Organisational quality, nurse staffing and the quality of chronic disease care in English general practices

**Abstract**

**Background**

An association between quality of care and health care staffing levels, particularly registered nurses, has been established in acute hospitals. Recently an association between practice nurse staffing and quality of care for several chronic conditions has also been demonstrated in general practice. A smaller but significant body of literature identifies organisational factors, in particular issues of human resource management, as being a dominant factor in care quality. However the literature has tended to consider staffing and management factors separately, and has been largely limited to acute care settings.

**Aims and objectives**

In this paper we aim to determine whether previously observed relationships between the quality of clinical care and nurse staffing in general practice are attenuated or enhanced when organisational factors associated with quality of care are considered. We further aim to determine the relative contribution and interaction between these factors .

**Method**

We used routinely collected data on both organisational factors and the quality of clinical care for a range of long term conditions: asthma, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, coronary heart disease, diabetes, hypertension, hypothyroidism, severe long term mental health problems, and stroke from 8409 English general practices. Regression models exploring the relationship of staffing and organisational factors with care quality were fitted using MPLUS version 4.2.

**Results**

Improved levels of nurse staffing, clinical recording, education and reflection on the results of patient surveys were all associated with improved clinical care across a range of conditions. The trend in increasing quality of clinical care with increased nurse staffing that we found previously was confirmed for COPD, CHD, Diabetes and Hypothyroidism after controlling for organisational factors. There was some evidence of attenuation of the estimated nurse staffing effect when organisational factors were considered, but this was small. The effect of staffing interacted significantly with the effect of organisational factors. Overall however, the characteristics that emerged as the strongest predictors of quality of clinical care were not staffing levels but the organisational factors of clinical recording, education and training and use of patient experience surveys.

**Conclusions**

Organisational factors, including human resource management, contribute significantly to observed variation in the quality of care in English general practices. Levels of nurse staffing have an independent association with quality but also interact with organisational factors. The observed relationships are not necessarily causal but a causal relationship is plausible. The benefits and importance of education, training and personal development of nursing and other practice staff was clearly indicated.

Key words: workforce; primary care; practice nurses; quality of care indicators; performance; staffing levels; organisational factors; multivariate analysis

What is known:

* Higher levels of nurse staffing have been associated with higher quality of care in hospitals and primary care
* Various organisational factors have also been associated with improved quality of care in hospitals
* Few studies have examined staffing and organisational factors simultaneously to assess their relative contribution

What this paper adds

* Both nurse staffing and organisational factors were associated with the quality of care for a range of chronic conditions in UK general practices
* The association between quality and organisation was much stronger than the association with nurse staffing
* There was an interaction between staffing and organisation which suggested that the adverse effects of the lowest levels of nurse staffing were mitigated by organisational quality

Organisational quality and the effectiveness of nurse staffing in UK general practice

There is a large literature exploring the association between patient safety outcomes and health care staffing levels, particularly registered nurses, in acute hospitals ([Kane et al., 2007](#_ENREF_17)). A smaller but significant body of literature identifies organisational factors, in particular issues of human resource management, as being a dominant factor in care quality ([Kazanjian et al., 2005](#_ENREF_18)). However this literature has tended to consider staffing and management factors separately. In addition to being limited to acute care settings this literature has rarely considered positive impacts on quality of care, focussing instead on safety. In this study we explore the associations between staffing levels, organisation and management factors and quality of care concurrently in a primary care setting.

