

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 & QUESTIONNAIRE
RESEARCH - EMPLOYEES**

PARTNER ORGANISATION:

University of Alicante

Spain

*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.*

Organizational Information – University of Alicante WP3

The main objective of this task from the WP3 was to explore the functioning of highly sensitive people in the workplace, from the perspective of a highly sensitive employees of various sectors. For that purpose a series of focus groups and individual interviews were performed. In the case of the UA we selected professionals from the sectors of health care (including nursings and psychologist) and from the field of education (including primary education and high education).

After collecting the data an inductive qualitative analysis was performed based on the previous codes identified in the qualitative analysis that took place with the Polish sample. 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 employees.

1. Dates of focus groups/interviews: + annex – participants list, logs (if online)

The interviews and the focus groups were conducted during the months of October 2021 to March 2022.

Focus Group 1 (Employees): 22/11/2021

Focus Group 2 (Employees): 23/11/2021

Interview 2 (Employee): 07/11/2021

Interview 4 (Employee): 17/12/2021

Inteview 6 (Employee): 16/12/2021

Interview 7 (Employee): 14/03/2021

We attach one excel files that include the information of each participants as well as the signed informed consent to participate in the study.

2. Place of focus groups/interviews

Considering the COVID-19 situation all of the focus groups and interviews were performed online through the Google Meet platform. All of them were recorded in audio and in video to make the verbatim transcripts.

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 (Employees): N=4

Focus Group 2 (Employees): N=2

Interview 2 (Employee): 1 participant

Interview 4 (Employee): 1 participant

Inteview 6 (Employee): 1 participant

Interview 7 (Employee): 1 participant

4. Type of participants: *HS employees*

The type of participants is described after each focus group in addition we have included the area of work.

Focus Group 1 (Employees): Health Care Professionals with Highly Sensitivity

Focus Group 2 (Employees): Health Care Professionals with Highly Sensitivity

Interview 2 (Employee): Education. Highly Sensitive Person.

Interview 4 (Employee): Health Care Professional. Highly Sensitive Person.

Interview 6 (Employee): Education. Highly Sensitive Person.

Interview 7 (Employee): Education. Highly Sensitive Person

Content Related Information – University of Alicante WP3

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

Sociodemographic Characteristics of Employees

Regarding the Employees that took part in the focus groups and in the individual interviews, a total of 10 participants were recruited. The majority were female (n=7) with a mean age of 33.23 years old (Minimum= 27 and Maximum= 44). Regarding their educational level, two participants had advanced vocational training, three have an University Degree, four have reached the level of Master and one of them had a Ph.D. The majority of them lived in a city, with the exception of one participant that came from a town. With regard to their profession three of them were teachers and the rest were health care professionals. All of them considered themselves as a highly sensitive person and showed higher values in the Highly Sensitivity Scale

4

(HSC). The mean value for the total score of the scale was 4.07 being the higher score 6.6 and the lower 3.

2. Categories from the results (based on the categories sent by the leader) - the document with the category analysis is entitled CODES Example QA Promotion_final

The Excel file with the results of the codification for both employers and employees is included as an additional file.

3. 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 (Spanish).

QUANTITATIVE DATA FOR EMPLOYEES

1. Sample and data - characteristics of the research group-

Descriptive statistics of the sample.

Descriptive statistics for the participants who took part in the quantitative phase of the project are given below.

Table 1. Sociodemographic data of the sample

Sociodemographic variables	Total sample N=39 n (%) / Mean (DT)
Age	39.49 (10.47)
Gender	
<i>Male</i>	10 (25.6)
<i>Female</i>	29 (74.4)
Level of education	
<i>High school</i>	1 (2.6)
<i>Undergraduate</i>	13 (33.3)

Sociodemographic variables	Total sample N=39 n (%) / Mean (DT)
<i>Postgraduate</i>	21 (64.1)
Marital status	
<i>In a couple or married</i>	28 (71.8)
<i>Single</i>	11 (28.2)
Size of the place of residence	
<i>Until 20,000 inhabitants</i>	13 (33.4)
<i>From 20,001 to 100,000 inhabitants</i>	11 (28.2)
<i>100,001 inhabitants or more</i>	15 (38.5)
Formal background	
<i>Biology</i>	1 (2.6)
<i>Nursing</i>	7 (17.9)
<i>Philology</i>	2 (5.1)
<i>Philosophy</i>	1 (2.6)
<i>History</i>	1 (2.6)
<i>Engineering</i>	1 (2.6)
<i>Teaching</i>	10 (25.6)
<i>Psychology</i>	16 (41)
Current professional field	
<i>Education</i>	19 (49.7)
<i>Health Sciences</i>	17 (43.6)
<i>Others</i>	3 (7.8)

2. Measures

The characteristics of the instruments employed in the quantitative phase of the project are described below.

