

**GPHSC 587**  
**Social and Behavioral Aspects of Pharmacy Practice**  
**Fall 2003**

**Credits:** 3.0

**Course Faculty:**

Shane P. Desselle, R.Ph., Ph.D., Dept of Pharmaceutical Administration  
Office: Bayer 308  
Office Telephone Number: (412) 396-6363  
Office Fax Number: (412) 396-5130  
Email: desselle@duq.edu

**Course Description:**

An analysis of social and behavioral issues that affect the practice of pharmacy and medication use systems. The course is designed to foster students' abilities to confront issues, recognize potential threats, and resolve problems facing their practices at both individual and professional levels. It focuses on current administrative topics in pharmacy management from a behavioral perspective; that is, well-known, validated and accepted models will be used to explain and predict behaviors of pharmacists, pharmacies, other practitioners, insurers, and most importantly, consumers of drugs and pharmacy services.

**Course Objectives:**

1. Develop a conceptual framework for understanding and interpreting the social and behavioral factors that influence the contemporary practice of pharmacy.
2. Develop an understanding of types of research conducted in the discipline of social and administrative pharmacy. For graduate students and those undergraduates interested in research, stimulate the development of ideas for future research in the health behavioral sciences.
3. Enhance analytical skills needed to critically evaluate research literature.
4. Foster abilities to engage in worthwhile discussion of issues that affect the profession, the medication use process, and future health services research.
5. Utilize literature in the social and behavioral pharmaceutical sciences to answer questions and solve problems in your practice of pharmacy. Subsequently identify ways in which you can improve your pharmacy's business position and/or improve patients' health outcomes.

**Course Materials:**

Assigned articles primarily from refereed journals such as *Journal of Social and Administrative Pharmacy*, *Journal of Pharmaceutical Marketing and Management*, *Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association*, *Journal of Managed Care Pharmacy*, *Health Marketing Quarterly*, *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*,

*Drug Information Journal* and *Medical Care*. Also included will be relevant book chapters. Students are responsible for all assigned materials. Students will also be required to retrieve other materials relative to the completion of class assignments.

**Course Format:**

The course will meet on Wednesday evenings at 6pm. The class format encourages active learning by emphasizing group discussion of reading assignments. After approximately 1 ½ class periods of lecture, Dr. Desselle may provide a formal summary of the topic either at the beginning of the class or toward the end of class during the prior week. Students will then engage in a discussion of the topic and the assigned readings. Students are required to read the assigned articles and on occasion provide written answers to questions or other “homework” assigned the previous week. Students are also expected to generate their own set of questions from the readings.

Participation scores will be derived from weekly contributions in class, not only in *quantity*, but in *quality*. Participation accounts for 25% of the grade and will be judged strictly. Students will complete two assignments. The first is a proposal defense competition. Students in teams of approximately four will present competing proposals on issues assigned to them. The second assignment is a term paper due toward the end of the course. Papers should be approximately ten to twelve double-spaced pages using a 12-point font size (Times New Roman font style) and one-inch margins. At least 10 references from peer-reviewed journals are required. Students may choose their own topic, however prior approval from the instructor is required.

Students will be assigned randomly to one of six teams competing in three proposal defense competitions. The intent of the proposal defense competition is to hone your ability to utilize the behavioral/managerial literature and the concepts learned in class to design a real-world project or make practical improvements in a pharmacy practice. Documentation and careful evaluation and use of the literature are absolutely necessary for success. There must be a justifiable rationale for every decision that you make in pursuit of the project. A scoring key is attached to the syllabus.

**Grading:**

Grades for this course will be based on a total of 200 points that have been allocated to various course activities as follows:

Assignments

Proposal competition	=	75 points
Term paper	=	75 points

Class contribution

Weekly	=	50 points*
--------	---	------------

Total

=	200 points
---	------------

Final course grades will be based upon the following percentages:

A	=	92.5-100% (93-100)
A-	=	88.5-92.4% (89-92)
B+	=	85.5-88.4% (86-88)
B	=	82.5-85.4% (83-85)
B-	=	78.5-82.4% (79-82)

C+	=	75.5-78.4% (76-78)
C	=	72.5-75.4% (73-75)
C-	=	68.5-72.4% (69-72)
D	=	64.5-71.4% (65-71)
F	=	<64.5% (<65)

\*Class attendance and participation are REQUIRED. Based on participation in class, students will be assigned to one of five levels of class contribution:

1. Outstanding Contributor (90-100%)

Contributions in class reflect exceptional preparation. Questions and answers are insightful and indicate thoughtful analysis of the issues. The quality of the course would be greatly diminished without this person.

