Factors associated with work ability and intention to leave nursing profession: a nested case-control study
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Abstract

Objective: To identify factors associated with impaired work ability and intention to leave the nursing profession. Methods: This is a case-control nested within a cross-sectional study. Samples were randomly selected for work ability (475 controls and 158 cases) and intention to leave profession (454 controls and 151 cases). Data on demographic, lifestyle, occupational features, work environment, work ability and intention to leave profession were collected. Multiple logistic regression analysis was performed. Results: Factors associated with work ability impairment were: risk for moderate (OR=1.28) and high (OR=2.26) job strain, effort-reward imbalance (OR=2.82), high overcommitment (OR=1.77), situations that may contribute to musculoskeletal pain/injury with moderate (OR=1.82) or high (OR=2.58) exposures, degree level (OR=2.13) or elementary/high school level (OR=1.67), and low physical activity (OR=1.74). Age of 31-40 years (OR=0.26) and ≥41 years (OR=0.27) were protective factors. Factors associated with intention to leave profession were: high risk for job strain (OR=1.81), effort-reward imbalance (OR=3.25), situations that may contribute to musculoskeletal pain/injury with high exposure (OR=1.54), and insomnia symptoms (OR=2.72). Age >40 years was a protective factor (OR=0.50). Conclusions: Individual characteristics and occupational conditions were associated with work ability impairment and intention to leave profession. Measures to improve working conditions and individual resources were recommended.
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Introduction

Work ability is defined as a worker’s physical and mental conditions to cope with the physical and mental demands of work. Work ability is a measure of the balance between individual resources (health status, functionalities, professional competencies, values, attitudes and motivation) and work-related characteristics (demands, content, environment, organization and management), influenced by external social and family factors. The predictive value of Work ability for sick leave, use of health services and employability is recognized, and influences premature departure from the profession.

Early exit from the profession, before statutory retirement age, may be the result of pressure or attraction factors. Pressure factors are adverse aspects that make people wish to give up work, such as negative working conditions or health problems. Attraction factors are incentives, such as the chance to study, pursue a new career or pension rules. Intention to leave is predictor of a definitive decision to exit the profession within 12 months of exhibiting intention to leave.

Nurses accounts for around 50% of the workforce in the health sector. Nursing professionals are involved in a range of roles and care and management settings, working to meet demographic, universal health coverage and healthcare challenges. Impaired work ability and early exit from the profession negatively impacts the jobs market, as well as health and pension systems in terms of maintaining a sufficient, high quality workforce. The nursing profession continues to face problems involving poor working conditions, ineffective public policy, understaffing, low recognition, and restricted autonomy, aspects which can affect both work ability and intention to leave. The present case-control study sought to
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identify factors associated with work ability impairment and intention to leave among nursing professionals.

Method

Study design and participants

A cross-sectional study was conducted among nursing professionals of São Paulo state (25% of contingent in Brazil), registered in 14 regional subsections of the Regional Nursing Council. Of the 411,162 professionals eligible, 1.0% (3,993 volunteers) enrolled on the study. Of this population, 942 (23.6%) were currently not practicing in the profession, while 3,051 (76.4%) were in active service, giving an overall enrolment rate of 0.74%.

In order to investigate factors associated with impaired work ability and with intention to leave nursing we decided to conduct two nested case-control analysis. The first one was to investigate factors associated with impaired work ability. The sample size was calculated assuming a 30% event rate for work ability (11), \( \alpha = 5\% \) and \( (1-\beta) = 90.0\% \). The cases were considered the people who had impaired (moderate and low) work ability (158 cases). We randomly sampled 3 controls per case, and a 20.0% replacement rate (475 controls), among those who had preserved (excellent or good) work ability.

The second study was to investigate factors associated with intention to leave nursing. The sample size was calculated assuming a 35% for intention to leave (11), \( \alpha = 5\% \) and \( (1-\beta) = 90.0\% \), inclusion of 3 control subjects per case, and a 20.0% replacement rate. The cases were considered the people who had intention to leave (151 cases). We randomly sampled 3 controls per case, and a 20.0% replacement rate (454 controls), among those who had no intention to leave.
Data collection and studied variables

Data collection was carried out between October 2018 and March 2019 with the support of Regional Nursing Council of São Paulo, which sent out emails to the professionals containing a link for internet access to access the data collection form. The form contained questions on sociodemographic characteristics (sex, age, marital status, place of residence, monthly family income, Regional Nursing Council subsection), lifestyle (tobacco use, CAGE questionnaire for assessing alcohol use risk\textsuperscript{11}), physical activity level, body mass index, the Karolinska Sleep Questionnaire – KSQ for assessing sleep quality\textsuperscript{12}, occupational history (age at joining the workforce, time working in nursing, nursing education, employment contract type, area of expertise, position/function, work shift, working week, recent history of work-related disease or injury). Urban development index was estimated using municipal data.

