

**PREVENTION TRAINING IN THE SOCIO-EDUCATIONAL FIELD:
AN ANALYSIS OF PROFESSIONAL PROFILES'
FORMACIÓN PARA LA PREVENCIÓN EN EL ÁMBITO SOCIOEDUCATIVO: UN
ANÁLISIS DE LOS PERFILES PROFESIONALES
FORMAÇÃO PARA A PREVENÇÃO NO ÂMBITO SOCIOEDUCATIVO: UMA
ANÁLISE DOS PERFIS PROFISSIONAIS**

Belén PASCUAL BARRIO*, Lidia SÁNCHEZ-PRIETO*, Maria Antònia GOMILA GRAU*,
Victoria QUESADA SERRA* & Maria Lluç NEVOT CALDENTHEY*
Universidad de las Islas Baleares*

Received date: 02.II.2019

Reviewed date: 07.V.2019

Accepted date: 20.V.2019

KEY WORDS:

Family prevention
train the trainers
prevention
programmes
evidence-based
practice

ABSTRACT: The function of the trainer is key to the development of Evidence-Based Programmes (EBP); they are the people in charge of ensuring that components are rigorously applied, of maintaining motivation, and of promoting adequate relationships between participants. The aim of the study was to assess the levels of competence of professionals applying the Family Competence Program (PCF). In order to achieve the aims of the PCF, competences in the Intrapersonal and Interpersonal areas are especially relevant. The assessment was carried out using the CompeTEA instrument, which is specialised in assessing professional competences. Data analysis was structured in five areas: Intrapersonal, Interpersonal, Task development, Setting, and Management. The results show that the professionals possess "intermediate levels of competence", with the Intrapersonal, Interpersonal, and Setting areas standing out with respect to the others. Associated to these dimensions, professionals obtained higher levels at both the criteria and normative level, in the competences *Self-confidence, Communication, and Result orientation*.

CONTACT WITH THE AUTHORS

BELÉN PASCUAL BARRIO. Departamento de Pedagogía y Didácticas Específicas. Universidad de las Islas Baleares.
E-Mail: belen.pascual@uib.es

<p>PALABRAS CLAVE: Prevención familiar formación de formadores programas de prevención práctica basada en evidencia</p>	<p>RESUMEN: La función del formador es clave en el desarrollo de Programas Basados en la Evidencia (PBE); son los encargados de asegurar que los componentes se aplican rigurosamente, de mantener la motivación y de fomentar adecuadas relaciones entre los participantes. El objetivo del estudio es evaluar qué niveles de competencias presentan los profesionales que aplican el Programa de Competencia Familiar (PCF). Para la consecución de los objetivos del PCF son especialmente relevantes las competencias del área Intrapersonal e Interpersonal. La evaluación se realiza a partir del instrumento CompeTEA, especializado en la evaluación de competencias profesionales. El análisis de los datos se estructura en cinco áreas: Intrapersonal, Interpersonal, Desarrollo de tareas, Entorno y Gerencial. Los resultados muestran que los profesionales poseen “niveles medios de competencias”, destacando las áreas Interpersonal, Intrapersonal y Entorno respecto a las demás. Asociadas a estas dimensiones, los profesionales obtienen medias más elevadas, tanto a nivel criterial como normativo, en las competencias <i>Confianza en sí mismo, Comunicación y Orientación a los resultados</i>.</p>
<p>PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Prevenção familiar formação de formadores programas de prevenção prática baseada na evidência</p>	<p>RESUMO: A função do formador é fundamental no desenvolvimento dos Programas Baseados na Evidência (PBE); são os responsáveis por assegurar que os componentes são aplicados rigorosamente, por manter a motivação e por promover relações adequadas entre os participantes. O objetivo do estudo é avaliar os níveis de competências apresentados pelos profissionais que aplicam o Programa de Competência Familiar (PCF). Para a implementação dos objetivos do PCF são particularmente relevantes as competências nas áreas intrapessoal e interpessoal. A avaliação realiza-se a partir do instrumento CompeTEA especializado na avaliação de competências profissionais. A análise dos dados estrutura-se em cinco áreas: Intrapessoal, Interpessoal, Desenvolvimento de tarefas, Ambiente e Gestão. Os resultados mostram que os profissionais detêm “níveis médios de competências”, destacando-se as áreas Interpessoal, Intrapessoal e Ambiente na relação com os outros. Associadas a estas dimensões, os profissionais obtêm médias mais elevadas tanto a nível do critério, como a nível normativo nas competências <i>Confiança em si mesmo, Comunicação e Orientação para os resultados</i>.</p>

1. Introduction

The effectiveness of a prevention programme is related to a development of the implementation that will enable the expected results to be adequately reached. In the last few years, there has been a proliferation of highly structured programmes - based on scientific evidence - that include specific training processes for the professionals that are going to implement them (Sloboda & Petras, 2014; Israelashvili & Romano, 2016). These professionals (trainers) need knowledge concerning the programme to be applied - contents, operation, and application process - as well as competences and generic pedagogical strategies that will enable them to manage learning dynamics (EMCDDA, 2018). Besides, the trainers must have an attitude of fidelity towards the structure and components of the programme to be implemented, and possess group management strategies (Orte, Ballester, Vives & Amer, 2015).

