.4)	103(100)	15.396	0.118
Social status	3(18.8)	12(75.0)	1(6.2)	16(100)		
Social relation	1(14.3)	4(57.1)	2(28.6)	7(100)		
Family	19(25.7)	32(43.2)	23(31.1)	74(100)		
Other	19(19.0)	53(53.0)	28(28.0)	100(100)		
Total	73(24.3)	153(51.0)	74(24.7)	300(100)		

There was no significant association between cause of stress and practices of preventive behaviors regarding stress management (p-value 0.118) (table 32).

Table 33: Association between ability to relieve stress and knowledge of preventive behaviors regarding stress management

Knowledge status	Ability to relieve stress			Chi-Square	P value
	Yes	No	Total		
Low	31(67.4)	15(32.6)	46(100)	9.227	0.01
Moderate	76(80.0)	19(20.0)	95(100)		
High	138(86.8)	21(13.2)	159(100)		
Total	245(81.7)	55(18.3)	300(100)		

As presented in table 33, an ability to relieve stress of the subjects had significant association with knowledge of preventive behaviors regarding stress management (p-value 0.01).

Table 34: Association between ability to relieve stress and attitudes of preventive behaviors regarding stress management

Attitudes status	Ability to relieve stress			Chi-Square	P value
	Yes	No	Total		
Low	26(53.1)	23(46.9)	49(100)	38.919	0.000
Moderate	108(81.2)	25(18.8)	133(100)		
High	111(94.1)	7(5.9)	118(100)		
Total	245(81.7)	55(18.3)	300(100)		

The ability to relieve stress of the subjects had a strongly significant association with attitudes of preventive behaviors regarding stress management ($p < 0.001$) (table 34).

Table 35: Association between ability to relieve stress and practices of preventive behaviors regarding stress management

Practices status	Ability to relieve stress			Chi-Square	P value
	Yes	No	Total		
Low	57(78.1)	16(21.9)	73(100)	5.200	0.074
Moderate	121(79.1)	32(20.9)	153(100)		
High	67(90.5)	7(9.5)	74(100)		
Total	245(81.7)	55(18.3)	300(100)		

As presented in table 35, there was no significant association between ability to relieve stress and practices of preventive behaviors regarding stress management (p -value 0.074).

Table 36: Association between sleep hours per night on average and practices of preventive behaviors regarding stress management

Sleep (hours)	Practices status				Chi-Square	P value
	Low	Moderate	High	Total		
	No (%)	No (%)	No (%)	No (%)		
1-5	24(27.0)	51(57.3)	14(15.7)	89(100)	7.278	0.122
6-8	49(23.9)	98(47.8)	58(28.3)	205(100)		
>8	0	4(66.7)	2(33.3)	6(100)		
Total	73(24.3)	153(51.0)	74(24.7)	300(100)		

As shown in table 36, there was no significant association between sleep hours per night on average and practices of preventive behaviors regarding stress management (p -value 0.122).

Table 37: Association between BMI and practices of preventive behaviors regarding stress management

BMI	Practices status				Chi-Square	P value
	Low	Moderate	High	Total		
	No (%)	No (%)	No (%)	No (%)		
<18.5	5(50.0)	3(30.0)	2(20.0)	10(100)	4.765	0.574
18.5-24.9	29(21.8)	72(54.1)	32(24.1)	133(100)		
25-29.9	25(24.0)	51(49.0)	28(26.9)	104(100)		
>=30	14(26.4)	27(50.9)	12(22.7)	53(100)		
Total	73(24.3)	153(51.0)	74(24.7)	300(100)		

There was no relationship between BMI of the subjects and practices of preventive behaviors regarding stress management (p -value 0.574), as presented in table 37.

Table 38: Association between systolic blood pressure and practices of preventive behaviors regarding stress management

Systolic blood pressure	Practices status				Chi-Square	P value
	Low	Moderate	High	Total		
	No (%)	No (%)	No (%)	No (%)		
<130	16(25.8)	34(54.8)	12(19.4)	62(100)	7.162	0.128
130-150	35(20.1)	94(54.0)	45(25.9)	174(100)		
>150	22(34.4)	25(39.0)	17(26.6)	64(100)		
Total	73(24.3)	153(51.0)	74(24.7)	300(100)		

As presented in table 38, there was no relationship between systolic blood pressure and practices of preventive behaviors regarding stress management (p -value 0.128).

Table 39: Association between diastolic blood pressure and practices of preventive behaviors regarding stress management

Diastolic blood pressure	Practices status				Chi- Square	P value
	Low	Moderate	High	Total		
	No (%)	No (%)	No (%)	No (%)		
<80	26(29.5)	43(48.9)	19(21.6)	88(100)	6.247	0.181
80-89	24(20.2)	69(58.0)	26(21.8)	119(100)		
>=90	23(24.7)	41(44.1)	29(31.2)	93(100)		
Total	73(24.3)	153(51.0)	74(24.7)	300(100)		

As shown in table 39, there was no significant association between diastolic blood pressure and practices of preventive behaviors regarding stress management (p -value 0.181).