The psychosocial work environment was assessed using the Job Stress Scale (JSS) adapted from the Job Content Questionnaire (JCQ) for use in Brazil, based on the Demand-Control Model, measuring demands, control and social support at work\textsuperscript{13, 14). Dimension scores were categorized into high or low according to mean point of the score\textsuperscript{6). Demand and control dimensions were combined into 4 categories of risk for job strain (high job strain, active job, low job strain and passive job)\textsuperscript{13). Demand/control ratio was estimated, yielding a score ranging from 0.21 to 3.33 points, subsequently categorized by tertiles, where higher scores indicate greater risk of job strain\textsuperscript{2, 15, 16).}

Psychosocial environment was also assessed using the Brazilian version of the Effort-Reward Imbalance (ERI) questionnaire, structured based on the theoretic model bearing the same name and comprising the dimensions effort, reward and overcommitment\textsuperscript{17, 18). The effort-reward ratio was calculated and multiplied by 6/11, giving a coefficient ranging from
0.17 to 5.00 points, where scores above 1.0 indicate imbalance\textsuperscript{17, 18}. Scores were then also categorized into tertiles, with higher score indicating greater risk of job strain\textsuperscript{2}).

Working conditions that may contribute to musculoskeletal disorders were assessed using the version of the Work-Related Activities That May Contribute To Job-Related Pain and/or Injury (WRAPI) scale validated for use in Brazil\textsuperscript{19}. This is a 15-item instrument yielding a score of 0–150 points, with higher scores indicating worse situation\textsuperscript{19}. Scores on the scale were categorized into tertiles\textsuperscript{2}).

The work ability outcome was measured using the Brazilian version of the Work Ability Index – WAI\textsuperscript{20}, comprising 7 dimensions and yielding a score of 7–49 points. Scores were calculated according to Tuomi \textit{et al.} (2005)\textsuperscript{3} and Kujala \textit{et al.} (2005)\textsuperscript{21}, considering differentiation of workers from 35 years of age and older. The variable was dichotomized into cases (impaired work ability – moderate and low) and control subjects (preserved work ability – excellent or good).

The intention to leave outcome was assessed based on the question from the NEXT-Study (Nurses’ Early Exit Study), “How often during the course of the past year have you thought about giving up nursing?”, with 6 response categories. The variable was dichotomized into cases (presence of intention to leave nursing profession, with answer categories “sometimes a month”, “sometimes a week”, “every day”) and control subjects (with answer categories “never” or “sometimes a year”)\textsuperscript{4}).

Assessment using Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient revealed that all scales provided satisfactory reliability (>0.65).

\textit{Statistical analysis}

To verify the association between work ability and intention to leave, the chi square test was used. We analysed the 2 outcomes (impaired work ability or intention to leave)
Work ability and intention to leave nursing separately, using the chi-square test and univariate/multiple logistic regression models. Model fit was determined using the Hosmer-Lemeshow test. The risk measure was odds ratio (OR) and a 95% confidence interval.

**Ethical aspects**

The study was approved by the Regional Nursing Council of São Paulo and by the Research Ethics Committee of the School of Public Health, University of São Paulo (ruling nº 2.614.513). The researchers were not given access to the databases containing registration information on the professionals in order to ensure information security rules (invulnerability and confidentiality) of Regional Nursing Council of São Paulo. All participants signed the Free and Informed Consent Form and confidentiality of individuals’ data was guaranteed. The study observed the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki and of the Council for International Organizations of Medical Sciences.

**Results**

There was a strong association was found between impaired work ability and intention to leave (p<0.001) (data not shown). Among those with intention to leave 10.4% were individuals with excellent work ability, 22.0% were individuals with good work ability, 39.4% had moderate work ability and 46.9% had low work ability. Because of this, impaired work ability is not included in the model for intention to leave.

Univariate analysis revealed a statistically significant association between work ability and the younger age group (p<0.001), lower monthly family income (p=0.021), sedentarism (p=0.002), intermediate or poor sleep quality (p<0.001) and insomnia (p<0.001). The factors showing significant associations with intention to leave were: male gender.
Work ability and intention to leave nursing

(p=0.001), age groups ≤40 years (p<0.001), married/partner or single marital status (p=0.042),
intermediate or poor sleep quality (p<0.001) and insomnia (p<0.001) (Table 1).

The occupational categories/variables associated with impaired work ability were:
qualification as nursing technician or assistant (p=0.037), qualified but without post-graduate
degree (p=0.001), time in the profession of 6–10 years (p<0.001), function involving
provision of care to patients (p=0.017), and history of work-related disease or injury
(p<0.001). Associations with intention to leave were: time in profession of 6–15 years
(p=0.014), involvement in hospital areas or emergency service (p=0.014), holding second job
(p=0.017), and history of work-related disease or injury (p=0.008) (Table 2).

All job characteristics had a statistically significant association, with increased risk of
work ability impairment in cases of worst exposures to job stressors (all p<0.004). The same
pattern was found for intention to leave (all p<0.001), except for the variables job demand,
control, psychosocial risk situation and job strain (Table 3).

Multiple logistic regression analysis showed that the independent variables associated
with work ability impairment were: demand/control ratio indicating high exposure to
psychosocial risk for strain (OR=2.26; 95%CI=1.32–3.90), effort-reward imbalance
(OR=2.82, 95%CI=1.44–2.75), high overcommitment (OR=1.77, 95%CI=1.14–2.75), work-
related activities that may contribute to job-related pain and/or injury with high (2.58,
95%CI=1.51–4.40) or moderate (OR=1.82, 95%CI=1.06–3.14) exposure, age group of 31 to
40 years (OR=0.26, 95%CI=0.14–0.47) or ≥41 years (OR=0.27, 95% CI=0.15–0.49), degree
education (OR=2.13, 95%CI=1.15–3.95) or high school/primary education (OR=1.67,
95%CI=1.05–2.67) and sedentarism (OR=1.74, 95%CI=1.15–2.66). The model was
controlled for gender, and residuals analysis showed good fit ($\chi^2=1.81; p=0.986$) (Table 4).

