INTRODUCTION

Many studies have shown that levels of distress at work are high in healthcare workers (Portoghese, Galletta, Coppola, Finco, & Campagna, 2014; Raiger, 2005; Ramirez, Graham, Richards, Cull, & Gregory, 1996). A variety of stress factors in the workplace, such as increased workload, emotional response to suffering/dying patients and organizational problems and conflicts, has been increasing the risk of distress for years among healthcare workers (McNeely, 2005). The negative effects of job stress on nurses have recently received increased attention. There is a wide range of potentially stressful situations in the workplace where the job stress could occur in nursing due...
to high workload, role conflict, limited staffing resources (Hsu, Chen, Yu, & Lou, 2010; Najimi, Goudarzi, & Sharifirad, 2012). Many findings have shown that the less job stress nurses have, the more job satisfaction, organizational commitment and the greater likelihood of turnover intentions they have (Garrosa, Moreno-Jimenez, Liang, & Gonzalez, 2008; McGowan, 2001; Walker, 2008; Yeh, Ko, Chang, & Chen, 2007). In addition, working in very stressful environments with minimal control and social support from colleagues may also have a negative effect on patient safety (Berland, Natvig, & Gundersen, 2008).

Moreover, in vitro fertilization (IVF) centres are known to be particularly stressful (Costantini-Ferrando, Joseph-Sohan, Grill, Rauch, & Spandorfer, 2016; Harata et al., 2012). The high emotional content of consultations involved in the management of infertile couples is a contributory factor to the stress (Greenfeld, 1997; Oddens, den Tonkelaar, & Nieuwenhuyse, 1999). The unpredictable outcome of the treatment is another major stress-inducing agent, more likely to evoke feelings of depression (Dunkel-Schetter & Lobel, 1991). Stressful working conditions can adversely affect not only the health and well-being of health professionals but also subsequently to patient outcomes (Halm et al., 2005; Leiter, Harvie, & Frizzell, 1998; Vahey, Aiken, Sloane, Clarke, & Vargas, 2004) if care is being given to infertile couples.

This is of relevance particularly in view of Vietnam’s recent economic growth and the increase in the number of private IVF centres. To our knowledge, this is the first study looking at the levels of stress experienced by health workers (especially nurses) providing IVF services.

2 | THE STUDY

2.1 | Aims

The primary aim of this study was to identify the level of stress and the stressors having an impact on nurses compared with other medical workers (including physicians and IVF laboratory technicians) in private IVF centres to inform the development of strategies to benefit staff well-being and quality of care for patients.

2.2 | Design

A cross-sectional study based on the survey design.

2.3 | Participants

From August 2016 to November 2016, all employees involved in seven private IVF centres in South Vietnam were invited to participate in the study. Only permanent employees of these IVF centres were included. Interns, medical students, residence, collaborating staffs and university-employed clinical lecturers were excluded.

2.4 | Data collection

Information about the study was included with the invitation letter and those who were willing to participate completed an Occupational Stress Index (OSI) questionnaire. Completion of the questionnaire was deemed to signify consent to participate in the study. The medical workers themselves actually filled out the three specific OSI questionnaires, such as nurses-specific OSI, physician-specific OSI and generic OSI, tailored respectively to nurse, physician and IVF laboratory technician.

OSI questionnaires were completed by participants without the intervention of the researchers after the participants were fully informed about the aims and methods of the study. These questionnaires were usually conducted at lunchtime or after working hours. The OSI of every participant was given a unique number on the questionnaire. Principle Investigator (PI) kept a list of names and form numbers. The PI attended again the following week and collected completed OSI by recruiting late starters and any new medical workers. Then gentle reminders to complete were sent to participants by SMS. Research assistants chased up late forms on behalf of PI.

2.5 | Ethical considerations

The study was reviewed by Scientific Board of Research Center for Genetics and Reproductive Health (CGRH)—National University and was conducted after the Ethics Committee approval of My Duc Hospital had been granted.

2.6 | Data analysis

The Occupation Stressor Index (Belkic, 2000; Belkic & Nedic, 2007, 2012; Levi et al., 2000; Nedic, Belkic, Filipovic, & Jocic, 2010), a two-dimensional matrix, was defined by the vertical axis composed of levels of information transmission (including input, central decision-making, output, general) and the stressor aspects placed along the horizontal axis. Each element in the OSI was scored from 0 to 2 (0: “not present,” 2: “strongly present”) and summed to give total scores under each domain. The domains are underload, high demand, strictness, external time pressure, aversive physical exposures, symbolic aversiveness (or avoidance) and conflict (or uncertainty). Summed scores for the aspects and the total OSI were calculated according to this framework (Belkic & Savić, 2013).