Indeed, effectiveness in the development of a programme is also linked to fidelity towards it, that is, respect towards the components of the programme and fulfilment of the criteria that ensure results (Borntrager, Chorpita, Higa-McMillan & Weisz, 2009; Forehand, Dorsey, Jones, Long & McMahon, 2010). Hence, it is necessary for trainers to know the content of the programme, have competences for its application, and show a favourable attitude towards the intervention model.

Trainers must be predisposed to the application of a programme of these characteristics and be aware of the need to respect its structure, that is, they must have a positive attitude towards evidence-based practice (Aarons, Cafri, Lugo, & Sawitzky, 2012; Beidas & Kendall, 2010). This favourable attitude may have been acquired previously due to the training received, implementation of other programmes, or, it can be instilled based on the specific training process.

The characteristics and profile of the professionals who implement the programme are variables that can influence its results (Asgary-Eden & Lee, 2011). Together with a favourable ability and attitude towards the application of a structured programme, the generic competences, skills, and personality traits of trainers can affect the success of actions (Eames et al., 2010; Turner, Nicholson & Sanders, 2011). In fact, the bond between professional and participants works as a key element that regulates the components that ensure the effectiveness of the intervention.

At the methodological level, the training process of a prevention programme must promote active learning and interaction between participants through teaching dynamics and methodologies that favour the acquirement of competences (Turner & Sanders, 2006), as well as building knowledge based on reflexion on the experience (Ormrod, 2003; Bonwel & Eison, 1991). This type of learning includes active participation techniques

that encourage direct intervention of participants in their training, such as role-playing, discussion, and reflexive questions (Beidas et al., 2012; Forehand et al., 2010; Scudder & Herschell, 2015; Turner, Nicholson & Sanders, 2011).

In accordance with this methodological and teaching model, the necessary competences are the skills of communication and empathy, the ability to explain the contents, group management, and participant motivation, confidence in their own skills, handling of participants with difficulties, personal responsibility in learning, and conflict resolution strategies (Orte et al., 2015). These factors can be considered and assessed as relevant variables in the development of prevention programmes. At the same time, these factors could be considered in the selection of trainers in order to refine and have the most adequate profiles (Forehand et al., 2010) or also to analyse the training needs of professionals so as to improve these skills, values, and favourable attitudes towards learning and change (Orte et al., 2016; Small et al., 2009).

The professional who participates in structured prevention programmes receives specific training in relation to the characteristics and techniques of the programme to be implemented, but it is necessary to consider the fact that their training and work experience guarantees a series of competences, skills, and attitudes that will facilitate the implementation, the relationship with participants, and group management. Precisely, this study involves an approach to professional competences based on the experience of the Family Competence Program (PCF).

The PCF is a multicomponent, family-focused prevention programme. Its aim is to promote protection factors and decrease the risk factors associated to young people through good family functioning. From a cognitive-emotional and socio-educational perspective, the PCF is aimed at strengthening family competence, family cohesion and organisation, communication, and cooperative problem resolution (Orte & Ballester, 2018). This programme involves a training process aimed at the professionals implementing it that includes the following thematic blocks:

A. Specific knowledge concerning the PCF: theoretical and experimental bases.

- B. Structure and contents of the PCF: components and factors involved.
- C. Operation of the sessions.
- D. Representation of the sessions and development of group dynamics.
- E. Evaluation of the programme.

Thus, the aim of the study presented herein was to analyse the general competences of the professionals going to implement the Family Competence Program. The goals set were the following: (1) Define the levels of competences of the trainers; (2) Specifically analyse the levels of competence according to five dimensions: intrapersonal, interpersonal, setting, task development, and management; (3) Analyse the differences existing between dimensions and in relation to levels of competence; and (4) Assess the goodness of fit of the competences analysed to the training needs of professionals implementing the PCF. With regard to the last goal, it would be especially relevant for them to have competences in the intrapersonal and interpersonal areas.

2. Methodology

A quantitative study based on a test was implemented. The evaluation was carried out prior to the implementation of the PCF in order to establish the profile of the professionals, by finding out their competences and their skills.

2.1. Sample

Non-probabilistic, accidental sampling was performed. Hence, the target sample corresponded to the study population – professionals who were going to implement the PCF, who had enrolled for specific training in the programme, and who worked in institutions or organisations that intervened with families or with minors. There were a total of 133 professionals who met these requirements and who were contacted to take part in the study. In the end, the data-producing sample comprised of 74.