Multiple logistic regression analysis showed that the independent variables associated
with intention to leave were: demand/control ratio indicating high exposure to psychosocial
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risk for job strain (OR=1.81, 95%CI=1.18–2.76), effort-reward imbalance (OR=3.25, 95%CI=1.93–5.47), work-related activities that may contribute to work-related pain and/or injury with high exposure (1.54, 95%CI=1.00–2.35), age group ≥41 years (OR=0.50, 95%CI=0.33–0.77), presence of insomnia symptoms (OR=2.72, 95%CI=1.65–4.47) and female gender (OR=2.70, 95%CI=1.58–4.62). The residuals analysis showed good fit ($\chi^2=2.48; p=0.963$) (Table 5).

Discussion

The study results showed an association between work ability and intention to leave. This behavior in nursing is supported by the existing literature\(^4, 7, 22\), where individuals with impaired work ability have a greater likelihood of giving up work, including before statutory retirement age\(^{10, 23}\). The decision to leave the nursing profession is preceded by intention to leave, which in turn is influenced by a range of underlying factors, such as cumulative or sudden exposures, consequences on private life, besides personal and macrosocial conditions, health and pension systems and the job market\(^4\).

In the present study, the factors associated with work ability impairment and intention to leave were analyzed. Several factors were common to both outcomes: high psychosocial risk for job strain, effort-reward imbalance, exposure to situations that may contribute to musculoskeletal pain/injury, and younger age. Overcommitment, lower professional qualifications and sedentarism were associated with impaired work ability, whereas insomnia symptoms and male gender were also associated with intention to leave.

Of the sociodemographic factors assessed, higher age proved protective against work ability impairment and intention to leave. The association between age and work ability may be absent or non-linear, since aspects such as qualifications, coping capacity and working
conditions can be more favourable among older workers, thereby protecting their work ability\(^2,10\). With regard to intention to leave, there is evidence that younger adults are more exposed to tasks involving higher physical load, content and limited autonomy, low pay and greater interest in pursuing new professional avenues, whereas older individuals face greater difficulties finding a new job\(^2,4,24\). A study of nurses in Brazil found age to be a protective factor for leaving the profession\(^24\). The effect of worker health should also be taken into account, with early exit of individuals with disability, poorer health or who are submitted to greater workloads\(^2,24\).

No association between sex and work ability was found in the present study, but men had higher risk of intention to leave. This absence of association between gender and work ability has been reported in previous studies, where factors such as working conditions proved more relevant\(^23\). The gender association with intention to leave was also observed in previous studies, showing that men more often wish to change profession\(^4,24\), possibly because males in nursing can feel professionally frustrated by aspects such as choice and low recognition of the profession, as well clashes with colleagues and clients, leading to dissatisfaction and consequent intention to leave\(^24\).

Sedentary individuals had higher risk of work ability impairment, echoing findings of a study on nursing professional at a private hospital in São Paulo\(^25\). Engagement in physical activity helps prevent impairment and enhance work ability\(^25,26\). The protective role of exercise can be explained by preservation of musculoskeletal and cardiorespiratory capacity, control of body weight, attenuation of emotional reactions to stress, and improvement in self-esteem\(^26,27\). However, this same association was not seen for intention to leave, which tends to be more impacted by job pressure factors and by attraction through external incentives\(^4\).

Insomnia was not associated with work ability impairment on the multiple model for job variables, but represented greater risk for intention to leave. Insomnia is associated with
daytime sleepiness and fatigue, inability to perform complex tasks, impacting performance, job turnover, absenteeism and job dissatisfaction, potentially leading to intention to leave28). A study of Greek nurses found that insomnia was associated with burnout, emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and limitation in personal restrictions29).

Level of professional qualifications was associated with work ability, but not with intention to leave. Impaired work ability was more frequent in individuals with primary or high school education and, to a greater degree, among those holding a graduate degree versus a post-graduate degree. Professionals educated to high school/primary level are generally nursing assistants or technicians, categories that perform predominantly care-related tasks involving high physical and mental load, favouring the occurrence of musculoskeletal and mental health disorders with consequent work ability impairment2). Nursing professionals holding degrees, but not post-graduate qualifications, are typically engaged in both patient care and administration duties. This group enjoys less autonomy than professionals with post-graduate qualifications, who hold more senior management or institutional posts24). These loads, determined by working conditions and organizational environment, can favour impairment of work ability.

External work-related factors create loads and stresses which can favour work ability impairment and intention to leave41). In the present study, several stressors of the psychosocial and physical work environment were associated with these outcomes, evidencing a dose-response relationship, with worse outcomes correlating with increased exposure to stressors.

