Assessing the Impact of Recent Regulatory Changes on the Scope of Practice and Responsibilities of Pharmacy Technicians

[1]Abdulrahman A. Bin Mousa, [2]Abdulaziz H. Alkhathami, [3]Ibrahim M. Hagawi, [4]Mohammed N. Alshammari, [5]Yousef A. Alzeer

Health Affairs of National Guard Hospital

Abstract

This study explores the impact of recent regulatory changes on the scope of practice, autonomy, job satisfaction, and professional development of pharmacy technicians in inpatient and outpatient hospital settings. A cross-sectional quantitative survey was conducted with 50 pharmacy technicians, including 30 from inpatient and 20 from outpatient settings. The findings indicate that the majority of technicians experienced an expansion in their responsibilities, with 70% reporting increased job responsibilities and 60% reporting enhanced autonomy. Inpatient technicians generally reported more positive outcomes, including higher job satisfaction and professional development opportunities, compared to their outpatient counterparts. However, challenges such as increased workload and stress were more prominent in outpatient settings. The study underscores the need for tailored support and training to optimize the benefits of regulatory changes for pharmacy technicians across different hospital settings.

Keywords: Pharmacy technicians, regulatory changes, scope of practice, autonomy, job satisfaction, professional development, inpatient settings, outpatient settings.

Introduction

Pharmacy technicians play a crucial role in the healthcare system, supporting pharmacists in various tasks, including medication dispensing, inventory management, and patient counseling. Over the past few decades, the role of pharmacy technicians has evolved significantly due to advancements in healthcare practices, increasing demands for medication safety, and the expansion of pharmacy services (Desselle and Holmes, 2015). Regulatory bodies have periodically revised the scope of practice for pharmacy technicians, aiming to enhance their contribution to patient care while ensuring safety and efficiency in pharmacy operations.

In recent years, several regulatory changes have been introduced to redefine the responsibilities and practice environment for pharmacy technicians. These changes are driven by the need to optimize the pharmacy workforce and address the growing complexities of medication management (Albanese et al., 2010). For instance, some states and regions have implemented new certification requirements, expanded the permissible duties for technicians, or modified supervisory requirements to reflect the evolving landscape of pharmacy practice (Albanese et al., 2010). While these changes aim to improve healthcare outcomes, their impact on the day-to-day practice and professional development of pharmacy technicians remains underexplored.

Understanding how these regulatory changes influence the scope of practice and responsibilities of pharmacy technicians is vital for ensuring that these professionals are adequately prepared and supported in their roles.

This study seeks to investigate the effects of recent regulatory changes on pharmacy technicians' practice, focusing on how these changes have altered their responsibilities, job satisfaction, and professional growth opportunities. By examining these factors, the study aims to provide insights that can inform future regulatory decisions and contribute to the optimization of pharmacy technician practice in the healthcare system.

Literature Review

Historical Overview of Pharmacy Technician Regulations

The role of pharmacy technicians has undergone substantial changes over the past several decades, with regulations continuously evolving to meet the demands of modern healthcare. Initially, pharmacy technicians were primarily involved in clerical tasks and the preparation of medications under the direct supervision of pharmacists (Desselle and Holmes, 2015). However, as the healthcare environment became more complex, there was a growing need to expand the responsibilities of pharmacy technicians, leading to the development of formal training programs and certification requirements (Albanese et al., 2010). These early regulations aimed to standardize the education and practice of pharmacy technicians, ensuring a consistent level of competence across the profession.

Recent Regulatory Changes

In the past decade, regulatory bodies have introduced significant changes to the practice environment of pharmacy technicians, driven by the increasing complexity of medication management and the need for more efficient pharmacy operations. For example, some states in the U.S. have implemented mandatory certification and continuing education requirements for pharmacy technicians, reflecting a shift towards recognizing these professionals as integral members of the healthcare team (Albanese et al., 2010). Additionally, changes in legislation have expanded the scope of practice for pharmacy technicians, allowing them to perform more complex tasks, such as medication therapy management and immunization administration under certain conditions (Albanese et al., 2010).

These regulatory changes are not limited to the United States; similar trends have been observed globally. In Canada, for instance, the National Association of Pharmacy Regulatory Authorities (NAPRA) has developed model standards for pharmacy technician practice, which include competencies related to patient care, medication distribution, and health promotion (NAPRA, 2014). Similarly, the United Kingdom has seen a push towards formalizing the role of pharmacy technicians in patient care, with an emphasis on enhancing their clinical skills and autonomy (Myers, 2011).

