Community pharmacists in England’s opinions on skill-mix and delegation

Abstract

Objectives
Following the 2005 contractual framework amendment, the expanding role of community pharmacy team-members required a shift in entrenched views on roles and duties. This study aimed to report on community Pharmacists’ opinions on skill-mix and explore how they can be addressed so that skill-mix may be optimised.

Methods
An invitation to complete an online questionnaire was sent via email, marked for the attention of the lead pharmacist. Following a low response, a paper-based questionnaire was sent to all community pharmacies in England (n=11,816 Questions elicited data about the respondent, the pharmacy (including staffing profile) and opinions on skill-mix.

Key Findings
1154 returns were received, representing a 10% response rate. Of these, most were pharmacy chains (76%; n=877), with 5-9 staff (54%; n=600); commonly open 40-49 hours (42%; n=487), dispensing <6000 prescriptions per week (41%, n=533). From 26 statements on skill-mix, 3 factors were identified by principal-components factor-analysis: “working well”, “feeling the pressure” and “open to development”. Associated with ‘working well’: pharmacy owners, single businesses, with a pharmacy technician, dispensing fewer prescriptions, open shorter hours. Associated with ‘feeling the pressure’: pharmacy chains, open longer hours, large numbers of prescriptions, relief pharmacists. Associated with ‘open to development’: recently qualified, second pharmacists, working longer hours, chains, dispensing lower numbers of prescriptions.

Conclusions
Although limited by a low response, results suggest being in a position to influence (more experienced, business owners) may be associated with more positive opinions. Further training (including about legalities and leadership) could contribute to optimising skill-mix in community pharmacies.
Introduction

In line with wider international developments in pharmacy, the role of the community pharmacist in England has expanded over the last decade with the introduction of a more clinical focus. In 2005, the essential, advanced and enhanced services of the new general pharmaceutical services contract came into place. This allowed pharmacists to provide services which were previously carried out by GPs, such as vaccination services (“flu jabs” or travel clinics) and assessments (e.g. cardiovascular disease risk assessments, blood pressure checking and cholesterol testing), and to delegate certain pharmacist tasks to other members of the pharmacy team. The 2006 Health Act facilitated the development of further clinical services and collaborative partnerships with GPs and others. While all of the United Kingdom are governed by the same pharmacy laws, the devolved nature of each nation within leads to some national differences. For example, the Healthy Living Pharmacy (HLP) initiative in England encouraged pharmacy delivered services such as weight management, smoking cessation, alcohol awareness and medicines use reviews.

Whilst the development of these new roles and services has increased the profile of the community pharmacy and the relationship of the pharmacist with patients, it is set against a background of an increasing dispensing service. Between 2005 and 2015 the number of dispensed prescriptions by community pharmacists in England increased by 51%. These developments have been linked to an increased workload for community pharmacists. One study found that 57% of pharmacists surveyed reported feeling stressed at work since the new contract, were working longer hours and had insufficient time for paperwork and other tasks. Other studies report similar pressures: perceived patient pressure to deliver services quickly, conflicting priorities, insufficient staffing, task frustration, guilt at taking breaks, management responsibilities, profit-driven organisational cultures and frustration that heavy workloads limitability to positively impact on patients’ healthcare. Jacobs et al reported that pharmacists’ perceived workload impacted on patient safety and their own well-being. Pharmacists reported concern that the busy, multi-tasking environment increased their risk of errors.

These developments align with a growing international interest in optimising the skill-mix within community pharmacies. Skill-mix refers to the mix of staff and the balance of different levels of responsibility. Role enhancement, role substitution or delegation all affect skill-mix. Role enhancement increases the depth of a role by adding additional competencies, delegation involves allocating a task to another, either upwards or downwards in the professional hierarchy, while role substitution increases breadth by incorporating tasks from other professional roles. In UK pharmacy, two forms of role substitution initiatives have occurred: inter-professional (where pharmacists carry out tasks previously undertaken by GPs) and intra-professional (for example where pharmacy technicians or accuracy checking technicians (ACTs) carry out tasks previously performed by pharmacists). See Table 1 for more information on pharmacy support staff roles in the UK.
Delegation of less-complex tasks to competent, but less-qualified and lower-cost professionals allows pharmacists more time to complete the interventions only they can perform. Workload studies post-2005 highlight that community pharmacists had problems delegating to appropriate members of staff. Despite reporting willingness to delegate parts of the dispensing process, pharmacists still carried out tasks which could be performed by pharmacy technicians or ACTs. While there is a paucity of evidence on pharmacists’ views on delegation, it does suggest that although they enjoy working within a team and are happy with the extra responsibility, they have concerns about maintaining their professional boundaries or accountability for delegated tasks. However, pharmacy technicians performing substituted roles, express feelings of enhanced job satisfaction.