The high demand-control ratio, representing greater exposure to psychosocial risk for job strain, was associated with higher risk for both work ability impairment and intention to leave. According to the demand-control model, jobs characterized by high psychosocial demands and low control favour the occurrence of psychosocial stress16). The resultant burnout has a deleterious effect on physical and mental health, impairing work ability and
encouraging attempts to avoid these situations through intention to leave\textsuperscript{2, 4). Other nursing studies have shown similar results, even after adjusting for other potential confounders\textsuperscript{2, 24).}

The risk for work ability impairment and intention to leave was greater among those professionals with more marked effort-reward imbalance. ERI was especially relevant for these two outcomes, even when assessed alongside other job stressors\textsuperscript{2, 30). Imbalance between effort and reward represents a risk for the occurrence of physical and mental health problems and reflects aspects of social reciprocity, pointing to the need for interventions centered on rewards in terms of esteem, recognition, and possibilities for development and career\textsuperscript{4). These results are in line with those of other studies in Brazil investigating work ability\textsuperscript{2) and intention to leave\textsuperscript{24).}

Professionals displaying overcommitment had higher risk for work ability impairment, but this factor showed no association with intention to leave. Individuals exhibiting overcommitment can underestimate work demands while overestimating their resources to cope, maximizing the effects of stress and rendering them more susceptible to exhaustion and sickness and consequent impairment in work ability\textsuperscript{4). In inadequate work situations, this individual pattern intrinsic to motivation is reinforced by external pressure\textsuperscript{4, 18). Similar results documented in other nursing studies reflect the impairment profile characterizing these professionals\textsuperscript{2).}

Greater exposure to situations that may contribute to musculoskeletal pain or injury was a risk for work ability impairment and for intention to leave, confirming results of earlier studies\textsuperscript{2, 22). The high physical loads of nursing are determinants of physical problems, particularly musculoskeletal disorders, leading to impaired work ability\textsuperscript{2, 4, 31). The NEXT-Study found a clear association between lifting and bending activities and intention to leave, a phenomena more prevalent among nurses with higher level of disability, given that
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In this study, individual characteristics (sociodemographic, lifestyle), particularly those related to the physical and psychosocial work environment, were associated with work ability impairment. Excessive physical and/or mental work increases susceptibility to disease, with consequent limitation in the ability to perform work activities, contributing to voluntary exit from the job or otherwise, and predicting intention to leave²). An assessment of the constructive model describing the “House of Work Ability” showed that work-related issues explained over 30% of work ability variance¹); in the NEXT-Study, around 20% of work ability variance was explained by working conditions, predominantly work organizational factors⁴). These are adverse pressure factors that make workers wish to leave their job in its present form, favoring intention to leave⁴).

The study results corroborate previous reports, providing fresh insights while highlighting the need to promote individual resources and improve conditions of the physical and psychosocial work environment as a strategy for enhancing work ability and retaining professionals in the workforce. The study limitation: the target population was nursing professionals living in the state of Sao Paulo, Brazil. Thus, the results of this study may be applicable to locations with similar socioeconomic conditions to those here described.

The work ability impairment and the intention to leave are especially relevant when we consider that the nursing profession plays a vital role in the health systems⁷–⁹, 3¹). The scarcity of nursing professionals and evasion in search of better conditions are prevalent problems in both developed and developing countries. The inadequate working conditions and the lack of recognition and professional perspectives are at the root of this problem², 4, 7, 3²). These issues are cause for concern in the context of demographic aging and the increased burden on health services, together with a dwindling interest in taking up the profession⁴, 8, 3¹).
The sheer number of psychosocial job factors impacting health, work ability and intention to leave is noteworthy, aspects which should be embraced in preventive and corrective practices. Recommended strategies include reducing workloads and optimizing resources, such as quality of leadership, opportunities for development, staffing levels and recognition\(^4,7,31\).

Conclusions

This study showed that individual characteristics, particularly inadequate working conditions, were associated with work ability impairment and intention to leave. Preventive public and institutional policies should include measures that promote improvements in the physical and psychosocial work environment, as well as strengthening individual resources.
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Table 1. Distribution of controls and cases according to demographic and lifestyle characteristics, Nursing workers, São Paulo State, 2019.

