Medical Students' Working Preferences - A Pilot Study in Romania

Andreea Marcu^{1 *}

¹ Babeş-Bolyai University of Cluj-Napoca, Cluj School of Public Health, 7 Pandurilor Street, Universitas Building, 9th floor, 400095 Cluj-Napoca, Romania

KEYWORDS

Job preferences
Medical students
Working conditions
Health and workforce
mobility

ABSTRACT

Health workforce migration affects healthcare services from all around the world. This present study hypothesized that: Romanian medical students' preference of a workplace is based not only on factors such as economical, working conditions and professional development, but also on other factors that are more related to personal values. A cross-sectional study was conducted involving 215 medical students from Cluj-Napoca. Students were invited to take part in a career preference questionnaire about: socio-demographic factors, work environment, job characteristics, influence of family and friends and the students' intention to emigrate. Results show that students would choose a job based on: quality of working conditions, intellectual challenges, job security, the location of job in an urban area, income and a good atmosphere at the workplace. The factors impacting the migration are: quality of working conditions, desire of support from nurses and acceptance of a job even if is far from where the students' family lives. The results could influence legislation on health and workforce mobility and improve the workforce recruitment, retention and motivation aspects on long-term.

Background

Migration is a global issue. It is estimated that out of 244 million migrants around the world, 150 million are workers (International Labour Organization

* Contact address: andreea.marcu@publichealth.ro (A. Marcu)

2015). As Feraru (2013) defines it, 'this phenomenon consists in the movement of crowds of people from one area to another, followed by the change of residence and/or by employment in a field of activity in the arrival area' (Feraru 2013). In 2011, 3.5 million Romanians were working abroad (Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development 2013). Migration of workers is caused by high unemployment rates, low salary for workers and low number of opportunities for professional development (Dayton-Johnson *et al.* 2009). The factors that impact migration in case of health professionals are poor working conditions, low salaries and low development of health system' services (Siyam and dal Poz 2014). The phenomenon of 'Brain Drain' which refers to the departure of health workers from one country to another for better living and working conditions is present in Romania as well (Suciu *et al.* 2017).

Health workforce mobility has tremendous effects on the health systems all around the world and because of it, there is a major shortage of health workers in many countries, including Romania. This represents an issue as human resources are essential for the good functioning of the health system and it influences the quality of medical services (Feraru 2013).

Between 2007 and 2010, 8131 doctors left Romania to work abroad and between 2008 and 2013, 8742 doctors had the intention to leave Romania and find a job in Germany, UK or France, which were the most popular destinations for medical doctors who wanted to leave Romania (Boncea 2015). Therefore, between these years, 3428 doctors requested a certificate to work in Germany, 3035 doctors wanted to work in UK and 2279 doctors wanted to migrate in France (Séchet and Vasilcu 2015). In 2010, each month, more than 300 Romanian doctors applied and received a certificate to leave the country (Suciu *et al.* 2017). 'Therefore, the number of doctors in Romanian hospitals decreased from 20648 doctors in 2011 to 14487 in 2012 and to 13521 in 2014' (Boncea 2015). This is an issue because in Romania the number of doctors who leave the country is higher than the number of students who finish the Medical Schools (Boncea 2015). Because of the migration of medical doctors from Romania to other countries, it is important to study what are the aspects

that determine them to move to another country and to try to improve these aspects in the Romanian system in order to prevent future shortage of health workers.

The career choice of medical students is influenced by several aspects, some of which weight more in their final decisions. In some studies, work life balance was identified as an important factor for choosing a job (Kiolbassa *et al.* 2011). Moreover, the level of patient contact, the student's intellectual satisfaction and the security of the job were other essential factors for students when considering a career (Glynn 2010; Takeda *et al.* 2013; Toren, Zelker and Porat 2012). Previous research discovered that students were influenced also by the advice received from family members and friends and by a positive social atmosphere at the workplace (Takeda *et al.* 2013; Toren, Zelker and Porat 2012). Besides the environment and the salary, the geographical area where the job is located and the distance of the workplace from students' family are taken into consideration by the medical students (Toren, Zelker and Porat 2012). One study (Alshahrani *et al.* 2014) found that 44% of students chose their speciality according to the lifestyle that speciality implies. Taking into consideration this factor, the most preferred specialities were internal medicine, followed by family medicine (Alshahrani *et al.* 2014). Internal medicine was also chosen because of the increased contact with patients. The students who chose this speciality enjoyed working with people and helping them (Borges and Savickas 2014). Another study (El-Hammadi 2013) identified income, personal fulfilment of students, development of their knowledge, skills and the prestige of the job as essential factors for choosing a career.