For community pharmacy to continue to develop and optimise its services, it is imperative that an appropriate skill-mix is employed within the community pharmacy. The aim of this study was to gauge pharmacists’ opinions on skill-mix within their pharmacy and changes that they would like to make to improve team work.

Methods

A questionnaire was issued to lead pharmacists in community pharmacies in England to explore their opinions on skill-mix, both within their pharmacy team and more generally. A combination of open and closed questions elicited data about the respondent and their pharmacy, their opinions to skill-mix, and the changes they would like to make to their team. Adopting a broad approach, the research team consulted two groups of pharmacists (one from England and the other Scotland) via local practice fora (LPF) meetings to clarify terminology. The team determined it useful to seek advice outside of England as well as within to help challenge use of terminology. A targeted review of literature published post-contract changes in 2005 was also used to inform the design of the questionnaire. The study’s Advisory Group (which included patient and public representatives) provided critical feedback on drafts. The questionnaire was piloted with a convenience sample of 10 local community pharmacists who provided feedback at a face-to-face meeting. Extensive consultation was also carried out with representatives from major pharmacy chains. Ethical approval was gained from Cardiff University (PGMDE/30.5.14).

The questionnaire was initially developed for online distribution via Bristol Online Surveys. Distribution of the questionnaire via chain pharmacies’ internal email communications was negotiated. To reach independent or small chain pharmacies, the survey was promoted on social media (Twitter) and via personal contact by members of the research team, Advisory Group and LPF contacts. Following a very low response rate, a paper version was developed and mailed, with covering letter and a pre-paid return envelope, to every community pharmacy in England listed on the GPhC database (registered January 2015) marked for the attention of the lead pharmacist. Pharmacies in hospitals, prisons and within GP surgeries/clinics were excluded. Questionnaires were sent to 11,846 community pharmacies, 30 were returned as undeliverable. No reminders were sent. Both versions of the survey asked participants to provide the first part of their postcode, this was used to check for duplicate responses.
The survey data from the paper and online questionnaires were combined and analysed in IBM SPSS Statistics 20. Principal component factor analysis, using varimax rotation with Kaiser normalization, was applied to responses to opinion statements. Multiple regression analysis was run for each factor to predict association of respondent characteristics (e.g. respondent role, years qualified, single/chain pharmacy, number of prescriptions issued, and employing a pharmacy technician or an ACT). Open comments were coded thematically and quantified for summary.

Results

**Respondent and pharmacy characteristics**

1154 returns were received (1108 paper-based; 46 online; no duplicates) representing a 10% voluntary sample. The main respondents were pharmacy managers (60%, n=60/1142) or owners (16%, n=185/1142). Most commonly respondents had been qualified for at least twenty years (39%, n=442/1148).

Respondents were asked to provide information on their main pharmacy. Most were from pharmacy chains (76%, n=877/1153), commonly open 40-49 hours (42%, n=487/1153), and dispensing fewer than 6,000 prescriptions per month (42%, n=533/1142). The pharmacy team size was most commonly six employees (14%, n=160/1119); over half (61%, n=677/1119) had between 5-9 members of staff. Of the pharmacies employing 5-9 team members, 42% (n=216/517) included a pharmacy technician and an ACT in 24% (n=122/517). Use of a dispensing hub (7%, n=75/1136) or a robot in the pharmacy dispensing process was rare (2%, n=22/1151). Prescription delivery services were offered by 87% (n=998/1149) of the pharmacies.