2. Good Contributor (80-90%)

Contributions in class reflect thorough preparation. Questions and answers usually provide some insight and are typically well thought-out. The course quality would be reduced significantly without this person.

3. Adequate Contributor (70-80%)

Contributions in class reflect minimally adequate preparation. Questions and answers reflect some thought but rarely provide any major insight. Without this person the quality of the course might be diminished slightly.

4. Unsatisfactory Contributor (60-70%)

Contributions in class, when presented, reflect little or no preparation. Questions and answers provide little insight. Without this person the quality of the course would be unchanged or might actually improve.

5. Non-Contributor (<60%)

This student does not contribute enough to make evaluation possible. If this person were not a member of the class, no one would even notice.

Students are not allowed ANY unaccepted absences from class. If any student misses class for an unexcused reason, 15 percentage points will automatically deducted from their final grade. The instructor should be contacted ahead of time, whenever possible, if a student is to miss a class for any reason so that make-up assignments can be negotiated.

## Tentative Schedule of Classes and Assignments

Sept. 08	Class policies and procedures; contributions of the social sciences in pharmacy practice; Health Belief Model (HBM), locus of control (LOC), theories of intention (TRA, TPB), and Transtheoretical Model of Change.	Mount (in class)
Sept. 15	Discuss readings on HBM, LOC, TRA. Introduction to other useful models.	Berger & Grimley; Nau et al; Odedina et al; Karmel
Sept. 22	Application of models and research tools to pharmacy management.	Holdford & Yom; Latif et al; Schommer & Wiederholt; Bislew & Sorensen
Sept. 29	Pharmacy management issues (continued).	Harrison & Ortmeier; Desselle et al; Desselle & Tipton; Schondelmeyer & Schafermeyer
Oct. 06	Marketing issues	Pritchard & Perry; McGee et al; McDonough et al; Holmes & Desselle
Oct. 13	Prescription drug utilization and control.	Kolassa; Motheral & Fairman; Smith et al; Shen et al
Oct. 20	Prescription drug utilization and control (continued).	Ganther & Kreling; Gilberg et al; Stacy et al; Szeinbach et al
Oct. 27	PROPOSAL DEFENSE COMPETITION	
Nov. 03	Pharmacy students and pharmacy education	Hastings et al.; Holdford et al.; Desselle et al(b); Romanelli & Ryan
Nov. 10	A closer look at consumers of medical & prescription services	Fiscella et al; Worley & Schommer; Conrad; Metge et al
Nov. 17	TERM PAPER DUE	

## **Bibliography**

Mount JK. Contributions of the social sciences. In: Pharmacy Practice: Social and Behavioral Aspects, Wertheimer AI, Smith MC, eds. Baltimore, MD: Williams & Wilkins; 1989.

Berger BA, Grimley D. Pharmacists' readiness for rendering pharmaceutical care. J Am Pharm Assoc 1997; NS37(5):535-542.

Nau DP, Ried LD, Lipowski EE, Kimberlin C, Pendergast J. A perceived value model for explaining patients' intentions to continue use of pharmaceutical care services. J Pharm Market Manage 2001; 14(1):63-80.

Odedina, FT. Hepler, CD. Segal, R. Miller, D. Pharmacists' implementation of pharmaceutical care (PIPC) model. Pharm Res. 14(Feb): p 135-144. 1997.

Karmel B. Hospital pharmacist: Master or victim of the environment? Am J Hosp Pharm 1978; 35(2): 151-4.

Holdford D, Yom SH. Content analysis of newspaper advertising of pharmacy services. J Pharm Market Manage 2003; 15(2):81-96.

Latif, DA. Berger, BA. Harris, SG. Barker, KN. Pearson, RE. et al. Relationship between community pharmacists' moral reasoning and components of clinical performance. J Soc Adm Pharmacy 1998; 15(3): p 210-224.