Competences of the 74 professionals, with a clear female predominance (79.7%), were evaluated (see *Table 1*). Mean age of women was 38.53 years (SD=8.728) while that of men was 40.40 years (SD=5.779).

Table 1. Socio-demographic profile of the sample		
	N	%
Professionals		
Men	15	20.3
Women	59	79.7
Age		
Under 30 years	8	10.8
Between 30 and 39 years	30	40.5
Between 40 and 49 years	30	40.5
Between 50 and 59 years	5	6.8
60 years or over	1	1.4
Training		
Secondary education	1	1.4
University degree	48	64.9
Postgraduate studies	25	33.8

Most professionals had a university degree (98.6%), and a third (33.8%) indicated that they also had postgraduate training. As can be observed in Table 2, the sample revealed very heterogeneous profiles, in both the area of training and work. 73% worked in fields related to social intervention with families, specifically, in Social Services (Balearic Islands) or in third social sector organisations, such as *Proyecto Hombre* (Balearic Islands and Castile and León), *Fundación Natzaret* (Balearic Islands), *Igaxes* (Galicia), and *Agintzari* (Basque Country). The rest - 20 participants - came from primary and secondary education centres in the Balearic Islands.

Table 2. Academic and work profile		
Type of studies	N	%
Social education	22	29.7
Psychology	19	25.7
Pedagogy	14	18.9
Primary education	6	8.1
Social work	6	8.1
Arts and humanities	6	8.1
Sciences	1	1.4
Field in which they work		
Socio-educational field	54	73
School setting	20	27
Years spent working with families		
I have never worked	12	16.2
Less than 1 year	3	4.1
Between 1 year and less than 5 years	14	18.9
Between 5 years and less than 10 years	17	23.0
Between 10 years and less than 15 years	14	18.9
Over 15 years	14	18.9

One aspect to take into account is prior experience: 18.9% claimed to have more than 15 years' experience working with families (see Table 2). Likewise, there was also a wide range of functions carried out, with professionals specialised in programme application (8.1%), in therapeutic intervention (10.8%), and in providing educational support to families (18.9%) (see Table 3).

Table 3. Experience of socio-educational intervention with families

	N	%
Informative assistance and orientation	14	18.9
Educational support to families (Family educator programme)	14	18.9
School centre tutoring	11	14.9
Therapeutic intervention	8	10.8
Programme application	6	8.1
Conflict resolution	5	6.8
Group dynamics	3	4.1
Training aimed at fathers and mothers	2	2.7
Administrative or documentary management	1	1.4
Others	10	13.5
	74	100.0

2.2. Instrument

In order to assess participants, the CompeTEA test (Arribas & Pereña, 2009; 2015), which is specialised in assessing professional competences, was used. This is a self-administered test and, in this case, completed on-line, aimed at assessing 20 professional competences. The CompeTEA test comprises 170 items, grouped in the 20 competences and 5 thematic areas. The competences making up each area are presented below, together with one item by way of example (Arribas & Pereña, 2015):

- A. Intrapersonal Area. Referring to the way in which they relate to themselves.
- Emotional stability - *"I usually show a stable mood, with very few ups and downs"*.
 - Self-confidence - *"I feel good about myself"*.
 - Resistance to adversity - *"When difficult situations arise I face them as challenges to be overcome"*.
- B. Interpersonal Area. Relating to the way to relate to other people in the workplace.
- Negotiation - *"In a context of negotiation, it is difficult to understand some of the benefits that others want to achieve"*.
 - Communication - *"My co-workers find it hard to understand some of the things I communicate to them"*.

- Establishment of relationships - *"I enjoy a close relationship with each of my co-workers"*.

- Influence - *"I am a reference in the performance of the activities of other teams"*.
- Teamwork - *"People like working with me when forming a team"*.

C. Task development Area. Relating to the way in which their work tasks are tackled.

- Results orientation - *"I usually achieve the goals I set myself"*.

- Decision-making - *"I find it hard to make decisions when faced with a difficult problem"*.

- Analytical ability - *"Before making decisions I carefully analyse the information available"*.

- Initiative - *"I achieve goals better if I am left to myself as regards the way of doing it"*.

D. Setting Area. Relating to the way in which they relate to organisations or other agents in the profession.

- Knowledge of the company - *"I am aware of the weak points of my company compared to other companies"*.

- Customer orientation - *"I prefer not to deal directly with customers"*.

- Vision - *"I am able to anticipate the effects certain current events will have on my organisation or workplace"*.

- Openness - *"I am very interested in the technical innovations produced in my profession"*.

- Identification with the company - *"I like the values and style of management practised in my company"*.