**Opinions on skill-mix and delegation**

Participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement/disagreement with a series of statements regarding skill-mix in community pharmacy (Table 2). Over half of respondents (51%, n=591/1146) strongly agreed that they worked well as a team in their pharmacy. At least two-thirds of respondents agreed/strongly agreed with statements about good team leadership (88%, n=1016/1146, although 68%, n=778/1142, would welcome leadership training), professional trust in team-members (82%, n=948/1148) and confidence in their abilities (75%, n=871/1145), desire to see greater use of extended roles in their workplace (74%, n=846/1140) and having the right people in the right jobs in their pharmacy (69%, n=790/1139). However, over half strongly agreed that their workload (58%, n=664/1140) and the workload of their pharmacy team (56%, n=647/1146) was increasing. A notable proportion (83%, n=950/1144) agreed/strongly agreed that there should be minimum staffing levels. Of interest is the finding that 40% (n=460/1146) agreed/strongly agreed that team-members worked beyond their qualification and training.
Principal component factor analysis (using varimax rotation) was employed to see if the 26 opinion statements could be grouped to create a smaller number of variables (or factors). This analysis identified three factors (Table 3).

Factor 1, ‘working well’ (15.6% variance) depicted pharmacy members working well as a team, aware of the different roles and responsibilities of team members, with skill-mix used to best advantage and sufficient staffing levels to provide services without pressure. Respondents felt able to influence both the number and the skill-mix of staff within their pharmacy. They reported having the right people in the right jobs and had professional trust and confidence in the members of their team. Resources were viewed as sufficient to improve staff skills. They felt able to offer good team leadership. Staff job satisfaction was reported to be high.

In factor 2, ‘feeling the pressure’ (7.9% variance) respondents showed high agreement with statements indicating that their workload, and the workload of their team was increasing. They reported that their practices had insufficient staffing to provide pharmaceutical services and that there should be minimum staffing levels related to the amount of business. Pharmacy technician pay was thought to be unsatisfactory and did not reflect the increased responsibilities required and their career options within community pharmacy were limited.

Factor 3, ‘open to development and training’ (5.03% variance) grouped statements which showed respondents felt the community pharmacy contract supported enhanced skill-mix and the provision of professional services. However, these statements also revealed a desire to see greater use of skill-mix and training in team leadership.

Multiple regression analysis predicted association of respondent characteristics with the three factors. Respondent characteristics showing statistically significant positive association (p<.05) with the factor ‘working well’ (factor 1) were pharmacy owners and those from single businesses, with a pharmacy technician, dispensing fewer prescriptions and open for shorter hours. Pharmacy chains, open for longer hours, handling large numbers of prescriptions or relief pharmacists were significantly positively associated with ‘feeling the pressure’ (factor 2). Views on ‘open to development and training’ (factor 3) were significantly positively associated with respondents qualified within the last five years, in a second pharmacist role, working longer hours in a chain, and dispensing lower numbers of prescriptions.

Confidence in delegation

Ninety-two percent of respondents reported confidence in delegating workload to other team members (n=990/1073). No statistically significant correlation was found between confidence delegating workload and respondent or pharmacy characteristics. From responses to an open question (n=159), confidence would increase through management support (2%, n=3) along with a relaxing of the legal responsibility for delegated work (“make ACTs fully responsible for their own mistakes. Pharmacist should be accountable only for limited check when working with an ACT.” Pharmacy Manager) (9%, n=15) and more highly trained staff (“I try to delegate but they don’t complete the tasks properly which needs to be redone by the pharmacist.” Pharmacy...
Manager) (25%, n=39) who are willing and able be trusted to take responsibility for tasks (16%, n=25) would enhance trust in their ability to work to professional standards. A high workload (“I feel the team already has pressure to work to limits and fear asking more.” Pharmacy Manager) (8%, n=12) and a lack of familiarity with the pharmacy team (locums or new staff members) (2%, n=3) negatively affected their willingness to delegate.