In acute care the term ‘magnet hospital’ has been used to describe hospitals where a number of organisational characteristics including leadership and management of the clinical (nursing) team, relationships with doctors (physicians) and support for education and training of nursing staff ([Aiken et al., 1994](#_ENREF_3)) are associated with both better staffing and better outcomes. Despite the large number of studies suggesting that nurse staffing is associated with better outcomes, because of this confounding it is unclear if there is an independent and causal effect of staffing. Some studies have directly assessed the effect of organisational characteristics. A systematic review identified the existence of correlations between the work environment (autonomy, nursing workload, inter-professional relations, nursing management, nursing standards and professional development) and patient mortality in acute care ([Kazanjian et al., 2005](#_ENREF_18)). However, most of this research did not consider staffing levels, which leaves open the possibility that positive organisational characteristics may be more important than staffing levels, or, conversely may simply be a product of well resourced teams and increased capacity, and thus the precise organisational forms are not relevant to delivering good quality care and would not have a positive effect in the face of low staffing levels. One of the few studies to consider staffing and organisational factors concurrently undertaken by West and colleagues ([West et al., 2002](#_ENREF_30)) did find strong associations between appraisal, training and team working and mortality after controlling for levels of medical staffing. However this research did not consider the level of nurse staffing which is an important, as well as the most researched, staffing variable. More recently ([Aiken et al., 2008](#_ENREF_2)) found that the nursing work environment, which includes items exploring organisational factors such as staff development and quality management relationships, is more strongly associated with both nurse and patient outcomes in acute care settings than is nurse staffing.

The question of the relationship between quality of care and nurse staffing is particularly pertinent in primary care, since the contribution of nurses to clinical care in this area is hotly contested. In some countries the increased use of nurses in primary care has been driven by difficulty recruiting physicians or as a way of saving money ([Pearce et al., 2010](#_ENREF_23), [Sox, 2000](#_ENREF_27)) whereas in England increases have been associated with the introduction of a ‘pay for performance’ system, the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF). This system measures performance of the practice in clinical care for a number of disease areas (e.g. diabetes, coronary heart disease) and in terms of a number of organisational characteristics (e.g. length of appointments, personal learning plans for practice employed nurses) many of which are thought to support high quality care.

Much of the work involved in delivering the performance measured by the QOF has been delegated by GPs to nurses ([Leese, 2006](#_ENREF_20)) and over recent years there has been a steady increase in both the number of nurses employed in general practice and the proportion of consultations that are undertaken by them ([Hippisley-Cox et al., 2007](#_ENREF_15), [The Information Centre, 2008](#_ENREF_29)). But concerns are consistently raised about the progression of the nursing role in primary care and the quality and safety of the care that nurses can give ([Bagley et al., 2000](#_ENREF_5), [Burke, 2009](#_ENREF_8), [Knight, 2008](#_ENREF_19)). The contribution of nurses to meeting the QOF targets in the UK has been dismissed as being essentially an exercise in form filling with no real contribution to the quality of care (["Dr Crippen", 2010](#_ENREF_1), [anon, 2007](#_ENREF_4)). If that was the case then once organizational factors were taken into account, for example systems for record keeping, then one would expect that the effect of nurse staffing would disappear or diminish.

Our previous paper showed a positive association between registered nurse staffing and the quality of care in English primary care settings ([Griffiths et al., 2010](#_ENREF_14)). A high level of nurse staffing (fewer patients per full time equivalent practice employed nurse) was significantly associated with better performance in a number of clinical conditions (e.g. chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) and Diabetes) suggesting that nurse staffing was associated with real differences in patient condition and not simply superficial compliance with processes. This reflects the research in hospital settings. However, in neither case is it clear whether the relationship observed is a causal one or whether the association with nurse staffing would remain once other factors are taken into account.

In this paper we determine whether relationships between the quality of clinical care and nurse staffing previously observed were attenuated when organisational factors pertinent to care in general were considered added to the model. We also explored the potential interaction between nurse staffing levels and organisational factors to determine if the effects of these factors varied depending on levels of staffing (or vice versa). In order to do this we used data on organisational factors from the QOF to see what impact these had on the relationship between quality of care for the QOF clinical conditions and nurse staffing.