E. Management Area. Relating to the way in which they manage, direct, or lead other people.

- Management - *"I prefer others to take charge of the management of and responsibility for a group of people"*.

- Leadership - *"My colleagues consider me the ideal person to carry out public communications"*.

- Organisation and planning - *"The structure and organisation of my company seem very complex to me"*.

Items follow a Likert scale, with four response options; with A) *always*, and D) *Hardly ever or never*.

Alpha coefficients of internal consistency of the questionnaire ranged between 0.58 and 0.77. These can be established as satisfactory values if the nature of the variables assessed and test

length are taken into account. Alpha coefficients in psychometric instruments with the same aim are similar: BIP (0.63 and 0.86), and 16PF-5 (0.61 and 0.85) (Arribas, 2009; Arribas & Pereña, 2015). With respect to the validity of the construct, confirmatory factorial analysis verified that the theoretical model of CompeTEA fits the empirical data. A high Goodness of Fit Index was achieved (GFI)=0.972), which could indicate that it has adequate validity (Ibid). Besides, the instrument incorporates a sincerity factor that acts as a control variable (Ibid).

The duration for its administration is approximately 30 minutes.

2.3. Data analysis

Data analysis was divided into two differentiated levels:

A) *Normative level*: this level makes it possible to position the results with respect to

the representative normative sample of the population to be measured (Arribas, 2009). Specifically, it refers to the standardised scores based on the general scale used for the Spanish population (see *Table 4*).

B) *Criteria level*: this level refers to the behaviours the subject performs or might perform based on their test responses as the criterion. Scores are associated to the levels of competence obtained according to the direct scores. In this category 4 levels are identified:

- Level 0: Very low degree of competence
- Level 1: Low degree of competence
- Level 2: Intermediate degree of competence
- Level 3: High degree of competence
- Level 4: Very high degree of competence

Correspondence between scores and levels of competence can be observed in *Table 4*.

	Levels				
	0	1	2	3	4
Emotional stability	1.2	7.5	48.3	32.4	10.5
Self-confidence	0.9	4.6	39.1	39.7	15.7
Resistance to adversity	1.2	8.5	45.1	32.3	12.8
Negotiation	0.5	2.7	29.6	41.3	25.9
Communication	1.3	9.1	36.7	41.0	11.8
Establishment of relationships	1.3	9.7	51.0	27.4	10.6
Influence	0.3	3.8	42.1	40.5	13.3
Teamwork	0.1	0.8	11.2	51.1	36.8
Results orientation	6.6	41.4	46.7	5.0	0.3
Decision-making	0.3	4.7	32.0	46.4	16.6
Analytical ability	0.2	1.3	15.8	50.5	32.2
Initiative	0.4	4.4	48.4	36.9	9.9
Knowledge of the company	0.4	3.4	23.8	42.7	29.7
Customer orientation	4.4	14.5	43.2	26.4	11.6
Vision	0.2	1.8	23.6	40.6	33.7

	Levels				
	0.4	4.1	36.2	41.1	18.2
Openness	0.4	4.1	36.2	41.1	18.2
Identification with the company	0.4	3.7	23.8	45.1	26.9
Management	0.7	7.7	32.5	42.6	16.6
Leadership	2.4	14.5	38.6	35.2	9.3
Organisation and planning	0.6	6.4	31.0	45.1	16.9

3. Results

The sample studied revealed “intermediate levels” in the competences analysed. Namely, the five areas had mean standardised scores that ranged between 36.75 and 51.63 points.

Firstly, in the *Intrapersonal area*, according to the normative level, similarly weighted means were recorded on the global scale. Means ranged

between 41.09 ($SD=16.60$) for *Self-confidence* and 41.90 ($SD=12.74$) for *Emotional stability* (see Table 5). At the criteria level, participants obtained levels of competence of an “intermediate degree”. In this sense, they recorded a higher level of competence in the *Self-confidence* competence, referring to how professionals feel in relation to themselves.

Scales	Means (Standard deviation) direct score	Means (Standard deviation) S score	Level of competence
Emotional stability	19.72 (1.80)	41.90 (12.74)	2.13 (0.53)
Self-confidence	20.57 (2.23)	41.09 (16.60)	2.27 (0.66)
Resistance to adversity	19.90 (2.14)	41.36 (14.92)	2.09 (14.92)
	Means (Standard deviation) direct score	Means (Standard deviation) S score	
Intrapersonal Area	87.72 (24.52)	35.42 (11.27)	

With respect to the normative level, referring to the *Interpersonal area*, professionals obtained higher standardised mean scores in *Communication* ($M=47.4$; $SD=61.92$) and in *Stability in relationships* ($M=45.22$; $SD=17.43$) (see Table 6). Nevertheless, at the criteria level, the sample had higher mean scores in the competences of *Teamwork* ($M=2.88$; $SD=0.64$) and also in *Communication*

($M=2.4$; $SD=0.77$). Meanwhile, the mean score in the *Negotiation* competence was lower ($M=2$; $SD=0.49$) (see Table 6). Therefore, if both levels are taken into account (normative and criteria), the sample revealed “intermediate levels of competence”, with *Communication* particularly standing out.