The data was stored in Microsoft Excel and the stress index scores were calculated for each participant using the scoresheet for each of the three specific OSI questionnaires. Categorical variables were reported as frequencies (percentages) and continuous variables were summarized as means (standard deviations). Means among the three medical workers were analysed by one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). Between-group differences in discrete variables were assessed by using the Chi-square test. If expected cell size was under five, the Fisher’s exact test was used with groups take two at a time. Tukey’s HSD post hoc test was calculated for each mean comparison. A correlation matrix was used to investigate the dependence between multiple variables at the same time. All analyses were performed using the R statistical packages. A p-value <0.05 was considered statistically significant.
2.7 | Validity, reliability and rigour

The OSI is an international validated survey tool developed and tailored specifically for professionals (Belkic, 2000; Belkic & Nedic, 2007, 2012; Levi et al., 2000; Nedic et al., 2010) to assess precisely levels of known stressors experienced by medical workers (including nurses, doctors, IVF laboratory technicians). The English versions of OSI questionnaire were translated into Vietnamese by using double translation technique approved by original developer in the US for ensuring linguistic validity. Cronbach’s alpha was also calculated for variable elements of each aspect of the OSI and was used to measure the strength of internal consistency of OSI aspects. The Cronbach alpha of OSI aspects which ranged from 0.75 to 0.79 in our findings showed acceptable reliability.

3 | RESULTS

Of the invited 131 medical professionals, 105 (80%) completed the confidential self-administered questionnaire (Figure 1). Thirty-five participants (33.3%) were nurses, 19 (18.1%) were doctors and 51 (48.6%) were IVF laboratory technicians. Approximately two-thirds reported not having children (67.6%, 71), half (50.48%, 53) were married and three-quarters (76.2%, 80) were women, with a significant difference by medical worker group ($p < 0.05$). Among the three groups, nurses significantly had lower education levels and lower income compared with the others. Further demographic characteristics of all participants are given in Table 1. Some of them (e.g., income, long working hours, education level, autonomous workspace) statistically represented the high significant source of job stress.

The OSI scores were significantly different among three groups with the exception of the threat avoidant vigilance, with nurses scoring most highly (see Table 2). Figure 2 shows where the differences in mean levels of OSI aspects occurred among the three groups. In nurses, the OSI score only had a moderate one with the noxious physical exposures, the threat avoidant vigilance and the conflict ($p < 0.05$) and had a strong uphill linear pattern with the high demand ($p < 0.001$). In IVF laboratory technicians, the threat
avoidant vigilance and the conflict had a strong relationship with OSI score \((p < 0.001)\) while the strictness and the noxious physical exposures had a moderate one \((p < 0.001)\). Otherwise, the OSI score had a strong relationship with the high demand \((p < 0.001)\) and had a moderate one with the conflict \((p = 0.05)\) and the underload \((p = 0.16)\) in the physician group. The detailed stressors between medical worker groups were clearly analysed in Table 3.

### DISCUSSION

This is the first study to examine stressors for health workers in IVF Clinics. What we have shown is that there are clear differences between nurses, doctors and IVF technicians in terms of the factors which cause them stress and each group varies in the factors that ameliorate their stress. In the nurse group, it was found that (i) the mean OSI score was significantly higher when compared with each of the other groups \((p < 0.001)\); (ii) the OSI score only had a strong relationship with the "high demand" \((p < 0.001)\); (iii) Some demographic variables (e.g., income, long working hours, education level, autonomous workspace) statistically represented the high significant source of job stress.

This study confirms previous findings that night shift and long working hours are one aspect of "high demand," which has a strong influence of on job stress (Cheng, Liou, Tsai, & Chang, 2015; Coffey, Skipper, & Jung, 1988; Kirkcaldy, Trimpop, & Cooper, 1997; Nabirye, Brown, Pryor, & Maples, 2011; van Wijk, 1997). Our results are also consistent with the findings of Hsiu–Yueh when the occupational stress differed significantly by salary level (Hsu et al., 2010). However, the findings of Garrett and McDaniel showed that demographic variables (e.g., education level, years of service) had no statistically significant relationship with job stress (Garrett & McDaniel, 2001).