Impact on Scope of Practice

The expansion of the scope of practice for pharmacy technicians has been a key outcome of recent regulatory changes. This expansion has allowed pharmacy technicians to take on more responsibilities, which were traditionally reserved for pharmacists, thus enabling pharmacists to focus on more clinical aspects of patient care (Desselle and Holmes, 2015). Research indicates that this shift has led to improved workflow efficiency in pharmacy settings, with technicians playing a more active role in medication management and patient counseling (Albanese et al., 2010).

However, the impact of these changes on pharmacy technicians' job satisfaction and professional development is mixed. Some studies suggest that while the expanded scope of practice has provided opportunities for career growth, it has also increased the complexity of the job, leading to higher levels of stress and job dissatisfaction among some technicians (Myers, 2011). Furthermore, the lack of uniformity in regulatory standards across

different regions and practice settings has created disparities in the roles and responsibilities of pharmacy technicians, potentially leading to confusion and variability in practice (Albanese et al., 2010).

Gaps in the Literature

Despite the growing body of research on the role of pharmacy technicians, several gaps remain. First, there is a lack of comprehensive studies that examine the long-term effects of recent regulatory changes on pharmacy technicians' practice, particularly in terms of job satisfaction, professional development, and patient outcomes. Additionally, most of the existing research is focused on specific regions or practice settings, making it difficult to generalize the findings to other contexts. There is also a need for more studies that explore the perspectives of pharmacy technicians themselves, as most research to date has primarily focused on the views of pharmacists and other healthcare professionals (Myers, 2011).

The literature suggests that regulatory changes have significantly impacted the scope of practice and responsibilities of pharmacy technicians, providing both opportunities and challenges. While these changes have enhanced the role of pharmacy technicians in the healthcare system, there is a need for further research to fully understand their implications, particularly concerning job satisfaction, professional development, and patient care. Addressing these gaps in the literature will be crucial for informing future regulatory decisions and optimizing the practice of pharmacy technicians in various healthcare settings.

Methodology

Study Design

This study employed a cross-sectional quantitative research design to evaluate the impact of recent regulatory changes on the scope of practice and responsibilities of pharmacy technicians working in both inpatient and outpatient hospital settings. The study aimed to quantitatively assess how these regulatory changes have influenced job responsibilities, autonomy, job satisfaction, and professional development opportunities among pharmacy technicians in these specific environments.

Population and Sample

The study population consisted of licensed pharmacy technicians employed in inpatient and outpatient settings within a hospital system. Due to the focus on both inpatient and outpatient settings, a purposive sampling method was used to ensure a balanced representation of technicians from both environments. The final sample included 50 pharmacy technicians, with 30 participants from inpatient settings and 20 from outpatient settings. This sample size was selected to ensure the study could provide meaningful insights while being manageable within the study's scope and resources.

Data Collection Methods

Data were collected through a structured survey questionnaire, which was distributed electronically to the selected pharmacy technicians. The questionnaire was developed specifically for this study, incorporating input from experts in pharmacy practice and regulatory affairs to ensure it accurately captured the impact of recent regulatory changes on the participants' professional roles. The survey included sections on demographic information, current job responsibilities, perceived changes in the scope of practice, levels of autonomy, job satisfaction, and professional development opportunities.

The survey utilized Likert scale questions (e.g., 1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree) to measure participants' perceptions and multiple-choice questions to capture specific details about changes in tasks and

responsibilities. Additionally, the survey allowed for the comparison of responses between technicians working in inpatient versus outpatient settings.

Data Analysis

The quantitative data collected from the survey were analyzed using statistical software (SPSS, Version 27). Given the smaller sample size, descriptive statistics (e.g., means, standard deviations, frequencies, and percentages) were primarily used to summarize the demographic characteristics of the participants and their responses to the survey questions.

Comparative analyses were conducted to explore differences between pharmacy technicians in inpatient and outpatient settings. Independent t-tests were used to compare mean responses between the two groups regarding perceived changes in job responsibilities, autonomy, and job satisfaction. Given the sample size, caution was taken in interpreting the results, with an emphasis on identifying trends rather than making broad generalizations.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical approval for the study was obtained from the ethics committee. Informed consent was obtained from all participants before the survey was administered. Participants were assured of the confidentiality of their responses, and all data were anonymized to protect their identities. Participation in the study was voluntary, and participants were informed of their right to withdraw from the study at any time without any consequences.

Limitations

While this study provides valuable insights into the impact of regulatory changes on pharmacy technicians in inpatient and outpatient hospital settings, several limitations should be acknowledged. The relatively small sample size (n = 50) may limit the generalizability of the findings, particularly when comparing results across different settings. The reliance on self-reported data could introduce response bias, as participants may have provided socially desirable answers. Additionally, the cross-sectional design captures the impact of regulatory changes at a single point in time, potentially overlooking long-term effects that may develop over time.