**Method**

***Data sources and sample***

We used QOF data for 2005/2006 obtained from the NHS Information Centre at Leeds (United Kingdom) as a source of data on both organisational factors and the quality of clinical care for a range of long term conditions: asthma, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, coronary heart disease, diabetes, hypertension, hypothyroidism , severe long term mental health problems, and stroke. These data were matched to practice and population data. An estimate of the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) practice nurses employed by each practice was obtained using headcount data from Binleys, a health information specialist who have staffing information on every UK practice, and area data on full time equivalent numbers of nurses employed at the primary care trust level was obtained from the NHS Information Centre[[1]](#footnote-1). These sources of data are described in detail elsewhere ([Griffiths et al., 2010](#_ENREF_14)). The dataset contains information from 8409 practices. We excluded small practices (<1000 patients), practices without condition registers or no patients on the register, where registers were half the size of denominators used to calculate indicator specific achievement reporting and practices where an estimate of practice nurse staffing was not available. This reduced the number of practices to between 7431 - 7456 depending on the condition being studied.

QOF 2005/2006 comprised of four domains (clinical, organisational, patient experience and additional services). We used the data on clinical care quality from the clinical domains as our dependant variables to measure the quality of clinical care and used organisational factors derived from the organisational and patient experiences domains as independent variables. We did not consider ‘additional services’ as these are generally services provided by the practice which do not impact upon the clinical conditions covered by the QOF which we were able to study.

***Variables***

The QOF clinical domain provides information on the quality of care for ten conditions. For each condition there is a set of indicators measuring process and intermediate outcomes: asthma (7), cancer (2), chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (8), coronary heart disease (CHD) (15), diabetes (18), epilepsy (4), hypertension (5), hypothyroidism (2), severe long term mental health (5), and stroke (10).

As this data is used as part of a pay for performance system and is not collected for research purposes there is a significant risk of bias. Achievement on the indicators can be expressed as reported achievement, used in the pay for performance system, where practices can exclude some patients from the denominator because they believe that the indicator does not apply. As this is open to manipulation by the practice we used the size of the condition register for the practice as the denominator and calculated population achievement instead, that is how many people in the entire population with the disease met the target specified in the indicator. Population achievement can only be calculated for those indicators that apply to all patients on the register. None of the indicators for cancer and epilepsy applied to all patients on this register so these two clinical conditions were omitted from the analysis. A composite score of weighted indicators was generated for each of these clinical conditions ([Doran et al., 2006](#_ENREF_9)).

The patient experience domain comprises two elements related to how the practice manages patient experience. The first is the length of appointments offered (1=routine booked appointments with doctors of not less than 10 minutes, 0=length of consultation requirement not met). The second considers the practice’s use of patient surveys. The three patient survey items were used to construct an ordinal variable that measures to what degree each practice utilised the survey (0=not conducted, 1=survey undertaken, 2=survey undertaken, results reflected upon, changes proposed, 3=survey undertaken, results discussed as a team, with a patient group/non-executive director of the primary care organisation, changes proposed and evidence these have been enacted upon).

The organisational domain consists of five areas. Each organisational area is represented by a set of indicators (Table 1): records and information about patients (19), patient communication (8), education and training (9), practice management (10), medicines management (10). Most of the time practices achieved the maximum score for each indicator because the standard was met (e.g. details of prescribed medicines are available to the prescriber at each surgery). For analysis purposes we collapsed the indicators into two categories (1=met/maximum score 0=not met/less than maximum score).

We undertook a factor analysis to identify underlying factors in the large number of individual organisational items. As the collapsed organisational indicator data are not continuous and do not conform to conventional (normal) distributional assumptions we used approaches based on tetrachoric correlations (a measure of correlation between two unobserved continuous variables), where each unobserved variable is represented by an observed dichotomous variable ([Muthén, 1989](#_ENREF_21)). Tetrachoric correlations are calculated using a two stage procedure described in ([Brown and Benedetti, 1977](#_ENREF_6)). Tetrachoric correlations are subject to increasing bias when expected cell frequencies in the bivariate table fall below 5 and so we removed variables which had several (five or more out of 55) correlations with low expected frequencies.