As mentioned above, some demographic variables statistically represented the high significant source of job stress. We did a further linear regression analysis to check whether the significant difference between groups is caused by these demographics. The findings show that demographic variables were not the factors causing these

| TABLE 1 Baseline characteristics of the three medical worker groups |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| **All (N = 105)**                               | **Nurse (N = 35)**       | **Doctor (N = 19)**       | **IVF technician (N = 51)** |
| **Mean (SD or N (%))**                           | **Mean (SD or N (%))**   | **Mean (SD or N (%))**   | **Mean (SD or N (%))**     |
| Age                                            | 31.06 (8.15)             | 29.83 (8.39)             | 38.26 (6.03)              | 29.22 (7.28)               | \(<0.001\)                       |
| Distance (home-to-hospital)                     | 10.00 (7.95)             | 10.51 (8.09)             | 9.53 (4.82)              | 9.82 (8.84)               | \(0.889\)                        |
| Number of work years                           | 6.55 (6.16)              | 7.40 (7.61)              | 11.95 (4.64)             | 3.96 (3.64)               | \(<0.001\)                        |
| Homeowner                                      | 33 (31.43)               | 9 (25.71)                | 14 (73.68)               | 10 (19.61)                | \(<0.001\)                        |
| Transportation                                 | 0.878*                   |                         |                         |                         |                                  |
| Motorcycle                                     | 90 (85.71)               | 30 (85.71)               | 17 (89.47)               | 43 (84.31)                |                                  |
| Other                                          | 15 (14.29)               | 05 (14.29)               | 02 (10.53)               | 08 (15.69)                |                                  |
| Education                                      |                         |                         |                         |                         | \(<0.001\)                        |
| Postgraduate                                   | 29 (27.62)               | 0 (0.00)                 | 14 (73.68)               | 15 (29.41)                |                                  |
| Undergraduate                                  | 76 (72.38)               | 35 (100)                 | 05 (26.32)               | 36 (70.59)                |                                  |
| Income (USD/year)                              |                         |                         |                         |                         | \(<0.001\)                        |
| Under 10,000                                   | 70 (66.67)               | 33 (94.29)               | 05 (26.32)               | 32 (62.75)                |                                  |
| 10,000–19,000                                  | 20 (19.05)               | 02 (5.714)               | 05 (26.32)               | 13 (25.49)                |                                  |
| 20,000–30,000                                  | 9 (8.57)                 | 0 (0.00)                 | 04 (21.05)               | 05 (9.80)                 |                                  |
| 30,000–40,000                                  | 2 (1.90)                 | 0 (0.00)                 | 01 (5.26)                | 01 (1.96)                 |                                  |
| Over 40,000                                    | 4 (3.81)                 | 0 (0.00)                 | 04 (21.05)               | 0 (0.00)                  |                                  |
| Long work hours/week                           |                         |                         |                         |                         | \(0.023*\)                        |
| Under 48                                       | 13 (12.38)               | 05 (14.29)               | 06 (31.58)               | 02 (3.92)                 |                                  |
| 48–60                                          | 69 (65.71)               | 20 (57.14)               | 11 (57.89)               | 38 (74.51)                |                                  |
| Over 60                                        | 23 (21.90)               | 10 (28.57)               | 02 (10.53)               | 11 (21.57)                |                                  |
| OSI range (total score)                        |                         |                         |                         |                         | \(0.023*\)                        |
| Under 70                                       | 52 (49.52)               | 11 (31.43)               | 09 (47.37)               | 32 (62.75)                |                                  |
| 70–80                                          | 41 (39.05)               | 16 (45.71)               | 09 (47.37)               | 16 (31.37)                |                                  |
| 80–90                                          | 12 (11.43)               | 08 (22.86)               | 01 (05.26)               | 03 (05.88)                |                                  |
| Over 90                                        | 0 (00.00)                | 00 (00.00)               | 00 (00.00)               | 00 (00.00)                |                                  |

Note. Fisher's exact test.
significant different OSI scores between groups with \( p \)-value >0.05. However, \( R^2 \), a statistical measure of how close the data are to the fitted regression line, is only around 0.148 (14.8% of the variability of the response data around its mean). Thus, the potential mechanism for the highest OSI score of nurses among three groups remains to be elucidated. There are few reasonable hypotheses. The lower income and longer working hours, compared with the other groups, maybe the main reasons. Being hindered from giving adequate patient care, more difficult to take time off from work and lower influence over schedule and lack of autonomous workspace may also contribute to higher OSI score (Table 1).

