Relationships of job demand, job control, and social support on intention to leave and depressive symptoms in Japanese nurses

Yasuaki SAIJO¹*, Eiji YOSHIOKA¹, Yasuyuki KAWANISHI¹, Yoshihiko NAKAGI¹, Toshihiro ITOH¹ and Takahiko YOSHIDA¹

¹Department of Health Science, Asahikawa Medical University, Japan

Received April 25, 2015 and accepted August 4, 2015 Published online in J-STAGE August 28, 2015

Abstract: This study aims to elucidate the relationships among the factors of the demand-control-support model (DCS) on the intention to leave a hospital job and depressive symptoms. Participants included 1,063 nurses. Job demand, job control, and support from supervisors were found to be significantly related to both the intention to leave and depressive symptoms. Based on the odds ratios per 1 SD change in the DCS factors, low support from supervisors was found to be most related to the intention to leave, and low job control was found to be most related to depressive symptoms. In models that did not include "job demand" as an independent variable, 60-h working weeks were found to have a significantly higher odds ratio for depressive symptoms. Support from supervisors is more important in preventing intention to leave and depressive symptoms among nurses than is support from co-workers. Improving job control and avoiding long working hours may be important to prevent depressive symptoms.

Key words: Nurses, Job demand, Job control, Social support, Intention to leave, Depressive symptoms

Introduction

The shortage of nurses is a global problem¹⁾, and rural and remote areas face more difficulty in recruiting and retaining nurses than the urban areas²⁾. According to a survey from the Japanese Nursing Association, the turnover rate of fulltime nurses was 11.0%³⁾, intention to leave is significantly related to low work ability, and actual turnover leads to nurse shortages, affecting the safety and equity of patient care⁴⁾. Nurses are usually affected by psychological stress and have a higher prevalence of depressive symptoms than the general population^{5,6)}. Nurses

with depressive symptoms have higher presenteeism, which is significantly associated with a higher number of patient falls, a higher number of medication errors, and lower quality-of-care scores⁷⁾.

The demand-control-support (DCS) model⁸⁾ is a major job-stress model that is widely used in the field of occupational health. The model has two dimensions, job demand and job control, with social support being included as a third dimension⁹⁾, and many studies report a negative relationship of high demand, low control, and low social support with psychological wellbeing^{10–14)}.

Because all DCS factors are mutually related, the analysis included all DCS factors simultaneously to adjust for mutual confounding. However, among nurses, few studies have reported the relationship of DCS factors on the intention to leave using multivariate analyses in which

^{*}To whom correspondence should be addressed. E-mail: y-saijo@asahikawa-med.ac.jp

^{©2016} National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health

all DCS factors were included. A Taiwanese study of 373 hospital clinical nurses reported that high job strain (high job demand and low job control) and low social support were significantly related to an intention to leave¹⁵⁾. In a European study of 17,524 registered female nurses, the Pearson's coefficients for social support from a direct superior and intention to leave were found to be higher than those for social support from close colleagues and intention to leave, but the analyses did not include job demand or control¹⁶). In another paper of the same European study, it was reported that job demand were included in the multiple regression analyses, but social support was not divided into supervisor support and co-worker support, though demand, control, and social support were introduced simultaneously in the models¹⁷⁾. Thus, there has not vet been any study of intention to leave among nurses in which demand, control, supervisor support, and co-worker support are simultaneously introduced to adjust for mutual confounding.

Estimates using the General Health Questionnaire, high job demand, low job control, and low social support were also found to be associated with mental distress in 372 Lithuanian nurses, though social support was not divided into supervisor support and co-worker support ¹⁸. For 1,592 Chinese nurses, support from supervisors was found to be significantly related to depressive symptoms, but support from co-workers and job demand were not selected in the stepwise multivariate model⁶⁾. Therefore, the final model was not adjusted for support from co-workers or job demand. Moreover, among Japanese psychiatric nurses¹⁹⁾ and Japanese acute-hospital nurses²⁰⁾, support from supervisors also was found to be significant, but support from co-workers was not. However, the former study was restricted to psychiatric nurses and had a relatively small number of participants (n=238), and the latter one did not adjust for socioeconomic variables such as income, job rank, or working hours; further, the nurses of the latter study were restricted to large urban hospitals. Thus, to our knowledge, the DCS factors most related to intention to leave and depressive symptoms in nurses has not been fully investigated when all factors, job demand, job control, social support from supervisors, and social support from co-workers are considered as independent variables in the model. "Social support" in workplaces has often been viewed as a combined factor of social support from supervisors and support from co-workers. However, because social support from supervisors and co-workers may have different effects on the intention to leave and depressive symptoms among nurses^{6, 18)}, each effect should

be evaluated separately.

Therefore, it is important to clarify the factors of the DCS model that influence the intention to leave and depressive symptoms among nurses. To our knowledge, there has been no study that investigates which DCS model factor is most closely related to both intention to leave and depressive symptoms in Japanese nurses, with adequate adjustment for confounders such as income, job rank, and working hours. Moreover, since job demand may include the "working hours" factor, a model that does not include "job demand" as an independent variable should also be analyzed. The aims of this study were to elucidate the impact of relationships among the DCS factors of job demand, job control, social support from supervisors, and social support from co-workers on the intention to leave and depressive symptoms, and to determine which of these factors was most closely related to the outcomes observed in local city hospital nurses.

Subjects and Methods

Participants

In November 2012, anonymous self-administered penand-paper questionnaires were distributed to all nurses (n=1,180) at four hospitals (one university hospital in Asahikawa City; two regional-center hospitals in Furano City and in Rumoi City, and one rehabilitation hospital in Asahikawa City) in the northern part of Hokkaido, the northernmost of the four main islands of Japan. In total, 1,063 nurses responded (response rate: 90.1%). This study was approved by the Institutional Ethical Board for Epidemiological Studies at the Asahikawa Medical University.

Demographics and work-related factors

The questionnaire gathered the following demographic information: gender, age (ranges: -29, 30-39, 40-49, 50+ yr old), marital status (married, not married), education (nursing school, university or more), annual income (ranges:-399, 400-599, 600+ million yen), job type (such as outpatient, inpatient, other: operating department, and dialysis center), job rank (such as chief or sub-chief), and working hours (-39, 40-49, 50-59, 60+ h/wk). The recall period for working hours was the preceding month.

Job stress and social support

The Brief Job Stress Questionnaire (BJSQ)²¹⁾, based on the DCS model⁸⁾, was used to evaluate two job stress dimensions (job demand and job control) and social support from supervisors, co-workers, and family/friends.

34 Y SAIJO et al.

The BJSO has been widely used in Japan for practical occupational health evaluation and occupational health research²²⁻²⁵⁾. The job demand portion comprised three factors: (1) You have to do an enormous amount of work, (2) You cannot complete all your work in the allotted time. and (3) You have to work very hard. In addition, there were three factors on job control: (1) You can work at your own pace, (2) You can decide the order in which you do your work and the way you do it, and (3) You can provide your opinions on the work strategy of your workplace. The responses were scored on a 4-point Likert-type scale (1=agree; 2=somewhat agree; 3=somewhat disagree; and 4=disagree)²²⁾. To evaluate job demand and job control, the reversed total score for the job-demand questions and the total score for the job-control questions were used. Then, higher scores denoted higher job demand or control^{24, 25)}.

Social support from supervisors, co-workers, and family/friends was also evaluated using three factors: (1) You can often communicate with supervisors/co-workers, (2) You can strongly rely on supervisors/co-workers when you have problems, and (3) Your supervisors/coworkers are prepared to spend their time on your personal problems. The responses to these items were scored on a 4-point Likert-type scale (1=agree; 2=somewhat agree; 3=somewhat disagree; and 4=disagree). To evaluate social support from supervisors and co-workers, the reversed total score was calculated for each of the three questions with higher scores denoting higher social support^{24, 25)}. Support from family/friends was found to have a buffering effect on depressive symptoms, and this significant relation has been previously reported for Japanese acute-carehospital nurses²⁰⁾. Therefore, support from family/friends were used as a confounder. Cronbach's alpha coefficients for the BSJQ subscales—job demand, job control, and social support from supervisors, from co-workers, and from family/friends, were 0.76, 0.72, 0.82, 0.81, and 0.86, respectively.

Intention to leave

The outcome "intention to leave the hospital" was measured using the query "Do you want to continue working at this hospital?" with four response choices: "want to continue," "neutral," "want to transfer another hospital if possible," and "want to transfer another hospital right away." The latter two responses were defined as "intention to leave" positive.

