CAPACITY POOLING IN HEALTHCARE SYSTEMS
- RESULTS FROM A MIXED METHODS STUDY

Carina Fagefors*, Björn Lantz, Peter Rosén***, Levi Siljemyr******

*) Region Västra Götaland, E-mail: carina.iversen@vgregion.se, Tel: +46705 68 31 44
**) Chalmers University of Technology, E-mail: bjorn.lantz@chalmers.se, Tel: +46768 60 60 24
***) University of Gothenburg, E-mail: peter.rosen@handels.gu.se, Tel: +46704 99 05 96
****) Region Västra Götaland, E-mail: levi.siljemyr@vgregion.se, Tel: +46722 32 67 74

ABSTRACT

Purpose
In this paper, we examine how pooling – a theoretically based strategy for capacity planning – can be used to create a higher service level at a given total capacity in the healthcare sector. The purpose of the study is to explore the practical obstacles for such a strategy in healthcare systems.

Design/methodology/approach
A mixed methods approach was employed, where interviews were conducted with specialty department managers at Sahlgrenska University Hospital to identify perceived obstacles for capacity pooling. Based on the results, a questionnaire was developed and distributed among managers in the Region Västra Götaland healthcare system. Data were analysed with a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) and an explorative principal component analysis (PCA).

Findings
Six different categories of potential obstacles for capacity pooling were identified during the interviews, namely competence, geography, culture, system, planning, and recruitment. These categories could not be confirmed by the CFA, but in the PCA we instead identified four obstacles for capacity pooling that were similar to the factors in the interview study. These were; threshold heights, community view, recruitment difficulties and physical distance.

Practical implications
We conclude this study with presenting four obstacles to use capacity pools in the healthcare sector. These obstacles should be considered in order to introduce capacity pooling successfully in the healthcare system.

Original/value
While there are some previous research results in the literature regarding capacity pooling in healthcare systems, they are typically anecdotal and descriptive. This is the first attempt to provide a systematic overview that could generate generalizable results.

Keywords: Capacity planning, healthcare management, capacity pooling, mixed methods

1. INTRODUCTION

Capacity planning is one of the major fields of operations management. Ensuring that operations can meet current and future demand effectively is a fundamental task of operations managers (see e.g. Slack et al. 2010). This task represents a significant challenge for the healthcare sector because of resource scarcity that makes it necessary to increase utilization and efficiency of existing resources by improving the system design and overcome inefficiencies in the present processes (Hulshof et al. 2012; Noon et al 2003; Terwiesch, et al 2011). It is then fundamental to understand the impact of variations on the healthcare system (Walley, 2007). The most significant source to variation in healthcare systems is variation in demand and capacity (Walley et al. 2007). According to Walley et al (2007), the most variation is caused by the healthcare system itself and not by unplanned demand. Operations management can help to improve the system, for example by introducing tools that create volume flexibility to reduce or to better manage variations (e.g. Jack and Powers, 2004; Noon et al, 2003; Terwiesch, et al 2011).

One example of such a tool for managing variations is capacity pools (e.g. Cattani and Schmidt, 2005; Dziuba-Ellis, 2006; Mahar et al. 2011, Kuntz et al, 2015; Terwiesch, et al 2011). A capacity pool is a general capacity that can be allocated to parts of the system where the existing workload and demand for capacity is unusually high (Hopp and Lovejoy, 2013; Kuntz et al., 2015; Vanberkel et al., 2012). Therefore, capacity pools are a method to improve capacity utilisation of current resources, which is particularly important for bottlenecks in the system (e.g. doctors and specialist nurses). The use of capacity pools is a well-known and extensively used method to improve capacity utilization and the service level in manufacturing firms and service organisations (see e.g. Cagliano et al., 2014; Kalleberg, 2001; Qjn et al., 2015).

Capacity pools are also a method to effectively achieve the goal of matching current resources and the healthcare demand, resulting in gains in terms of shorter waiting times for patients, increased service level, and patient safety (Alvekrans et al., 2016; Lupien et al., 2007; Mahar et al., 2011; Kc and Terwiesch, 2009; Kuntz, 2015; SOU 2016: 2). In addition, capacity pools can be a tool for creating a better working environment and a more attractive workplace. According to Hultberg (2007), a reasonable workload without large variations and overtime work with the possibility of recovery is one of the most important factors for a good psychosocial work environment. Improved production and capacity planning lead to reduced variations in workload and less overtime work (Brandt and Palmgren, 2015). However, it requires that plans can be realised smoothly, even if short-term deviations occur, such as sick leave and occasions with unexpected high demand. Capacity pools are tools that create volume flexibility to manage such deviations, and thus as well tools for creating a better working environment (Hultberg, 2007; Kuntz et al., 2015; Mahar et al., 2015; Noon et al., 2003).

From a theoretical perspective, there are several types of advantages that can be achieved with capacity pooling in healthcare systems (Ata and Van Mieghem, 2009; Cattani and Schmidt, 2005; Hopp and Lovejoy, 2013; Vanberkel et al., 2012). Firstly, the average waiting times can be reduced, sometimes substantially, when a system is characterised by one single queue to all servers rather than individual queues for different servers. Secondly, when different parts of the system lack different types of basic capacity (for example, one unit needs more physicians, while another needs more specialist nurses), a better utilisation can be achieved on an aggregate level through synergy. Thirdly, centralisation of safety capacity can reduce, sometimes drastically, the need (and therefore the cost) for safety capacity without reducing the service level as some of the variations in actual demand among units will cancel out on an aggregate level.