The area, understood as the geographical location, was also crucial in the process of choosing a workplace. A study targeting 6th year medical students determined that they mostly prefer to work in urban public hospitals. The most important factors for their decision were good career prospects, salary and living close to their family (Hou *et al.* 2015). Another study conducted in Germany showed that students were more likely to choose Berlin and Hamburg as places to work and live than underdeveloped

rural areas in Germany (Heinz 2012). The reason why they would choose Berlin and Hamburg is because they are the first two cities in Germany as size. Also, Berlin has a developing economy.

Another study which was conducted at the Medical School in Cluj-Napoca (Suciu *et al.* 2017) identified the factors that impact students' intention to migrate. These factors refer to the salary, the working and living conditions and their dissatisfaction with the Romanian healthcare system. Moreover, another important aspect that would determine students to migrate is the 'under the table' payments offered by patients, which is discussed in the media and affects the image of the doctors (Suciu *et al.* 2017).

There are clear differences between females and males regarding their preferences for a workplace. The female students prefer aspects such as direct contact with patients and regular working hours with more leisure time than men (Soethout and ten Cate 2014). Also, female students are more inclined to apply for jobs in primary care with low level of stress even if the earnings are low (Gąsiorowski, Rudowicz and Safranow 2015). Furthermore, males from final year were more likely to prefer working in the public sector. They weren't interested in a high salary, but wanted a secure, interesting and socially important work (Gąsiorowski, Rudowicz and Safranow 2015). The occupational aspects that students preferred changed during their undergraduate studies. A study identified that the students 'preferences for working hours declined during the undergraduate program (Soethout and ten Cate 2014). In addition to this, final year students' preference for working in the public sector changed since their first year of medical school (Gąsiorowski, Rudowicz and Safranow 2015). Moreover, 'as medical students progressed with their studies, a significant decline in the wish to seek employment abroad was observed' (Gąsiorowski, Rudowicz and Safranow 2015).

In Romania, in 2010, the salaries of doctors were cut by 25%. More Romanian doctors are leaving to work in Western European countries as these countries offer better salaries, better working conditions and modern medical equipment (Boncea 2015; Séchet and Vasilcu 2015).

This study aims to address the two research questions and determine *What are the factors preferred by last year medical students from Cluj-Napoca when choosing their job?* and *To what extent these job characteristics or factors influence the students' workplace choice when it comes to work in Romania or go abroad?*

Therefore, we hypothesize that *the Romanian medical students' preference of a workplace is based not only on factors such as economical, working conditions and professional development, but also on other factors that are more related to personal values when it comes to work in the country.* Through personal values we understand desire to receive support from nurses and acceptance of a job even if it is far from the students' family.

Methodology

In order to test the hypothesis, a cross-sectional study was conducted on a sample size of N=215 medical students from the Iuliu Hațieganu University of Medicine and Pharmacy Cluj-Napoca, Romania. All students involved in the study were in their final year of studies (6th Year of Medical School). The number of students from the sample was calculated according to the total population of students from the Faculty of Medicine in Cluj-Napoca, which was N=320, using a confidence level of 99%. Students of other nationality than Romanian were excluded from the study.

For the data collection part, students completed a questionnaire after they had signed an informed consent which explained the study and asked for the participants' consent to participate in the study. The questionnaire consisted of five parts: (I) socio-demographic factors, (II) work environment, (III) characteristics of the job, (IV) the influence of the students' family and friends on their choice of job and (V) the students' intention to work in the country or abroad in the future.