**Desired changes to the pharmacy team**

An open question asked what, if anything, respondents would like to change about their pharmacy team (n=758). Desired change included recruiting new staff (38%, n=289) or staff training and development (20%, n=151) (“We need fully trained staff. I have to train them whilst doing my job which is stressful.” Pharmacy manager). Others commented on the need for improvement in individual team members’ motivation or professionalism (13%, n=99) (“Attitude. People think they are working in retail and not in healthcare. Staff need to understand importance of clinical and procedural requirements.” Pharmacy manager) and a few wished to replace underperforming staff. Respondents wanted to see better financial recognition for staff with extended roles and changes to the career pathways for pharmacy technicians and ACTs. They also highlighted regulatory constrictions.

When asked, just under half (46%, n=513/1105) reported wanting to appoint new staff to enable them to develop or extend the skill-mix in their pharmacy while 35% (n=389/1105) did not (18%, n=203/1105, were unsure). Of those who wanted more staff, 79% (n=405/513) were from chains, and 39% (n=197/510) processed between 2,200-5,999 prescriptions. Respondents were asked to identify job-roles they would like to recruit: ACTs (70%, n=214/305), medicine counter assistants (MCAs) (65%, n=181/278), dispensing assistants (NVQ L2) (64%, n=165/259), pharmacists (61%, n=159/259), pharmacy technicians (55%, n=135/243) and pre-registration trainee pharmacists (53%, n=120/225).

**Discussion**

While responses to opinion statements reflected a positive depiction of community pharmacy skill-mix, the factor analysis identified three broad views of skill-mix in community pharmacies. There were respondents identifying teams that were working well; ‘right’ people in the ‘right’ roles, with a pharmacist with good knowledge of the roles and confidence in their team, with sufficient resources for training and the ability to influence their staffing and skill-mix. Another pattern represented community pharmacists feeling the pressure of their increasing workloads; insufficient staffing and no influence over staffing decisions, recognising poor career prospects or financial reward for team members who extend their role. A third group were satisfied with the current contract but welcomed training in leadership and would like to see greater use of skill-mix. The present study also adds a level of detail that sheds light on how practice factors influence how skill-mix is viewed and operationalised. Skill-mix was more likely to be perceived as working well by pharmacy owners and those from single businesses, dispensing fewer prescriptions, open for shorter hours and those employing pharmacy technicians. In contrast, workload pressures seemed to be felt more acutely by those in pharmacy chains, open for
longer hours, handling large numbers of prescriptions and by pharmacists in a manager, rather than owner position. Second pharmacists, fewer years qualified, working longer hours, dispensing fewer prescriptions in a chain were associated with the factor identifying “open to development”. While confident about their ability to delegate, many respondents still valued further leadership training.

Our study has limitations, most notably difficulties were experienced in generating a higher response rate to the questionnaire. After lengthy, in-depth consultation with several large UK chains we trusted them to disseminate the information to their pharmacies but we have no way of knowing how many received and read the email. More thorough piloting of this method would have identified and avoided these issues. A mailed paper copy proved notably more successful but owing to time and budgetary limitations we were unable to send a reminder. Targeting a smaller, representative sample (e.g. a sample of pharmacies with and without a Pharmacy Technician) and sending reminders may have improved our response rate. While the sample was diverse (single businesses/chains; managers/owners), the findings arising from the survey must be interpreted in light of the low response rate. Additionally, we did not determine the tasks that each team member carries out within their pharmacy, future research would benefit from establishing how the skill-mix was being implemented.

Those with higher workload and working longer hours were feeling the pressure. Staffing levels insufficient for their heavy workload and preventing time to train up current team members was identified by some; reflecting the literature\textsuperscript{8, 24, 27, 29, 30, 35, 36} A high number of pharmacy support roles were part-time. This can lead to communication issues, and leaves the pharmacy in a precarious position if unexpectedly short-staffed (e.g. sickness leave); this may result in tasks being partially delegated, if at all.\textsuperscript{36} Our results also suggested that power over staffing or skill-mix were influencing factors in whether respondents’ viewed skill-mix positively or negatively. Jacobs et al\textsuperscript{13} also found links between areas of self-reported pharmacist stress, increasing workload, and little autonomy.