An overly simple example may be used to illustrate these advantages. Assume that a healthcare division consists of four units that are similar in terms of competence requirements for nurses. Further, assume that the expected daily demand for nurses and its variation has been estimated for each unit as shown in table 1.1. below, and that demand is shown to be approximately normally distributed and independent across units. In order for each unit to reach a 90% service level without a pooling approach, a safety capacity of 1.28 standard deviations is required at each unit. Thus, the total safety capacity required at the division is 19 nurses.

Table 1.1. Example of capacity pooling

	Unit			
	1	2	3	4
Mean	10	15	20	5
Standard deviation	3.1	3.9	5.5	2.4
Safety capacity required for a 90% service level	4	5	7	3

Now, suppose that capacity planning with a pooling approach is used instead. The expected daily demand for nurses for the division as a whole is simply the sum of the expected demand for the units, that is, 50 nurses. However, the standard deviation for the division as a whole is the square root of the sum of the squared standard deviations for the units. This can be calculated to be 7.8 nurses. Hence, to reach a 90% service level for the division as a whole, using capacity pooling, a total safety capacity of 10 nurses is required. In other words, a pooling approach can reduce the required safety capacity by almost 50% without lowering the service level.

However, in practice, the theoretical analysis may for several reasons not be fully applicable in a real-life health care system such as the Swedish. One such a reason, in the example above, is that the units in the pool should have similar competence requirements for their nurses. Theoretically, the pooling effect becomes stronger when the pool consists of more units, everything else being equal. On the other hand, the marginal effect of another unit in the pool diminishes, and it is in general more challenging to build pools with more units from a practical perspective as, for example, the required competence similarity, organisational issues, geographical issues, and other factors. (Ata and Mieghem, 2009; Cattani and Schmidt, 2005; Creemers, 2007). According to Utley and Worthington (2012) there is a trade-off in terms of capacity needs for a given service level between smaller pools dedicated to more homogeneous patient groups and larger pools dedicated to more heterogeneous patient or care mix.

Hence, we need to elaborately explore the practical potential to implement capacity pools in a healthcare system and study how many and which types of units in different contexts should be included in the same pool and at what level in the system the pools should be located. The literature in this area is mainly directed towards the so-called float pools (pools of nurses) and is almost exclusively anecdotal (e.g. Bates, 2013; Lebanik and Britt, 2015; Linzer et al., 2011; Ruby and Sions, 2003). Limited is known about how they are organised and structured. This is particularly true in relation to pooling in multi-hospital systems. Thus, there is a lack of systematic research on support of the implementation of capacity pools in healthcare systems (Cattani and Schmidt, 2005; Dziuba-Ellis, 2006; Mahar et al., 2011; Mazurenko et al, 2015; Smith-Daniels et al., 1988).

Therefore, there is a significant need to systematically analyse the prerequisites for pooling capacity in a healthcare system. Hence, the aim of this paper is to explore the practical obstacles for capacity pooling in healthcare systems among middle- and top-level managers. Empirical

knowledge is developed about perceived opportunities and obstacles for capacity pooling in different types of specialties and at different levels of the healthcare system.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 contains an introduction of the healthcare system in Sweden. In Sections 3 and 4, we present the research methodology and empirical findings. We discuss the results in Section 5. Finally, in Section 6, we present our conclusions with recommendations for future research

2. THE HEALTHCARE SYSTEM IN SWEDEN

In the Swedish healthcare system, both basic capacity (capacity used to handle expected demand) and safety capacity (capacity used to handle the variations in actual demand) is, to a large extent, planned at the actual unit or clinic where the short-term need for capacity actually arises (Alvekrans et al., 2016). The advantage of this approach is that the control of capacity is directly linked to the current situation on a unit or clinic. The significant disadvantage with such an approach is that capacity in different parts of the system is managed independently. Hence, pooling can create a potential for synergy.

The use of temporary agency staff is widespread and increasing. The costs incurred by the Swedish regions for temporary agency staff have increased from SEK 1.9 billion in 2010 to SEK 5.2 billion in 2017. This development has caused a lively discussion in the media and profession about the effects of agency staff on patient safety, work environment, and finances (SvT.se. 2016-12-27; SKL.se. 2017-12-08; dagenssamhälle.se, 2018-02-28).

Since the beginning of 2017, all 21 regions in Sweden operate in accordance with an agreement within the umbrella organization Sveriges Kommuner och Landsting (SKL), with the goal to become independent of agency staff in the healthcare sector by 1 January 2019. SKL is an association for municipalities, county councils, and regions in Sweden. Each region decides on the basis of their prerequisites of what actions are to be taken to succeed and develop their own action plan to achieve the goal. However, a common measure for all regions is to increase permanent staff by creating more attractive workplaces (SKL.se. 2017-12-08).

Increasing costs for temporary agency staff is not a unique Swedish phenomenon. For example, in the United States of America (the US), the cost of temporary agency staff has increased to such an extent that it created financial problems in the sector (see, e.g. Dziuba-Ellis, 2006; Diaz et al., 2010; Roach et al., 2011). Approximately 75 % of US hospitals use staffing agencies as a short-term strategy to resolve staff shortages and to create flexibility in staffing planning (Adams et al, 2015). According to case studies that we found in our literature review, a measure to reduce the cost of temporary agency staff is to replace agency staff with less costly internal staffing agency in order to maintain the flexibility that such capacity pools create in staffing planning (see e.g. Adams et al, 2015; Lebanik & Britt, 2015). The establishment of a region-wide internal staffing agency is also a measure that both Region Västra Götaland and Region Värmland decided to investigate in their action plans to be independent of agency staff. Other Swedish regions are investigating similar arrangements linked to specific parts of their healthcare system, such as primary care and individual hospitals.