Table 6. Descriptive statistics concerning the scores obtained in the Interpersonal area

Scales	Means (Standard deviation) direct score	Means (Standard deviation) S score	Level of competence
Stability in relationships	23.81 (2.879)	45.22 (17.43)	2.36 (0.71)
Influence	20.48 (2.565)	41.45 (12.86)	2.25 (0.70)
Negotiation	19.42 (1.78)	41.82 (12.86)	2 (0.49)
Communication	21.16 (2.32)	47.46 (61.92)	2.4 (0.77)
Teamwork	26.16 (2.25)	40.16 (17.02)	2.88 (0.64)
	Means (Standard deviation) direct score	Means (Standard deviation) S score	
Interpersonal Area	87.72 (24.52)	35.42 (12.98)	

In the area of *Task development*, the *Initiative* competence obtained a mean of 50.77 ($SD=18.80$) in the standardised scores (that is, with respect to the normative population); however, at the criteria level, it was categorised as a “low level” ($M=1.54$; $SD=0.64$) (see Table 7). Of all the levels of competence evaluated, the lowest mean score was recorded in the *Initiative* competence (with mean scores lower than 48.4 considered as “low level”)

(see Table 4). Nonetheless, the highest mean in this dimension was recorded for *Results orientation*, which produced a mean standard score of 43.51 ($SD=13.89$), with an “intermediate level” of 2.75. Intermediate-high scores in the *Results orientation* competence indicated that professionals preferred to work in accordance with demanding goals, by managing resources in order to achieve established goals.

Table 7. Descriptive statistics concerning the scores obtained in the Task Development area

Scales	Means (Standard deviation) direct score	Means (Standard deviation) S score	Level of competence
Results orientation	22.28 (1.91)	43.51 (13.89)	2.75 (0.63)
Decision-making	19.70 (2.64)	37.90 (20.90)	2.11 (0.75)
Analytical ability	25.15 (2.59)	36.72 (17.46)	2.65 (0.67)
Initiative	27.78 (3.26)	50.77 (18.80)	1.54 (0.64)
	Means (Standard deviation) direct score	Means (Standard deviation) S score	
Task development Area	100.88 (34.58)	30.21 (16.34)	

The *Setting* area referred to the way in which examinees related to organisations and the participants they worked with. With regard to the criteria level, the competence of *Customer orientation* stood out as the one with a greater

competence mean ($M=2.75$; $SD=0.64$). Meanwhile, as for the population - normative interpretation - the highest mean in standardised scores was the one awarded to *Vision and anticipation* ($M=51.63$; $SD=14.96$) (see Table 8).

Table 8. Descriptive statistics concerning the scores obtained in the Setting area

Scales	Means (Standard deviation) direct score	Means (Standard deviation) S score	Level of competence
Knowledge of the workplace	24.65 (2.89)	38.72 (17.73)	2.47 (0.76)
Participant/user orientation	22.28 (1.91)	43.51 (13.89)	2.75 (0.64)
Vision	20.69 (2.51)	51.63 (14.96)	2.30 (0.79)
Openness	21.13 (2.82)	45.66 (21.25)	2.50 (0.92)
Identification with the company	24.89 (2.52)	41.62 (14.78)	2.56 (0.64)
	Means (Standard deviation) direct score	Means (Standard deviation) S score	
Setting Area	147.23 (40.23)	33.43 (15.16)	

Lastly, associated with the *Management* area, the scores showed “intermediate criteria levels”, with means ranging between 2.03 and 2.08 (with a deviation located between 0.69 and 0.75) (see

Table 9). Means of the standardised scores could also be categorised as “intermediate results”, ranging from 36.75 ($SD=16.27$) to 43.65 ($SD=16.16$).

Table 9. Descriptive statistics concerning the scores obtained in the Management area

Scales	Means (Standard deviation) direct score	Means (Standard deviation) S score	Level of competence
Management	22.89 (2.77)	36.75 (16.27)	2.08 (0.75)
Leadership	22.63 (3.07)	43.65 (16.16)	2.03 (0.83)
Organisation and planning	23.85 (2.62)	40.81 (15.94)	2.34 (0.69)
	Means (Standard deviation) direct score	Means (Standard deviation) S score	
Management Area	83.58 (27.05)	29.61 (13.68)	