Findings

Demographic Characteristics of Participants

The study sample consisted of 50 pharmacy technicians, with 30 working in inpatient settings and 20 in outpatient settings. The majority of participants were female (60%), with an average age of 34.8 years (SD = 8.7). The mean years of experience as a pharmacy technician was 7.5 years (SD = 4.9), with a similar distribution of experience across both inpatient and outpatient settings.

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Participants

Characteristic	Inpatient (n = 30)	Outpatient (n = 20)	Total (n = 50)
Gender			
- Male	12 (40%)	8 (40%)	20 (40%)
- Female	18 (60%)	12 (60%)	30 (60%)
Age (years)			
- Mean (SD)	35.5 (8.9)	33.7 (8.4)	34.8 (8.7)

Years of Experience			
- Mean (SD)	8.0 (5.1)	6.8 (4.5)	7.5 (4.9)

Impact of Regulatory Changes on Scope of Practice

The survey results indicated that the majority of pharmacy technicians experienced an expansion in their scope of practice due to recent regulatory changes. Specifically, 73% of inpatient technicians and 65% of outpatient technicians reported an increase in their responsibilities, including tasks such as medication reconciliation and patient counseling.

Table 2. Changes in Job Responsibilities Due to Regulatory Changes

Change in Job Responsibilities	Inpatient (n = 30)	Outpatient (n = 20)	Total (n = 50)
Expanded Responsibilities	22 (73%)	13 (65%)	35 (70%)
No Change in Responsibilities	6 (20%)	5 (25%)	11 (22%)
Reduced Responsibilities	2 (7%)	2 (10%)	4 (8%)

Impact on Autonomy

The regulatory changes also affected the level of autonomy experienced by pharmacy technicians. In inpatient settings, 67% of technicians reported increased autonomy in their roles, compared to 50% in outpatient settings. Although the difference between the two settings was notable, the smaller sample size limits the statistical significance of this finding.

Table 3. Changes in Autonomy Due to Regulatory Changes

Change in Autonomy	Inpatient (n = 30)	Outpatient (n = 20)	Total (n = 50)
Increased Autonomy	20 (67%)	10 (50%)	30 (60%)
No Change in Autonomy	8 (27%)	8 (40%)	16 (32%)
Decreased Autonomy	2 (6%)	2 (10%)	4 (8%)

Job Satisfaction and Professional Development

Regarding job satisfaction, 60% of inpatient technicians reported an increase in job satisfaction following the regulatory changes, compared to 45% of outpatient technicians. Additionally, 63% of inpatient technicians perceived an increase in professional development opportunities, while only 40% of outpatient technicians reported the same.

Table 4. Job Satisfaction and Professional Development Opportunities

Aspect	Inpatient (n = 30)	Outpatient (n = 20)	Total (n = 50)
Increased Job Satisfaction	18 (60%)	9 (45%)	27 (54%)
No Change in Job Satisfaction	8 (27%)	7 (35%)	15 (30%)

Decreased Job Satisfaction	4 (13%)	4 (20%)	8 (16%)
Increased Professional Development Opportunities	19 (63%)	8 (40%)	27 (54%)
No Change in Professional Development Opportunities	9 (30%)	8 (40%)	17 (34%)
Decreased Professional Development Opportunities	2 (7%)	4 (20%)	6 (12%)

Comparative Analysis Between Inpatient and Outpatient Settings

The comparative analysis highlighted some differences between the inpatient and outpatient settings. Inpatient technicians reported higher levels of increased autonomy and job satisfaction compared to their outpatient counterparts. However, the overall trends were similar, with both groups experiencing an expansion in responsibilities and a generally positive impact on their professional development opportunities.

Table 5. Comparative Analysis Between Inpatient and Outpatient Settings

Variable	Inpatient (Mean ± SD)	Outpatient (Mean ± SD)	p-value
Change in Autonomy	4.1 ±0.7	3.8 ±0.8	> 0.05
Job Satisfaction	3.9 ±1.0	3.5 ±1.1	> 0.05
Professional Development Opportunities	4.0 ±0.8	3.6 ±1.0	> 0.05

Discussion

Overview of Findings

This study examined the impact of recent regulatory changes on the scope of practice, autonomy, job satisfaction, and professional development of pharmacy technicians in inpatient and outpatient hospital settings. The findings reveal that these regulatory changes have significantly influenced pharmacy technicians' roles, with notable variations between inpatient and outpatient settings.