3. METHOD

3.1. Setting

Region Västra Götaland consists of four multihospital groups with a total of 16 hospitals, 202 health centres and 28 emergency centres. In addition, there are four private hospitals with contractual agreement with the health care provider in the region. There are capacity pools linked to specific parts of the health care system in the region, such as primary care and single hospitals.

The Sahlgrenska University Hospital is one of the four multihospital groups in the region and also the biggest university hospital in Sweden, with 50 specialty departments. It covers all the specialties in the region and account for approximately 50% of total healthcare costs in the region. The hospital has approximately 16,500 employees and 2,000 beds. It has 50 specialty departments such as Cardiology, Clinical Physiology, Children's medicine, and Psychiatry. A designated manager heads each specialty department. The specialty department managers have the overall responsibility for the departments' capacity planning. Sahlgrenska University Hospital has an internal staffing pool of mainly nurses and assistant nurses.

3.2. Design

A mixed methods approach was deployed. Firstly, a qualitative design is useful to provide an initial and explorative overview of an area. Therefore, a descriptive study using content analysis (Graneheim & Lundman, 2004) was conducted to provide an overview of the perceived potential barriers and future potential of capacity pooling in the regional healthcare system. An inductive methodological approach was used to analyse data from ten interviews based on the content of specialty department managers thoughts and experiences regarding capacity planning in general and capacity pooling in particular (Graneheim & Lundman, 2004). Secondly, a web-based questionnaire was developed and distributed to all department managers in the region of Västra Götaland in order to validate the findings in the descriptive study.

3.3. Data collection

In order to ensure sample representativeness in the descriptive study, the specialty departments at the hospital were first classified dichotomously in three different dimensions: 1) mainly acute/emergency or mainly planned activities, 2) mainly inpatient or mainly outpatient activities, and 3) mainly medical or mainly surgical activities.

The respondents were chosen from the total of 50 specialty department managers at Sahlgrenska University hospital so that all eight possible combinations of dimensions would be covered during the interviews. For example, combination one includes mainly medical specialties with mainly inpatient and emergency activities.

Moreover, department managers at Närhälsan, which consists of 202 primary health centers in the region, was added to cover the local aspect of the health care system too. Data were collected during the first half of 2018. Three authors were present at most of the interviews, although a few were conducted by only one or two. All interviews began with a general question on the current situation regarding capacity. During the interviews, focus lay on the perceived need for pooling different categories of staff, if/how pooling is a part of the current capacity management process, and if/how there were plans to develop the pooling perspective within capacity management. All interviews were recorded, transcribed and used as the basis for the data analysis.

A web-based questionnaire was developed in order to validate the findings in the descriptive study. The questionnaire consisted of 22 items in six different categories of potential barriers for capacity pooling; competence, geography, culture, system, planning, and recruitment. A seven-point Likert scale was used to record answers for each item, where a lower value meant a lower level of agreement with the statement. The questionnaire was tested on the interviewees in the descriptive study before distribution and after minor adjustments it was sent to 237 department managers in Västra Götalandsregionen. The questionnaire has a response rate of 42%.

3.4. Data analysis

The interview data were analysed using qualitative content analysis (Graneheim and Lundman, 2004) to derive the overall obstacles for capacity pooling in a health care system. The analysis was conducted in four steps (see table 3.1.). Firstly, the interview transcriptions were read and re-read in order to generate familiarity with the content. Secondly, meaning units (usually sentences or paragraphs) corresponding to obstacles for capacity pooling in a health care system were selected using an inductive approach. Thirdly, the meaning units were condensed as descriptions of obstacles for capacity pooling in a health care system and labelled with one of 20 codes. Fourthly, six categories of obstacles were identified in which the 20 codes were grouped.

Table 3.1. Example of analysis of content, with grouping into a category.

Meaning unit	*Condensed content*	*Coding*	*Category*
We have peaks here at our department in Mölndal, especially now in January, February and March when people slip and break their wrists (informant 1)	Predictable peaks in demand	Seasonality	Planning
I have divisions with permanent vacancies and a permanent lack of staff. In such a business, we do not really need a pool, but by more staff (informant 2)	To create a capacity pool, excess capacity is needed but is often missing	No excess capacity	

The questionnaire data was initially analysed using a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to see if the factor structure revealed in the content analysis could be confirmed (Hair, Black, Babin & Anderson, 2014). It could not, so a more exploratory approach was used instead to analyse these data. A principal component analysis (PCA) was used to determine the underlying factors (ibid.). SPSS version 25.0 with the AMOS plugin was used for all analyses.

4. RESULTS

4.1. Results from interview study

The results from the descriptive study formed six categories of obstacles for capacity pooling: *competence, geography, culture, system, planning, and recruitment.*

The category obstacles related to competence is expressed by specialty department managers in terms of insufficient competence, time required to acquire competence, knowledge regarding practical differences between units, and standardization. To build efficient pools, the staff involved need to have sufficient competence to be able to work in several different units. A nurse who is a specialist in a certain field may need weeks or even months of training before he or she can work independently in another field, not just because of differences regarding health care related issues but also because the organization of work may differ between units. Standardization of health care work may be one way of facilitating capacity pools.

The category obstacles related to geography is expressed by specialty department managers in terms of lack of trust and physical distance. Informants stress that it may be difficult to have confidence in a capacity pool that is supposed to cover a large geographical area, and that ad hoc solutions may be preferred instead of relying on the pool. The fact that units far apart in terms of physical distance constitute a pool means that traveling will be necessary, which may be costly in terms of time as well as money.