| Variable                        | Impaired work ability | Intention to leave nursing profession |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|
|                                 | Controls n° %         | Cases n° % Total n° % p* | Controls n° % Cases n° % Total n° % p* |
| Sex                             |                       |                         |                                                  |
| Female                          | 392 74.2 136 25.8 528 100.0 0.299 | 399 77.5 116 22.5 515 100.0 0.001 |
| Male                            | 83  79.0 22 21.0 105 100.0          | 55  61.1 35 38.9 90 100.0            |
| Age (years)                     |                       |                         |                                                  |
| ≤ 30                            | 42  50.6 41 49.4 83 100.0 <0.001   | 72  69.9 31 30.1 103 100.0 <0.001 |
| 31 – 40                         | 185 78.1 52 21.9 237 100.0         | 153 68.6 70 31.4 223 100.0           |
| ≥ 41                            | 248 79.2 65 20.8 313 100.0         | 229 82.1 50 17.9 279 100.0           |
| Marital status                  |                       |                         |                                                  |
| Married / living with a partner | 308 76.2 96 23.8 404 100.0 0.635  | 292 73.7 104 26.3 396 100.0 0.042    |
| Divorced / widowed              | 54  72.0 21 28.0 75 100.0          | 69  86.3 11 13.8 80 100.0            |
| Single                          | 113 73.4 41 26.6 154 100.0         | 93  72.1 36 27.9 129 100.0           |
| Monthly family income (US dollars) |                       |                         |                                                  |
| ≥ 1,804                         | 149 81.9 33 18.1 182 100.0 0.021   | 111 71.6 44 28.4 155 100.0 0.242    |
| > 773.5 and < 1,804             | 217 74.1 76 25.9 293 100.0         | 231 78.0 65 22.0 296 100.0           |
| ≤ 773.5                         | 109 69.0 49 31.0 158 100.0         | 112 72.7 42 27.3 154 100.0           |
| Place of residence              |                       |                         |                                                  |
| Capital of the state            | 194 75.8 62 24.2 256 100.0 0.722   | 199 76.2 62 23.8 261 100.0 0.551    |
| Countryside                     | 281 74.5 96 25.5 377 100.0         | 255 74.1 89 25.9 344 100.0           |
| Human development Index         |                       |                         |                                                  |
| Very high                       | 303 77.9 86 22.1 389 100.0 0.096   | 290 75.7 93 24.3 383 100.0 0.870    |
| High                            | 169 70.7 70 29.3 239 100.0         | 159 74.0 56 26.0 215 100.0           |
| Medium                          | 3  60.0 2 40.0 5 100.0            | 5  71.4 2 28.6 7 100.0              |
| Smoking                         |                       |                         |                                                  |
| Never smoked                    | 340 73.1 125 26.9 465 100.0 0.190   | 347 75.9 110 24.1 457 100.0 0.180   |
| Former smoker                   | 92  80.0 23 20.0 115 100.0         | 77  76.2 24 23.8 101 100.0           |
| Current smoker                  | 43  81.1 10 18.9 53 100.0          | 30  63.8 17 36.2 47 100.0            |
| Alcohol use risk | 461 | 75.2 | 152 | 24.8 | 613 | 100.0 | 0.597 | 439 | 75.6 | 142 | 24.4 | 581 | 100.0 | 0.147 |
|------------------|-----|-------|-----|-------|-----|-------|-------|-----|-------|-----|-------|-----|-------|-------|
| No               | 461 | 75.2 | 152 | 24.8 | 613 | 100.0 | 0.597 | 439 | 75.6 | 142 | 24.4 | 581 | 100.0 | 0.147 |
| Yes              | 14  | 70.0 | 6   | 30.0 | 20  | 100.0 |       | 15  | 62.5 | 9   | 37.5 | 24  | 100.0 |       |

| Regular practice of physical activity | Yes | 241 | 80.6 | 58  | 19.4 | 299 | 100.0 | 0.002 | 194 | 78.2 | 54  | 21.8 | 248 | 100.0 | 0.131 |
|--------------------------------------|-----|-----|-------|-----|-------|-----|-------|-------|-----|-------|-----|-------|-----|-------|-------|
| No                                   | 234 | 70.1| 100   | 29.9| 334  | 100.0|       | 260  | 72.8 | 97  | 27.2 | 357 | 100.0 |       |

| Body mass index | Normal | 183 | 76.6 | 56  | 23.4 | 239 | 100.0 | 0.908 | 167 | 78.0 | 47  | 22.0 | 214 | 100.0 | 0.296 |
|-----------------|--------|-----|-------|-----|-------|-----|-------|-------|-----|-------|-----|-------|-----|-------|-------|
| Overweight      | 164    | 74.5| 56    | 25.5| 220  | 100.0|       | 166  | 75.8 | 53  | 24.2 | 219 | 100.0 |       |
| Obesity         | 123    | 73.7| 44    | 26.3| 167  | 100.0|       | 113  | 71.1 | 46  | 28.9 | 159 | 100.0 |       |
| Not informed    | 5      | 71.4| 2     | 28.6| 7    | 100.0|       | 8    | 61.5 | 5   | 38.5 | 13  | 100.0 |       |

| Sleep quality   | Good   | 348 | 80.0 | 87  | 20.0 | 435 | 100.0 | <0.001| 272 | 85.5 | 46  | 14.5 | 318 | 100.0 | <0.001|
|                 |        |     |      |     |      |     |       |       |     |       |     |      |     |       |       |
| Intermediate    | 92     | 67.2| 45    | 32.8| 137  | 100.0|       | 130  | 67.0 | 64  | 33.0 | 194 | 100.0 |       |
| Poor            | 35     | 57.4| 26    | 42.6| 61   | 100.0|       | 52   | 55.9 | 41  | 44.1 | 93  | 100.0 |       |

| Insomnia        | No     | 274 | 87.5 | 39  | 12.5 | 313 | 100.0 | <0.001| 196 | 88.3 | 26  | 11.7 | 222 | 100.0 | <0.001|
|                 | Yes    | 201 | 62.8 | 119 | 37.2 | 320 | 100.0|       | 258 | 67.4 | 125 | 32.6 | 383 | 100.0 |       |

| Total           | 475    | 75.0| 158  | 25.0| 633  | 100.0|       | 454  | 75.0 | 151 | 25.0 | 605 | 100.0 |       |

* Chi square test
Table 2. Distribution of controls and cases according to occupational features, Nursing workers, São Paulo State, 2019.