Belkic and colleagues found that the urgent intervention was needed when the prototypical total OSI scores for clinical cases involving mental health disorders was >90 (Belkić & Savić, 2013). However, all nurses in our study had OSI scores under 90. Firstly, it is possible that this is a real characteristic of this population, but this may also be a chance result. Secondly, the descriptive analysis of levels of occupational stress by demographic characteristics (age, education level, number of work years), conducted by Nabirye et al., indicated that the higher the nurses had progressed in the system, the more stressed they have become (Jordan, Khubchandani, & Wiblishauser, 2016; Nabirye et al., 2011). By contrast, our findings show that the nurses had the lowest level of education, but they have obtained the highest OSI scores. It is possible that the working environment which had high rates of promotion, recognition at work, rest breaks and support with difficulties may have lead to the under-90-OSI scores.

The most significant implication of this study concerns the improvement of nurses’ work environment in IVF field. Organizations

### TABLE 2 Occupational stress index aspects of the three medical worker groups

| Aspect of OSI | Cronbach alpha | All (\( N = 105 \)) | Nurse (\( N = 35 \)) | Doctor (\( N = 19 \)) | IVF technician (\( N = 51 \)) | \( p \)-values |
|---------------|----------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|
| High demand   | 0.75           | 24.24 (5.65)         | 29.17 (2.80)         | 28.46 (2.71)         | 19.27 (3.08)                | <0.001         |
| Strictness    | 0.79           | 12.15 (3.32)         | 13.79 (2.79)         | 11.46 (2.12)         | 11.29 (3.64)                | 0.001          |
| Conflict/uncertainty | 0.77       | 9.85 (2.94)         | 10.57 (2.03)         | 12.87 (2.07)         | 8.23 (2.66)                | <0.001         |
| Underload     | 0.77           | 4.82 (3.01)          | 3.21 (1.73)          | 2.16 (1.41)          | 6.91 (2.67)                | <0.001         |
| Threat avoidant vigilance | 0.78     | 8.24 (2.38)          | 8.63 (2.22)          | 7.97 (1.88)          | 8.08 (2.65)                | 0.5            |
| Extrinsic time pressure | 0.79    | 6.62 (1.31)          | 6.82 (1.11)          | 5.84 (0.83)          | 6.78 (1.49)                | 0.015          |
| Noxious physical exposures | 0.78  | 3.04 (2.37)          | 1.40 (1.24)          | 1.03 (0.98)          | 4.92 (1.81)                | <0.001         |
| OSI (Total score) | 0.79    | 68.96 (9.42)         | 73.59 (6.85)         | 69.79 (6.24)         | 65.48 (10.53)              | <0.001         |
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TABLE 3  A detailed analysis for stressors among three groups