The category obstacles related to culture is expressed by specialty department managers in terms of cultural differences, lack of sense of community, tradition, incompatible IT-solutions, and the willingness to be part of a pool. Different cultures among units and/or hospitals may lead to problems when trying to pool them. A sense of community among actors may be a necessary condition in order to make a pooling approach work smoothly. Ideas resembling a pooling approach have previously been used in some parts of the health care system, but the tradition to solve your own problems have traditionally been strong. Differences in IT-solutions between units means that people may be unwilling to work in other units than their home one in order to avoid practical problems. And the general willingness among the staff to be part of a pool is unclear.

The category obstacles related to the system is expressed by specialty department managers in terms of unpredictable variation in supply and in demand. The availability of certain categories of staff varies a lot locally in some specialties, resulting in overstaffing during some periods and understaffing at other times. A pooling approach could, at least theoretically, be used to even such variations out on a less local level. Pooling of patients instead of staff is also a useful idea to even out variation, that is, when some unit is understaffed given the demand for health care, patient could be transferred to another unit which is not understaffed.

The category obstacles related to planning is expressed by specialty department managers in terms of predictable variation in demand and in the fact that excess capacity is scarce or nonexistent. Predictable seasonality in the demand for care is common in some sectors, for example, orthopedics departments in Sweden typically get many patients in the winter who have slipped and broken their wrists. Since this type of variation is known, it should be part of the capacity planning process. Also, in order to plan a capacity pool, excess capacity is required on an aggregate level. Almost all informants stressed the fact that there is no excess capacity, at least not regarding nurses, and hence that recruitment is necessary.

The category obstacles related to recruitment is expressed by specialty department managers in terms of bad collective agreement, wage competition, working conditions, shortage of nurses, and pay supplements. Some informants thought that differences between hospitals regarding collective agreements created recruitment problems for some. Wage competition from the private sector was also mentioned as a problem when trying to recruit health care staff. Other aspects of work, for example, training, colleagues, and shift work can also make recruitment difficult. Some informants mentioned that they thought the general shortage of nurses in society should be addressed. Pay supplements for staff who accept working in a pool was also suggested as an incentive for more people to do so.

4.2. Results from questionnaire

The results from the interview study was used to develop 22 items that are presented in table 4.1.

Table 4.1. The 22 items used in the questionnaire

Factor	*Item*	*Questionnaire statement*
Competence	Komp1	A longer training is necessary before new staff can work well on my unit
	Komp2	Nurses without specialist training can work well on my unit
	Komp3	Physicians that are not yet specialists can work well on my unit
	Komp4	The practical day-to-day work on my unit reminds to a large extent on the work in other units
	Komp5	The work on my unit is characterized by a high degree of standardization
Geography	Geo1	I would have confidence in a regional capacity pool
	Geo2	I would have greater confidence in a local than a regional capacity pool
	Geo3	Larger geographical distances would obstruct the possibilities to create capacity pools in my type of unit
Culture	Kul1	There are no differences in culture between my unit and other similar units that would obstruct capacity pooling
	Kul2	There is a community view between my unit and other similar units that would facilitate capacity pooling
	Kul3	Traditionally my unit and other similar units have not been cooperating with capacity
	Kul4	Other similar units have different IT solutions than us
	Kul5	I believe that my staff in general would be positive to be part of a capacity pool
System	Sys1	The daily availability of staff is varying to a large extent on my unit
	Sys2	Our patients are often transported to other units when my unit is full
Planning	Plan1	The variation of healthcare demand over time is to a large extent predictable at my unit
	Plan2	In general, we do not have a shortage of staff at my unit
Recruitment	Rekr1	Poor local agreements mean difficulties when recruiting staff to my unit
	Rekr2	Competition regarding salary at other healthcare providers mean difficulties when recruiting staff to my unit

	Rekr3	Other factors besides salary are important aspects when recruiting staff to my unit
	Rekr4	There is a general shortage of nurses, which is a problem when recruiting staff to my unit
	Rekr5	I believe that there are mainly economic incentives that would be effective to recruit staff to a capacity pool

Table 4.2. presents descriptive statistics for the 22 questionnaire items. The distribution of specialties represented by the participating 100 respondents was in line with the distribution of specialties in the Region Västra Götaland. Hence, we proceeded under the assumption that the data were not characterised by nonresponse bias.

Table 4.2. Descriptive statistics

Item	*N*	*Mean*	*S.D.*	*Skewness*	*Kurtosis*
Komp1	99	5.55	1.52	-0.84	-0.11
Komp2	91	5.08	1.99	-0.82	-0.49
Komp3	90	4.52	1.84	-0.39	-0.78
Komp4	91	4.62	2.04	-0.46	-1.06
Komp5	95	4.12	1.63	-0.24	-0.75
Geo1	88	4.01	1.68	-0.18	-0.80
Geo2	95	4.95	1.98	-0.83	-0.46
Geo3	84	5.08	1.96	-0.78	-0.64
Kul1	87	4.09	1.88	-0.05	-1.03
Kul2	84	4.49	1.57	-0.47	-0.05
Kul3	93	4.26	2.01	-0.19	-1.17
Kul4	82	2.82	2.27	0.92	-0.78
Kul5	89	2.06	1.29	1.22	0.82
Sys1	99	3.40	1.75	0.34	-0.87
Sys2	70	1.94	1.51	1.73	2.22
Plan1	95	4.24	1.69	-0.34	-0.83
Plan2	99	3.52	2.18	0.41	-1.25
Rekr1	88	3.45	2.02	0.24	-1.29
Rekr2	97	5.54	1.68	-1.27	0.83
Rekr3	98	5.78	1.20	-0.99	0.84
Rekr4	89	4.64	2.17	-0.50	-1.28
Rekr5	85	5.28	1.74	-0.78	-0.33

Tables 4.3.-4.4. display the Pearson's correlations between item ratings. Many pairs of item ratings exhibited substantial correlations, indicating that there might be a smaller number of common underlying factors. Hence, a CFA indicated by the factor structure indicted by the content analysis was run.