Depressive symptoms

Depressive symptoms were assessed using the Japanese version of the Center for Epidemiologic Studies for Depression scale (CES-D)^{26, 27)}. A CES-D scale score \geq 16 is a widely used cutoff point for the general population^{26, 27)}. However, a high percentage of participants in this study (46.7%) were found to be above the CES-D positive cutoff score of \geq 16. A recent study on Japanese workers recommended that the optimal cutoff score be \geq 19²⁸⁾, and a further study of Japanese nurses used this \geq 19 cutoff¹⁹⁾. Therefore, in this study, the depressive symptoms positive was defined as a CES-D score \geq 19 (31.6%), to allow for the identification of mild mental health problems. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the CES-D was 0.88.

Statistical analysis

Employing multivariate logistic regression analyses, adjusting odds ratios for the demographics, work-related factors, job demand, job control, social support from supervisors, social support from co-workers, and social support from family/friends for intention to leave and depressive symptoms were analyzed. Since "working hours per week" may be an intermediate variable for "job demand," we analyzed another model that did not include "job demand" as an independent variable. Standardized scores for job demand, job control, social support from supervisors, social support from co-workers, and social support from family/friends were included in the model.

Though this study focused on the risk of each DCS factor, not job strain (combination of demand and control), job strain has been used widely. Therefore, the job strain categories of low demand and high control, high demand and high control, low demans and low control, and high demans and low control were also introduced in the models in the place of scores for job demand and control. The job-strain variable was constructed after demand and control were dichotomized.

Of the participants, 15.3% had missing data for one or more of the variables. On the basis of the "missing at random" (MAR) assumption, we used multiple imputations (20 imputed datasets). The variables included in the imputation model were as follows: hospital, age, sex, education, marital status, income, job type, job rank, working hours, whether working in shifts, job demand, job control, social support from supervisors, social support from co-workers, social support from family/friends, intention to leave, and all 20 separate CES-D item scores. After the imputation was completed, the total CES-D score was calculated and a depressive-symptoms positive (≥19) was established for

those participants with one or more missing values in the CES-D 20-item scores. The odds ratios were calculated both for the multiple imputation analyses and the complete case analyses.

P values<0.05 were considered statistically significant. All calculations were conducted using IBM SPSS Statistics 23.0 for Windows (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA).

Results

Table 1 shows demographic and work-related factors, along with each score for the BJSQ factors, intention to leave, CES-D scores, and positive depressive symptoms score (CES-D \geq 19). Of the participants, 16.2% of the participants had an intention to leave, and 31.6% showed a positive depressive-symptoms score.

Table 2 shows the adjusted odds ratio for each variable for the intention to leave. In the multiple imputation models, age, education, job demand, job control and support from supervisors were found to be significantly related to the intention to leave. However, support from co-workers did not have any statistical significance. Complete data results showed a similar pattern.

Table 3 shows the adjusted odds ratio for each depressive-symptoms variable. In multiple imputation models, job demand, job control, support from supervisors and support from family/friends were found to be significantly related to depressive symptoms. However, support from co-workers did not have any statistical significance. The complete data result showed a similar pattern.

In the models not including "job demand" as the independent variable, job control and support from supervisors were found to be significantly related to an intention to leave, and job control, support from supervisors, and support from family/friends were found to be significantly related to depressive symptoms. Furthermore, ≥60 h/wk working hours had a significantly higher odds ratio for depressive symptoms in the multiple imputation model, though the relationship was marginal in the complete data set.

We also introduced the variable "job strain" in the models instead of the scores of demand and control, and high demand and high control, low demand and low control, and high demand and low control (reference: low demand and high control) had significant higher odds ratios for intention to leave and depressive symptoms.

Table 1. Participant characteristics (N=1,063)