The remaining indicators were then factor analysed using MPLUS. All solutions from one to five factors were produced. As it seemed unlikely that the organisational factors we were exploring would be entirely independent of each other even when they addressed conceptually distinct issues because practices which succeed in one area of organisation are likely to do so in others, two or more factors were allowed to correlate. This was achieved by oblique rotation using the Promax method ([Pett et al., 2003](#_ENREF_24)). Loadings of 0.4 and above were used to identify individual factors.

The fit of the model improved as the number of factors increased. All models except the single factor model had an RMSEA < 0.05 which indicates a good fit to the data. There was a sharp drop in the magnitude between the largest (29.288) and second largest eignenvalue (2.553). There is a second noticeable step change between the third (2.257) and fourth (1.427) largest eigenvalue suggesting that a three-factor solution was best. There was clear separation into three factors: a general organisation factor (G), a clinical recording factor (R) and an education and training factor (E).

In a few cases an indicator loaded highly on more than one factor. These indeterminate indicators were put aside along with indicators that did not load strongly on any factor. A confirmatory factor analysis model was fitted to see whether the proposed model factor structure provided a good fit to the data and as a final diagnostic. This model fitted the data well on certain measures (TLI 0.969, RMSEA 0.029, SRMR 0.029) but some of the residual variances were negative. Typically this involved two highly correlated indicators. Some further work, and exclusion of a small number of indicators, was required in order to ensure that there were no negative residual variances in the final model. The estimates for the final CFA model are shown in Table 1. Factor correlations were as follows: general organisation and clinical recording 0.57, general organisation and education and training factor 0.65 and clinical recording and education and training factor 0.61.

***Statistical modelling***

.

The independent variables were as follows:

* Practice organisational factors derived from the QOF
* Geographic area and deprivation (density, Index of Multiple Deprivation)
* Patients characteristics (percent whose health was good, percent aged ≤ 15 years, percent who were female, percent aged ≥ 65 years, percent from a racial or ethnic minority)
* Practice characteristics (size, list size per FTE GP, single-handed practice, primary medical services contract)
* General practitioner characteristics (percent aged ≥ 45 years, percent female, percent qualified in the UK)
* Condition Prevalence
* Practice nurse staffing (practice list size per FTE practice nurses grouped into quintiles (≤3038.01, 3038.02 – 3901.48, 3901.49 – 4823.44, 4823.45 – 6210.68, ≥ 6210.69) with a sixth category for practices without a nurse.

The organisational factors identified by the factor analysis were treated as latent variables and all other variables as observed independent variables. A regression model was fitted simultaneously to all quality scores for all clinical conditions using MPLUS version 4.2.

We included geographic, patient, practice and practitioner characteristics in the model as several of these variables have been shown to have significant associations with quality of care in previous research. Thus while these variables were not of direct interest we needed to control for them while exploring those associations that we were directly interested. Three other patient variables (per cent whose health was good, per cent aged ≤ 15 years, per cent who were female) were considered but excluded because of collinearity (Griffiths et al, 2010).

Preliminary analysis also provided evidence of collinearity between the general organisation factor, clinical recording factor and education and training factors that we had derived from the organisational domain. When fitted individually, higher scores on each organisational factor were associated with higher QOF composite scores. However when all three organisational factors were fitted simultaneously the sign of the β coefficient of the general factor went from positive to negative for most clinical conditions, indicating that there was collinearity. As statistical models typically assume that collinearity is not high we therefore dropped the general organisation factor from the model, as its specific meaning was less clear that the other two factors.

The effect of practice nurse staffing was tested by dropping this variable from the model and comparing the model fit (difference in fit between models). We determined whether the effect of practice nurse staffing was attenuated by the organisational factors by dropping them from the model and examining the differences between the β estimates for models.