More specifically, the questionnaire used questions with scales of 5 levels from 'very little' to 'very much' to measure the preferences of students when choosing a workplace. Therefore, they were asked about the specialty they want to choose in the future and about the importance for them of

several factors such as working in urban area, working in the public sector, the quality of working conditions, interacting with patients, new intellectual challenges, the prestige of the job, advancing possibilities in the job, support received from manager, co-workers and nurses, the safety of the job, the workload, schedule, number of on calls that they want to do in a month and importance of the income in choosing a job. Also, they were asked if they would choose a job which implies a fixed schedule even if the income is lower. Another similar question was if the students would choose a job with a reduced workload, but a low salary. Moreover, the questionnaire addressed the importance of the opinion of students' family and friends on the students' job choice. The students were asked if they thought about leaving Romania in the future and what would be the reasons for this. They were also asked if they intend to leave in the next year, in the next 5 years and in the next 10 years. The students who intend to leave were asked about the period of time they want to spend abroad and, if they intend to return to Romania, what are the reasons for doing this.

Descriptive statistics which consists in frequencies were performed for all the variables. For the logistic regression, a dependent variable and several independent variables were chosen. The dependent variable was 'migration', a nominal variable expressing the intention of students to work abroad. It was constructed from the variables 'the intention of students to emigrate in the next year', 'the intention to emigrate in the next 5 years' and 'the intention to emigrate in the next 10 years'. If in the answers to any of these questions, there was at least one yes answer, then in the dependent variable, 'migration', the answer will be yes. If in any of the questions, there wasn't any yes, then in the new dependent variable, the answer will be no. Using the dependent variable 'migration' and the independent variables, logistic regression was performed for identifying the factors which could influence the intention of students to emigrate.

The independent variables chosen were gender, age, the area where students came from, if students graduated another faculty before, if they have a job besides faculty, their marital status, importance of working in the urban

area, importance of the quality of working conditions, interaction with patients, new intellectual challenges, prestige of the job, possibility of advancing in the job, desire of support from manager, desire of support from co-workers, desire of support from nurses, job security, number of on calls per month, income, the desire to choose a job with a fixed schedule but a low income, the desire to choose a job with a reduced workload but a low income, family opinion, friends opinion, the intention to choose a job even if it is far from their family.

Results

The descriptive showed that the sample size of 215 students consisted of 149 (70%) females and 65 (30%) males (Appendix 1). The majority of students (N=191, 89%) lived in urban area before coming to the Medical School in Cluj-Napoca. Almost all students (N=208, 97%) didn't graduated another faculty in the past and 205 (95%) of students don't have a job in the present.

For 192 (89%) students, working in the urban area is important, while for 88 (41%) is important to work in the public sector. Moreover, 213 (99%) students consider working conditions essential in choosing a job. For 186 (88%) students, the interaction with patients is essential and 210 (98%) students would choose a job that consists in new intellectual challenges. The prestige of the job matters for 129 (61%) of students, the possibility of advancing in the career matters for 180 (84%) of students, while 5 (3%) have little interest and 2 (1%) had no interest in this aspect. Regarding the support offered by the manager, for 180 (88%) of students it is important. The support from the co-workers is important as well for 155 (72%) and the support offered by nurses matters for 181 (85%) of students. For 197 (93%) of students, job security matters when choosing a job. Regarding a reduced workload, the percentage of students who consider it important is the same with the percentage of students who don't consider it important when choosing a job (N=57, 27%). Also, a fixed schedule is important only for 98 (46%) of students when choosing a job.

The number of students who would do between 3 and 5 on calls per month is 112 (55%), while the number of students who would do only one on call per month is 50 (25%). Income was an important factor for 181 (85%) of students when choosing a job. Therefore, 119 (61%) of students won't choose a workplace that has a fixed schedule, but a low income and 147 (30%) of students won't choose a workplace with a reduced workload, but a low income. For 103 (48%) of students, the opinion of family related to their workplace choice is not important and for 167 (78%) the opinion of friends is not important as well. Moreover, 127 (59%) students would accept a job that is far from the place where their family lives.