Age	Table 1. Participant characteristics (N	i=1,063)
30–39 40–49 207 (19.5) 50+ 160 (15.4) Unknown 1 (0.1) Sex Women 992 (93.3) Men 65 (6.1) Unknown 6 (0.6) Education Nursing school Unknown 2 (0.2) Marital status Not married Married Unknown 2 (0.2) Income -399 559 (52.6) 400–599 407 (38.3) 600+ 69 (6.5) Unknown 28 (2.6) Job type Outpatient Inpatient 739 (69.5) Other 139 (13.1) Job rank Chief or sub chief Staff 920 (86.5) Unknown 11 (1.0) Working hours -39 407 (38.3) 600+ 10 (30.3) 400-599 407 (38.3) 600-50 Chief or sub chief 132 (12.4) Staff 920 (86.5) Unknown 11 (1.0) Working hours -39 40–49 433 (40.7) 50–59 60+ 126 (11.9) Unknown 15 (1.4) Shift or not Daytime work Night shift 757 (71.2) Job demand (N=1,043) Job control (N=1,039) Support from supervisors (N=1,040) Staft (1.2) Support from supervisors (N=1,040) Staft (1.2) Support from family/friends (N=1,045) Intention to leave (N=1,050) CEC-D score (N=979) I7.1 ± 9.7	Age	
40-49 207 (19.5) 50+ 160 (15.4) Unknown 1 (0.1) Sex Women Women 692 (93.3) Men 65 (6.1) Unknown 6 (0.6) Education 895 (84.2) University or more 166 (15.6) Unknown 2 (0.2) Marital status 895 (84.2) Married 166 (15.6) Unknown 2 (0.2) Income -399 -399 559 (52.6) 400-599 407 (38.3) 600+ 69 (6.5) Unknown 28 (2.6) Job type Outpatient 185 (17.4) Inpatient 739 (69.5) Other 139 (13.1) Job rank Chief or sub chief 132 (12.4) Staff 920 (86.5) Unknown 11 (1.0) Working hours -39 279 (26.2) 40-49 433 (40.7) 50-59 210 (19.8) 60+ 126 (11.9) Unknown 15 (1.4) Sh	-29	391 (36.8)
50+ 160 (15.4) Unknown 1 (0.1) Sex 992 (93.3) Men 65 (6.1) Unknown 6 (0.6) Education 895 (84.2) Nursing school 895 (84.2) University or more 166 (15.6) Unknown 2 (0.2) Married 166 (15.6) Unknown 2 (0.2) Income 399 -399 559 (52.6) 400-599 407 (38.3) 600+ 69 (6.5) Unknown 28 (2.6) Job type Outpatient 185 (17.4) Inpatient 739 (69.5) Other 139 (13.1) Job rank Chief or sub chief 132 (12.4) Staff 920 (86.5) Unknown 11 (1.0) Working hours -39 279 (26.2) 40-49 433 (40.7) 50-59 210 (19.8) 60+ 126 (11.9) Unknown 15 (1.4) Shift or not Daytime work 306 (28.8) Night shift 75	30–39	304 (28.6)
Unknown 1 (0.1) Sex Women 992 (93.3) Men 65 (6.1) Unknown 6 (0.6) Education Nursing school 895 (84.2) University or more 166 (15.6) Unknown 2 (0.2) Marital status Not married 895 (84.2) Married 166 (15.6) Unknown 2 (0.2) Income -399 559 (52.6) 400-599 407 (38.3) 600+ 69 (6.5) Unknown 28 (2.6) Job type Outpatient 185 (17.4) Inpatient 739 (69.5) Other 139 (13.1) Job rank Chief or sub chief 132 (12.4) Staff 920 (86.5) Unknown 11 (1.0) Working hours -39 279 (26.2) 40-49 433 (40.7) 50-59 210 (19.8) 60+ 126 (11.9) Unknown 15 (1.4) Shift or not Daytime work 306 (28.8) Night shift 757 (71.2) Job demand (N=1,043) 9.2 ± 1.9 Support from supervisors (N=1,040) 7.4 ± 2.1 Support from family/friends (N=1,045) 10.1 ± 1.9 Intention to leave (N=1,050) 172 (16.2) CEC-D score (N=979) 17.1 ± 9.7	40–49	207 (19.5)
Sex Women 992 (93.3) Men 65 (6.1) Unknown 6 (0.6) Education 895 (84.2) Nursing school 895 (84.2) University or more 166 (15.6) Unknown 2 (0.2) Marital status Not married 895 (84.2) Married 166 (15.6) Unknown 2 (0.2) Income -399 559 (52.6) 400-599 407 (38.3) 600+ 69 (6.5) Unknown 28 (2.6) Job type Other 139 (13.1) Job rank Chief or sub chief 132 (12.4) Staff 920 (86.5) Unknown 11 (1.0) Working hours -39 279 (26.2) 40-49 433 (40.7) 50-59 210 (19.8) 60+ 126 (11.9) Unknown 15 (1.4) Shift or not Daytime work 306 (28.8) Night shift 757 (71.2) Job demand (N=1,043) <t< td=""><td>50+</td><td>160 (15.4)</td></t<>	50+	160 (15.4)
Women 992 (93.3) Men 65 (6.1) Unknown 6 (0.6) Education 895 (84.2) Nursing school 895 (84.2) University or more 166 (15.6) Unknown 2 (0.2) Marital status 895 (84.2) Married 166 (15.6) Unknown 2 (0.2) Income 399 559 (52.6) 400–599 407 (38.3) 600+ 69 (6.5) Unknown 28 (2.6) Job type Outpatient 185 (17.4) Inpatient 739 (69.5) Other 139 (13.1) Job rank Chief or sub chief 132 (12.4) Staff 920 (86.5) Unknown 11 (1.0) Working hours 39 279 (26.2) 40-49 433 (40.7) 50-59 210 (19.8) 60+ 126 (11.9) Unknown 15 (1.4) Shift or not 10 Daytime work 306 (28.8) Night shift 757 (71.2) Job control	Unknown	1 (0.1)
Men 65 (6.1) Unknown 6 (0.6) Education 895 (84.2) Nursing school 895 (84.2) University or more 166 (15.6) Unknown 2 (0.2) Marital status 895 (84.2) Married 166 (15.6) Unknown 2 (0.2) Income -399 559 (52.6) 400-599 407 (38.3) 600+ 69 (6.5) Unknown 28 (2.6) Job type Outpatient 185 (17.4) Inpatient 739 (69.5) Other 139 (13.1) Job rank Chief or sub chief 132 (12.4) Staff 920 (86.5) Unknown 11 (1.0) Working hours -39 279 (26.2) 40-49 433 (40.7) 50-59 210 (19.8) 60+ 126 (11.9) Unknown 15 (1.4) Shift or not Daytime work 306 (28.8) Night shift 757 (71.2) Job control (N=1,039) 7.3 ± 1.9 Support from supervisors (N=1,04	Sex	
Unknown 6 (0.6) Education Nursing school 895 (84.2) University or more 166 (15.6) Unknown 2 (0.2) Marital status 895 (84.2) Married 166 (15.6) Unknown 2 (0.2) Income -399 -399 559 (52.6) 400-599 407 (38.3) 600+ 69 (6.5) Unknown 28 (2.6) Job type Outpatient 185 (17.4) Inpatient 739 (69.5) Other 139 (13.1) Job rank Chief or sub chief 132 (12.4) Staff 920 (86.5) Unknown 11 (1.0) Working hours -39 279 (26.2) 40-49 433 (40.7) 50-59 210 (19.8) 60+ 126 (11.9) Unknown 15 (1.4) Shift or not Daytime work 306 (28.8) Night shift 757 (71.2) Job demand (N=1,043) 9.2 ± 1.9 Job control (N=1,039) 7.3 ± 1.9 </td <td>Women</td> <td>992 (93.3)</td>	Women	992 (93.3)
Education Nursing school 895 (84.2) University or more 166 (15.6) Unknown 2 (0.2) Marital status Not married 895 (84.2) Married 166 (15.6) Unknown 2 (0.2) Income -399 559 (52.6) 400-599 407 (38.3) 600+ 69 (6.5) Unknown 28 (2.6) Job type Outpatient 185 (17.4) Inpatient 739 (69.5) Other 139 (13.1) Job rank Chief or sub chief 132 (12.4) Staff 920 (86.5) Unknown 11 (1.0) Working hours -39 279 (26.2) 40-49 433 (40.7) 50-59 210 (19.8) 60+ 126 (11.9) Unknown 15 (1.4) Shift or not Daytime work 306 (28.8) Night shift 757 (71.2) Job demand (N=1,043) 9.2 ± 1.9 Support from supervisors (N=1,040) 7.4 ± 2.1 Support from supervisors (N=1,045) 10.1 ± 1.9 Intention to leave (N=1,050) 172 (16.2) CEC-D score (N=979) 17.1 ± 9.7	Men	65 (6.1)
Nursing school 895 (84.2) University or more 166 (15.6) Unknown 2 (0.2) Marital status 895 (84.2) Married 166 (15.6) Unknown 2 (0.2) Income -399 -399 559 (52.6) 400-599 407 (38.3) 600+ 69 (6.5) Unknown 28 (2.6) Job type Outpatient 185 (17.4) Inpatient 739 (69.5) Other 139 (13.1) Job rank Chief or sub chief 132 (12.4) Staff 920 (86.5) Unknown 11 (1.0) Working hours -39 279 (26.2) 40-49 433 (40.7) 50-59 210 (19.8) 60+ 126 (11.9) Unknown 15 (1.4) Shift or not Daytime work 306 (28.8) Night shift 757 (71.2) Job demand (N=1,043) 9.2 ± 1.9 Job control (N=1,039) 7.3 ± 1.9 Support from supervisors (N=1,040) 7.4 ± 2.1 Support from fa	Unknown	6 (0.6)
University or more Unknown 2 (0.2) Marital status Not married 895 (84.2) Married 166 (15.6) Unknown 2 (0.2) Income -399 559 (52.6) 400-599 407 (38.3) 600+ 69 (6.5) Unknown 28 (2.6) Job type Outpatient 185 (17.4) Inpatient 739 (69.5) Other 139 (13.1) Job rank Chief or sub chief 132 (12.4) Staff 920 (86.5) Unknown 11 (1.0) Working hours -39 279 (26.2) 40-49 433 (40.7) 50-59 210 (19.8) 60+ 126 (11.9) Unknown 15 (1.4) Shift or not Daytime work Night shift 757 (71.2) Job demand (N=1,043) Job control (N=1,039) Support from supervisors (N=1,040) Support from family/friends (N=1,045) Intention to leave (N=1,050) CEC-D score (N=979) 17.1 ± 9.7	Education	