Schommer JC, Wiederholt JB. A field investigation of participant and environment effects on pharmacy-patient communication in community pharmacies. Med Care 1995; 33(6):567-84.

Bislew HD, Sorensen TD. Use of focus groups as a tool to enhance a pharmaceutical care practice. J Am Pharm Assoc 2003; 43(3):424-434.

Harrison DL, Ortmeier BG. Levels of independent community pharmacy strategic planning. J Pharm Market Manage 1997; 11(4):21-34.

Desselle SP, Vaughan MA, Faria TF. Creating a performance appraisal template for community pharmacy technicians using the method of equal-appearing intervals. J Am Pharm Assoc 2002; 42(5):768-779.

Desselle SP, Tipton DJ. Factors contributing to the satisfaction and performance ability of community pharmacists: a path model analysis. J Soc Adm Pharm 2001; 15-23.

Schondelmeyer SW, Schafermeyer SW. Pharmacists' value-added services: What are their costs? Burroughs Wellcome Co.1991:CE2-CE10.

Pritchard FL, Perri M. Development of a scale to measure the quality of service in the retail pharmacy setting: An examination of expectations and perceptions. J Pharm Mark Manage 1997;11(3):41-61.

McGee JE, Love LG, Festervand TA. Competitive advantage and the independent retail pharmacy: The role of distinctive competencies. J Pharm Mark Manage 2000;13(3):31-46.

McDonough RP, Pithan ES, Doucette WR, Brownlee MJ. Marketing pharmaceutical care services. *J Am Pharm Assoc* 1998; 38(6):667-77.

Holmes ER, Desselle SP. Evaluating the balance of persuasive and informative content within product-specific print direct-to-consumer ads. *Drug Inf J* 2004; 38(1):85-98.

Kolassa EM. Physicians' perceptions of prescription drug prices: Their accuracy and effect on the prescribing decision. *J Res Pharm Econ* 1995; 6(1):23-37.

Motheral B, Fairman KA. Effect of a three-tier prescription copay on pharmaceutical and other medical utilization. *Med Care* 2001; 39(12):1293-1304.

Smith SR, Boyd EL, Kirking DM. Nonprescription and alternative medication use by individuals with HIV disease. *Ann Pharmacother* 1999; 33(3):294-300.

Shen J, Andersen R, Brook R, Kominski G, Albert PS, Wenger N. The effects of payment method on clinical decision-making: physician responses to clinical scenarios. *Med Care* 2004; 42(3):297-302.

Ganther JM, Kreling DH. Consumer perceptions of risk and required cost savings for generic prescription drugs. *J Am Pharm Assoc* 2000; 40(3):378-383.

Gilberg K, Laouri M, Wade S, Isonaka S. Analysis of medication use patterns: apparent overuse of antibiotics and underuse of prescription drugs for asthma, depression, and CHF. *J Manage Care Pharmacy* 2003; 9(3):232-237.

Stacy J, Shaw E, Arledge MD, Howell-Smith D. Pharmacoeconomic modeling of prior-authorization intervention for COX-2 specific inhibitors in a 3-tier copay plan. *J Manage Care Pharmacy* 2003; 9(4):327-334.

Szeinbach SL, Williams PB, Mutendam P, O'Connor RD. Identification of allergic disease among users of antihistamines. *J Manage Care Pharm* 2004; 10(3):234-238.

Hastings JK, West DS, Perrot LJ, Deloney LA. Pharmacy student motivation: Phase 1 of a longitudinal study. *Am J Pharm Educ* 2001; 65(3):254-258.

Holdford D, Reinders TP. Development of an instrument to assess student perceptions of the quality of pharmaceutical education. *Am J Pharm Educ* 2001; 65(2):125-131.

Desselle SP, Collins CC, Harrold MW, Kalis MM, Quattrocchi EJ. Consensus within five academic subdisciplines of pharmacy: progress toward establishing their scientific paradigms. *J Pharmacy Teach* 2002; 9(2):27-46.

Romanelli F, Ryan M. A survey and review of attitudes and beliefs of generation X pharmacy students. *Am J Pharm Educ* 2003; 67(1):72-79.