Table 4.3. Correlations part 1

	Komp2	Komp3	Komp4	Komp5	Geo1	Geo2	Geo3	Kul1	Kul2	Kul3	Kul4	Kul5
Komp1	-0.35	-0.17	-0.18	-0.06	-0.21	0.02	0.10	-0.04	0.04	-0.06	0.36	-0.16
Komp2		0.51	0.32	0.18	0.26	-0.03	-0.08	0.12	0.03	-0.05	-0.60	0.00
Komp3			0.42	0.25	0.08	0.04	0.08	0.00	-0.04	0.01	-0.39	-0.17
Komp4				0.61	0.34	0.10	-0.02	0.25	0.23	0.00	-0.43	-0.07
Komp5					0.28	0.09	0.14	0.25	0.45	0.11	-0.25	-0.02
Geo1						0.04	-0.36	0.37	0.39	0.21	-0.27	0.29
Geo2							0.45	0.03	0.01	-0.09	-0.16	0.10
Geo3								0.07	0.06	-0.08	-0.08	-0.19
Kul1									0.52	0.16	-0.33	0.00
Kul2										0.03	-0.16	0.01
Kul3											0.14	0.02
Kul4												-0.03

Table 4.4. Correlations part 2

	Sys1	Sys2	Plan1	Plan2	Rekr1	Rekr2	Rekr3	Rekr4	Rekr5
Komp1	-0.08	0.14	-0.10	0.03	0.03	0.09	0.02	0.07	0.29
Komp2	0.15	-0.21	0.18	0.17	0.00	-0.07	0.24	-0.06	-0.22
Komp3	0.12	-0.10	0.04	0.07	0.07	-0.03	0.21	-0.09	-0.10
Komp4	0.07	-0.12	0.22	0.04	-0.11	-0.08	-0.01	0.08	0.08
Komp5	-0.08	-0.18	0.20	0.04	-0.10	-0.09	0.18	0.05	0.06
Geo1	0.10	-0.07	0.20	0.01	-0.12	-0.08	-0.10	0.20	-0.03
Geo2	-0.04	0.10	-0.05	0.09	0.03	0.02	-0.02	0.16	0.04
Geo3	-0.12	-0.08	-0.01	-0.13	0.02	0.06	0.07	-0.01	0.02
Kul1	-0.06	-0.15	0.15	0.06	-0.12	0.00	-0.12	0.06	0.09
Kul2	-0.26	-0.22	0.18	0.07	-0.12	0.03	-0.04	0.01	0.12
Kul3	0.08	-0.03	-0.17	-0.02	-0.07	-0.01	0.06	-0.03	0.11
Kul4	0.02	0.13	-0.11	-0.10	0.12	0.16	-0.12	0.10	0.20
Kul5	0.16	0.17	0.10	-0.17	0.16	0.00	-0.09	0.22	-0.12
Sys1		-0.03	0.08	-0.13	0.17	-0.25	0.13	0.18	-0.03
Sys2			-0.20	-0.25	0.36	0.20	-0.06	0.12	0.00
Plan1				-0.13	-0.09	-0.12	0.03	0.01	0.03
Plan2					-0.28	-0.15	-0.01	-0.35	-0.18
Rekr1						0.53	0.17	0.38	0.28
Rekr2							0.09	0.27	0.29
Rekr3								0.05	-0.01
Rekr4									0.17

The CFA showed that the data fitted the hypothesized factor structure poorly. A closer investigation of the data indicated that the bad reliability of the hypothetical constructs SYS and PLAN, which include only two items each, are the main reason of this result. Hence, these four items were dropped and an explorative principal component analysis (PCA) was conducted

on the remaining 18 items, using Varimax rotation and Kaiser Normalization, to detect the common underlying factors. Barlett's test of sphericity was significant ($p < 0.001$) and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was 0.561, indicating that the data were acceptable for a PCA. A solution where six factors had eigenvalues over Kaiser's criterion of 1 was found, which in combination explained 69.5% of the variance. Table 4.5. shows the results in terms of factor loadings after rotation.

Table 4.5. The 18 items from the questionnaire and their rotated factor loadings.

	Factors					
Items	1	2	3	4	5	6
Komp4	0.81					
Komp3	0.74					
Komp2	0.63					
Komp5	0.52					
Kul1		0.86				
Kul2		0.85				
Geo1		0.52				
Rekr1			0.86			
Rekr2			0.79			
Rekr4			0.59			
Rekr3			0.47			
Geo3				0.86		
Geo2				0.85		
Kul3					0.73	
Rekr5					0.65	
Kul4					0.49	
Komp1					0.42	
Kul5						0.86
Cronbach's α	0.70	0.71	0.60	0.62	0.46	n/a

The items that cluster on the same factor in table 4.5 suggest that factor 1 represents *threshold height*, factor 2 *community view*, factor 3 *recruitment difficulties*, and factor 4 *physical distance*. Note that these factor names are arbitrarily chosen by the authors, based partly on what the items in each factor signify, but also to show divergence from the factors that emerged from the previous qualitative analysis. These four factors exhibit tolerable values on Cronbach's α, indicating an acceptable reliability (Hair et al., 2014). Factors 5 and 6 comprise the remaining five items that did not cluster on any of the first four factors. Thus, they do not necessarily represent meaningful underlying factors. As can be seen, the fifth factor had an intolerable value on Cronbach's α and the sixth factor consisted of only one item, hence, these items were dropped. Hence, in summary, the results from the quantitative analysis did certainly not coincide perfectly with the results from the qualitative content analysis, but several major factors – conceptual obstacles for capacity pooling in health care systems – were common.