|                      | All (N = 105) | Nurse (N = 35) | Doctor (N = 19) | IVF technicians (N = 51) | p-value |
|----------------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------------|---------|
| **Underload**        |              |                |                |                         |         |
| Fixed pay            | 50 (47.62)   | 16 (45.71)     | 3 (15.79)      | 31 (60.78)              | <0.001* |
| Inadequate pay       |              |                |                |                         |         |
| Totally inadequate   | 9 (8.57)     | 5 (14.29)      | 0 (0.00)       | 4 (7.84)                | <0.001* |
| Just barely covers expense | 48 (45.71) | 19 (54.29)     | 1 (5.26)       | 28 (54.90)              |         |
| **Promotion**        |              |                |                |                         |         |
| Yes                  | 80 (76.19)   | 24 (68.57)     | 15 (78.95)     | 41 (80.39)              |         |
| No                   | 25 (23.81)   | 11 (31.43)     | 4 (21.05)      | 10 (19.61)              |         |
| **Recognition of good work** |          |                |                |                         |         |
| Definitely yes       | 41 (39.05)   | 14 (40.00)     | 8 (42.11)      | 19 (37.25)              | 0.852*  |
| Yes, to some extent  | 43 (40.95)   | 15 (42.86)     | 8 (42.11)      | 20 (39.22)              |         |
| Not very much        | 20 (19.05)   | 5 (14.29)      | 3 (15.79)      | 12 (23.53)              |         |
| Not at all           | 1 (0.95)     | 1 (2.86)       | 0 (0.00)       | 0 (0.00)                |         |
| **High demand**      |              |                |                |                         |         |
| Piece rate           |              |                |                |                         |         |
| Fixed pay            | 50 (47.61)   | 16 (45.71)     | 3 (15.79)      | 31 (60.78)              | <0.001* |
| Group work           | 23 (21.91)   | 12 (34.29)     | 3 (15.79)      | 8 (15.69)               |         |
| By individual work   | 32 (30.48)   | 7 (20.00)      | 13 (68.42)     | 12 (23.53)              |         |
| **Long work hours**  |              |                |                |                         |         |
| Not more than 48 hr/week | 13 (12.38) | 5 (14.29)      | 6 (31.58)      | 2 (3.92)                | 0.022*  |
| 48 to 60 hr/week     | 69 (65.71)   | 20 (57.14)     | 11 (57.89)     | 38 (74.51)              |         |
| More than 60 hr/week | 23 (21.90)   | 10 (28.57)     | 2 (10.53)      | 11 (21.57)              |         |
| **Two or more jobs** |              |                |                |                         |         |
| Yes                  | 12 (11.43)   | 3 (8.57)       | 3 (15.79)      | 6 (11.76)               | 0.486*  |
| No                   | 93 (88.57)   | 32 (91.43)     | 16 (84.21)     | 45 (88.24)              |         |
| **Rest breaks**      |              |                |                |                         |         |
| Never                | 4 (3.81)     | 3 (8.57)       | 0 (0.00)       | 1 (1.96)                | 0.022*  |
| Rarely               | 9 (8.57)     | 6 (17.14)      | 0 (0.00)       | 3 (5.88)                |         |
| Occasionally         | 75 (71.43)   | 24 (68.57)     | 13 (68.42)     | 38 (74.51)              |         |
| Frequently           | 17 (16.19)   | 2 (5.71)       | 6 (31.58)      | 9 (17.65)               |         |
| **Night shift/irregular work** |          |                |                |                         | <0.001* |
| Yes                  | 11 (10.48)   | 1 (2.86)       | 10 (52.63)     | 0 (0.00)                |         |
| No                   | 94 (89.52)   | 34 (97.14)     | 9 (47.37)      | 51 (100)                |         |
| **Insufficient paid vacation** |       |                |                |                         | 0.058   |
| 3–4 weeks            | 1 (0.95)     | 0 (0.00)       | 1 (5.26)       | 0 (0.00)                |         |
| 2 weeks              | 98 (93.33)   | 35 (100)       | 17 (89.47)     | 46 (90.20)              |         |
| Less than 2 weeks    | 6 (5.72)     | 0 (0.00)       | 1 (5.26)       | 5 (9.80)                |         |
| **Strictness**       |              |                |                |                         |         |
| Fixed posture        |              |                |                |                         | <0.001* |
| Mobile               | 59 (56.19)   | 17 (48.57)     | 10 (52.63)     | 32 (62.75)              |         |
| Main single posture, but free to move | 22 (20.95) | 4 (11.43)     | 0 (0.00)       | 18 (35.29)              |         |
| Fixed body position, constrained motion | 24 (22.86) | 14 (40.00)     | 9 (47.37)      | 1 (1.96)                |         |
| Window—less area     |              |                |                |                         | <0.001* |
| With a direct window | 31 (29.52)   | 13 (37.14)     | 5 (26.32)      | 13 (25.49)              |         |
| With an indirect window | 22 (20.95) | 11 (31.43)     | 5 (26.32)      | 6 (11.76)               |         |
| Without a window     | 52 (49.52)   | 11 (31.43)     | 9 (47.37)      | 32 (62.75)              |         |
| **Autonomous workspace** |           |                |                |                         | <0.001* |
| Yes                  | 10 (9.52)    | 4 (11.43)      | 6 (31.58)      | 0 (0.00)                |         |
| No                   | 95 (90.48)   | 31 (88.57)     | 13 (68.42)     | 51 (100)                |         |