Impact on Scope of Practice

The expansion in job responsibilities reported by a majority of pharmacy technicians aligns with the objectives of recent regulatory changes aimed at enhancing the role of pharmacy technicians in medication management. Both inpatient (73%) and outpatient (65%) technicians reported increased responsibilities, reflecting a shift towards more complex and autonomous roles. This finding is consistent with the literature, which suggests that regulatory changes often aim to leverage the capabilities of pharmacy technicians to improve workflow efficiency and medication management (Desselle and Holmes, 2015; Albanese et al., 2010).

Autonomy and Job Satisfaction

The increased autonomy experienced by a higher percentage of inpatient technicians (67%) compared to their outpatient counterparts (50%) suggests that the regulatory changes may have been more effectively implemented or supported in inpatient settings. This enhanced autonomy aligns with the reported increase in job satisfaction among 60% of inpatient technicians. The positive correlation between increased autonomy and job satisfaction is supported by previous studies, which indicate that greater autonomy can lead to improved job satisfaction and professional fulfillment (Desselle and Holmes, 2015).

In contrast, the lower percentage of outpatient technicians reporting increased autonomy and job satisfaction may reflect unique challenges within the outpatient setting, such as higher patient volumes and more varied responsibilities. These challenges could contribute to a less favorable impact of regulatory changes in outpatient environments, potentially due to the increased workload and stress associated with expanded responsibilities.

Professional Development Opportunities

The findings also reveal that 63% of inpatient technicians perceived an increase in professional development opportunities, compared to 40% of outpatient technicians. This discrepancy highlights the need for targeted professional development programs to support pharmacy technicians in outpatient settings. The variation in professional development opportunities between settings could be attributed to differences in organizational support and resources available to pharmacy technicians in different environments (Albanese et al., 2010).

Comparative Analysis

The comparative analysis between inpatient and outpatient settings underscores the distinct experiences of pharmacy technicians in these environments. Inpatient technicians generally reported more positive outcomes in terms of autonomy, job satisfaction, and professional development opportunities. This could be due to the structured nature of inpatient settings, which might better accommodate the implementation of regulatory changes and provide more comprehensive support for pharmacy technicians.

In contrast, the outpatient setting may present additional challenges that impact the effectiveness of regulatory changes, such as varying patient demands and less centralized organizational support. These factors may contribute to the observed differences in job satisfaction and professional development opportunities.

Implications for Practice

The study's findings have several implications for practice. First, there is a need for tailored support and training programs that address the specific challenges faced by pharmacy technicians in different settings. For instance, outpatient pharmacy technicians may benefit from additional resources and support to manage increased responsibilities and maintain job satisfaction. Additionally, fostering environments that enhance autonomy and professional development opportunities can contribute to improved job satisfaction and performance.

Limitations and Future Research

While this study provides valuable insights, several limitations should be noted. The relatively small sample size and focus on only two settings limit the generalizability of the findings. Additionally, the cross-sectional design captures a snapshot of the impact of regulatory changes but does not account for long-term effects that may emerge over time. Future research should include larger and more diverse samples, longitudinal designs,

and qualitative studies to explore the ongoing impact of regulatory changes and to address gaps identified in this study.

Conclusion

In summary, recent regulatory changes have had a notable impact on the scope of practice, autonomy, job satisfaction, and professional development of pharmacy technicians. While these changes have generally been positive, with variations between inpatient and outpatient settings highlighting the need for tailored support, further research is essential to fully understand and optimize the benefits of these changes. Addressing the specific needs of pharmacy technicians in different settings will be crucial for enhancing their roles and contributions to the healthcare system.

References

1. Albanese, N. P., Rouse, M. J., Schlaifer, M., & Council on Credentialing in Pharmacy. (2010). Scope of contemporary pharmacy practice: roles, responsibilities, and functions of pharmacists and pharmacy technicians. *Journal of the American Pharmacists Association*, *50*(2), e35-e69.

2. Desselle, S. P., & Holmes, E. R. (2015). 2015 National Pharmacy Technician Workforce Study Sponsored by: Pharmacy Technician Accreditation Commission (PTAC), Pharmacy Technician Certification Board (PTCB), and Pharmacy Workforce Center (PWC).

3. Myers, C. E. (2011). Opportunities and challenges related to pharmacy technicians in supporting optimal pharmacy practice models in health systems. *American Journal of Health-System Pharmacy*, *68*(12), 1128-1136.

- National Association of Pharmacy Regulatory Authorities (NAPRA). (2014). Model Standards of Practice for Canadian Pharmacy Technicians. *NAPRA.* Retrieved from https://www.napra.ca/sites/default/files/2017-08/Model_Standards_of_Practice_for_Canadian_Pharmacy_Technicians_March2014.pdf