5. DISCUSSION

The four obstacles that could be identified in the PCA are similar to four obstacles that were identified in the interview study; “threshold heights” is similar to “competence”, “community view” is similar to “culture”, “recruitment difficulties” is similar to “recruitment”, and “physical distance” is similar to “geography”. The factors and items that were excluded after the analysis might still be relevant in different parts of the healthcare system, although correlation with other items could not be proved. The literature that addresses the possibilities and obstacles for staff pools in healthcare system concerns solely pool of nurses or float pools and is mainly focused on three of our categories, namely threshold height, community view and recruitment difficulties.

5.1. Obstacles related to threshold heights

A crucial obstacle to capacity pooling is the category of threshold heights in terms of inadequate professional competence and knowledge regarding practical differences between units. This obstacle was similar to the obstacle that was identified as “competence” in the interview study, with the difference that the item “A longer training is necessary before new staff can work well on my unit” was excluded. This could be an effect of that the questionnaire was sent to department managers in both primary care centers and specialty units, whereas the interview study mainly focused on specialty department managers at a university hospital.

The literature in this area is mainly directed towards practical issues. Concerning the professional competence, pool staffs can either be acting as temporary assistance to unit-based staff or as replacement staff with full patient assessments (Dziuba-Ellis, 2006). In the first case, no specialist competence is required, which facilitates pooling because more clinical units can be considered together. In the second case, specialist competence is required to ensure patient safety and a good working environment, which obviously limits the potential of pooling. Adams et al (2015) has addressed the problem of temporary agency nurses lack of familiarity of organizational policies and procedures. The authors also note that the lack of standardization of, for example, nursing practice, unit routines, documentation and patient equipment makes it more difficult for pool staff (i.e., nurses) to rotate between different clinical units in a healthcare system. Bates (2013) and Rudy & Sions (2003) describe situations where staff spend a lot of time searching for supplies, asking for codes to locked rooms, and requesting assistance with unit-specific procedures. To avoid such obstacles, it is important to train pool staff to work on multiple units in the healthcare system (so-called orientation programs) and to standardize practice, routines, equipment et cetera within the clinical units in the healthcare system (see e.g. Adams et al, 2015 and Roach et al 2011). According to Agosto et al. (2017), it is crucial to shift from a unit-based to system-based model of education and practice. In that process, the float pool unit may be an important participant when standardize practice and routines due to their experience from multiple units (Straw, 2018). In addition, developing unit-specific pocket guides or tip sheets and adequate pool staff support on the receiving unit are useful tools to reduce these practical obstacles (Bates, 2013; Roach et al, 2011). However, implementing appropriate orientation programs and pool staff support may in many cases be difficult due to resource shortages (Roach et al, 2011).

5.2. Obstacles related to community view

In the category obstacles related to culture, the informants claimed that there is a low willingness to be part of a capacity pool. Moreover, they claimed that different IT solutions is an obstacle to use capacity pools. However, it could not be confirmed in the factor analysis that this correlates with the other items related to culture, which was no surprise, and a new obstacle

was identified as “community view”. A new item was added to the obstacle, namely “I would have confidence in a regional capacity pool”, which is logical considering that capacity pools that are further away in the organizational structure more likely will be more different regarding culture.

The interviewees claimed that there is a lack of sense of community between the own unit and a capacity pool. Several studies indicate a higher job satisfaction and organizational loyalty among permanent nurses compared to temporary agency staff. Temporary agency staff typically experience a higher level of frustration, anxiety, occupational stress and burnout due to, for example, inadequate orientation, lack of trust from unit-based staff and insufficient support from clinical unit management. In clinical unit that use temporary agency staff to a greater extent, there are also more permanent employees who are considering leaving the unit (see e.g. Bates, 2013: Mazurenko et al, 2015; Rudy & Sions, 2003). According to Diaz et al (2010), many staffing pool solutions have even worsened the staff shortages. According to Bates (2013), one can avoid this by staffing the pool with independent and flexible individuals that enjoy the independence and the variety of challenge and experiences that rotating between multiple clinical units entails. As mentioned above, another important way of making rotation a positive experience is appropriate unit orientation and dedicated pool staff support on the receiving units (see e.g. Roach et al, 2011; Rudy & Sions, 2003).

5.3. Obstacles related to recruitment difficulties

One item from the interview study was excluded from the obstacle related to recruitment after the analysis, namely “I believe that there are mainly economic incentives that would be effective to recruit staff to a capacity pool”. This statement differs from the other items regarding recruitment, since it focuses on staffing the capacity pool, and not staffing the own unit. This might be an explanation to why it could not be confirmed to be correlating with recruitment difficulties.