Fiscella K, Franks P, Clancy CM. Skepticism toward medical care and health care utilization. *Med Care* 1998; 36(2):180-189.

Worley MM, Schommer JC. Pharmacist-patient relationships: Factors influencing quality and commitment. *J Soc Adm Pharm* 1999; 16(3/4):157-73.

Conrad P. The meaning of medications: Another look at compliance. *Soc Sci Med* 1985; 20(1):2-37.

Metge CJ, Hendericksen C, Maine L. Consumer attitudes, behaviors, and perceptions about pharmacies, pharmacists, and pharmaceutical care. *J Am Pharm Assoc* 1998; 38(1):37-47.

## Proposal Topics

*The first two topics will definitely be utilized. The class will select one of the four remaining topics. Teams and topics will then be assigned to individual students.*

- #1 Develop plans for the marketing and implementation of a cognitive/disease management service in a community or outpatient clinic pharmacy.
- #2 Design a series of two television and one print direct-to-consumer prescription drug ad (DTC ad) for a new, fictitious product, Serenty1® brand of zertrefladine, a serotonin-reuptake inhibitor used to treat obsessive-compulsive disorder.
- #3 Design a prescription department for a community pharmacy to achieve efficiency in workflow, facilitate counseling, and optimize human resources.
- #4 Design an intervention whose aim is to improve health and drug literacy among residents of Allegheny County.
- #5 Create an outline for a “Policies and Procedures” manual for technicians in a hospital pharmacy. Include basic provisions under each major facet of the manual.
- #6 Propose a cost-effectiveness evaluation of two or more drug therapies from the perspective of a health plan.

# Proposal Defense Scoring Sheet

TITLE OF PRESENTATION \_\_\_\_\_

TEAM MEMBERS \_\_\_\_\_

Originality	_____ points (10 possible)
Support from literature	_____ points (15 possible)
Validity/Content	_____ points (20 possible)
Handling of Questions	_____ points (05 possible)
Overall Effective Presentation (clarity, volume, pace, etc.)	_____ points (10 possible)
Class points (from voting)**	_____ points (15 possible)*

**\*Note—The final part of your score comes from the remaining members of the class NOT participating in the defense. Out of 15 “possible” points, the following scheme is used to determine the allocation of the final 30 points to both teams for this exercise. Please note that it is quite possible to score above 15; also note that you will be awarded a minimum of 08 points and a maximum of 22 points for participating in the proposal defense.**

< 20.0% =	08 points
20.0% -- 29.9% of class =	10 points
30.0% -- 39.9% of class =	12 points
40.0% -- 49.9% of class =	14 points
50.0% of class =	15 points
50.1% -- 60.0% of class =	16 points
60.1% -- 70.0% of class =	18 points
70.1% -- 80.0% of class =	20 points
> 80.0% of class =	22 points

## Vote for the Best Proposal

**Instructions:** Vote for either “Team A” or “Team B”. If you vote for both teams, your vote will be discarded. **Please** vote for the team that you believe made the most effective presentation in regards to defending their position with numerous references to social and behavioral theory, sound reasoning, and clarity. **DO NOT** vote for the team whose members you “like” most or whose which you have more personal friends. Thank you.

### Competition #1:

\_\_\_\_\_ Team A

\_\_\_\_\_ Team B

## Vote for the Best Proposal

**Instructions:** Vote for either “Team A” or “Team B”. If you vote for both teams, your vote will be discarded. **Please** vote for the team that you believe made the most effective presentation in regards to defending their position with numerous references to social and behavioral theory, sound reasoning, and clarity. **DO NOT** vote for the team whose members you “like” most or whose which you have more personal friends. Thank you.

### Competition #2:

\_\_\_\_\_ Team A

\_\_\_\_\_ Team B

## Vote for the Best Proposal

**Instructions:** Vote for either “Team A” or “Team B”. If you vote for both teams, your vote will be discarded. **Please** vote for the team that you believe made the most effective presentation in regards to defending their position with numerous references to social and behavioral theory, sound reasoning, and clarity. **DO NOT** vote for the team whose members you “like” most or whose which you have more personal friends. Thank you.

### Competition #3:

\_\_\_\_\_ Team A

\_\_\_\_\_ Team B