(Continues)
| Table 3 (Continued)                          | All (N = 105) | Nurse (N = 35) | Doctor (N = 19) | IVF technicians (N = 51) | p-value |
|---------------------------------------------|--------------|---------------|----------------|-------------------------|---------|
| Chance to take time off from work           |              |               |                |                         |         |
| No problem (to take time off)              | 13 (12.38)   | 0 (0.00)      | 3 (15.79)      | 10 (19.61)              | 0.036*  |
| A little difficult                          | 27 (25.71)   | 8 (22.86)     | 7 (36.84)      | 12 (23.53)              |         |
| Somewhat difficult                          | 54 (51.43)   | 23 (65.71)    | 7 (36.84)      | 24 (47.06)              |         |
| Very difficult                              | 11 (10.48)   | 4 (11.43)     | 2 (10.53)      | 5 (9.80)                |         |
| Low influence over schedule                 |              |               |                |                         | 0.012*  |
| Complete influence                          | 1 (0.95)     | 0 (0.00)      | 1 (5.26)       | 0 (0.00)                |         |
| Major influence                             | 37 (35.24)   | 8 (22.86)     | 11 (57.90)     | 18 (35.29)              |         |
| A little influence                          | 54 (51.43)   | 23 (65.71)    | 7 (36.84)      | 24 (47.06)              |         |
| No influence                                | 13 (12.38)   | 4 (11.43)     | 0 (0.00)       | 9 (17.65)               |         |
| Low influence over with whom works          |              |               |                |                         | 0.156*  |
| Complete influence                          | 16 (15.24)   | 8 (22.86)     | 3 (15.79)      | 5 (9.80)                |         |
| Major influence                             | 36 (34.29)   | 11 (31.43)    | 5 (26.32)      | 20 (39.22)              |         |
| A little influence                          | 20 (19.05)   | 7 (20.00)     | 7 (36.84)      | 6 (11.77)               |         |
| No influence                                | 33 (31.43)   | 9 (25.71)     | 4 (21.05)      | 20 (39.22)              |         |
| Low influence over tasks                    |              |               |                |                         | 0.043*  |
| Complete influence                          | 30 (28.57)   | 10 (28.57)    | 3 (15.79)      | 17 (33.33)              |         |
| Major influence                             | 45 (42.86)   | 14 (40.00)    | 9 (47.37)      | 22 (43.14)              |         |
| A little influence                          | 18 (17.14)   | 9 (25.71)     | 6 (31.58)      | 3 (5.88)                |         |
| No influence                                | 12 (11.43)   | 2 (5.71)      | 1 (5.26)       | 9 (17.65)               |         |
| Low influence over policy                   |              |               |                |                         | 0.691*  |
| Complete influence                          | 22 (20.95)   | 9 (25.71)     | 4 (21.05)      | 9 (17.65)               |         |
| Major influence                             | 37 (35.24)   | 12 (34.29)    | 8 (42.11)      | 17 (33.33)              |         |
| A little influence                          | 27 (25.71)   | 10 (28.57)    | 5 (26.32)      | 12 (23.53)              |         |
| No influence                                | 19 (18.10)   | 4 (11.43)     | 2 (10.53)      | 13 (25.49)              |         |
| Extrinsic time pressure                     |              |               |                |                         |         |
| Deadline pressure                           |              |               |                |                         | 0.104*  |
| Never                                      | 6 (5.71)     | 4 (11.43)     | 1 (5.26)       | 1 (1.96)                |         |
| Rarely                                     | 11 (10.48)   | 6 (17.14)     | 3 (15.79)      | 2 (3.92)                |         |
| Occasionally                                | 41 (39.05)   | 13 (37.14)    | 8 (42.11)      | 20 (39.22)              |         |
| Frequently                                  | 47 (44.76)   | 12 (34.29)    | 7 (36.84)      | 28 (54.90)              |         |
| Speedup                                    |              |               |                |                         | 0.412*  |
| Rarely or never                             | 9 (8.57)     | 3 (8.57)      | 1 (5.26)       | 5 (9.80)                |         |
| Certain periods of the month or year        | 73 (69.52)   | 23 (65.71)    | 15 (78.95)     | 35 (68.44)              |         |
| At least weekly but not daily               | 10 (9.52)    | 2 (5.71)      | 3 (15.79)      | 5 (9.80)                |         |
| Daily                                      | 13 (12.38)   | 7 (20.00)     | 0 (0.00)       | 6 (11.76)               |         |
| Noxious exposure                            |              |               |                |                         |         |
| Heat exposure                               |              |               |                |                         | <0.001* |
| Not over 25°C                               | 32 (30.48)   | 17 (48.57)    | 13 (68.42)     | 2 (3.92)                |         |
| Not over 30°C                               | 58 (55.24)   | 13 (37.14)    | 4 (21.05)      | 41 (80.39)              |         |
| Over 30°C                                   | 15 (14.29)   | 5 (14.29)     | 2 (10.53)      | 8 (15.69)               |         |
| Cold exposure                               |              |               |                |                         | 0.061*  |
| At least 20°C                               | 91 (86.67)   | 27 (77.14)    | 19 (100)       | 45 (88.24)              |         |
| At least 18°C                                | 13 (12.38)   | 8 (22.86)     | 0 (0.00)       | 5 (9.80)                |         |
| Under 18°C                                  | 1 (0.95)     | 0 (0.00)      | 0 (0.00)       | 1 (1.96)                |         |