The number of students who thought of leaving Romania is 167 (78%) (Appendix 2). In the next year, only 36 (17%) plan to leave, but in the next 5 years the number of the students who intend to leave is 101 (47%) and in the next 10 years is 95 (44%). The most common reasons stated by students for leaving the country are: low income (N=137, 85%), poor working conditions (N=100, 62%), little professional development opportunities (N=57, 35%), lack of equipment and technology (N= 49, 30%), the little respect given to doctors (N=28, 17%), better lifestyle abroad (N=26, 16%) and low number of jobs in Romania (N=19, 12%). There were 113 (53%) students who wrote 3 reasons for leaving Romania, while 53 (25%) didn't write any reasons. However, there were cases of students offering more than 3 reasons (N=6; 3%). From the students who want to leave Romania, 74 (34%) want to stay more years abroad, while 44 (21%) would stay between 6 months and 1 year. The number of students who would leave definitely is 25 (12%).

The hypothetical reasons why students would come back in Romania after working abroad a period of time are: missing their family (N=92, 74%), missing the country (N=26, 21%), desire to change the Romanian healthcare system (N=21, 17%) and the inability to adapt to other culture (N= 16, 13%). There were 91 (42%) students who gave no reasons for coming back and 83 (39%) who offered 1 reason.

Logistic regression was also performed (Appendix 3) in order to identify the factors which could influence the intention of students to emigrate.

The omnibus test showed that there is an effect of the independent variables taken together on the dependent variable ($p=0.000$). The score test was also performed. The independent variables that are significant for the model are (1) possibilities to advance in the job ($p=0.047$), (2) support offered by nurses ($p=0.016$), (3) number of on calls that future doctors want to do ($p=0.022$), (4) income ($p=0.006$), (5) the choice of a job that implies a fixed schedule but a low income ($p=0.060$), (6) the choice of a job that implies a reduced workload and a low income ($p=0.026$) and (7) the decision of students to choose a job even if it is far from their family ($p=0.000$).

The logistic regression (Appendix 3) results indicate that the variables that significantly impact the dependent variable 'migration' are quality of working conditions ($p=0.041$), support offered by nurses ($p=0.003$) and the decision of students to choose a job even if it is far from their family ($p=0.002$). If the importance of the quality of working conditions increases with 1 unit, then the log odds of emigrating will increase with 0.928. A student who considers working conditions important has 2.53 times more chances to emigrate ($OR=2.530$; 95% C.I.= 1.039-6.158) than the students who don't consider this aspect important.

If the importance of the support given by nurses increases with 1 unit, the log odds of migration will decrease with 1.028. A student who considers the support offered by nurses important has significant less chances of emigrating ($OR=0.358$; 95% C.I.=0.182-0.701) than the students who don't consider this aspect important.

If the acceptance of a job that is far from the place where the students' family lives increases, then the log odds of migration will increase with 0.856. A student who would accept a job that is far from the place where his/her family lives, has 2.35 times more chances of emigrating ($OR=2.355$; 95% C.I.=1.357-4.086) than the students who won't accept this.

The variables that don't significantly impact the dependent variable 'migration' having the p value higher than 0.05 are gender, age, area where students came from, graduation of another faculty, if they have a job besides faculty, their marital status, the desire to work in the urban area, interaction

with patients, intellectual challenges, prestige of job, possibilities to advance in the job, the support offered by the manager and by co-workers, job security, the number of on calls that the future doctors want to do in a month, income, the choice of job that has a fixed schedule even if the income is low, the choice of a job that has a reduced workload even if the income is low, the opinion of students' family and the opinion of their friends on their workplace choice.

Discussions

The hypothesis of this study is that the Romanian medical students' preference of a workplace is based not only on factors such as economical, working conditions and professional development, but also on other factors that are more related to personal values when it comes to work in the country. The hypothesis is confirmed by the results of this study. Therefore, the majority of students would choose their job based on the quality of working conditions (N=213; 99%), if the job is located in an urban area (N=192; 89%), if they can interact with patients (N=186; 88%) and experience intellectual challenges (N= 210; 98%). Also, the prestige of the job (N=129; 61%), the opportunity to advance in the job (N=180; 84%), the income (N=181; 85%) and the job security (N=197; 93%) are important factors for students when choosing a workplace. However, besides these factors, the majority of students also prefer a good atmosphere at the workplace in the sense that they want to receive help and support from their co-workers (N=155; 72%), the nurses (N=181; 85%) and the manager (N=180; 88%). When choosing a job, they would accept one even if is far from the place where their family lives.