Unknown 2 (0.2) Marital status 895 (84.2) Married 166 (15.6) Unknown 2 (0.2) Income -399 559 (52.6) 400-599 407 (38.3) 600+ 69 (6.5) Unknown 28 (2.6) Job type Outpatient 185 (17.4) Inpatient 739 (69.5) Other 139 (13.1) Job rank Chief or sub chief 132 (12.4) Staff 920 (86.5) Unknown 11 (1.0) Working hours -39 279 (26.2) 40-49 433 (40.7) 50-59 210 (19.8) 60+ 126 (11.9) Unknown 15 (1.4) Shift or not Daytime work 306 (28.8) Night shift 757 (71.2) Job demand (N=1,043) 9.2 ± 1.9 Job control (N=1,039) 7.3 ± 1.9 Support from supervisors (N=1,040) 7.4 ± 2.1 Support from family/friends (N=1,045) 10.1 ± 1.9 Intention to leave (N=1,050) 172 (16.2) CEC-D score (N=979) </td <td>Nursing school</td> <td>895 (84.2)</td>	Nursing school	895 (84.2)
Marital status 895 (84.2) Married 166 (15.6) Unknown 2 (0.2) Income -399 -399 559 (52.6) 400-599 407 (38.3) 600+ 69 (6.5) Unknown 28 (2.6) Job type Outpatient 185 (17.4) Inpatient 739 (69.5) Other 139 (13.1) Job rank Chief or sub chief 132 (12.4) Staff 920 (86.5) Unknown 11 (1.0) Working hours -39 279 (26.2) 40-49 433 (40.7) 50-59 210 (19.8) 60+ 126 (11.9) Unknown 15 (1.4) Shift or not Daytime work 306 (28.8) Night shift 757 (71.2) Job demand (N=1,043) 9.2 ± 1.9 Job control (N=1,039) 7.3 ± 1.9 Support from supervisors (N=1,040) 7.4 ± 2.1 Support from family/friends (N=1,045) 10.1 ± 1.9 Intention to leave (N=1,050) 172 (16.2) CEC-D score (N=979) 17.1 ± 9.7 <td>University or more</td> <td>166 (15.6)</td>	University or more	166 (15.6)
Not married 895 (84.2) Married 166 (15.6) Unknown 2 (0.2) Income -399 559 (52.6) 400-599 407 (38.3) 600+ 69 (6.5) Unknown 28 (2.6) Job type Outpatient 185 (17.4) Inpatient 739 (69.5) Other 139 (13.1) Job rank Chief or sub chief 132 (12.4) Staff 920 (86.5) Unknown 11 (1.0) Working hours -39 279 (26.2) 40-49 433 (40.7) 50-59 210 (19.8) 60+ 126 (11.9) Unknown 15 (1.4) Shift or not Daytime work 306 (28.8) Night shift 757 (71.2) Job demand (N=1,043) 9.2 ± 1.9 Support from supervisors (N=1,040) 7.4 ± 2.1 Support from supervisors (N=1,045) 10.1 ± 1.9 Intention to leave (N=1,050) 172 (16.2) CEC-D score (N=979) 17.1 ± 9.7	Unknown	2 (0.2)
Married 166 (15.6) Unknown 2 (0.2) Income -399 400-599 407 (38.3) 600+ 69 (6.5) Unknown 28 (2.6) Job type Outpatient 185 (17.4) Inpatient 739 (69.5) Other 139 (13.1) Job rank Chief or sub chief 132 (12.4) Staff 920 (86.5) Unknown 11 (1.0) Working hours -39 279 (26.2) 40-49 433 (40.7) 50-59 210 (19.8) 60+ 126 (11.9) Unknown 15 (1.4) Shift or not Daytime work 306 (28.8) Night shift 757 (71.2) Job demand (N=1,043) 9.2 ± 1.9 Job control (N=1,039) 7.3 ± 1.9 Support from supervisors (N=1,040) 7.4 ± 2.1 Support from family/friends (N=1,045) 10.1 ± 1.9 Intention to leave (N=1,050) 172 (16.2) CEC-D score (N=979) 17.1 ± 9.7	Marital status	
Unknown Income -399 559 (52.6) 400-599 407 (38.3) 600+ 69 (6.5) Unknown 28 (2.6) Job type Outpatient Inpatient 739 (69.5) Other 139 (13.1) Job rank Chief or sub chief Staff 920 (86.5) Unknown 11 (1.0) Working hours -39 40-49 433 (40.7) 50-59 210 (19.8) 60+ 126 (11.9) Unknown 15 (1.4) Shift or not Daytime work Night shift 757 (71.2) Job demand (N=1,043) Job control (N=1,039) Support from supervisors (N=1,040) Support from family/friends (N=1,045) Intention to leave (N=1,050) CEC-D score (N=979) 17.1 ± 9.7	Not married	895 (84.2)
Income $-399 & 559 (52.6) \\ 400-599 & 407 (38.3) \\ 600+ & 69 (6.5) \\ Unknown & 28 (2.6) \\ Job type & \\ Outpatient & 185 (17.4) \\ Inpatient & 739 (69.5) \\ Other & 139 (13.1) \\ Job rank & \\ Chief or sub chief & 132 (12.4) \\ Staff & 920 (86.5) \\ Unknown & 11 (1.0) \\ Working hours & \\ -39 & 279 (26.2) \\ 40-49 & 433 (40.7) \\ 50-59 & 210 (19.8) \\ 60+ & 126 (11.9) \\ Unknown & 15 (1.4) \\ Shift or not & \\ Daytime work & 306 (28.8) \\ Night shift & 757 (71.2) \\ Job demand (N=1,043) & 9.2 \pm 1.9 \\ Support from supervisors (N=1,040) & 7.4 \pm 2.1 \\ Support from co-workers (N=1,039) & 8.3 \pm 2.0 \\ Support from family/friends (N=1,045) & 10.1 \pm 1.9 \\ Intention to leave (N=1,050) & 172 (16.2) \\ CEC-D score (N=979) & 17.1 \pm 9.7 \\ \end{tabular}$	Married	166 (15.6)
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Unknown	2 (0.2)
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Income	
600+ 69 (6.5) Unknown 28 (2.6) Job type 0utpatient 185 (17.4) Inpatient 739 (69.5) Other 139 (13.1) Job rank 132 (12.4) Chief or sub chief 920 (86.5) Unknown 11 (1.0) Working hours 290 (86.5) Unknown 11 (1.0) Working hours 279 (26.2) 40-49 433 (40.7) 50-59 210 (19.8) 60+ 126 (11.9) Unknown 15 (1.4) Shift or not 306 (28.8) Night shift 757 (71.2) Job demand (N=1,043) 9.2 ± 1.9 Job control (N=1,039) 7.3 ± 1.9 Support from supervisors (N=1,040) 7.4 ± 2.1 Support from family/friends (N=1,045) 10.1 ± 1.9 Intention to leave (N=1,050) 172 (16.2) CEC-D score (N=979) 17.1 ± 9.7	-399	559 (52.6)
Unknown $28 (2.6)$ Job type 0utpatient $185 (17.4)$ Inpatient $739 (69.5)$ Other $139 (13.1)$ Job rank $132 (12.4)$ Chief or sub chief $132 (12.4)$ Staff $920 (86.5)$ Unknown $11 (1.0)$ Working hours -39 $279 (26.2)$ $40-49$ $433 (40.7)$ $50-59$ $210 (19.8)$ $60+$ $126 (11.9)$ Unknown $15 (1.4)$ Shift or not $00 (28.8)$ Night shift $757 (71.2)$ Job demand $(N=1,043)$ 9.2 ± 1.9 Job control $(N=1,039)$ 7.3 ± 1.9 Support from supervisors $(N=1,040)$ 7.4 ± 2.1 Support from co-workers $(N=1,039)$ 8.3 ± 2.0 Support from family/friends $(N=1,045)$ 10.1 ± 1.9 Intention to leave $(N=1,050)$ $172 (16.2)$ CEC-D score $(N=979)$ 17.1 ± 9.7	400–599	407 (38.3)
Job type 185 (17.4) Inpatient 739 (69.5) Other 139 (13.1) Job rank 132 (12.4) Staff 920 (86.5) Unknown 11 (1.0) Working hours 279 (26.2) -39 279 (26.2) $40-49$ 433 (40.7) $50-59$ 210 (19.8) $60+$ 126 (11.9) Unknown 15 (1.4) Shift or not 306 (28.8) Night shift 757 (71.2) Job demand (N=1,043) 9.2 ± 1.9 Job control (N=1,039) 7.3 ± 1.9 Support from supervisors (N=1,040) 7.4 ± 2.1 Support from co-workers (N=1,039) 8.3 ± 2.0 Support from family/friends (N=1,045) 10.1 ± 1.9 Intention to leave (N=1,050) 172 (16.2) CEC-D score (N=979) 17.1 ± 9.7	600+	69 (6.5)
Outpatient $185 (17.4)$ Inpatient $739 (69.5)$ Other $139 (13.1)$ Job rank $132 (12.4)$ Staff $920 (86.5)$ Unknown $11 (1.0)$ Working hours -39 $279 (26.2)$ $40-49$ $433 (40.7)$ $50-59$ $210 (19.8)$ $60+$ $126 (11.9)$ Unknown $15 (1.4)$ Shift or not 00 Daytime work 00 Night shift 00 <t< td=""><td>Unknown</td><td>28 (2.6)</td></t<>	Unknown	28 (2.6)
Inpatient $739 (69.5)$ Other $139 (13.1)$ Job rank $132 (12.4)$ Staff $920 (86.5)$ Unknown $11 (1.0)$ Working hours -39 $279 (26.2)$ $40-49$ $433 (40.7)$ $50-59$ $210 (19.8)$ $60+$ $126 (11.9)$ Unknown $15 (1.4)$ Shift or not 00 Daytime work 00 Night shift 00	Job type	