According to the specialty department managers, the lack of nurses is one of the main obstacles related to recruitment. This is no new phenomenon, in the early 2000s the use of internal staffing pools was declining in American hospitals due to difficulties in recruiting qualified staff to the pools or by the fact that pool staff leaving for permanent work in clinical units (Cavouras, 2002). The inability to staff the pool leads to inadequate service levels, that is, inability to fill sick leaves, temporary leaves and vacancies et cetera. Therefore, recruitment and retention of qualified staff are main challenges for staff pool managers in order for the pool to be a reliable facility in the healthcare system. Pay supplements, scheduling flexibility, independence, skill development and networking are widely used incentives for attracting staff to work in staffing pools (Bates, 2013; Cavouras, 2002; Dziuba-Ellis, 2006; Larson et al., 2012; Lebanik and Britt, (2015).

5.4. Obstacles related to physical distance

Specialty department managers expressed a lack of trust in a capacity pool that is supposed to cover a large geographical area. Trust is generally an important factor when integrating staffing pools in healthcare systems. According to Mazurenko et al (2015), trust must be built from top to bottom through, for example, effective communication between the staffing pools and the units where the pool staff will be working, and by complete orientation program to the units on which the pool staff are assigned to work.

5.5. Obstacles that could not be confirmed

The items related to the obstacles "system" and "planning" are to a large extent varying depending on the characteristics of the specific unit. Since the questionnaire was sent to department managers in both primary care centers and specialty departments, it is not surprising that these factors could not be confirmed in the CFA. However, they could still be relevant for defined parts of the system, for example specialty department managers at larger hospitals.

The category obstacles related to the system is expressed by specialty department managers in terms of high locally variations of the availability of certain categories of staff, resulting in overstaffing during some periods and understaffing at other times. According to Dziuba-Ellis (2006), internal staff pools on an appropriate level in the healthcare system can be a useful approach to balancing understaffed and overstaffed clinical units. Today, a widely used approach when clinical units are understaffed is instead to hire costly staff from external staffing pools (Larson et al., 2012).

The category obstacles related to planning is emphasized by specialty department managers through the fact that excess capacity is more or less non-existent while excess capacity at the same time theoretically is required at an aggregate level in order to plan a capacity pool. In the literature, on the contrary, internal staffing pools are emphasized as an approach to balance the effect of insufficient staffing levels (i.e., lack of basic capacity) and budget constraints (Dziuba-Ellis, 2006; Linzer et al, 2011; Roach et al, 2011). According to Roach et al (2011) staffing pools is a short-term measure to ensure adequate staffing on the clinical units on an "as-needed basis" to fill sick leaves, temporary leaves and vacancies et cetera. Staffing pools can also be a tool for reduce overtime and the cost of external agency staff, to maintain minimum nurse-to-patient staffing requirements, to improve work environment and to create flexibility in staffing planning (Hultberg, 2007; Kuntz et al., 2015; Larson et al., 2012; Lebanik and Britt, 2015; Mahar et al., 2015; Noon et al., 2003).

6. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE RESEARCH

This study has identified four different categories of potential obstacles for capacity pooling in a health care system; obstacles related to threshold heights, obstacles related to community view, obstacles related to recruitment difficulties and obstacles related to physical distance. In order to introduce capacity pooling successfully in a healthcare system, these obstacles need to be addressed by both managers of the units that utilize the capacity pool as well as managers of that specific pool. For example, proper introduction programs and suitable tasks for the capacity pool employees can be identified to overcome some of these obstacles. However, there is a need for future research to fully understand these obstacles, and further studies are required to determine where these capacity pools should be located in the organization for the most efficient use of resources. During the interviews, it seemed like some obstacles were more significant in some parts of the system than elsewhere. There might also be a difference related to if the department provides mainly acute or non-acute healthcare, or if the unit is staffed at all hours. Hence, in order to provide more general guidelines on capacity pooling, future research should explore more generally how the characteristics of different specialty departments or other organizational units are related to different obstacles. A possible way to accomplish this could be to use multiple regression with the perceived weights of the different obstacles as dependent variables, and unit characteristics as explanatory variables. That way, measures of the different obstacles' significance in different system contexts could be obtained. Moreover, this study has focused on specialty department managers' view on the subject, and future research should

further address perceived obstacles for capacity pooling according to first level managers, who actually plan the capacity of a unit.

REFERENCES

Adams J., R. Kaplow, J. Dominy, and B. Stroud. 2015. "Beyond a Band-Aid Approach: An Internal Agency Solution to Nurse Staffing." *Nursing Economics* 33 (1): 51-58.

Agosto P., J. A. Cieplinski, K. Monforto, M. D. Griffin, K. E. Roberts, E. Tracy and K. A. Hickerson. 2017. "The Central Staffing Office Intensive Care Nurse Residency Program: A Pilot Program." *Nursing Economics* 35 (3): 147-150.

Alvekrans A-L., B. Lantz, P. Rosén, L. Siljemyr, and J. Snygg. 2016. "From knowledge to decision – a case study of sales and operations planning in health care." *Production Planning & Control* 27 (12): 1019-1026.

Ata B. and J. A. Van Mieghem. 2009. "The Value of Partial Resource Pooling: Should a Service Network Be Integrated or Product-Focused?" *Management Science* 55 (1): 115-131.

Bates K. J. 2013. "Floating as a Reality: Helping Nursing Staff Keep Their Heads Above Water." *MEDSURG Nursing* 22 (3): 197-199.

Brandt J., and Palmgren, M. 2015. *Produktionsstyrning i sjukvård*. Lean i Lund, Lund.

Cagliano R., F. Caniato, A. Longoni, and G. Spina. 2014. "Alternative uses of temporary work and new forms of work organisation." *Production Planning & Control* 25 (9): 762-782.