The results from this study were compared with the results from other articles in the literature. The literature states that students would choose a job based on work life balance (Kiolbassa *et al.* 2011), the level of patient contact (Glynn 2010), the intellectual satisfaction (Toren, Zelker and Porat 2012), security of job (Takeda *et al.* 2013), opinion of their family and friends (Takeda *et al.* 2013; Toren, Zelker and Porat 2012), the positive atmosphere at the workplace, income (El-Hammadi 2013), the distance between the location of

job and the place where their family lives (Toren, Zelker and Porat 2012), prestige of the job (El-Hammadi 2013), and the location of the job in an urban area (Hou *et al.* 2015). However, this study didn't find all these factors important for students in choosing a job. The medical students from Cluj-Napoca don't consider the work life balance factors such as fixed schedule and reduced workload as essential in choosing a job. For example, they wouldn't choose a job with a fixed schedule or a reduced workload, but that offers a low income. Also, the majority of students would perform more on calls per month (between 3 and 5 on calls). Another difference between the results of this study and the results from other articles is the fact that medical students from Cluj-Napoca don't consider so important their family and friends' opinion when choosing a job and they would accept a job even if it is far from the place where their family lives.

Even if there are multiple factors that contribute to the students' decision to choose a job, not all of these factors determine their intention to leave Romania and seek employment abroad. The logistic regression found several factors that determine migration and that are statistically significant such as (1) quality of working conditions, (2) support and help received from nurses and (3) distance of job from the place where their family lives. In this study, not all of the factors were statistically significant and therefore they don't significantly impact the migration. The results showed that income was not statistically significant, even if it was close to being statistically significant ($p=0.058$). An initial assumption of this study was that the income would be the most important factor that would determine migration of students, but it was proved that working conditions is the most important factor that impacts migration.

Students who accept a job even if it is far from their family have several reasons for doing this. These reasons or benefits can be income or prestige of the job. Also, the majority of students who would do between 3 and 5 or even more on calls per month are interested in increasing their income. Therefore, even if income is not statistically significant in the results, certain answers

demonstrate the fact that income is also important for students when choosing a job and thinking of leaving Romania.

Limitation

The study has several limitations. The students who participated in the study are only from general medicine specialty. Students from pharmacy or dentistry were not included in the study and this could have affected how representative the study is. Also, with the same effect is the fact that only the medical students from Cluj-Napoca were included. Another limitation is that, even if the initial sample consisted in 280 students, only 215 students completed the questionnaire. The others refused to participate in the study.

Conclusion

The factors that impact the migration are working conditions, desire of support offered by nurses and the acceptance of students to choose a job even if it is far from their family. It is important to understand and tackle these factors so that students would be motivated to remain in the country. Therefore, the results of this study could influence the legislation on health and workforce mobility and could improve the workforce recruitment, retention and motivation. More specifically, these results can improve the state of art and raise awareness about this issue in Romania. Moreover, policies could be formulated and implemented to assure better working conditions, higher salaries and better funding for necessary equipment and a human resources strategy should be implemented in Romania to also address these factors.