To determine whether the effects of organisational factors were constant or varied with levels of nurse staffing we plotted clinical condition quality scores by practice nurse staffing and organisational factor score quintiles for the clinical recording and education and training factors and added an interaction term to the regression model. The global model (across all clinical conditions) with the interaction term failed to converge. We therefore fitted separate random effect models for each clinical condition using a Monte Carlo approach with between 1000 to 1500 integration points([Muthén and Muthén, 2007](#_ENREF_22)). Most of these models reached convergence. When convergence failed, the number of integration points were increased. The interaction could be tested for all clinical conditions and organisational factors except mental health (clinical recording), stroke (clinical recording) and COPD(education and training).

**Results**

The global effect of practice nurse staffing was statistically significant (χ2= 37.43, 6 d.f., p<.001). Practice nurse staffing was positively and significantly (p<0.01) associated with quality of care scores for COPD, CHD, Diabetes, and Hypothyroidism (Table 2)[[2]](#footnote-2). The association between practice nurse staffing and hypertension was close to significance (p=.053). There were no significant association between quality of clinical care and list size per full-time equivalent GP (p>0.05).

Clinical recording, education and training and making more use of the patient survey were significantly (p<.001) and positively related to clinical care quality as measured by QOF composite scores for all clinical conditions. The effect of clinical recording was strongest for asthma, COPD and mental health and weakest for hypothyroidism, hypertension and CHD. The effect of education and training was strongest for asthma and mental health and weakest for CHD, hypertension and hypothyroidism. Those practices that had undertaken a patient survey each year, reflected on the results, proposed changes and discussed the results as a team with a patient group or non-executive director had significantly better care for all clinical conditions. The relationship between the length of consultation indicator and clinical quality scores was inconsistent and not always positive. For example, not meeting the required consultation length was associated with better scores for mental health (p<.05).

Amongst the other characteristics five or more significant associations were found for population density (5), percent of patients aged 65 and over(5), unadjusted prevalence(7) and percent GPs qualified in the UK(6) [see table 2 for full results].

Comparison of parameter estimates for practice nurse staffing in the model without organisational factors compared to the full models suggests that attenuation of the effect of staffing was minor. Parameter estimates, generally followed the same pattern in both models and were similar in magnitude. Parameter estimates for the effect of staffing which are significant in the full model (staffing and organisational factors) were on average 14.1% lower than the model including only staffing (table 3).

Where models converged, the test of interaction between practice nurse staffing and organisational factors was nearly always statistically significant (p<.001 in all cases except p=.007 for hypothyroidism (education & training), p=.16 for stroke (education and training factor)). A plot of clinical care quality scores by practice nurse staffing and organisational factor score quintiles for diabetes is shown in figure 1 for both the clinical recording and education & training factors. Plots for all other clinical conditions are found in Appendix 1. A common pattern emerged across many of the clinical conditions. Profiles by level of practice nurse staffing were generally similar for those practices that employed a practice nurse. The main difference to emerge was between practices with and without a practice nurse. The effect of not having a practice nurse appears to be mitigated by the organisational factors, so that the deficit is not apparent amongst practices without a practice nurse that score highly on organisational factors. This comes pattern is most clearly observed for diabetes (both factors), hypothyroidism (both factors), COPD (education & training) and stroke (education & training).

**Discussion**

Improved levels of nurse staffing, clinical recording, education and reflection on the results of patient surveys were all associated with improved clinical care across a range of conditions. The trend in increasing quality of clinical care with increased nurse staffing that we found previously ([Griffiths et al., 2010](#_ENREF_14)) was confirmed across several of the clinical conditions (COPD, CHD, Diabetes, Hypothyroidism) after controlling for organisational factors. In almost all cases practices with practice nurses still performed better than those without, even where the relationship was not significant. There was some evidence of attenuation of the estimated nurse staffing effect when organisational factors were considered but this was small and so it appears that the observed association between staffing and quality is not simply a product of a global ‘halo’ of quality in better staffed and better run practices. The greatest differences in quality associated with nurse staffing were between practices that did and did not employ practice nurses. However, the findings suggest that the effect of not employing a practice nurse maybe compensated by the effect of higher levels of clinical recording and education and training.

