

# PROJECT

## PRO-MOTION. Sensitive career management

Erasmus+ Program, KA3: Social inclusion and common values: the contribution in  
the field of education and training

No.: 621491-EPP-1-2020-1-PL-EPPKA3-IPI-SOC-IN

**TITLE OF DOCUMENT: WP3 – PREPARATORY PHASE**

**NATIONAL REPORT – FOCUS GROUPS/INTERVIEWS WITH EMPLOYERS**

**PARTNER ORGANISATION:**

**WSEI University**

**Poland**

*Copyright: This project has received funding from the European Union's Erasmus + Programme.*

*Unless officially marked PUBLIC, this document and its contents remain the property of the partners of PRO-motion Consortium.*

1

### **Introductory information – WSEI University WP3**

The purpose of this preparatory phase of the project was to actively involve end users on the labor market – employers - with experience in working with highly sensitive persons (HSPs) in a need analysis. This phase was to assure that the results of the project are based on real needs and real life situations and useful for the stakeholders on the labor market.. To gather relevant information about HSP exploratory studies were conducted:

- a qualitative analysis based on the information elicited through focus groups and interviews. Within this work package, focus groups and interviews with employers and employees were conducted in order to obtain a double perspective about the characteristics and functioning of a HSP

#### **1. QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS**

The main objective of this task from the WP3 was to explore the functioning of highly sensitive people in the workplace, both from the perspective of a highly sensitive employer of various sectors. For that purpose a series of focus groups and individual interviews were performed. In the case of the WSEI we selected professionals from the various economic sectors administration and local government.

After collecting the data an inductive qualitative analysis was performed based on the previous codes identified in the qualitative analysis that took place. Atlas.ti was used to develop the codes. The areas (themes) relating to professional satisfaction were distinguished and formulated.

The areas /themes for category employers are as follows.

- The beliefs of high sensitivity
- The importance of sensitivity for the work performed
- Management

2

- Relations
- Conditions
- Practical implications for management

Overall, the results are in line with the main themes and codes identified in the initial analysis and no substantial modification was made to the initial codification proposal. In the report of the qualitative part we outline the main characteristics of the participants and we attach the excel file with the most important codes identified in the analysis, both for employers and for employees.

### 1.1. Dates of focus groups/interviews

The interviews and the focus groups were conducted from October 2021 to March 2022.

Focus Group 1 (Employers): 07.03.2022

Focus Group 2 (Employers): 08.03.2022

Focus Group 3 (Employers): 29.10.2021

Focus Group 4 (Employers): 20.12.2021

Focus Group 5 (Employers): 29.11.2021

Focus Group 6 (Employers): 30.11.2021

Interview 1 (Employer): 28.12.2021

Interview 2 (Employer): 09.03.2022

Interview 3 (Employer): 28.12.2021

The attachment of excel file includes the information of each participant.

## 1.2. Place of focus groups/interviews

Considering the COVID-19 situation majority of the focus groups and interviews were performed online through the Google Meet platform and using the WSEI e-learning platform in Lublin; some at the Education Development Center in Warsaw. All of them were recorded in audio and in video to make the verbatim transcripts.

## 1.3. Number of participants per each of focus groups/interviews:

The number of participant in each focus group and interview is described as follows:

Focus Group 1 (Employers): N=4

Focus Group 2 (Employers): N=7

Focus Group 3 (Employers): N=6

Focus Group 4 (Employers): N =6

Focus Group 5 (Employers): N= 9

Focus Group 6 (Employers): N=13

Interview 1 (Employer): 1 participant

Interview 2 (Employer): 1 participant

Interview 3 (Employer): 1 participant

#### 1.4. Type of participants

Below is a description of the focus groups and participants of individual interviews in terms of professional profile. The specific characteristics of each group are described with their numbers.

##### Employers/Focus groups

The participants of the groups: Focus Group 1, Focus Group 2 were Employers who, as part of their professional work, have a superior relationship with the employees subordinated to them. They act as leaders, managers, managers and directors in small and medium-sized enterprises (in state-owned and private companies and the public administration sector). They manage teams of several to a dozen or so employees.

The participants in focus groups 3 and 4 of management staff were management staff in public administration who, as part of their professional work, have a superior relationship with the employees subordinated to them. They act as managers, project managers and directors. The respondents from the third group constitute managerial staff in state administration. They manage teams of several to a dozen or so employees. In turn, the respondents from the fourth group are directors of departments/faculties or independent local government administration units. The directors come from two cities in the Lublin Voivodeship, namely Lublin and Puławy.