| Variable | Impaired work ability | | | | Intention to leave nursing profession | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Controls | Cases | Total |  | Controls | Cases | Total |  |  |
|  | n° | % | n° | % | n° | % | n° | % | n° | % | p* | n° | % | n° | % | n° | % | p* |
| Professional category |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Registered nurse | 321 | 78.3 | 89 | 21.7 | 410 | 100.0 | 0.037 | 276 | 73.6 | 99 | 26.4 | 375 | 100.0 | 0.235 |
| Nurse technician | 128 | 68.8 | 58 | 31.2 | 186 | 100.0 | 0.001 | 216 | 74.7 | 73 | 25.3 | 289 | 100.0 | 0.374 |
| Nurse assistant | 26 | 70.3 | 11 | 29.7 | 37 | 100.0 | 0.014 | 27 | 87.1 | 4 | 12.9 | 31 | 100.0 | 0.026 |
| Nursing education |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| College education with postgraduate degree | 267 | 81.4 | 61 | 18.6 | 328 | 100.0 | 0.001 | 216 | 74.7 | 73 | 25.3 | 289 | 100.0 | 0.374 |
| College education | 54 | 65.9 | 28 | 34.1 | 82 | 100.0 | 0.001 | 60 | 69.8 | 26 | 30.2 | 86 | 100.0 | 0.107 |
| High and elementary school | 154 | 69.1 | 69 | 30.9 | 223 | 100.0 | 0.001 | 178 | 77.4 | 52 | 22.6 | 230 | 100.0 | 0.012 |
| Age at joining the workforce (years) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ≥ 18 | 231 | 75.5 | 75 | 24.5 | 306 | 100.0 | 0.001 | 243 | 77.6 | 70 | 22.4 | 313 | 100.0 | 0.311 |
| ≥ 14 and < 18 | 184 | 73.3 | 67 | 26.7 | 251 | 100.0 | 0.001 | 166 | 72.2 | 64 | 27.8 | 230 | 100.0 | 0.001 |
| < 14 | 60 | 78.9 | 16 | 21.1 | 76 | 100.0 | 0.001 | 45 | 72.6 | 17 | 27.4 | 62 | 100.0 | 0.001 |
| Time in the nursing profession (years) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| < 6 | 63 | 76.8 | 19 | 23.2 | 82 | 100.0 | <0.001 | 72 | 75.8 | 23 | 24.2 | 95 | 100.0 | 0.014 |
| 6 – 10 | 88 | 61.5 | 55 | 38.5 | 143 | 100.0 | 0.001 | 93 | 66.9 | 46 | 33.1 | 139 | 100.0 | 0.001 |
| 11 – 15 | 89 | 80.2 | 22 | 19.8 | 111 | 100.0 | 0.001 | 81 | 71.1 | 33 | 28.9 | 114 | 100.0 | 0.001 |
| ≥ 16 | 235 | 79.1 | 62 | 20.9 | 297 | 100.0 | 0.001 | 208 | 80.9 | 49 | 19.1 | 257 | 100.0 | 0.001 |
| Contract type of main employer |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Formal contract in a private institution | 250 | 76.5 | 77 | 23.5 | 327 | 100.0 | 0.001 | 220 | 72.1 | 85 | 27.9 | 305 | 100.0 | 0.015 |
| Civil servant | 165 | 74.3 | 57 | 25.7 | 222 | 100.0 | 0.001 | 179 | 79.9 | 45 | 20.1 | 224 | 100.0 | 0.001 |
| Others | 60 | 71.4 | 24 | 28.6 | 84 | 100.0 | 0.001 | 55 | 72.4 | 21 | 27.6 | 76 | 100.0 | 0.001 |
| Working sector |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hospital | 234 | 77.5 | 68 | 22.5 | 302 | 100.0 | 0.012 | 215 | 71.0 | 88 | 29.0 | 303 | 100.0 | 0.014 |
| Primary health care | 89 | 69.0 | 40 | 31.0 | 129 | 100.0 | 0.001 | 94 | 77.0 | 28 | 23.0 | 122 | 100.0 | 0.001 |
|                           | Count | Proportion | Count | Proportion | Count | Proportion | Count | Proportion | Count | Proportion |
|---------------------------|-------|------------|-------|------------|-------|------------|-------|------------|-------|------------|
| Emergency service         | 55    | 82.1       | 12    | 17.9       | 67    | 100.0      | 40    | 70.2       | 17    | 29.8       | 57    | 100.0      |
| Others                    | 97    | 71.9       | 38    | 28.1       | 135   | 100.0      | 105   | 85.4       | 18    | 14.6       | 123   | 100.0      |
| **Main job**              |       |            |       |            |       |            |       |            |       |            |       |            |
| Direct patient care       | 280   | 71.8       | 110   | 28.2       | 390   | 100.0      | 310   | 74.0       | 109   | 26.0       | 419   | 100.0      |
| Others                    | 195   | 80.2       | 48    | 19.8       | 243   | 100.0      | 144   | 77.4       | 42    | 22.6       | 186   | 100.0      |
| **Holding a second job**  |       |            |       |            |       |            |       |            |       |            |       |            |
| No                        | 324   | 75.2       | 107   | 24.8       | 431   | 100.0      | 307   | 78.1       | 86    | 21.9       | 393   | 100.0      |
| Yes                       | 151   | 74.8       | 51    | 25.2       | 202   | 100.0      | 147   | 69.3       | 65    | 30.7       | 212   | 100.0      |
| **Working at night shift (1st and/or 2nd job)** |       |            |       |            |       |            |       |            |       |            |       |            |
| No                        | 353   | 75.1       | 117   | 24.9       | 470   | 100.0      | 343   | 76.9       | 103   | 23.1       | 446   | 100.0      |
| Yes                       | 122   | 74.8       | 41    | 25.2       | 163   | 100.0      | 111   | 69.8       | 48    | 30.2       | 159   | 100.0      |
| **Total weekly working hours** |       |            |       |            |       |            |       |            |       |            |       |            |
| Not informed              | 24    | 85.7       | 4     | 14.3       | 28    | 100.0      | 24    | 96.0       | 1     | 4.0        | 25    | 100.0      |
| 40 – 59                   | 157   | 76.2       | 49    | 23.8       | 206   | 100.0      | 155   | 74.5       | 53    | 25.5       | 208   | 100.0      |
| 60 – 79                   | 194   | 73.0       | 70    | 27         | 264   | 100.0      | 175   | 73.5       | 63    | 26.5       | 238   | 100.0      |
| ≥ 80                      | 100   | 74.1       | 35    | 25.9       | 135   | 100.0      | 100   | 74.6       | 34    | 25.4       | 134   | 100.0      |
| **Work injury or work-related illness** |       |            |       |            |       |            |       |            |       |            |       |            |
| No                        | 406   | 82.5       | 86    | 17.5       | 492   | 100.0      | 329   | 78.1       | 92    | 21.9       | 421   | 100.0      |
| Yes                       | 69    | 48.9       | 72    | 51.1       | 141   | 100.0      | 125   | 67.9       | 59    | 32.1       | 184   | 100.0      |
| **Total**                 | 475   | 75.0       | 158   | 25.0       | 633   | 100.0      | 454   | 75.0       | 151   | 25.0       | 605   | 100.0      |