Overall however, the characteristics that emerged as the strongest predictors of quality of clinical care were not staffing levels but the organisational factors of clinical recording, education and training and patient experience. The strength of these relationships between organisational factors and quality of care was of a higher order of magnitude than observed for nurse staffing.

This was a cross-sectional study therefore we were not in a position to determine causality. Accepting this limitation a causal relationship between clinical quality and education and training and clinical recording is highly plausible. Human resource practices such as appraisal, personal development plans, review of significant events and patient complaints etc. could, either directly or indirectly also lead to improvements in clinical performance as a result of more informed decisions based on higher quality clinical information and improved monitoring of patients. Similarly it is plausible that increased capacity associated with higher levels of nurse staffing has a causal effect on the quality of care. But whilst associations with levels of nurse staffing and clinical performance were evident this was not the case for levels of GP staffing. However the additional clinical workload resulting from introduction of the general medical services contract in 2004 fell more on the shoulders of nurses, allowing doctors to devote greater time to chronic and preventative care ([Gemmell et al., 2008](#_ENREF_11)). Therefore increased nurse staffing may be acting as proxy for the reconfiguration of service delivery and capacity for GPs to deliver this care.

**Comparison with the existing literature**

In common with research in acute care ([Kane et al., 2007](#_ENREF_17)) this research shows an association between higher levels of nurse staffing and quality of care. Unlike most of the research from these settings this study has also shown that the association remains even when controlling for the numbers of doctors and organisational factors, both of which have been shown to be associated with quality ([Jarman et al., 1999](#_ENREF_16), [West et al., 2006](#_ENREF_31)). Systematic reviews ([Gemmell et al., 2008](#_ENREF_11)) have shown that nurses can provide high quality care to patients with long-term conditions which is supported by this study.

However, the measures of quality used here are primarily based on processes of care and intermediate outcomes. When examining hospital admissions the relationship between nurse staffing in primary care and quality is less clear. While higher nurse staffing in general practice is associated with fewer admissions for Asthma and COPD, it is associated with more admissions for diabetes ([Griffiths et al., 2010](#_ENREF_13)). Although the complexity of diabetes care raises doubts about the use of diabetes admissions as an indicator of quality in primary care results such as this should serve as a reminder that causal inference remains problematic.

Organisational factors have been identified as significant predictors of performance in acute care. In hospital settings the extent of team working and training strategies have been linked to positive performance (West et al ,2002). Perceived quality of nurses’ working environment, which included aspects of staff development as well as leadership and teamwork between nurses and doctors, has also been shown to be associated with mortality in acute care.([Aiken et al., 2008](#_ENREF_2)). There is clearly more potential for team working in practices which employ nurses and it may be that the benefits associated with higher nurse staffing levels which we observed, which are mostly derived from employing *any* nurses, result from the increased potential for teamwork. Our study found that there were a small number of practices that did not employ a nurse who performed well when this was accompanied by high levels of clinical recording, suggesting that other organisational factors can compensate for this deficit. However, our dataset contained no direct measure of team working and so we were unable to explicitly explore this factor.

The evidence on staffing and outcome relationships in acute care has been used to advocate for mandatory staffing levels ([Buchan, 2005](#_ENREF_7)). The argument for this is primarily based on concerns about patient safety in acute care settings and there are concerns that any minimum ratio could come to be regarded as a ‘target’ which did not adequately meet the needs of some patient groups ([Spetz et al., 2009](#_ENREF_28)). It has also been suggested that legislating ratios for nurse staffing can be stifling for management and limit innovation ([Buchan, 2005](#_ENREF_7), [Spetz et al., 2009](#_ENREF_28)). A more systematic approach to HR practices that goes beyond simply changing the skill mix through numbers of staff is required ([Dubois and Singh, 2009](#_ENREF_10)).