Other $139 (13.1)$ Job rank Chief or sub chief $132 (12.4)$ Staff $920 (86.5)$ Unknown $11 (1.0)$ Working hours -39 $279 (26.2)$ -39 $433 (40.7)$ $50-59$ $210 (19.8)$ $60+$ $126 (11.9)$ Unknown $15 (1.4)$ Shift or not $00 (28.8)$ Night shift $00 (28.8)$ Night shift $00 (28.8)$ Job demand (N=1,043) $00 (28.8)$ Job control (N=1,039) $00 (28.8)$ Support from supervisors (N=1,040) $00 (28.8)$ Support from co-workers (N=1,040) $00 (28.8)$ Support from family/friends (N=1,045) $00 (28.8)$ Intention to leave (N=1,050) $00 (28.8)$ Intention to leave (N=1,050) $00 (28.8)$ CEC-D score (N=979) $00 (28.8)$ $00 (28.8)$ $00 (28.8)$ $00 (28.8)$ $00 (28.8)$ $00 (28.8)$ $00 (28.8)$ $00 (28.8)$ $00 (28.8)$ $00 (28.8)$ $00 (28.8)$ $00 (28.8)$ <	Outpatient	185 (17.4)
Job rank 132 (12.4) Staff 920 (86.5) Unknown 11 (1.0) Working hours 279 (26.2) -39 279 (26.2) $40-49$ 433 (40.7) $50-59$ 210 (19.8) $60+$ 126 (11.9) Unknown 15 (1.4) Shift or not 306 (28.8) Night shift 757 (71.2) Job demand (N=1,043) 9.2 ± 1.9 Job control (N=1,039) 7.3 ± 1.9 Support from supervisors (N=1,040) 7.4 ± 2.1 Support from co-workers (N=1,039) 8.3 ± 2.0 Support from family/friends (N=1,045) 10.1 ± 1.9 Intention to leave (N=1,050) 172 (16.2) CEC-D score (N=979) 17.1 ± 9.7	Inpatient	739 (69.5)
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	Other	139 (13.1)
Staff 920 (86.5) Unknown 11 (1.0) Working hours 279 (26.2) -39 279 (26.2) $40-49$ 433 (40.7) $50-59$ 210 (19.8) $60+$ 126 (11.9) Unknown 15 (1.4) Shift or not 306 (28.8) Night shift 757 (71.2) Job demand (N=1,043) 9.2 \pm 1.9 Job control (N=1,039) 7.3 \pm 1.9 Support from supervisors (N=1,040) 7.4 \pm 2.1 Support from co-workers (N=1,039) 8.3 \pm 2.0 Support from family/friends (N=1,045) 10.1 \pm 1.9 Intention to leave (N=1,050) 172 (16.2) CEC-D score (N=979) 17.1 \pm 9.7	Job rank	
Unknown $11 (1.0)$ Working hours -39 $279 (26.2)$ $40-49$ $433 (40.7)$ $50-59$ $210 (19.8)$ $60+$ $126 (11.9)$ Unknown $15 (1.4)$ Shift or not 0 Daytime work 0 0 Night shift 0 0 Job demand (N=1,043) 0 0 Job control (N=1,039) 0 0 Support from supervisors (N=1,040) 0 0 Support from co-workers (N=1,039) 0 0 Support from family/friends (N=1,045) 0 0 Intention to leave (N=1,050) 0 0 CEC-D score (N=979) 0 0	Chief or sub chief	132 (12.4)
Working hours 279 (26.2) -39 279 (26.2) $40-49$ 433 (40.7) $50-59$ 210 (19.8) $60+$ 126 (11.9) Unknown 15 (1.4) Shift or not 306 (28.8) Night shift 757 (71.2) Job demand (N=1,043) 9.2 ± 1.9 Job control (N=1,039) 7.3 ± 1.9 Support from supervisors (N=1,040) 7.4 ± 2.1 Support from co-workers (N=1,039) 8.3 ± 2.0 Support from family/friends (N=1,045) 10.1 ± 1.9 Intention to leave (N=1,050) 172 (16.2) CEC-D score (N=979) 17.1 ± 9.7	Staff	920 (86.5)
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Unknown	11 (1.0)
$\begin{array}{llll} 40-49 & 433 \ (40.7) \\ 50-59 & 210 \ (19.8) \\ 60+ & 126 \ (11.9) \\ \text{Unknown} & 15 \ (1.4) \\ \end{array}$ Shift or not $\begin{array}{lll} \text{Daytime work} & 306 \ (28.8) \\ \text{Night shift} & 757 \ (71.2) \\ \text{Job demand (N=1,043)} & 9.2 \pm 1.9 \\ \text{Job control (N=1,039)} & 7.3 \pm 1.9 \\ \text{Support from supervisors (N=1,040)} & 7.4 \pm 2.1 \\ \text{Support from co-workers (N=1,039)} & 8.3 \pm 2.0 \\ \text{Support from family/friends (N=1,045)} & 10.1 \pm 1.9 \\ \text{Intention to leave (N=1,050)} & 172 \ (16.2) \\ \text{CEC-D score (N=979)} & 17.1 \pm 9.7 \\ \end{array}$	Working hours	
$\begin{array}{lll} 50-59 & 210 \ (19.8) \\ 60+ & 126 \ (11.9) \\ Unknown & 15 \ (1.4) \\ \hline Shift or not & & \\ Daytime work & 306 \ (28.8) \\ Night shift & 757 \ (71.2) \\ Job demand \ (N=1,043) & 9.2 \pm 1.9 \\ Job control \ (N=1,039) & 7.3 \pm 1.9 \\ Support from supervisors \ (N=1,040) & 7.4 \pm 2.1 \\ Support from co-workers \ (N=1,039) & 8.3 \pm 2.0 \\ Support from family/friends \ (N=1,045) & 10.1 \pm 1.9 \\ Intention to leave \ (N=1,050) & 172 \ (16.2) \\ CEC-D score \ (N=979) & 17.1 \pm 9.7 \\ \end{array}$	-39	279 (26.2)
$\begin{array}{lll} 60+ & 126 \ (11.9) \\ \text{Unknown} & 15 \ (1.4) \\ \text{Shift or not} & \\ \text{Daytime work} & 306 \ (28.8) \\ \text{Night shift} & 757 \ (71.2) \\ \text{Job demand (N=1,043)} & 9.2 \pm 1.9 \\ \text{Job control (N=1,039)} & 7.3 \pm 1.9 \\ \text{Support from supervisors (N=1,040)} & 7.4 \pm 2.1 \\ \text{Support from co-workers (N=1,039)} & 8.3 \pm 2.0 \\ \text{Support from family/friends (N=1,045)} & 10.1 \pm 1.9 \\ \text{Intention to leave (N=1,050)} & 172 \ (16.2) \\ \text{CEC-D score (N=979)} & 17.1 \pm 9.7 \\ \end{array}$	40–49	433 (40.7)
Unknown 15 (1.4) Shift or not 306 (28.8) Daytime work 306 (28.8) Night shift 757 (71.2) Job demand (N=1,043) 9.2 ± 1.9 Job control (N=1,039) 7.3 ± 1.9 Support from supervisors (N=1,040) 7.4 ± 2.1 Support from co-workers (N=1,039) 8.3 ± 2.0 Support from family/friends (N=1,045) 10.1 ± 1.9 Intention to leave (N=1,050) 172 (16.2) CEC-D score (N=979) 17.1 ± 9.7	50–59	210 (19.8)
Shift or not 306 (28.8) Daytime work 306 (28.8) Night shift 757 (71.2) Job demand (N=1,043) 9.2 ± 1.9 Job control (N=1,039) 7.3 ± 1.9 Support from supervisors (N=1,040) 7.4 ± 2.1 Support from co-workers (N=1,039) 8.3 ± 2.0 Support from family/friends (N=1,045) 10.1 ± 1.9 Intention to leave (N=1,050) 172 (16.2) CEC-D score (N=979) 17.1 ± 9.7	60+	126 (11.9)
$\begin{array}{lll} \text{Daytime work} & 306 \ (28.8) \\ \text{Night shift} & 757 \ (71.2) \\ \text{Job demand (N=1,043)} & 9.2 \pm 1.9 \\ \text{Job control (N=1,039)} & 7.3 \pm 1.9 \\ \text{Support from supervisors (N=1,040)} & 7.4 \pm 2.1 \\ \text{Support from co-workers (N=1,039)} & 8.3 \pm 2.0 \\ \text{Support from family/friends (N=1,045)} & 10.1 \pm 1.9 \\ \text{Intention to leave (N=1,050)} & 172 \ (16.2) \\ \text{CEC-D score (N=979)} & 17.1 \pm 9.7 \\ \end{array}$	Unknown	15 (1.4)
Night shift 757 (71.2) Job demand (N=1,043) 9.2 ± 1.9 Job control (N=1,039) 7.3 ± 1.9 Support from supervisors (N=1,040) 7.4 ± 2.1 Support from co-workers (N=1,039) 8.3 ± 2.0 Support from family/friends (N=1,045) 10.1 ± 1.9 Intention to leave (N=1,050) 172 (16.2) CEC-D score (N=979) 17.1 ± 9.7	Shift or not	
Job demand (N=1,043) 9.2 ± 1.9 Job control (N=1,039) 7.3 ± 1.9 Support from supervisors (N=1,040) 7.4 ± 2.1 Support from co-workers (N=1,039) 8.3 ± 2.0 Support from family/friends (N=1,045) 10.1 ± 1.9 Intention to leave (N=1,050) 172 (16.2) CEC-D score (N=979) 17.1 ± 9.7	Daytime work	306 (28.8)
Job control (N=1,039) 7.3 ± 1.9 Support from supervisors (N=1,040) 7.4 ± 2.1 Support from co-workers (N=1,039) 8.3 ± 2.0 Support from family/friends (N=1,045) 10.1 ± 1.9 Intention to leave (N=1,050) 172 (16.2) CEC-D score (N=979) 17.1 ± 9.7	Night shift	757 (71.2)
Support from supervisors (N=1,040) 7.4 ± 2.1 Support from co-workers (N=1,039) 8.3 ± 2.0 Support from family/friends (N=1,045) 10.1 ± 1.9 Intention to leave (N=1,050) 172 (16.2)CEC-D score (N=979) 17.1 ± 9.7	Job demand (N=1,043)	9.2 ± 1.9
Support from co-workers (N=1,039) 8.3 ± 2.0 Support from family/friends (N=1,045) 10.1 ± 1.9 Intention to leave (N=1,050) 172 (16.2) CEC-D score (N=979) 17.1 ± 9.7		7.3 ± 1.9
Support from family/friends (N=1,045) 10.1 ± 1.9 Intention to leave (N=1,050) $172 (16.2)$ CEC-D score (N=979) 17.1 ± 9.7		
Intention to leave (N=1,050) 172 (16.2) CEC-D score (N=979) 17.1 \pm 9.7		8.3 ± 2.0
CEC-D score (N=979) 17.1 ± 9.7	Support from family/friends (N=1,045)	10.1 ± 1.9
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	172 (16.2)
CEC-D≥19 (N=979) 336 (31.6)		
	CEC-D ≥19 (N=979)	336 (31.6)