- **Sociodemographic data.** An ad-hoc questionnaire was included to determine the main characteristics of the participants (gender, year of birth, educational level, size of their place of residence, marital status, profession of study, profession currently exercised, name of the company in which they work, group to which they belong in their work).
- The **Highly Sensitive Person Scale (HSPS)** (Aron & Aron, 1997; Spanish adaptation by Chacón et al., 2021), is an instrument designed to assess environmental sensitivity as a personality trait. It consists of 27 items, with a 7-point Likert-type scale (from 1=Strongly disagree to 7=Strongly agree). The Spanish adaptation has five dimensions: i) Sensitivity to overstimulation (SOS): items 5, 11, 14, 16, 19, 21, 23, 26, 27; ii) Aesthetic sensitivity (AES): items 2, 3, 8, 10, 15, 22; iii) Low sensory threshold (LST): items 1, 7, 9, 18, 25. iv) Psychophysiological discrimination (FPD): items 4, 6, 13, 20; v) Harm avoidance (HA): items 12, 17, 24. For its correction, averages are made to calculate the value of the dimensions separately and for the total score of the scale is an overall average of all items. There are no inverse items. Higher scores indicate higher levels of sensory processing sensitivity. The internal consistency of the total scale score of the Spanish adaptation of HSPS-S was $\alpha = 0.92$ and the HSPS subscales presented acceptable reliability scores with $\alpha = 0.86$ for SOS, $\alpha = 0.79$ for AES, $\alpha = 0.82$ for LST, $\alpha = 0.56$ for FPD and $\alpha = 0.67$ for HA (Chacón et al., 2021).
- The **Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI)** (Maslach, 1996) is an instrument designed to assess Burnout syndrome. It consists of 22 items with a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (daily). It is distributed in 3 subscales: i) Emotional Exhaustion (EA), 9 items: 1,2,3,6,8,13,14,16,20. The maximum score is 54. High scores correspond to high feelings of being emotionally exhausted by the demands of the job. ii) Depersonalization (DP), 5 items: 5,10,11,15,22. The maximum score is 30. High scores correspond to a high tendency of coldness and detachment attitudes. iii) Personal

Accomplishment at work (PR), 8 items: 4,7,9,12,17,18,19,21. The maximum score is 48, The higher score, the greater feelings of self-efficacy and self-fulfillment at work. The syndrome can be observed when the person scores high on the first two subscales and low on the third. The internal consistency of the subscales is $\alpha = 0.82$ for AE, $\alpha = 0.80$ for DP and $\alpha = 0.85$ for RP (Manso-Pinto, 2006).

- The **Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS)** (Diener et al., 1985) is an instrument designed to assess the global cognitive judgements of individuals' satisfaction with their life. It consists of 5 items with a Likert-type scale with 7 response possibilities in which participants indicate the degree of agreement with each statement (from 1=Strongly disagree to 7=Strongly agree). The internal consistency of the scale was $\alpha = 0.87$ (Diener et al., 1985). A score of between 5 and 35 is obtained. Scores are assigned in six categories: 31-35, very satisfied; 26-30, satisfied; 21-25, somewhat satisfied; 20, neutral; 15-19, somewhat dissatisfied; 10-14, dissatisfied; and 5-9, very dissatisfied (Pavot & Diener, 1993).
- **Quantitative Workload Inventory (QWI)**; Spector & Jex, 1998). Instrument designed to evaluate the amount of work in a job. It consists of 5 items with a Likert-type scale with 5 response possibilities in which participants indicate the frequency of the described situations (from 1=Less than once a month or never to 5=Several times a day). A score between 5 and 25 is obtained. The higher the score, the higher the level of workload. An average internal consistency reliability of $\alpha = 0.82$ has been reported from 15 studies.
- The **Interpersonal Conflict at Work Scale (ICAWS)**; Spector & Jex, 1998) is an instrument designed to assess interpersonal conflict in the workplace. It consists of 4 items with a Likert-type scale with 5 response possibilities in which participants

indicate the frequency of the described situations (from 1=Less than once a month or never to 5=Several times a day). A score between 4 and 20 is obtained. The higher the score, the higher the frequency of conflicts with others. An average internal consistency reliability of $\alpha = 0.74$ has been reported from 13 studies.

3. Process of research carried out

Prior to complete the research survey electronically via Google platform, participants were provided with the informed consent, and they were asked to accomplish the online questionnaire, which took 7 minutes roughly. Participation was voluntary anonymous, and no compensation of any kind was received for it. Participants could drop out of the study at any time. Appropriate measures were taken to safeguard the information in compliance with Organic Law 3/2018 on data protection and guarantee of digital rights. Here is the link used for the questionnaire:

<https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSfj8sFd9rSvLL0cqquSckEoU5-wyXuMqnlrKScteuzqUyj0tQ/viewform>

4. Data - as an attachment in Excel databases

The data of the quantitative phase of the Project has been attached.

5. Descriptive Statistics of the questionnaires

In the Table 2, the mean and standard deviation of the total score and the score obtained in each dimension of the Highly Sensitive Person Scale (HSPS) questionnaire have been included.

9

Table 2. Means and standard deviations of the HSPS total score and its dimensions.

Total score/dimensions	M (SD)
Sensitivity to overstimulation	4.25 (1.42)
Aesthetic sensitivity	4.95 (1.13)
Low sensory threshold	4.02 (1.49)
Psychophysiological discrimination	3.64 (1.12)
Harm avoidance	5.58 (1.39)
HSPS total score	4.40 (1.06)

Table 3 includes means and standard deviations of the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) dimensions.

Table 3. Means and standard deviations of the MBI dimensions.

Dimensions	M (SD)
Emotional exhaustion	20.85 (7.90)
Despersonalization	9.85 (4.48)
Personal accomplishment at work	31.64 (5.44)

In the Table 4, means and standard deviations of the total score in the Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS), the Quantitative Workload Inventory (QWI), and The Interpersonal Conflict at Work Scale (ICAWS) have been included.

Table 4. Means and standard deviations of the SWLS, QWI and ICAWS total scores.

Items	M (SD)
SWLS	26.15 (6.99)
QWI	15.41 (4.51)

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>
- 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>
- 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
- Maslach, C. (1976). Burned-out. *Human Behavior*, 9(5), 16-22.
- Pavot, W., & Diener E. (1993). The affective and cognitive contest 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.