Less qualified roles were viewed positively and seen as easing workloads and releasing pharmacist time for services and greater patient contact. For example, respondents noted that MCAs were the public-facing first-line of pharmacy for patients, able to deal with enquiries and reducing interruptions to dispensing assistants or pharmacists, a noted source of workplace stress.\textsuperscript{13} DAs were requested to carry out the less complex work within the dispensing process to free up pharmacists and ACTs. MCAs and DAs are also the largest group of community pharmacy support staff.\textsuperscript{15} These findings may also, in part, be influenced by familiarity with the roles or responses which raised questions about support staff’s scope of practice.

While a high proportion had confidence in their staff and trust in their work, respondents also identified staff professionalism as an area for improvement—some reported that staff still view it as a retail job rather than healthcare and others had staff uninterested in training to extend their role. Staff members unwilling to train or take on new tasks impact the development and workflow of skill-mix.\textsuperscript{8, 11, 15, 25, 28} A New Zealand study found pharmacy assistants gave mixed responses when asked if they were healthcare assistants or retail assistants.\textsuperscript{37} A UK-based study
found that the location and hours of the job were almost as frequent a reason for applying for the role as a desire to work in healthcare. Like some other countries (e.g. Canada, Denmark, South Africa) certain roles within the pharmacy team are regulated professions. Mandatory registration and associated requirements of some roles (e.g. pharmacy technicians, ACTs) may also deter some staff from developing their role. Limited opportunities for career progression and unsatisfactory levels of financial reward for the additional responsibility were also recognized in our results.

Conclusions

Although limited by a low response rate, the sample was diverse and circumstances and opinions differ. By revealing how practice factors influence the way in which skill-mix is viewed our study makes a novel contribution to the literature. We highlight the cycle that some community pharmacies find themselves in where skill-mix has the potential to ease workload and enhance service provision, particularly in larger, busy pharmacies, but pharmacists’ lack the time, or influence to implement the necessary changes. The results suggest that being in a position to influence (more experienced, business owners in single pharmacies) may make a difference to opinions. Patient-facing and dispensing staff were highly valued alongside more technical roles as a way to lessen pharmacists’ workload. However such team members’ motivation and understanding of their role may not always match expectations. This highlights the importance of the whole team culture in community pharmacy and the pharmacists’ role as motivational team leader.
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### Table 1: Roles and responsibilities of pharmacy support staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Skill/Qualification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medicine Counter Assistant (MCA)</strong></td>
<td>A medicine counter assistant (MCA) is involved in the sale of over-the-counter medicine and works under the supervision of a pharmacist. A MCA is trained to offer advice on common ailments and must know when to refer a customer to a pharmacist.</td>
<td>Medicines counter assistants must complete an accredited medicines counter assistant course. The programme is taught at Qualifications Credit Framework level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dispensing Assistant</strong></td>
<td>A dispensing assistant is involved in:</td>
<td>Dispensing assistant must complete a level 2 knowledge and competency-based dispensing assistant qualification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The provision of information to customers on symptoms and products</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Prescription receipt and collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Assembly of prescribed items (including the generation of labels)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ordering, receiving and storing of pharmaceutical stock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Preparation for the manufacture of pharmaceutical products</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Manufacture and assembly of medicinal products</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technician</strong></td>
<td>Technicians prepare medicines and other healthcare products and supply them to patients. They also take an active role in providing patients with guidance on taking medicines. The role may also include training and development, and supervision and management of staff and the dispensary.</td>
<td>The training consists of two years consecutive work-based experience under the direction of a pharmacist to whom the trainee is directly accountable. The training programme must be approved by GPhC and meet the requirements below:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Level 3 Diploma in Pharmaceutical Science (Knowledge)</td>
<td>• Level 3 Diploma in Pharmaceutical Science (Knowledge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Level 3 NVQ Diploma in Pharmacy Services Skills (Competence)</td>
<td>• Level 3 NVQ Diploma in Pharmacy Services Skills (Competence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Once the course is successfully completed technicians are required to register with GPhC before they can practice as a Pharmacy technician.</td>
<td>Once the course is successfully completed technicians are required to register with GPhC before they can practice as a Pharmacy technician.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accuracy checker</strong></td>
<td>The accuracy checker is able to confirm the dispensing accuracy of any prescription that has been clinically screened/approved by a registered pharmacist.</td>
<td>Within the UK there is a recognised competency framework for the accuracy checker training programme, but there is no requirement for programmes to be aligned to the framework. The range of skills and knowledge which may be covered within a programme are: checking accuracy skills, effective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
communication skills, team working skills, legal considerations, dispensing and medication errors.