Variables are presented as number (percent) or mean \pm SD

36 Y SAIJO et al.

Table 2. Adjusted odd ratios for the intention to leave

	Mult	iple imputation (N	V=1,063)	Complete data (N=962)		
	OR	95% CI	p value	OR	95% CI	p value
Age						
-29	7.62	2.56 to 22.68	< 0.001	5.21	1.71 to 15.85	0.004
30–39	6.61	2.44 to 17.93	< 0.001	4.05	1.47 to 11.16	0.007
40–49	3.71	1.34 to 10.29	0.012	2.60	0.92 to 7.36	0.071
50+	1.00			1.00		
Male (vs. female)	0.87	0.41 to 1.84	0.709	0.92	0.43 to 1.96	0.821
University or more	0.50	0.29 to 0.88	0.016	0.48	0.27 to 0.85	0.012
Married	0.82	0.52 to 1.28	0.380	0.80	0.50 to 1.28	0.350
Income						
-399	2.65	0.76 to 9.24	0.127	4.01	0.81 to 19.83	0.088
400–599	2.15	0.65 to 7.17	0.211	3.04	0.64 to 14.44	0.161
600+	1.00			1.00		
Job type						
Outpatient	1.00			1.00		
Inpatient	2.32	1.01 to 5.30	0.047	2.09	0.88 to 4.94	0.094
Other	2.46	1.01 to 6.00	0.048	2.09	0.83 to 5.26	0.118
Staff (vs. chief or sub chief)	1.12	0.52 to 2.41	0.771	0.99	0.45 to 2.18	0.976
Working hours (per wk)						
-39	1.00			1.00		
40–49	1.28	0.74 to 2.22	0.370	1.40	0.78 to 2.51	0.262
50–59	1.49	0.81 to 2.74	0.198	1.67	0.88 to 3.19	0.119
60+	0.98	0.49 to 1.98	0.954	1.18	0.56 to 2.49	0.667
Night shift	1.31	0.67 to 2.57	0.432	1.23	0.60 to 2.49	0.574
Job demand (per 1SD)	1.53	1.21 to 1.92	< 0.001	1.53	1.21 to 1.94	< 0.001
Job control (per 1SD)	0.73	0.59 to 0.89	0.003	0.75	0.60 to 0.94	0.010
Support from supervisors (per 1SD)	0.59	0.46 to 0.76	< 0.001	0.58	0.44 to 0.75	< 0.001
Support from co-workers (per 1SD)	0.83	0.66 to 1.05	0.124	0.84	0.66 to 1.07	0.167
Support from family/friends (per 1SD)	1.05	0.86 to 1.28	0.641	1.10	0.89 to 1.36	0.388

Above all variables, smoking, drinking, and hospitals were introduced in the models

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to elucidate the impact of relationships among DCS factors and to determine which DCS factor was most strongly related to the outcomes for local city hospital nurses. We found significant relationships between job demand, job control and support from supervisors on both the intention to leave and depressive symptoms. Based on the odds ratios per 1 SD change, support from supervisors was determined to be most related to the intention to leave, and job control was most related to depressive symptoms.

Of the participants, 16.2% were found to have intention to leave. A recent study of Japanese nurses conducted in Tokyo reported that 29.6% had an intention to leave the workplace within the following year.²⁹⁾ In other Japanese studies on small-to medium-sized private hospital nurses,

16.7% answered "negligible" to the query regarding the intention to stay³⁰⁾. In a European study of 23,159 surgical and medical unit nurses, 33% had an intention to leave the hospital workplace³¹⁾. It is difficult to directly compare the prevalence of the intention to leave, since the methods used to measure an intention to leave have not been standardized. However, because the prevalence of the intention to leave in our study was not high, the hospitals in our study did not seemed to be atypical workplaces.

Of the participants, 31.6% were found to have depressive symptoms (CES-D \geq 19). In a recent Japanese survey on 24,896 individuals, 25.6% of males aged 20–59 yr and 29.5% of females aged 20–59 yr were found to have depressive symptoms (CES-D \geq 16)³²⁾. A recent study on Japanese workers recommended that the optimal cutoff score be \geq 19, with the prevalence of positive depressive symptoms at 9.5%²⁸⁾. In a study of Japanese psychiatric

Table 3. Adjusted odd ratios for depressive symptoms

	Multiple imputation (N=1,063)			Complete data (N=904)		
	OR	95% CI	p value	OR	95% CI	p value
Age						
-29	1.61	0.87 to 2.99	0.133	1.97	0.94 to 4.11	0.072
30–39	1.33	0.79 to 2.23	0.284	1.56	0.83 to 2.92	0.170
40–49	1.15	0.69 to 1.93	0.596	1.10	0.59 to 2.07	0.765
50+	1.00					1.00
Male (vs. female)	1.23	0.68 to 2.20	0.496	1.16	0.63 to 2.14	0.636
University or more (vs. nursing school)	0.89	0.58 to 1.37	0.593	0.93	0.59 to 1.46	0.750
Married	0.76	0.54 to 1.07	0.112	0.75	0.52 to 1.09	0.128
Income						
-399	2.00	0.96 to 4.16	0.063	1.62	0.70 to 3.71	0.258
400–599	1.61	0.81 to 3.18	0.173	1.30	0.60 to 2.83	0.509
600+	1.00					1.00
Job type						
Outpatient	1.00					1.00
Inpatient	1.34	0.78 to 2.33	0.291	1.61	0.86 to 3.05	0.140
Other	1.22	0.68 to 2.19	0.504	1.35	0.70 to 2.63	0.375
Staff (vs. chief or sub chief)	0.70	0.42 to 1.16	0.161	0.79	0.45 to 1.40	0.420
Working hours (per wk)						
-39	1.00					1.00
40–49	1.21	0.81 to 1.79	0.354	1.40	0.90 to 2.18	0.135
50-59	1.27	0.79 to 2.02	0.325	1.38	0.82 to 2.33	0.225
60+	1.57	0.92 to 2.66	0.095	1.69	0.94 to 3.03	0.080
Night shift	1.25	0.77 to 2.04	0.362	1.12	0.64 to 1.95	0.692
Job demand (per 1SD)	1.39	1.17 to 1.66	< 0.001	1.40	1.16 to 1.70	0.001
Job control (per 1SD)	0.63	0.53 to 0.74	< 0.001	0.58	0.48 to 0.70	< 0.001
Support from supervisors (per 1SD)	0.81	0.67 to 0.97	0.024	0.79	0.64 to 0.97	0.024
Support from co-workers (per 1SD)	0.87	0.73 to 1.05	0.149	0.86	0.71 to 1.06	0.154
Support from family/friends (per 1SD)	0.67	0.57 to 0.78	< 0.001	0.63	0.53 to 0.76	< 0.001

Above all variables, smoking, drinking, and hospitals were introduced in the models

nurses, however, 36.4% of males and 37.2% of females were found to have depressive symptoms with a \geq 19 cutoff¹⁹⁾. In a Chinese nursing study using a \geq 16 cutoff, 61.7% were found to have depressive symptoms⁶⁾, and in a Korean study using a \geq 21 cutoff, 37.7% nurses were found to have positive depressive symptoms³³⁾. The reason for the higher depressive symptom prevalence among nurses was speculated to be the different levels of occupational stress in the nursing profession compared to other occupations¹⁹⁾. In our study, however, participants were not found to have a high depressive-symptom prevalence. The reason for such a prevalence of intention to leave and depressive symptoms may be that mental health needs seemed to be acknowledged in the participating hospitals.