The participants of the supervisors' (managerial staff) focus groups nb 5 and 6 were people who, as part of their professional work, have a superior relationship with the employees subordinated to them. They act as leaders, managers, managers and directors. They manage teams of several to a dozen or so employees. Participants of focus groups 5 and 6 work in small and medium-

5

sized enterprises in the Lublin and Podkarpackie voivodeships, state and private companies and non-governmental organizations (foundations, associations).

### Employers/Interview

The participants of the individual interviews were:

Interview 1 – representative of local government unit

Interview 2 – representative of management staff, holding a managerial position in a book trading company. This lady is a disabled person, which additionally allowed us to notice interesting aspects of managing highly sensitive employees.

Interview 3 – representative of management staff – HR director

### **1.5. Information about participants (from the recruitment form) - *sociodemographic characteristics of the respondents***

#### *Sociodemographic Characteristics of Employers*

Regarding the Employers that took part in the focus groups and in the individual interviews, a total of 48 participants were recruited. The majority were female (n=38) with a mean age of 41,8 years old (Minimum= 25 and Maximun= 60). There were n=10 male participants with a mean age of 37,5 years old (Minimum = 22 and Maximum= 52).

Regarding their educational level the majority n=32 of participants hold higher education level, the rest have secondary education level. Out of 48 n=22 participants live in Large city (100,000 and more), n=11 live in Medium city (20 000 – 100 000), n=4 live in Small town (up to 20 thousand) and the rest in a village. With regard to their profession the group of employers was diverse in terms of occupations and representative sectors.

### **1.6. Categories from the results (based on the categories sent by the leader)**

The Excel file with the results of the codification is included as an additional file.

### **1.7. Transcripts (as an attachment)**

All the transcriptions of the focus groups and the individual interviews are included as an attachment. The transcripts are in their original language (Polish).

## References

- Aron, E. N., & Aron, A. (1997). Sensory-processing sensitivity and its relation to introversion and emotionality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73(2), 345–368. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.73.2.345>
- Baryła-Matejczuk, M., Poleszak, W., & Porzak, R. (2021). Short Polish version of the Highly Sensitive Person Scale – exploring its multidimensional structure in a sample of emerging adults. *Current Issues in Personality Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.5114/cipp.2021.107339>
- Chacón, A., Pérez-Chacón, M., Borda-Mas, M., Avargues-Navarro, M. L., & López-Jiménez, A. M. (2021). Cross-Cultural Adaptation and Validation of the Highly Sensitive Person Scale to the Adult Spanish Population (HSPS-S). *Psychology Research and Behavior Management*, 14, 1041–1052. <https://doi.org/10.2147/PRBM.S321277>
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 16(3), 297–334. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02310555>
- Diener, E., Emmons, R., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The Satisfaction With Life Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49, 71-75.
- Manso-Pinto, J. F. (2006). Estructura factorial del maslach burnout inventory - version human services survey - en Chile. *Interamerican Journal of Psychology*, 40(1), 111-114. [http://pepsic.bvsalud.org/scielo.php?script=sci\\_arttext&pid=S0034-96902006000100012&lng=pt&tlng=es](http://pepsic.bvsalud.org/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0034-96902006000100012&lng=pt&tlng=es)
- Maslach, C. (1976). Burned-out. *Human Behavior*, 9(5), 16-22.
- Neukrug, E., & Fawcett, R. C. (2020). *Essentials of Testing and Assessment: A Practical Guide for Counselors, Social Workers, and Psychologists, Enhanced*. Cengage Learning; 3rd edition.



- Pavot, W., & Diener E. (1993). The affective and cognitive content of self-reports measures of subjective well-being. *Social Indicators Research*, 28(1), 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01086714>
- Spector, P. E., & Jex, S. M. (1998). Development of Four Self-Report Measures of Job Stressors and Strain: Interpersonal Conflict at Work Scale, Organizational Constraints Scale, Quantitative Workload Inventory, and Physical Symptoms Inventory. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 3, 356-367.
- Taber, K. S. (2018). The Use of Cronbach's Alpha When Developing and Reporting Research Instruments in Science Education. *Research in Science Education*, 48(6), 1273–1296. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-016-9602-2>