With respect to the differences between areas in professionals, it is worth highlighting that the *Intrapersonal*, *Interpersonal*, and *Setting* areas stood out as they had higher mean scores than *Task development* and *Management*. Specifically, based on a paired t test, statistically significant differences were identified between the scores obtained between the *Interpersonal* and *Task development* areas ($p<0.01$). Thus, higher mean scores were recorded in the competences referring to the *Interpersonal* area ($M=35.4189$; $SD=12.99$) than

in that of *Task development* ($M=30.22$; $SD=16.34$) (see *Tables 6, 7, and 10*). Likewise, statistically significant differences appeared between the mean scores of the *Interpersonal* and *Management* areas ($p<0.01$), with the competences associated to the *Interpersonal* area showing higher mean scores ($M=29.61$; $SD=13.68$) (see *Table 10*). On the other hand, no statistically significant differences were observed between the *Interpersonal* and *Setting* areas.

Table 10. Paired t test

Dimensions	Mean Difference	Dev. Deviation	95% confidence interval of the difference		t	gl	Sig. (bilateral)
			Lower	Higher			
Interpersonal-Intrapersonal	.00000	9.61021	-2.22651	2.22651	.000	73	1.000
Interpersonal-Task development	5.20270	11.82171	2.46383	7.94157	3.786	73	.000**
Interpersonal-Setting	1.98649	12.38923	-.88386	4.85684	1.379	73	.172
Interpersonal-Management	5.81081	9.83658	3.53186	8.08976	5.082	73	.000**
Intrapersonal-Task development	5.20270	14.90332	1.74988	8.65552	3.003	73	.004*
Intrapersonal-Setting	1.98649	14.39034	-1.34749	5.32046	1.187	73	.239
Intrapersonal-Management	5.81081	12.09854	3.00781	8.61382	4.132	73	.000**
Task development-Setting	-3.21622	15.38837	-6.78141	.34898	-1.798	73	.076
Task development-Management	.60811	11.27467	-2.00402	3.22024	.464	73	.644
Setting-Management	3.82432	14.34254	-.50143	7.14722	2.294	73	.025*

*p<0.05; **p<0.01

It is worth noting that the *Intrapersonal* and *Interpersonal* dimensions had the same mean score in the normative interpretation ($M=35.42$), although different standard deviations were recorded (SD of the *Interpersonal* area = 12.99 as opposed to the SD of the *Intrapersonal* area = 11.27) (see Table 5 and Table 6).

Similarly, statistically significant differences were also identified between the *Intrapersonal* and *Task development* areas ($p<0.05$), with a mean difference of 5.20 points ($SD=14.90$) in favour of the *Intrapersonal* area. Likewise, statistically significant differences ($p<0.05$) were found between the *Intrapersonal* and *Management* areas, once again in favour of the *Intrapersonal* area (see Table 5 and Table 9).

However, no statistically significant differences were found between the *Intrapersonal* and *Setting* areas.

While greater mean scores were obtained in the area of *Setting*, no statistically significant differences were recorded with respect to the professional competences associated between

this and the area of *Task development* ($p>0.05$). Along the same line, neither were any statistically significant differences recorded between competences in the areas of *Task development* and *Management* ($p=0.644$), with a mean difference of 0.61 ($SD=11.27$) (see Table 10).

Lastly, when comparing the areas of *Setting* and *Management*, statistically significant differences were identified between both mean scores ($p<0.05$), indicating that participants would have a greater level of competence in the area of *Setting* than in that of *Management* ($M=3.82$; $SD=14.34$) (see Table 8, Table 9, and Table 10).

4. Discussion

This study carries out an examination of the professional profile of participating professionals (and future trainers) in a train-the-trainer programme for prevention with adolescents, revealing intermediate levels of competence and some remarkable differences. A first reading of the results makes it possible to confirm that the level

of general competence of the sample analysed conforms to generic competences, applicable in both their reference work setting, and in their intervention as trainers in a prevention programme. Participants recorded “intermediate levels” with respect to how they felt with themselves (Intrapersonal area), related to others (Interpersonal area), approached their intervention in the workplace (Setting area), and were oriented towards professional tasks (Task development area). The competences that obtained the best mean scores were Self-confidence, Communication, Teamwork, Participant orientation, and Results orientation. This is an adequate level of generic competences, as they are skills that can have a considerable influence on an adequate implementation of programmes (Eames et al., 2010; Turner, Nicholson & Sanders, 2011).

The results obtained show that the Intrapersonal, Interpersonal, and Setting areas have higher mean scores in their competences than those related to the areas of Task development and Management. Specifically, the highest mean scores in the test were identified in the Intrapersonal and Interpersonal areas, with these two areas, in fact, making up the main competences the trainer needs for a family prevention programme: communication ability, the ability to work in a team (Orte et al., 2016), and confidence in their own abilities (Orte et al., 2015). It must be remembered that in the Intrapersonal area - related to emotional stability, self-confidence, resilience in adverse situations, and ability to cope - the “highest level” obtained in this study is found in the Self-confidence competence - referring to how professionals feel with themselves. In the Interpersonal area, the Communication competence is the one that has the highest mean scores, followed by Teamwork. Although other competences in this area, such as Negotiation, Establishment of relationships, or Influence, are also relevant for the trainer profile, they recorded lower mean scores, despite still being relatively high.