In this study, support from supervisors was found to have a significant relation with both intention to leave and depressive symptoms, but support from co-workers had no significant relation. In the Chinese nursing study, support from supervisors was found to be significantly related to depressive symptoms, but support from co-workers was not selected in the stepwise multivariate model⁶). Moreover, two Japanese studies have reported that support from supervisors was found to be significant, whereas support from co-workers was not 19, 20). A meta-analysis has reported that low social support had a significantly higher odds ratio for common mental disorders 14). However, the protective effect varied depending on the social support type and the worker characteristics³⁴⁾. In an European nurses' study, the Pearson's coefficients for social support from a direct superior and intention to leave were found to be higher than for social support from close colleagues and intention to leave¹⁶⁾. A study of Malaysian nurses reported that support from a supervisor was positively related to work engagement, but support from co-workers was found 38 Y SAIJO et al.

to have no effect on work engagement³⁵). Support from supervisors plays a significant role in the development of occupational competence and growth potential^{36, 37}). In a nursing setting, supervisors with good leadership skills may have effects on job satisfaction and good patient outcomes, and supervisors have an important role in staff education³⁸). Furthermore, support from supervisors can lead to a resourceful work environment, which would improve the staff member's willingness to apply greater effort to the work tasks³⁵). Those mechanisms could explain why support from supervisors had protective effects on intention to leave and depressive symptoms in our study. Therefore, increased attention should be paid to supervisor social support to prevent nursing turnover and improve mental health.

Job control was consistently related to both the intention to leave and depressive symptoms, and was found to be most related to depressive symptoms based on a 1-SD change in the DCS factors. The meta-analysis reported that low job control had a significantly higher odds ratio for common mental disorders¹⁴⁾. Moreover, significant results were also found in the previously highlighted Japanese nursing studies^{19, 20)} and the Chinese nursing study⁶⁾. Job control is related to job satisfaction, commitment, involvement, performance, and motivation³⁹⁾. To prevent medical errors and accidents, paperwork has been increasing, and strict adherence to the manual has recently been required. Thus, nurses' job control has been decreasing, but nurses should have more latitude in their jobs, for their mental health. To increase job control, team-oriented organizational structures are preferable, as compared with traditional hierarchical nursing structures⁴⁰⁾. Because the existence of a double line of command (nursing department and physicians) among nurses may reduce job control⁴¹⁾, a good nurse-physician relationship may improve job control among nurses⁴²⁾.

Job demand was also found to be consistently related to both the intention to leave and depressive symptoms. Meta-analysis reported that high job demand had a significantly higher odds ratio for common mental disorders¹⁴). The Chinese nursing study had a significant result in univariate analysis, but not in multivariate analysis⁶). However, among Japanese psychiatric nurses¹⁹) and Japanese acute-hospital nurses²⁰, job demand was significantly related to depressive symptoms. The European study reported that job demand was mostly related to intention to leave in the multiple regression analyses¹⁷). Thus, the reason for a non-significant result in the Chinese study is unknown, but the other study indicated that job demand is

as significant a factor for mental health as in other occupations. Nurses have been confronting increasing burdens, such as rapidly expanding knowledge base and patient expectations. However, increasing nurse staff is difficult because of the shortage of nurses and staff cost restriction. According to the survey of Japanese Nursing Association, unpaid overtime work has existed, and sometimes long hours are necessary to hand off their patients, and nurses have a great many educational duties and meetings⁴³). Thus, we need to reduce uncompensated overtime, time to hand off their patient, too many educational duties, and long hours of meetings. Moreover, if these measures cannot be applied soon, countermeasures to low job control and low social support may be practical.

Comparing of four DCS factors, support from supervisors was determined to be the most related to the intention to leave, and job control was most related to depressive symptoms. In the European study, support from a direct superior was more related to intention to leave compared with support from close colleagues, though the analyses did not include job demand and control¹⁶). Among Japanese psychiatric nurses, support from supervisors was most related to depressive symptoms¹⁹⁾, and among Japanese acute-hospital nurses, qualitative work load was mostly related to depressive symptoms²⁰⁾. The former study was restricted to psychiatric nurses and had a relatively small number of participants. The later one, restricted to large urban hospitals, did not adjust for socioeconomic variables such as income, job rank, and working hours, though the Chinese study reported a significant relation of job rank and education to depressive symptoms, and speculated on the influence of salary⁶). The strengths of our study are that the results were adjusted for job rank, education, and income, and are that participants were not restricted to specific specialties. As previously mentioned, support from supervisors has a significant role in the development of occupational competence and growth potential^{36, 37)}. The importance of the nursing practice environment has been reported, and the subscale "nurse manager ability, leadership, and support of nurses" was the most related to intention to stay among Japanese nurses²⁹⁾. Thus, supervisor may be the most influential factor for nurses who work in practical environment and need to study continuously. That may be the reason for the strongest relationship of support from supervisors.

Since working hours may be an intermediate variable for "job demand," the model that did not include "job demand" as an independent variable was analyzed. In the model, \geq 60 h/wk of working hours (vs. \leq 39 h/wk) was

found to have a significantly higher odds ratio for depressive symptoms in the multiple imputation models. A recent systematic review concluded that long working hours were a significant risk factor for depressive symptoms⁴⁴), and the Chinese study on nurses also reported that long working hours were significantly related to depressive symptoms, which was estimated using the Zung Self-Rating Depression Scale (SDS)⁴⁵). Thus, because long working hours affect mental health and 31.6% of the participants worked 50 h per week or more, measures to reduce working hours should be considered, as previously mentioned.

Many previous studies reported a job strain effect on psychological wellbeing among various populations^{11, 13)}, and job strain had a significantly higher odds ratio for intention to leave and depressive symptoms in the present study. Thus, job strain results were compatible with those of previous studies. In the present study, high demand and low control had an odd ratio of 3.2 for intention to leave and an odds ratio of 4.3 for depressive symptoms. Thus, because job strain was also significant indicator, a combination of reducing job demand and increasing job control may be a more effective countermeasure to prevent intention to leave and depressive symptoms among nurses, especially with high job strain.

This study had several limitations. First, since this study was cross-sectional, we were unable to infer cause-effect relationships. The necessity of longitudinal studies has been emphasized, and the possible reciprocity between DCS and wellbeing was reported^{11, 13)}. However, because there has been no study to clarify which DCS factor is most related to both intention to leave and depressive symptoms among Japanese nurses, we believe that this study can lead to effective countermeasures. Second, while the response rate was relatively high, there might have been a tendency by nurses with greater job stress not to participate, which may have attenuated the significance of the results. Third, the participants were restricted to four local city hospitals. However, the rates for the intention to leave and the depressive symptoms were relatively compatible with similar recent studies, so we believe our results can be largely generalized to other nurses in other hospitals. Fourth, the lack of a significant result for social support from co-workers could have been due to the inadequate sample size, but the larger sample-sized Japanese study also did not have a significant result of support of co-workers on depressive symptoms²⁰⁾. Fifth, we used the four-response-choice questions to measure "intention to leave." As previously mentioned, the standard method to measure "intention to leave" has not been established.

Finally, because this study used a questionnaire that measured exposures and outcomes simultaneously, a common method bias may exist. However, we believe that the comparison of four DCS factors is possible, though the odds may be overestimated.

Conclusion

Our study of nurses suggested that job demand, job control and support from supervisors related to both the intention to leave and depressive symptoms. Support from supervisors was found to be most related to the intention to leave, and job control was found to be most related to depressive symptoms. In terms of social support, support from supervisors was found to be more important to a nurse's intention to stay and to mental health compared to support from co-workers. Improving job control and avoiding long working hours may be important to prevent depressive symptoms.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 24590592. The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

References

- World Health Organization (2010) A global survey monitoring progress in nursing and midwifery. WHO, Geneva
- Buchan J, Aiken L (2008) Solving nursing shortages: a common priority. J Clin Nurs 17, 3262–8. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- Japanese Nursing Association (2015) Reserach Report No.89—2014 Survey of Hospital Nurses Demand and Supply—. Japanese Nursing Association Publishing Company, Tokyo.
- Buerhaus PI, Donelan K, Ulrich BT, Norman L, DesRoches C, Dittus R (2007) Impact of the nurse shortage on hospital patient care: comparative perspectives. Health Aff (Millwood) 26, 853–62. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- Su JA, Weng HH, Tsang HY, Wu JL (2009) Mental health and quality of life among doctors, nurses and other hospital staff. Stress Health 25, 423–30. [CrossRef]
- 6) Gao YQ, Pan BC, Sun W, Wu H, Wang JN, Wang L (2012) Depressive symptoms among Chinese nurses: prevalence and the associated factors. J Adv Nurs 68, 1166–75. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- Letvak SA, Ruhm CJ, Gupta SN (2012) Nurses' presenteeism and its effects on self-reported quality of care