| Noxious gases, fumes, dusts                 |              |               |                |                         | <0.001  |
| Never                                      | 48 (45.71)   | 25 (71.43)    | 15 (78.95)     | 8 (15.69)               |         |
| At least occasionally                       | 57 (54.29)   | 10 (28.57)    | 4 (21.05)      | 43 (84.31)              |         |
| Threat avoidant vigilance | All (N = 105) | Nurse (N = 35) | Doctor (N = 19) | IVF technicians (N = 51) | p-value |
|---------------------------|--------------|---------------|----------------|--------------------------|---------|
| **Experienced accident at work** |              |               |                |                          | 0.013   |
| Yes                       | 48 (45.71)   | 14 (40.00)    | 4 (21.05)      | 30 (58.82)               |         |
| No                        | 57 (54.29)   | 21 (60.00)    | 15 (78.95)     | 21 (41.18)               |         |
| **Witnessed accident at work** |              |               |                |                          | 0.185*  |
| Never heard about or witnessed | 0 (0.00)   | 0 (0.00)      | 0 (0.00)       | 0 (0.00)                 |         |
| Heard about but never witnessed | 8 (7.62)    | 4 (11.43)     | 2 (10.53)      | 3 (7.84)                 |         |
| Witnessed a serious accident at work | 6 (5.71)    | 0 (0.00)      | 2 (10.53)      | 4 (7.84)                 |         |
| Witnessed fatal accident at work  | 91 (86.67)  | 31 (88.57)    | 15 (78.95)     | 45 (88.24)               |         |
| **Suicide among coworkers** |              |               |                |                          | 0.495*  |
| Yes                       | 23 (21.90)   | 6 (17.14)     | 6 (31.58)      | 11 (21.57)               |         |
| No                        | 82 (78.10)   | 29 (82.86)    | 13 (68.42)     | 40 (78.43)               |         |
| **Liquitation/testifying in court** |              |               |                |                          | 0.140*  |
| No feedback               | 2 (1.91)     | 2 (5.71)      | 0 (0.00)       | 0 (0.00)                 |         |
| No                        | 103 (98.10)  | 33 (94.29)    | 19 (100)       | 51 (100)                 |         |
| **Functioning emergency system** |            |               |                |                          | 0.154*  |
| Yes, and knows that it functions properly | 24 (22.86)  | 7 (20.00)     | 2 (10.53)      | 15 (29.41)               |         |
| Yes, but does not know whether it functions properly | 51 (48.57)  | 15 (42.86)    | 10 (52.63)     | 26 (50.98)               |         |
| No                        | 30 (28.57)   | 13 (37.14)    | 7 (36.84)      | 10 (19.61)               |         |
| **Conflict/uncertainty**  |              |               |                |                          |         |
| **Emotionally charged work atmosphere** |            |               |                |                          | 0.464*  |
| No                        | 21 (20.00)   | 7 (20.00)     | 4 (21.05)      | 10 (19.61)               |         |
| Minimal                   | 63 (60.00)   | 24 (68.57)    | 12 (63.16)     | 27 (52.94)               |         |
| Occasionally              | 21 (20.00)   | 4 (11.43)     | 3 (15.79)      | 14 (27.45)               |         |
| Great deal of tension    | 0 (0.00)     | 0 (0.00)      | 0 (0.00)       | 0 (0.00)                 |         |
| **Lack of help with difficulties** |              |               |                |                          | <0.001* |
| Can count on help         | 73 (69.52)   | 33 (94.29)    | 15 (78.95)     | 25 (49.02)               |         |
| More often than not, can get help | 28 (26.67)  | 1 (2.86)      | 3 (15.79)      | 24 (47.06)               |         |
| Can’t really count on help | 2 (1.90)     | 0 (0.00)      | 0 (0.00)       | 2 (3.92)                 |         |
| Rarely of never can get help | 2 (1.90)    | 1 (2.86)      | 1 (5.26)       | 0 (0.00)                 |         |
| **Opposition to career advancement** |            |               |                |                          | 0.444*  |
| Yes                       | 80 (76.19)   | 24 (68.57)    | 15 (78.95)     | 41 (80.39)               |         |
| No                        | 25 (23.81)   | 11 (31.43)    | 4 (21.05)      | 10 (19.61)               |         |
| **Violations of behaviour norms/abuses of power** |            |               |                |                          | 0.002*  |
| Never                     | 78 (74.29)   | 33 (94.28)    | 13 (68.42)     | 32 (62.75)               |         |
| Rarely                    | 20 (19.05)   | 1 (2.86)      | 3 (15.79)      | 16 (31.37)               |         |
| Occasionally              | 7 (6.67)     | 1 (2.86)      | 3 (15.79)      | 3 (5.88)                 |         |
| Frequently                | 0 (0.00)     | 0 (0.00)      | 0 (0.00)       | 0 (0.00)                 |         |
| **Lack of redress of grievance** |          |               |                |                          | 0.02*   |
| Redress can be done and is efficient and confidential | 55 (52.38)  | 19 (54.29)    | 12 (63.16)     | 24 (47.06)               |         |
| In principle, yes but not effective or not confidential | 29 (27.62)  | 5 (14.29)     | 5 (26.32)      | 19 (37.25)               |         |
| No opportunity to redress grievances | 21 (20.00)  | 11 (31.42)    | 2 (10.53)      | 8 (15.69)                |         |
| **Threat of job loss**    |              |               |                |                          | 0.475*  |
| Yes                       | 6 (5.71)     | 2 (5.71)      | 2 (10.53)      | 2 (3.92)                 |         |
| No                        | 99 (94.29)   | 33 (94.29)    | 17 (89.47)     | 49 (96.08)               |         |
| **Job lacks coherence**   |              |               |                |                          | <0.001* |
| Work tasks fit together and clear relation to the goals | 55 (52.38)  | 7 (20.00)     | 2 (10.53)      | 46 (90.20)               |         |