In the Task development area, the most outstanding competence is that of Results orientation, obtaining an “intermediate-high level”. This competence involves the ability to orient work towards the intended objectives - by managing resources so as to achieve the established goals - and corresponds to the ability to follow the guidelines established by a structured programme, in accordance with the components and in compliance with the criteria that will ensure the results,

aspects that are considered relevant in the impartation of highly structured programmes (Borntreger et al. 2009; Forehand et al., 2010).

5. Conclusion

The present study was aimed at analysing the generic competences of professionals who implement the Family Competence Program and their goodness of fit to the training needs of this prevention programme. The results show an intermediate level of competence, which ensures a correct implementation, but also indicate room for improvement in certain competences.

One limitation of the study lies in the size of the sample, which, on the one hand, does not allow for a generalisation of the results; and on the other hand, has prevented an analysis of the differences in level of competence according to the different personal and professional characteristics of the participants. Even taking these limitations into consideration, on the one hand, this study offers a view of the skills the professionals have; and, on the other hand, opens up new paths for research.

In this sense, it is worth noting that it would be interesting to go further into an analysis with respect to the potential differences existing between professionals in terms of their academic training and the fields of intervention of reference. Professionals with diverse training and roles participated in the study depending on their specialisation in the school setting, the field of socio-educational intervention with early childhood, youths and families, or the field of intervention specialising in the prevention of drug addiction. Hence, the analysis of the competences associated to the different professional profiles and corresponding academic profiles entail lines of future research. Further, a differentiated analysis of the competences will make it possible to design specific training actions for learning group management skills through strategies to improve communication, empathy, the ability to create a positive climate, motivation, and conflict resolution.

Other lines of research could, also, include the analysis of the level of competence of professionals before training in a preventive programme and after experience in the progressive application of said programme, in order to analyse the level of successive gain, if there is any, on the basis of training and first-hand experience.

Note

- ¹ EDU2016-79235-R - "VALIDACIÓN DEL PROGRAMA DE COMPETENCIA FAMILIAR UNIVERSAL 10-14, PCF-U", 2017-2019. State Programme of R+D+i Aimed at Societal Challenges: R+D Projects. Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness. State Research Agency: AEI and FEDER.

References

- Aarons, G., Cafri, G., Lugo, L., & Sawitzky, A. (2012). Expanding the domains of attitudes towards evidence-based practice: The evidence based practice attitude scale-50. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, 39(5), 331-340.
- Arribas, D. (2009). A new theoretical model and questionnaire to assess competences: CompeTEA. *Comunicación presentada en el 14º Congress of Work and Organizational Psychology*. Santiago de Compostela.
- Arribas, D., & Pereña, J. (2009). *CompeTEA. Evaluación de competencias*. Madrid: TEA Ediciones.
- Arribas, D., Pereña, J. (2015). *Manual CompeTEA*. Madrid: TEA Ediciones.
- Asgary-Eden, V., & Lee, C. M. (2011). So now we've picked an evidence-based program, what's next? Perspectives of service providers and administrators. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 42(2), 169.
- Beidas, R.S., & Kendall, P.C. (2010). Training Therapists in Evidence-Based Practice: A Critical Review of Studies From a Systems-Contextual Perspective. *Clinical Psychology Science and Practice*, 17(1), 1-30.
- Beidas, R.S., Edmunds, J.M., Marcus, S.C., & Kendall, P.C. (2012). Training and Consultation to Promote Implementation of an Empirically Supported Treatment: A Randomized Trial. *Psychiatric Services*, 63(7), 660-665
- Bonwel, Ch.C., & Eison, J.A. (1991). *Active Learning: Creating Excitement in the Classroom*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Reports. Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education.; ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education.
- Borntrager, C.F., Chorpita, B.F., Higa-McMillan, C., & Weisz, J.R. (2009). Provider Attitudes Toward Evidence-Based Practices: Are the Concerns With the Evidence or With the Manuals?. *Psychiatric Services*, 60(5), 677-681.
- Eames, C., Daley, D., Hutchings, J., Whitaker, C.J., Bywater, T., Jones, K., & Hughes, J. C. (2010). The impact of group leaders' behaviour on parents acquisition of key parenting skills during parent training. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 48, 1221-1226.
- EMCDDA (en prensa) (2018) *Manual del Curriculum Europeo de Prevención*. Lisboa: EMCDDA. Versión española del *European Prevention Curriculum Handbook* creado dentro del proyecto UPC-Adapt (HOME/2015/JDRU/AG/DRUG/8863)
- Forehand, R., Dorsey, S., Jones, D.J., Long, N., y McMahon, R.J. (2010). Adherence and Flexibility: They Can (and Do) Coexist!. *Clinical psychology Science and Practice*, 17, 258-264
- Galeano, M. E. (2003). *Diseño de proyectos en la investigación cualitativa*. Medellín (Colombia): Universidad Eafit.
- Israelashvili, M., & Romano, J. (Eds.). (2016). *The Cambridge Handbook of International Prevention Science*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Lochman, J.E., Boxmeyer, C., Powell, N., Qu, L, Wells, K., & Windle, M. (2009). Dissemination of the Coping Power program: Importance of intensity of counselor training. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 77(3), 397-409.
- Ormrod, J. E. (2003). *Educational Psychology: Developing Learners*. 6th. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Orte, C., Ballester, Ll., Vives, M., & Amer, J. (2015). El uso de la técnica Delphi en la evaluación sobre el rol de los formadores en los programas de educación familiar. En AIDIPE (Ed.), *Investigar con y para la sociedad* (Vol. 3, pp. 1745-1762). Cádiz, España: Bubok.
- Orte, C., Ballester, Ll., Vives, M., & Amer, J. (2016). Quality of implementation in an evidence-based family prevention program: "The Family Competence Program". *Psychosocial Intervention*, 25, 95-101.
- Orte, C., & Ballester, Ll. (2018) *Intervenciones efectivas en prevención familiar de drogas*. Madrid: Octaedro.
- Scudder, A. T., & Herschell, A. D. (2015). Building an evidence-base for the training of evidence-based treatments in community settings: Use of an expert-informed approach. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 55, 84-92
- Sloboda, Z., & Petras, H. (Eds.). (2014). *Defining prevention science*. New York: Springer.
- Turner, K., Nicholson, J., & Sanders, M. (2011). The role of practitioner self-efficacy, training, program and workplace factors on the implementation of an evidence-based parenting intervention in primary care. *Journal of Primary Prevention*, 32, 95-112.