* Chi square test
Table 3. Distribution of controls and cases according to working conditions, Nursing workers, São Paulo State, 2019.

| Variable                        | Impaired work ability | Intention to leave nursing profession |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|
|                                | Controls n° | %  | Cases n° | %  | Total n° | %  | Controls n° | %  | Cases n° | %  | Total n° | %  | p*     |
| Demands at work                 |             |    |          |    |          |    |             |    |          |    |          |    |        |
| Lower                           | 76          | 87.4 | 11       | 12.6 | 87       | 100.0 | 59          | 83.1 | 12       | 16.9 | 71       | 100.0 | 0.004  |
| High                            | 399         | 73.1 | 147      | 26.9 | 546      | 100.0 | 395         | 74.0 | 139      | 26.0 | 534      | 100.0 | 0.095  |
| Control at work                 |             |    |          |    |          |    |             |    |          |    |          |    |        |
| High                            | 419         | 77.3 | 123      | 22.7 | 542      | 100.0 | 378         | 75.8 | 121      | 24.2 | 499      | 100.0 | 0.001  |
| Low                             | 56          | 61.5 | 35       | 38.5 | 91       | 100.0 | 76          | 71.7 | 30       | 28.3 | 106      | 100.0 | 0.381  |
| Social support at work          |             |    |          |    |          |    |             |    |          |    |          |    |        |
| High                            | 438         | 76.8 | 132      | 23.2 | 570      | 100.0 | 409         | 79.9 | 103      | 20.1 | 512      | 100.0 | <0.001 |
| Low                             | 37          | 58.7 | 26       | 41.3 | 63       | 100.0 | 45          | 84.8 | 48       | 15.2 | 93       | 100.0 |        |
| Demand/control ratio            |             |    |          |    |          |    |             |    |          |    |          |    |        |
| Low                             | 207         | 87.3 | 30       | 12.7 | 237      | 100.0 | 158         | 86.8 | 24       | 13.2 | 182      | 100.0 | <0.001 |
| Moderate                        | 147         | 78.6 | 40       | 21.4 | 187      | 100.0 | 144         | 80.0 | 36       | 20.0 | 180      | 100.0 |        |
| High                            | 121         | 57.9 | 88       | 42.1 | 209      | 100.0 | 152         | 62.6 | 91       | 37.4 | 243      | 100.0 |        |
| Psychosocial work environment   |             |    |          |    |          |    |             |    |          |    |          |    |        |
| Low strain                       | 60          | 85.7 | 10       | 14.3 | 70       | 100.0 | 48          | 81.4 | 11       | 18.6 | 59       | 100.0 | 0.189  |
| Active job                      | 359         | 76.1 | 113      | 23.9 | 472      | 100.0 | 330         | 75.0 | 110      | 25.0 | 440      | 100.0 |        |
| Passive job                     | 16          | 94.1 | 1        | 5.9  | 17       | 100.0 | 11          | 91.7 | 1        | 8.3  | 12       | 100.0 |        |
| High strain                      | 40          | 54.1 | 34       | 45.9 | 74       | 100.0 | 65          | 69.1 | 29       | 30.9 | 94       | 100.0 |        |
| Job strain                       |             |    |          |    |          |    |             |    |          |    |          |    |        |
| No                              | 419         | 77.3 | 123      | 22.7 | 542      | 100.0 | 378         | 75.8 | 121      | 24.2 | 499      | 100.0 | 0.381  |
| Yes                             | 56          | 61.5 | 35       | 38.5 | 91       | 100.0 | 76          | 71.7 | 30       | 28.3 | 106      | 100.0 |        |
| Efforts at work                 |             |    |          |    |          |    |             |    |          |    |          |    |        |
| Low                             | 415         | 79.8 | 105      | 20.2 | 520      | 100.0 | 384         | 83.5 | 76       | 16.5 | 460      | 100.0 | <0.001 |
| High                            | 60          | 53.1 | 53       | 46.9 | 113      | 100.0 | 70          | 48.3 | 75       | 51.7 | 145      | 100.0 |        |
| Rewards at work                 |             |    |          |    |          |    |             |    |          |    |          |    |        |
| High                            | 440         | 78.2 | 123      | 21.8 | 563      | 100.0 | 405         | 80.7 | 97       | 19.3 | 502      | 100.0 | <0.001 |
| Low                             | 35          | 50.0 | 35       | 50.0 | 70       | 100.0 | 49          | 47.6 | 54       | 52.4 | 103      | 100.0 |        |
| Overcommitment                  |             |    |          |    |          |    |             |    |          |    |          |    |        |
| Low                             | 331         | 82.1 | 72       | 17.9 | 403      | 100.0 | 300         | 88.2 | 40       | 11.8 | 340      | 100.0 | <0.001 |
| Effort-reward imbalance | No | Yes |
|-------------------------|----|-----|
|                         | 453 78.1 127 21.9 580 100.0 <0.001 | 414 80.4 101 19.6 515 100.0 <0.001 |