ACTs are GPhC registered professionals.
Table 2: Opinions on skill-mix within their pharmacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements (n=valid number)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We work well as a team in this pharmacy (n=1146)</td>
<td>1 (7)</td>
<td>1 (16)</td>
<td>4 (43)</td>
<td>42 (489)</td>
<td>51 (591)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My workload is increasing (n=1140)</td>
<td>1 (7)</td>
<td>21 (17)</td>
<td>5 (61)</td>
<td>34 (391)</td>
<td>58 (664)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The workload of the pharmacy team is increasing (n=1146)</td>
<td>0 (5)</td>
<td>3 (32)</td>
<td>6 (65)</td>
<td>34 (397)</td>
<td>56 (647)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I am able to offer good team leadership (n=1136)</td>
<td>0 (4)</td>
<td>2 (18)</td>
<td>9 (98)</td>
<td>59 (684)</td>
<td>29 (332)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There should be minimum staffing levels related to the amount of business (n=1144)</td>
<td>3 (31)</td>
<td>5 (55)</td>
<td>9 (108)</td>
<td>43 (493)</td>
<td>40 (457)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have professional trust in the other members of staff in this pharmacy (n=1148)</td>
<td>1 (9)</td>
<td>5 (54)</td>
<td>12 (137)</td>
<td>58 (670)</td>
<td>24 (278)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have confidence in the abilities of all members of this pharmacy team (n=1145)</td>
<td>1 (14)</td>
<td>10 (114)</td>
<td>13 (146)</td>
<td>49 (567)</td>
<td>26 (304)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to see greater use of extended roles and responsibilities in my workplace (n=1140)</td>
<td>1 (13)</td>
<td>4 (44)</td>
<td>21 (237)</td>
<td>53 (607)</td>
<td>21 (239)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have the right people in the right jobs at this pharmacy (n=1139)</td>
<td>2 (18)</td>
<td>14 (157)</td>
<td>15 (174)</td>
<td>50 (571)</td>
<td>19 (219)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would welcome training in team leadership (n=1142)</td>
<td>3 (30)</td>
<td>9 (104)</td>
<td>20 (230)</td>
<td>45 (514)</td>
<td>23 (264)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The community pharmacy contract encourages pharmacies to supply professional services (n=1145)</td>
<td>6 (66)</td>
<td>15 (166)</td>
<td>18 (206)</td>
<td>48 (547)</td>
<td>14 (160)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The skill-mix in this pharmacy is being used to best advantage (n=1140)</td>
<td>2 (23)</td>
<td>15 (174)</td>
<td>21 (239)</td>
<td>49 (539)</td>
<td>12 (141)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to influence the skill-mix required for this pharmacy (n=1139)</td>
<td>8 (87)</td>
<td>17 (195)</td>
<td>18 (202)</td>
<td>40 (454)</td>
<td>18 (201)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career prospects for pharmacy technicians in community pharmacy are limited (n=1143)</td>
<td>4 (41)</td>
<td>18 (203)</td>
<td>24 (277)</td>
<td>39 (450)</td>
<td>15 (172)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compared to dispensers, the financial reward is not great enough for the increased responsibilities of the pharmacy technician (n=1120)</td>
<td>3 (33)</td>
<td>15 (174)</td>
<td>30 (343)</td>
<td>35 (399)</td>
<td>15 (171)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction levels of staff in this pharmacy are high (n=1138)</td>
<td>7 (74)</td>
<td>20 (226)</td>
<td>27 (310)</td>
<td>37 (430)</td>
<td>9 (98)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am able to influence the number of staff required for this pharmacy (n=1146) | 19 (215) | 24 (275) | 12 (138) | 27 (306) | 19 (212)