(Continues)
wishing to give patients with a high quality and compassionate service are advised to consider working conditions which can cause stress to employees. There are many suggesting strategies to retain nurses or recruiting new nurses (Berliner & Ginzberg, 2002; Smith-Stoner & Markley, 2007), but identifying ways to improve the work environment is still lacking. These may be in the way the workforce is managed or in the physical design and configuration of the workplace. Although the results can be generalized only to nurses in IVF settings, the findings may be helpful for other medical staff (physicians, IVF lab technicians) who are working together with nurses. Another significant contribution from this study is it is highlighting the need for future researchers to focus on the variables that had strong or moderate relationships with stress, for example, an aspect such as the threat avoidant vigilance. Research should be conducted to test the hypothesis that helps explain the relationship between accidents at work and job stress.

4.1 | Limitations

Although the OSI is an international detailed and validated survey tool developed specifically for professionals, this study also has several limitations. First, the recall and nonresponse bias maybe occurred because the questionnaire measured only self-reported data and was quite long with nine pages. Second, the study was only based on quantitative approach. Future studies should include a qualitative aspect to gain a deep understanding of these issues. Third, this study failed to differentiate normal nurses from the stress ones. The Vietnamese validated version of OSI questionnaire is needed to find the cut-off score for appropriate and just-in-time intervention.

5 | CONCLUSIONS

In the nurse group, the OSI score was significantly highest among the three groups. This points to the importance of “high demand” aspect which has a strong relationship with OSI score. The authors recommend that further studies involve not only nurses but also medical workers in IVF field to increase the generalizability of the findings.
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