

Jari Metsämuuronen, PhD, Senior Researcher

Published in The Anticipation Methods and Practices. Edited by K.Mäkelä & K.Heinonen. Objective 4 Programs of the ESF Finland. Ministry of Labour Finland 11/1998 n:o 16.

Documentation of the Anticipation Practice/Method

Key words

Qualifications, Delphi-technique, Social affairs, Health care, Skills

1. Anticipation Method or Practice

Measurement of qualification in the area of social affairs and health care

2. Developers of the Practice/Method

Jari Metsämuuronen, EdD, Researcher
National Board of Education
Hakaniemenkatu 2
P.B. 358
00531 HELSINKI
FINLAND

Tel. (fin)-0-7747 7062

Fax. (Fin)-0-7747 7715

E-mail Jari.Metsamuuronen@OPH.fi

3. Background and Framework of the Practice/Method

Four Finnish national institutions:

- Ministry of Social Affairs and Health,
- National Board of Education,
- National Research and Development Centre for Welfare and Health,
- Association of Finnish Local and Regional Authorities

initiated an anticipation project funded by the European Social Fund (ESF). The anticipation project dealt with changes in work, and therefore with the changes in qualifications in the area of social affairs and health care.

The anticipation project was part of a large national project called SoTeKeKo. One of the aims of the SoTeKeKo project was to create co-operational practices for work and the educational world. The network of the SoTeKeKo project was used in the process of collecting the experts in the Delphi panel.

A technique somewhat different from the traditional Delphi technique was used in the present study. The study began in the normal manner as a mail questionnaire study with 205 experts involved in it. The experts were arranged into two panels, the expert panel proper consisting of representatives of working life and education (n=187), while the control panel composed of people representing organisations and research (n=18). The open-ended answers of the first round were analysed using content analysis and concept map technique. The participants for the second round, i.e. the best argumentators of qualification requirement, were selected from the expert panel based on an argumentation analysis. This resulted in an essentially smaller group of experts (total of 43 for the expert panel proper and 18 for the control panel) being selected for the second round from among those interviewees who had taken part in the first round.

4. Use of the Practice/Method

With the measurement of qualifications developed in the anticipation project it is possible to analyse and classify the qualifications needed in the future in the area of social affairs and health care. The measurement is a useful tool for collecting raw material of the opinions of the experts in a Delphi panel.

The measurement of qualifications is restricted to the areas of public and private sector of social affairs and health care. Still the qualifications found were not specially focused on any special area, but qualifications connected to social affairs and health care were comparable to other areas too.

The results are restricted to the Scandinavian way of organising social affairs and health care. However, the measurement itself is not restricted to the Scandinavian welfare system.

5. Users of the Practice/Method

The central issues involved are what the experts' beliefs of their customers are like in the areas of social affairs and health care and their needs to change in the future and what changes will take place in the work that is done. The measurement should be used with the group of experts concerning the qualifications needed in the future.

6. Description of the Anticipation Practice/Method

The qualification requirements were classified into 22 separate qualification classes, two of which – *Assuming of greater responsibility* and *Self-defence skills* – were unique. Figure one presents the qualifications grouped according to the extent to which the indicator clauses came to be classified in to them during the first Delphi round. Thus, the first class presented, of *Dealing with people*, got the greatest number of indicator clauses, while the last class, that of *Self-defence skills* got the least.

In the light of the averages for all the experts, **factual future qualification** included *Technological know-how* (change intensity 1.1), *Internationalism know-how* (0.9), and *Entrepreneurship know-how* (0.9). **Potential future qualification** included *Social environmental know-how* (0.7), *Self-defence know-how* (0.7), *Project-work know-how* (0.7), *Assuming-greater-responsibility know-how* (0.7), *Information-procurement know-how* (0.6), *Co-operation know-how* (0.6), *Active change know-how* (0.6), *Self-steering know-how* (0.5), *Change know-how* (0.5), *Innovative-approach-to-work know-how* (0.4), *Influencing work and influencing-at-the-workplace know-how* (0.4), *Leader-*

ship know-how (0.4), *Social know-how* (0.4), *Service know-how* (0.4), and *Taking-difficult-decisions know-how* (0.4). **Basic qualification** included *Managing tacit knowledge and soft skill* (0.3), *Dealing-with-people know-how* (0.3), *Value know-how and Ethical know-how* (0.3), and *Using-one's-own-person know-how* (0.2).

Figure 1. Emphasis given to qualification requirement classes in the areas of social affairs and health care.

7. Application of the Practice/Method

The measurement of qualifications can be ordered from the researcher. The original version is in Finnish, but an English version is available.

8. Assessment of the Practice/Method

Because the reliability of Delphi technique research is not obvious, two independent expert groups were used in this study. The second panel filled in two slightly different versions of the measurement, that is, (1) the measurement of their own group, and (2) the measurement of the first group. With these measurements, it is possible to evaluate the two panels' differences and on the other hand, how consistent they find the second in their opinion. The reliability of the measurement was studied in four different ways: (1) 96.3 % of the qualifications were same in the two panels. (2) The smaller panel gave 17 unique qualifications, which might have been easily classified into categories developed with the larger panel. (3) The internal consistency of the second panel was considerably high. Test -retest-correlation or stability varied from 0.70 to 0.94 with a few exceptions. (4) The internal consistency of the 22 classes of qualification was measured with Cronbach's Alfa. The alfa of the classes varied from 0.66 - 0.93.