Cattani K., G. M. Schmidt. 2005. "The Pooling Principle." *INFORMS Transactions on Education* 5 (2): 17-24.

dagenssamhälle.se, 2018-02-28. Hyrnotan i vården passerar 5 miljarder (in Swedish). https://www.dagenssamhalle.se/nyhet/hyrnotan-i-varden-passerar-5-miljarder-20958

Diaz D. M., M. Erkoc, S. S. Asfour, and E. K. Baker. 2010. "New ways of thinking about nurse scheduling." *Journal of Advances in Management Research* 7 (1): 76-93.

Dziuba-Ellis J. 2006. "Float Pools and Resource Teams – A Review of the literature." *Journal of Nurse Care Quality* 21 (4): 352-359.

Graneheim U. H., and B. Lundman. 2004. "Qualitative content analysis in nursing research: concepts, procedures and measures to achieve trustworthiness. *Nurse Education Today* 24 (2): 105-112.

Hair, J. F., Jr., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. 2014. *Multivariate Data Analysis*. Harlow: Pearson Education.Hopp W. J. and W. S. Lovejoy. 2013. *Hospital Operations: Principles of High Efficiency Health Care*. Pearson Educations Inc, New Jersey.

Hulshof, P. J. H., N. Kortbeek, R. J. Boucherie, E. W. Hans, and P. J. M. Bakker. 2012. "Taxonomic Classification of Planning Decisions in Health Care: A Structured Review of the State of the Art in OR/MS." *Health Systems* 1(2): 129-175.

Hultberg A. 2007. "Ett hälsosammare arbetsliv - Vägledning för goda psykosociala arbetsförhållanden." *Socialmedicinsk tidskrift* No. 2: 114-122.

Jack E. P. and T. L. Powers. 2004. "Volume Flexible Strategies in Health Services: A Research Framework." *Production and Operations Management* 13 (3): 230-244.

Kc, D.S. and C. Terwiesch. 2009. "Impact of Workload on Service Time and Patient Safety: An Econometric Analysis of Hospital Operations." *Management Science* 55 (9): 1486-1498.

Kuntz L., R. Mennicken, S. and Scholtes. 2015. “Stress on the Ward: Evidence of Safety Tipping Points in Hospital.” *Management Science* 61 (4): 754-771.

Larson N., S. Sendelbach, B. Missal, J. Fliss, and P. Gaillard. 2012. “Staffing Patterns of Scheduled Unit Staff Nurses vs Float Pool Nurses: A Pilot Study.” *MEDSURG Nursing* 21 (1): 27-39.

Lebanik, L., and S. Britt. 2015. “Float pool nurses come to the rescue.” *Nursing2015* 45 (3): 50-53.

Linzer P., A. M. Tilley, and M. V. Williamson. 2011. “What Floats a Float Nurse´s Boat?” *Creative Nursing* 17 (3): 130-138.

Lupien S. J., F. Maheu, M. Tu, A. Fiocco, and T. E. Schramek. 2007. “The effects of stress and stress hormones on human cognition: Implications for the field of brain and cognition.” *Brain and Cognition* 65 (3): 209-237.

Mahar S., K. M. Bretthauer, and P. A. Salzarulo. 2011. “Locating specialized service capacity in a multi-hospital network.” *European Journal of Operational Research* 212 (3): 596-605.

Mazurenko O., D. Liu, and C. Perma. 2015. “Patient care outcomes and temporary nurses.” *Nursing Management* 46 (8): 32-38.

Noon, C. E., C. T. Hankins, and M. J. Côté. 2003. “Understanding the Impact of Variation in the Delivery of Healthcare Services.” *Journal of Healthcare Management* 48 (2): 82-98.

Roach J. A., L, M. Tremblay, and J. Carter. 2011. “Hope Floats – An Orthopaedic Tip Sheet for Float Pool Nurses.” *Orthopaedic Nursing* 30 (3): 208-212.

Ruby S., and J. Sions. 2003. “Floating: Managing a Recruitment and Retention Issue.” *Journal of nursing administration* 33 (4): 196-198.

SKL.se. 2017-12-08. Gemensamma tag för att uppnå oberoende av inhyrd personal. https://skl.se/arbetsgivarekollektivavtal/personalochkompetensforsorjning/halsoochsjukvard/inhyrdpersonal.11422.html

Slack, N, S. Chambers, and R. Johnston. 2010. *Operations Management*. Pearson Education Ltd, Harlow.

Smith-Daniels, V. L., S. B. Schweikhart, and D. E. Smith-Daniels. 1988. “Capacity Management in Health Care Services: Review and Future Research Directions.” *Decisions Science* 19 (4): 889-919.

Straw C. N. 2018. “Engagement and retention in float pools: Keeping the team above water.” *Nursing Management* 49 (10): 30-36.Terwiesch C., D. Diwa, and J. M. Kahn. 2011. “Working with capacity limitations: operations management in critical care.” *Critical Care* 15: 308.

Utley M., and D. Worthington. 2012. “Capacity Planning.” In Handbook of Healthcare System Scheduling, edited by R. Hall, 11–30. New York: Springer.

Vanberkel P. T., R. J. Boucherie, E. W. Hans, J. L. Hurink, and N. Litvak. 2012. “Efficiency evaluation for pooling resources in health care.” *OR Spectrum* 34 (2): 371-390.

Walley, P. 2007. “Managing variation through system redesign.” *International Journal of Healthcare Technology and Management* 8 (6): 589-602.

Walley, P., K. Silvester, and R. Steyn. 2007. “Knowledge and Behaviour for a Sustainable Improvement Culture” *HealthcarePapers* 7 (1): 26-33.