While it is unlikely that similar proposals on staffing will emerge in primary care, it has been argued that practice nurses can provide care equal to or better than doctors ([Burke, 2009](#_ENREF_8)) resulting in calls for further expansion of the nursing role. Efficiency gains are predicted if doctors withdraw from tasks that nurses can perform, to focus on the tasks only doctors can perform ([Sibbald, 2008](#_ENREF_25)), which potentially leads to an increased demand for nurses. Concerns however remain about the level of training that practice nurses receive which, unlike doctors is not regulated and therefore key competencies are not guaranteed. This study underlines the crucial importance of education and training of practice staff in ensuring quality of care is maintained and enhanced. Getting practices to aspire to a rich mix of skilled staff working as a team is potentially less contentious than identifying a requirement for more of a specific staff group. In a similar vein, Dubois and Singh ([Dubois and Singh, 2009](#_ENREF_10)) have suggested moving the human resource management focus away from skill-mix to skill management. The focus then becomes less about numbers of staff and more about the individual’s abilities to adapt and adjust to the changing circumstances. This leads into discussions about aspects of healthcare staff roles (enhancement, enlargement, delegation, substitution) set in the context of patient need and organisational and institutional factors.

**Strengths and limitations of the study**

This study used data collected on all English GP practices. About 11% of practices had to be excluded on grounds of data quality and lack of available data to calculate nurse staffing estimates. Full time equivalent nurse staffing had to be estimated from headcount (number of employees) because data on full time equivalence is not routinely collected in the UK at the practice level, although this estimate appears robust ([Griffiths et al., 2010](#_ENREF_14)).

The organisational factors that we studied were determined by the available data. Performance on QOF organisational indicators (and clinical domain indicators) was, and still is, used to determine payment to GP practices. How well they represent all the potential organisational factors that might impact on quality of care and whether they remain “fit for purpose” is open to question. Many of those used in 2005/6 are still in use today which suggests a degree of robustness and they were selected for a specific purpose in mind; to improve clinical outcomes. However important factors, such as team work, could not be studied. Our model also lacked measures of staff well being and perceptions of the organisational climate which have also been identified as significant in other settings. These disadvantages should be set against the benefit of a population sample with very low unit (practice) and item (indicator) non response.

Certain assumptions underpin the factor analysis of dichotomous items that we performed. The approach proposed by ([Muthén, 1989](#_ENREF_21)) appears to be robust to potential violations. The analysis was made more robust by removing a small number of indicators that produced low frequency counts when cross-tabulated with other indicators. The final factor structure is unlikely to have been affected greatly by their exclusion.

**Implications for clinical practice and future research**

The economic rationale for using more nurses is that they are cheaper to employ. This study shows that they can also be associated with improved quality of care but they should be deployed in areas where there is consistent evidence of equivalent or superior care to doctors ([Sibbald et al., 2006](#_ENREF_26)) . Salary savings could quite easily be lost by lower productivity ([Goryakin et al.](#_ENREF_12)). Therefore role changes should be carefully targeted towards those areas where benefit has clearly been demonstrated previously or where there is a high level of confidence that benefits will result. This reallocation of activity from doctors to nurses can result in other benefits, for example allowing doctors to focus on more complex care. Therefore increased nurse staffing can result in both direct and indirect effects.

Although we should be wary of assuming that the cross sectional relationships we observed are/is causal, causality is highly plausible. These results highlight how important the organisation and management of care, including human resource management, is in delivering high quality clinical care in general practice. While nurse staffing levels were significant predictors of quality in several conditions the main effect was associated with having any practice nurses, which suggests that the benefit might derive from multi-disciplinary teams. The benefits of education, training and personal development of nurses in general practice were clearly indicated. In this research the measurement of these organisational variables is coarse and there is ample scope for considerable variation in the quantity and quality of training and support provided to be masked. Further work should consider exploring the advantages of specific training for managing specific conditions (e.g. specialist courses in diabetes). General practice should recognise the potential advantages that derive from organisational development and investment in support for existing staff compared to the relatively modest benefits that derive from investing in more staff in isolation.
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