Sufficient resources are available to improve staff skills (n=1141) | 7 (82) | 23 (265) | 23 (27267) | 39 (440) | 8 (87)

I think the registration requirements deter staff from developing into the registered pharmacy technician role (n=1141) | 7 (81) | 26 (299) | 28 (315) | 31 (353) | 8 (93)

There are members of this team who are working beyond their qualification and training levels (n=1146) | 10 (112) | 30 (349) | 20 (225) | 27 (306) | 13 (154)

The staff level in this pharmacy is sufficient to provide pharmaceutical services without pressure (n=1142) | 15 (170) | 31 (353) | 16 (188) | 30 (342) | 8 (89)

The community pharmacy contract supports enhanced skill-mix (n=1140) | 9 (103) | 22 (249) | 35 (393) | 30 (336) | 5 (59)

The pay for pharmacy technicians is satisfactory (n=1136) | 7 (84) | 24 (276) | 37 (423) | 27 (300) | 5 (53)

I am unsure of the legalities of pharmacy technicians’ scope of practice (n=1141) | 13 (144) | 34 (393) | 28 (319) | 22 (246) | 4 (40)

Staff turn-over is high in this pharmacy (n=1134) | 35 (401) | 34 (382) | 15 (171) | 11 (121) | 5 (59)

I am not quite sure of the roles and responsibilities of different members of the team (n=1147) | 48 (550) | 40 (453) | 7 (84) | 4 (48) | 1 (12)
Table 3: Results of factor analysis and summary of statistically significant relationships between responses and pharmacy or respondent characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Significant relationships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Working well (15.59% variance)</td>
<td>- Open regular hours&lt;br&gt;- Fewer prescriptions&lt;br&gt;- Single businesses&lt;br&gt;- Pharmacy owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- We work well as a team in this pharmacy&lt;br&gt;- We have the right people in the right jobs at this pharmacy&lt;br&gt;- I am able to influence the number of staff required for this pharmacy&lt;br&gt;- I feel I am able to offer good team leadership&lt;br&gt;- I have confidence in the abilities of all members of this pharmacy team&lt;br&gt;- The staff level in this pharmacy is sufficient to provide pharmaceutical services without pressure&lt;br&gt;- I am not quite sure of the roles and responsibilities of different members of the team (INVERTED)&lt;br&gt;- Job satisfaction levels of staff in this pharmacy are high&lt;br&gt;- I have professional trust in the other members of staff in this pharmacy&lt;br&gt;- I am able to influence the skill-mix required for this pharmacy&lt;br&gt;- The skill-mix in this pharmacy is being used to best advantage&lt;br&gt;- Sufficient resources are available to improve staff skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Feeling the pressure (7.860% variance)</td>
<td>- Open longer hours&lt;br&gt;- Larger numbers of prescriptions&lt;br&gt;- Chains&lt;br&gt;- Relief pharmacists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Compared to dispensers, the financial reward is not great enough for the increased responsibilities of the pharmacy technician&lt;br&gt;- My workload is increasing&lt;br&gt;- The staff level in this pharmacy is sufficient to provide pharmaceutical services without pressure (INVERTED)&lt;br&gt;- Career prospects for pharmacy technicians in community pharmacy are limited&lt;br&gt;- There should be minimum staffing levels related to the amount of business&lt;br&gt;- The workload of the pharmacy team is increasing&lt;br&gt;- The pay for pharmacy technicians is satisfactory (INVERTED)&lt;br&gt;- I am able to influence the number of staff required for this pharmacy (INVERTED)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Open to development &amp; training (5.032% variance)</td>
<td>- Open longer hours&lt;br&gt;- Fewer prescriptions&lt;br&gt;- More recently qualified&lt;br&gt;- Chains&lt;br&gt;- Second pharmacists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The community pharmacy contract supports enhanced skill-mix&lt;br&gt;- The community pharmacy contract encourages pharmacies to supply professional services&lt;br&gt;- I would welcome training in team leadership&lt;br&gt;- I would like to see greater use of extended roles and responsibilities in my workplace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KMO .810, Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity p>0.001, all values were above the Measure of Sampling Adequacy level of 0.5.