References

- Alshahrani, Mohammed, Bander Dhafery, Mohammed Almulhim, Noor Bukhamsin, Faisal Alkhadra, and Doaa Albagshi. 2014. "Factors influencing Saudi medical students and interns' choice of future specialty: a self-administered questionnaire". *Advances in Medical Education and Practice* 5: 397-402. doi:10.2147/amep.s69152.
- Boncea, Irina. 2015. "Brain Drain or Circular Migration: The Case of Romanian Physicians". *Procedia Economics and Finance* 32: 649-656. doi:10.1016/S2212-5671(15)01445-8.
- Borges, Nicole J., and Suzanne Savickas. 2014. "Work Style Preferences among Medical Specialties". *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 84(3): 303-306. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2014.02.004.
- Dayton-Johnson, Jeff, Antje Pfeiffer, Kirsten Schuettler, and Johanna Schwinn. 2009. *Migration and Employment*. Accessed June 9, 2016. <https://www.oecd.org/dac/povertyreduction/43280513.pdf>
- El-Hammadi, Mazen. 2013. "Career preferences of Syrian students and their attitudes toward a number of practice areas: Will community pharmacy continue to dominate the profession?" *Currents in Pharmacy Teaching and Learning* 5(5): 373-380. doi: 0.1016/j.cptl.2013.03.004.
- Feraru, Petronela Daniela. 2013. "Romania and the Crisis in the Health System. Migration of doctors". *Global Journal of Medical Research Interdisciplinary* 13(5). https://globaljournals.org/GJMR_Volume13/4-Romania-and-the-Crisis-in.pdf
- Gąsiorowski, Jakub, Elżbieta Rudowicz, and Krzysztof Safranow. 2015. "Motivation towards Medical Career Choice and Future Career Plans of Polish Medical Students". *Advances in Health Sciences Education* 20(3): 709-725. doi:10.1007/s10459-014-9560-2.
- Glynn, Ronan W. and Michael J. Kerin. 2010. "Factors Influencing Medical Students and Junior Doctors in Choosing a Career in Surgery". *The Surgeon* 8(4): 187-191. doi:10.1016/j.surge.2009.11.005.
- Heinz, Andreas and Rüdiger Jacob. 2012. "Medizinstudenten und ihre Berufsperspektiven: In welcher Facharztrichtung, wo und wie wollen sie arbeiten?" *Bundesgesundheitsblatt - Gesundheitsforschung - Gesundheitsschutz* 55(2): 245-253. doi:10.1007/s00103-011-1413-z.
- Hou, Jianlin, Maoyi Xu, Joseph C Kolars, Zhe Dong, Weimin Wang, Amy Huang, and Yang Ke. 2015. "Career Preferences of Graduating Medical Students in China: A Nationwide Cross-Sectional Survey". *The Lancet* 386: S13. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(15)00591-7.

- International Labour Organization. 2015. *ILO global estimates on migrant workers*. Accessed June 10, 2016.
http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---dcomm/documents/publication/wcms_436343.pdf
- Kiolbassa, Kathrin, Antje Miksch, Katja Hermann, Andreas Loh, Joachim Szecsenyi, Stefanie Joos, and Katja Goetz. 2011. "Becoming a General Practitioner - Which Factors Have Most Impact on Career Choice of Medical Students?" *BMC Family Practice* 12: 25. doi:10.1186/1471-2296-12-25.
- Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development. 2013. *International migration outlook 2013*. France: Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development Publishing.
http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/migr_outlook-2013-en
- Séchet, Raymonde and Despina Vasilcu. 2015. "Physicians' migration from Romania to France: a brain drain into Europe?" *Cybergeog European Journal of Geography*. <https://cybergeog.revues.org/27249>.
- Siyam, Amani and Mario Roberto dal Poz. 2014. *Migration of health workers: The WHO code of practice and the global economic crisis*. Geneva: World Health Organization. http://www.who.int/hrh/migration/14075_MigrationofHealth_Workers.pdf
- Soethout, Marc B. M., and Olle Th J. ten Cate. 2014. "[Career preferences among medical students]". *Nederlands Tijdschrift Voor Geneeskunde* 158: A6655.
- Suciu, Șoimita Mihaela, Codruța Alina Popescu, Mugur Daniel Ciumageanu, and Anca Dana Buzoianu. 2017. "Physician Migration at Its Roots: A Study on the Emigration Preferences and Plans among Medical Students in Romania". *Human Resources for Health* 15: 6. doi:10.1186/s12960-017-0181-8.
- Takeda, Yuko, Kunimasa Morio, Linda Snell, Junji Otaki, Miyako Takahashi, and Ichiro Kai. 2013. "Characteristic Profiles among Students and Junior Doctors with Specific Career Preferences". *BMC Medical Education* 13: 125. doi:10.1186/1472-6920-13-125.
- Toren, Orly, Revital Zelker, and Nurit Porat. 2012. "Preferences of Israeli Nursing Students in Choosing Their Future Workplace: Israeli Nursing Students' Preferences in Future Workplaces". *Journal of Nursing Management* 20(1): 45-55. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2834.2011.01255.x.