Table40: Association between systolic blood pressure and ability to relieve stress

Systolic blood pressure	Ability to relieve stress			Chi- Square	P value
	Yes	No	Total		
<130	52(83.9)	10(16.1)	62(100)	0.768	0.681
130-150	143(82.2)	31(17.8)	174(100)		
>150	50(80.6)	14(19.4)	64(100)		
Total	245(81.7)	55(18.3)	300(100)		

There was no significant relationship between systolic blood pressure and ability to relieve stress (p -value 0.681), as shown in the above table.

Table 41: Association between diastolic blood pressure and ability to relieve stress

Diastolic blood pressure	Ability to relieve stress			Chi-Square	P value
	Yes	No	Total		
<80	70(79.5)	18(20.5)	88(100)	0.568	0.753
80-89	97(81.5)	22(18.5)	119(100)		
>=90	78(83.9)	15(16.1)	93(100)		
Total	245(81.7)	55(18.3)	300(100)		

As presented in table 41, there was no significant association between diastolic blood pressure and ability to relieve stress (p -value 0.753).

Table 42: Association between cause of stress and systolic blood pressure

Cause of stress	Systolic blood pressure				Chi-Square	P value
	<130	130-150	>150	Total		
Financial	20(19.4)	68(66.0)	15(14.6)	103(100)	10.335	0.242
Social status	4(25.0)	6(37.5)	6(37.5)	16(100)		
Social relation	1(14.3)	5(71.4)	1(14.3)	7(100)		
Family	17(23.0)	43(58.9)	14(19.1)	74(100)		
Other	20(20.0)	52(52.0)	28(28.0)	100(100)		
Total	62(20.7)	174(58.0)	64(21.3)	300(100)		

There was no significant association between cause of stress and systolic blood pressure (p -value 0.242), as shown in table 42.

Table43: Association between cause of stress and diastolic blood pressure

Cause of stress	Diastolic blood pressure			Total	Chi-Square	P value
	<80	80-89	>=90			
Financial	32(31.1)	40(38.8)	31(30.1)	103(100)	1.217	0.996
Social status	4(25.0)	8(50.0)	4(25.0)	16(100)		
Social relation	2(28.6)	3(42.8)	2(28.6)	7(100)		
Family	20(27.0)	30(40.6)	24(32.4)	74(100)		
Other	30(30.0)	38(38.0)	32(32.0)	100(100)		
Total	88(29.3)	119(39.7)	93(31.0)	300(100)		

As presented in table 43, there was no significant association between cause of stress and diastolic blood pressure (p -value 0.996).

4.6 Association between knowledge and attitudes of preventive behaviors regarding stress management

Table 44: Association between knowledge and attitudes of preventive behaviors regarding stress management

Knowledge status	Attitudes status			Total	Chi-Square	P value
	Low No (%)	Moderate No (%)	High No (%)			
Low	19(41.3)	16(34.8)	11(23.9)	46(100)	32.648	0.000
Moderate	18(18.9)	45(47.4)	32(33.7)	95(100)		
High	12(7.5)	72(45.3)	75(47.2)	159(100)		
Total	49(16.3)	133(44.3)	118(39.3)	300(100)		

There was a highly significant association between knowledge and attitudes of preventive behaviors regarding stress management ($p < 0.001$), as presented in table 44.

4.7 Association between knowledge and practices of preventive behaviors regarding stress management

Table 45: Association between knowledge and practices of preventive behaviors regarding stress management

Knowledge status	Practices status				Chi-Square	P value
	Low No (%)	Moderate No (%)	High No (%)	Total No (%)		
Low	10(21.7)	29(63.0)	7(15.3)	46(100)	6.891	0.142
Moderate	29(30.5)	45(47.4)	21(22.1)	95(100)		
High	34(21.4)	79(49.7)	46(28.9)	159(100)		
Total	73(24.3)	153(51.0)	74(24.7)	300(100)		

Table 45 showed that there was no significant association between knowledge and practices of preventive behaviors regarding stress management (p -value 0.142).

4.8 Association between attitudes and practices of preventive behaviors regarding stress management

Table 46: Association between attitudes and practices of preventive behaviors regarding stress management

Attitudes status	Practices status				Chi- Square	P value
	Low No (%)	Moderate No (%)	High No (%)	Total No (%)		
Low	20(40.8)	23(46.9)	6(12.3)	49(100)	22.955	0.000
Moderate	33(24.8)	76(57.1)	24(18.1)	133(100)		
High	20(16.9)	54(45.8)	44(37.3)	118(100)		
Total	73(24.3)	153(51.0)	74(24.7)	300(100)		

There was a highly significant association between attitudes and practices of preventive behaviors regarding stress management ($p < 0.001$), as shown in table 46.