| Effort-reward ratio | Low | Moderate | High |
|---------------------|-----|----------|------|
|                     | 233 88.6 30 11.4 263 100.0 <0.001 | 160 80.0 40 20.0 200 100.0 | 107 53.2 94 46.8 201 100.0 |

| Work-related activities that lead to pain and/or injury | Low | Moderate | High |
|----------------------------------------------------------|-----|----------|------|
|                                                          | 205 86.9 31 13.1 236 100.0 <0.001 | 159 78.7 43 21.3 202 100.0 | 133 64.3 74 35.7 207 100.0 |

| Total | 475 75.0 158 25.0 633 100.0 | 454 75.0 151 25.0 605 100.0 |

* Chi square test
Table 4. Multiple logistic regression analysis of factors associated with impaired work ability, Nursing workers, São Paulo State, 2019.

| Variables                                         | OR  | CI<sub>95%</sub> (OR) | p   |
|---------------------------------------------------|-----|------------------------|-----|
| Demand/control ratio                              |     |                        |     |
| Low                                               | 1.00|                        |     |
| Moderate                                          | 1.28| 0.73 2.23              | 0.396|
| High                                              | 2.26| 1.32 3.90              | 0.003|
| Effort-reward imbalance                           |     |                        |     |
| No                                                | 1.00|                        |     |
| Yes                                               | 2.82| 1.44 5.52              | 0.002|
| Overcommitment                                    |     |                        |     |
| Low                                               | 1.00|                        |     |
| High                                              | 1.77| 1.14 2.75              | 0.011|
| Work-related activities that lead do pain and/or injury |     |                        |     |
| Low                                               | 1.00|                        |     |
| Moderate                                          | 1.82| 1.06 3.14              | 0.031|
| High                                              | 2.58| 1.51 4.40              | 0.001|
| Age (years)                                       |     |                        |     |
| ≤ 30                                              | 1.00|                        |     |
| 31 – 40                                           | 0.26| 0.14 0.47              | <0.001|
| ≥ 41                                              | 0.27| 0.15 0.49              | <0.001|
| Nursing education                                 |     |                        |     |
| College education with postgraduate degree        | 1.00|                        |     |
| College education                                 | 2.13| 1.15 3.95              | 0.016|
| High /Elementary school                           | 1.67| 1.05 2.67              | 0.030|
| Regular practice of physical activity             |     |                        |     |
| Yes                                               | 1.00|                        |     |
| No                                                | 1.74| 1.15 2.66              | 0.010|

The model was adjusted for gender. Hosmer-Lemeshow test: $\chi^2=1.81; p=0.986$. 
Table 5. Multiple logistic regression analysis of factors associated with intention to leave nursing profession, Nursing Workers, São Paulo State, 2019.

|                                | OR  | CI95% (OR) | p     |
|--------------------------------|-----|------------|-------|
| **Demand/control ratio**       |     |            |       |
| Low / moderate                 | 1.00| 1.00       |       |
| High                           | 1.81| 1.18       | 2.76  | 0.006 |
| **Effort-reward imbalance**    |     |            |       |
| No                             | 1.00| 1.00       |       |
| Yes                            | 3.25| 1.93       | 5.47  | <0.001|
| **Work-related activities that lead to pain and/or injury** |     |            |       |
| Low / moderate                 | 1.00| 1.00       |       |
| High                           | 1.54| 1.00       | 2.35  | 0.048 |
| **Age (years)**                |     |            |       |
| ≤ 40                           | 1.00| 1.00       |       |
| ≥ 41                           | 0.50| 0.33       | 0.77  | 0.002 |
| **Insomnia**                   |     |            |       |
| No                             | 1.00| 1.00       |       |
| Yes                            | 2.72| 1.65       | 4.47  | <0.001|
| **Sex**                        |     |            |       |
| Female                         | 1.00| 1.00       |       |
| Male                           | 2.70| 1.58       | 4.62  | <0.001|

Hosmer-Lemshow test: $\chi^2=2.48; p=0.963$. 