Appendices

Appendix 1. Table 1: Descriptive statistics

Socio-demographic factors							
Gender	Female= 149 (69.6%)	Males=65 (30.4%)					
Area where students came from	Urban =191 (88.8%)	Rural=24 (11.2%)					
	Yes N (%)	No N (%)					
Graduated another faculty	7 (3.3%)	208 (96.7%)					
Job besides faculty	10 (4.7%)	205 (95.3%)					
Work environment							
	Very little N (%)	Little N (%)	Medium N (%)	Much N (%)	Very much N (%)	Not interested N (%)	Don't know N (%)
Importance of working in the urban area	3 (1.4%)	5 (2.3%)	15 (7%)	58 (27%)	134 (62.3%)		
Importance of working in public sector	14 (6.5%)	23 (10.7%)	90 (41.9%)	66 (30.7%)	22 (10.2%)		
Importance of prestige of job	6 (2.8%)	19 (8.9%)	59 (27.7%)	86 (40.4%)	43 (20.2%)		2 (0.9%)
Importance of advancing in the job	1 (0.5%)	5 (2.3%)	26 (12.1%)	82 (38.3%)	98 (45.8%)	2 (0.9%)	1 (0.5%)
Importance of	3 (1.4%)	3 (1.4%)	20	111	78 (36.3%)		

support from manager			(9.3%)	(51.6%)		
Importance of support from coworkers	2 (0.9%)	3 (1.4%)	55 (25.6%)	82 (38.1%)	73 (34%)	
Importance of support from nurses	4 (1.9%)	3 (1.4%)	26 (12.1%)	98 (45.8%)	83 (38.8%)	1 (0.5%)

	Definitely no N (%)	Probably no N (%)	Probably yes N (%)	Definitely yes N (%)	Don't know N (%)
Importance of quality of working conditions	1 (0.5%)	1 (0.5%)	42 (19.5%)	171 (79.5%)	
Importance of interaction with patients	9 (4.2%)	17 (8%)	80 (37.7%)	106 (50%)	3 (1.4%)
Importance of intellectual challenges	0	5 (2.3%)	68 (31.6%)	142 (66%)	

Job characteristics	Very little N (%)	Little N (%)	Medium N (%)	Much N (%)	Very much N (%)	Don't know N (%)
Importance of job security	2 (0.9%)	1 (0.5%)	13 (6%)	52 (24.4%)	145 (68.1%)	2 (0.9%)
Importance of reduced workload	16 (7.4%)	41 (19.1%)	96 (44.7%)	40 (18.6%)	17 (7.9%)	5 (2.3%)
Importance of fixed work schedule	8 (3.7%)	26 (12.1%)	82 (38.1%)	65 (30.2%)	33 (15.3%)	1 (0.5%)

	Definitely no N (%)	Probably no N (%)	Probably yes N (%)	Definitely yes N (%)	Don't know N (%)
Importance of	4 (1.9%)	29	92 (43%)	89	1 (0.5%)

income		(13.6%)		(41.6%)		
Fixed work schedule; low income	21 (10.7%)	98 (50%)	68 (34.7%)	9 (4.6%)	19 (8.8%)	
Reduced workload; low income	41 (20.7%)	106 (53.5%)	45 (22.7%)	6 (3%)	17 (7.9%)	
<hr/>						
	Never N (%)	Once N (%)	Between 3 and 5 N (%)	Between 5 and 7 N (%)	More than 7 N (%)	Don't know N (%)
On calls per month	10 (4.9%)	50 (24.5%)	112 (54.9%)	25 (12.3%)	7 (3.3%)	11 (5.1%)
<hr/>						
Family and friends influence	Very little N (%)	Little N (%)	Medium N (%)	Much N (%)	Very much N (%)	
Importance of family opinion	45 (20.9%)	58 (27%)	76 (35.3%)	27 (12.6%)	9 (4.2%)	
Importance of friends opinion	93 (43.3%)	74 (34.4%)	39 (18.1%)	9 (4.2%)	0	
<hr/>						
	Definitely no N (%)	Probably no N (%)	Probably yes N (%)	Definitely yes N (%)	Don't know N (%)	
Distance of job from family	21 (10.3%)	56 (27.5%)	98 (48%)	29 (14.2%)	11 (5.1%)	