- and costs. Am J Nurs 112, 30-8, quiz 48, 39. [Medline]
- 8) Karasek R (1979) Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: implication for job resign. Adm Sci Q **24**, 285–309. [CrossRef]
- 9) Johnson JV, Hall EM, Theorell T (1989) Combined effects of job strain and social isolation on cardiovascular disease morbidity and mortality in a random sample of the Swedish male working population. Scand J Work Environ Health 15, 271–9. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- Bonde JP (2008) Psychosocial factors at work and risk of depression: a systematic review of the epidemiological evidence. Occup Environ Med 65, 438–45. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 11) de Lange AH, Taris TW, Kompier MA, Houtman IL, Bongers PM (2003) "The very best of the millennium": longitudinal research and the demand-control-(support) model. J Occup Health Psychol 8, 282–305. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 12) Netterstrøm B, Conrad N, Bech P, Fink P, Olsen O, Rugulies R, Stansfeld S (2008) The relation between work-related psychosocial factors and the development of depression. Epidemiol Rev 30, 118–32. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 13) Häusser JA, Mojzisch A, Niesel M, Schulz-Hardt S (2010) Ten years on: a review of recent research on the Job Demand-Control (-Support) model and psychological wellbeing. Work Stress 24, 1–35. [CrossRef]
- 14) Stansfeld S, Candy B (2006) Psychosocial work environment and mental health—a meta-analytic review. Scand J Work Environ Health **32**, 443–62. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 15) Chiu YL, Chung RG, Wu CS, Ho CH (2009) The effects of job demands, control, and social support on hospital clinical nurses' intention to turn over. Appl Nurs Res 22, 258–63. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 16) van der Heijden BI, Kümmerling A, van Dam K, van der Schoot E, Estryn-Béhar M, Hasselhorn HM (2010) The impact of social support upon intention to leave among female nurses in Europe: secondary analysis of data from the NEXT survey. Int J Nurs Stud 47, 434–45. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 17) Widerszal-Bazyl M, Radkiewicz P, Hasselhorn H-M, Maurice Conway P, van der Heijden B, the N S G (2008) The Demand-Control-Support model and intent to leave across six European countries: the role of employment opportunities. Work Stress 22, 166–84. [CrossRef]
- 18) Malinauskiene V, Leisyte P, Malinauskas R (2009) Psychosocial job characteristics, social support, and sense of coherence as determinants of mental health among nurses. Medicina (Kaunas) 45, 910–7. [Medline]
- 19) Yoshizawa K, Sugawara N, Yasui-Furukori N, Danjo K, Furukori H, Sato Y, Tomita T, Fujii A, Nakagam T, Sasaki M, Nakamura K (2014) Relationship between occupational stress and depression among psychiatric nurses in Japan. Arch Environ Occup Health 1–6. [Medline] [CrossRef]

- 20) Kawano Y (2008) Association of job-related stress factors with psychological and somatic symptoms among Japanese hospital nurses: effect of departmental environment in acute care hospitals. J Occup Health 50, 79–85. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 21) Shimomitsu T, Yokoyama K, Ohno H, Maruta T, Tanigawa T (2000) Manual of the Brief Job Stress Questionnaire. In: Reports on the study of job stress and its effects on health in the workplace: The research grant for the prevention of work-related diseases from the Japan Ministry of labour. The Ministry of Labor, Tokyo.
- 22) Suwazono Y, Dochi M, Kobayashi E, Oishi M, Okubo Y, Tanaka K, Sakata K (2008) Benchmark duration of work hours for development of fatigue symptoms in Japanese workers with adjustment for job-related stress. Risk Anal 28, 1689–98. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 23) Kawada T, Otsuka T (2011) Relationship between job stress, occupational position and job satisfaction using a brief job stress questionnaire (BJSQ). Work 40, 393–9. [Medline]
- 24) Saijo Y, Chiba S, Yoshioka E, Kawanishi Y, Nakagi Y, Ito T, Sugioka Y, Kitaoka-Higashiguchi K, Yoshida T (2013) Job stress and burnout among urban and rural hospital physicians in Japan. Aust J Rural Health 21, 225–31. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 25) Otsuka T, Kawada T, Ibuki C, Kusama Y (2009) Relationship between job strain and radial arterial wave reflection in middle-aged male workers. Prev Med 49, 260–4. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 26) Radloff LS (1977) The CES-D scale: a self-report depression scale for research in the general population. Appl Psychol Meas 1, 385–401. [CrossRef]
- 27) Shima S, Shikano T, Kitamura T, Asai M (1985) Reliability and validity of CES-D. Jpn J Psychiatry **27**, 717–23 (in Japanese).
- 28) Wada K, Tanaka K, Theriault G, Satoh T, Mimura M, Miyaoka H, Aizawa Y (2007) Validity of the Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale as a screening instrument of major depressive disorder among Japanese workers. Am J Ind Med 50, 8–12. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 29) Ogata Y, Nagano M, Fukuda T, Hashimoto M (2011) [Job retention and nursing practice environment of hospital nurses in Japan applying the Japanese version of the Practice Environment Scale of the Nursing Work Index (PES-NWI)]. Nippon Koshu Eisei Zasshi 58, 409–19 (in Japanese, English abstract). [Medline]
- 30) Kudo Y, Satoh T, Hosoi K, Miki T, Watanabe M, Kido S, Aizawa Y (2006) Association between intention to stay on the job and job satisfaction among Japanese nurses in small and medium-sized private hospitals. J Occup Health 48, 504–13. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 31) Heinen MM, van Achterberg T, Schwendimann R, Zander B, Matthews A, Kózka M, Ensio A, Sjetne IS, Moreno Casbas T, Ball J, Schoonhoven L (2013) Nurses' intention to leave their profession: a cross sectional observational study in 10

- European countries. Int J Nurs Stud **50**, 174–84. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 32) Kaneita Y, Ohida T, Uchiyama M, Takemura S, Kawahara K, Yokoyama E, Miyake T, Harano S, Suzuki K, Fujita T (2006) The relationship between depression and sleep disturbances: a Japanese nationwide general population survey. J Clin Psychiatry 67, 196–203. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 33) Yoon SL, Kim JH (2013) Job-related stress, emotional labor, and depressive symptoms among Korean nurses. J Nurs Scholarsh **45**, 169–76. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 34) Stansfeld SA, Fuhrer R, Shipley MJ, Marmot MG (1999) Work characteristics predict psychiatric disorder: prospective results from the Whitehall II Study. Occup Environ Med **56**, 302–7. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- Othman N, Nasurdin AM (2013) Social support and work engagement: a study of Malaysian nurses. J Nurs Manag 21, 1083–90. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 36) van der Heijden BIJM (2001) Organisational influences upon the development of professional expertise in SMEs in the Netherlands. J Enterprising Cult 09, 367–406. [CrossRef]
- 37) Van Der Heijden BIJM (2003) Organisational influences upon the development of occupational expertise throughout the career. Int J Train Dev 7, 142–65. [CrossRef]
- 38) Pearson A, Laschinger H, Porritt K, Jordan Z, Tucker D, Long L (2007) Comprehensive systematic review of evidence on developing and sustaining nursing leadership that fosters a healthy work environment in healthcare. Int J Evid-Based Healthc 5, 208–53. [Medline]

- 39) Spector P (1986) Perceived control: Ameta analysis. Hum Relat **39**, 1005–16. [CrossRef]
- 40) Munro L, Rodwell J, Harding L (1998) Assessing occupational stress in psychiatric nurses using the full job strain model: the value of social support to nurses. Int J Nurs Stud 35, 339–45. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 41) Kageyama T, NIshikido N, Kobayashi T, Oga J, Kawashima M (2001) Characteristics of work stress among hospital nurses and its association with mental health. The Japanese Journal of Mental Health 16, 69–81 (in Japanese, English abstract).
- 42) Van Bogaert P, van Heusden D, Timmermans O, Franck E (2014) Nurse work engagement impacts job outcome and nurse-assessed quality of care: model testing with nurse practice environment and nurse work characteristics as predictors. Front Psychol 5, 1261. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 43) Sakai K, Mori I, Okumura M, Ogawa S (2011) Ways to improve nursing work as suggested by free remarks written by hospital nurses in a questionnaire survey. J Sci Labour 87, 99–115 (in Japanese, English abstract).
- 44) Bannai A, Tamakoshi A (2014) The association between long working hours and health: a systematic review of epidemiological evidence. Scand J Work Environ Health 40, 5–18. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 45) Gong Y, Han T, Yin X, Yang G, Zhuang R, Chen Y, Lu Z (2014) Prevalence of depressive symptoms and work-related risk factors among nurses in public hospitals in southern China: a cross-sectional study. Sci Rep 4, 7109. [Medline] [CrossRef]