Appendix 2: Descriptive statistics

Intentions related to job	Yes	No	Don't know			
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)			
Thought of leaving Romania	167 (77.7%)	48 (22.3%)				
Intention to leave in the next year	36 (16.7%)	140 (65.1%)	39 (18.1%)			
Intention to leave in the next 5 years	101 (47%)	42 (19.5%)	72 (33.5%)			
Intention to leave in the next 10 years	95 (44.2%)	29 (13.5%)	91 (42.3%)			
	Less than 1 month N (%)	Between 1 and 3 months N (%)	Between 3 and 6 months N (%)	Between 6 months and 1 year N (%)	More years N (%)	Definitely N (%)
Period of time to stay abroad	0	1 (0.5%)	10 (4.7%)	44 (20.5%)	74 (34.4%)	25 (11.6%)
Reasons for leaving Romania	Income- 137 (84.5%)					
	Working conditions- 100 (62.3%)					
	Lifestyle- 26 (16%)					
	Little respect for doctor- 28 (16.60%)					
	Professional development- 57 (34.5%)					
	Equipment and services- 49 (30.2%)					
	Education of patients- 9 (5.5%)					
	Corruption- 8 (4.9%)					
	Lack of jobs- 19 (12.3%)					
	Family reasons- 7 (4.3%)					
	Unfair criteria for promotion- 3 (1.8%)					

Help people from other countries - 0		
Reasons to return in Romania	to	Missing the country- 26 (20.9%)
	in	Missing family- 92 (74.1%)
		Change the Romanian healthcare system- 21 (16.9%)
		Inability to adapt to other culture- 16 (12.9%)
		Personal reasons- 4 (3.2%)
		Working in private sector- 4 (3.2%)
		If the system will be improved- 8 (4.8%)

Appendix 3: Logistic regression

Indep. Var.	Dep. var. intention of migration				
	B	Sig.	Exp(B) 95% EXP(B)	Lower C.I.for	Upper
Gender	0.255	0.566	1.291	0.539	3.089
Age	0.2	0.416	1.221	0.755	1.977
Area where students came from	-1.123	0.109	0.325	0.082	1.283
Graduated another faculty	22.025	0.999	3677091650.539	0	
Job besides faculty	-21.26	0.999	0	0	
Marital status	-0.661	0.316	0.516	0.142	1.878
Working in urban area	-0.058	0.837	0.943	0.541	1.644
Quality of working conditions	0.928	0.041	2.53	1.039	6.158
Interaction with patients	-0.02	0.934	0.98	0.603	1.592
Intellectual challenges	0.378	0.338	1.459	0.674	3.159
Prestige of job	-0.413	0.078	0.662	0.418	1.047
Advance possibilities in the job	0.273	0.329	1.313	0.759	2.271
Support from manager	0.325	0.305	1.384	0.744	2.576

Support from co-workers	0.205	0.487	1.228	0.688	2.190
Support from nurses	-1.028	0.003	0.358	0.182	0.701
Job security	-0.099	0.769	0.906	0.468	1.754
Nr of on calls	0.495	0.06	1.64	0.979	2.749
Income	0.567	0.058	1.762	0.981	3.165
Fixed work schedule and low income	-0.172	0.576	0.842	0.461	1.538
Reduced workload and low income	-0.254	0.432	0.776	0.412	1.461
Opinion of family regarding job	0.104	0.642	1.109	0.716	1.718
Opinion of friends regarding job	-0.22	0.399	0.803	0.482	1.337
Distance of job from family	0.856	0.002	2.355	1.357	4.086
Constant	-10.753	0.395	0		