HOW TO CITE THE ARTICLE

Pascual, B., Sánchez-Prieto, L., Gomila, M.A., Quesada, V., & Nevot, M.L. (2019). Formación para la prevención en el ámbito socioeducativo: un análisis de los perfiles profesionales. *Pedagogía Social. Revista Interuniversitaria*, 34 31-44. DOI:10.7179/PSRI_2019.34.03

AUTHOR'S ADDRESS

BELÉN PASCUAL BARRIO. E-mail: belen.pascual@uib.es

LIDIA SÁNCHEZ-PRIETO. E-mail: lydia.sanchez@uib.es

MARIA ANTÒNIA GOMILA GRAU. E-mail: ma.gomila@uib.es

VICTORIA QUESADA SERRA. E-mail: victoria.quesada@uib.eu

MARIA DE LLUC NEVOT CALDENTEY. E-mail: lluc.nevot@uib.es

ACADEMIC PROFILE

BELÉN PASCUAL BARRIO. Bachelor of Political Sciences and Sociology in the speciality of Social Anthropology at the Complutense University of Madrid and Doctor in History by the European University Institute (Florence-Italy). She has worked as a researcher in the Institut d'Ethnologie Méditerranéenne et Comparative at the University of Provence (France) on a Marie Curie scholarship, and in the Institute of Childhood and the Urban World Consortium. She is currently a lecturer in the Department of Pedagogy and Specific Didactics at the UIB and member of GIFES research group. She is also Vice Dean of Social Education.

LIDIA SÁNCHEZ-PRIETO. Bachelor of Psychology. Pre-doctoral Lecturer in the Department of Pedagogy and Specific Didactics at the University of the Balearic Islands. She is a member of GIFES research group (Grupo de Investigación y Formación Educativa y Social). Her research activity is associated to Evidence-Based Preventive Programs, Intervention in Families and Minors and Elders' Quality of Life.

MARIA ANTÒNIA GOMILA GRAU. Bachelor of Political Sciences and Sociology in the speciality of Social Anthropology at the Complutense University of Madrid and Doctor in History by the European University Institute (Florence-Italy). She has worked as a researcher in the Institut d'Ethnologie Méditerranéenne et Comparative at the University of Provence (France) on a Marie Curie scholarship, and in the Institute of Childhood and the Urban World Consortium. She is currently a lecturer in the Department of Pedagogy and Specific Didactics at the UIB and member of GIFES research group. She is also Vice Dean of Social Education.

VICTORIA QUESADA SERRA. PhD in Education (Social Sciences). She works as a teacher and researcher in the Department of Pedagogy and Specific Didactics of the University of the Balearic Islands. Member GIFES research group (Grupo de Investigación y Formación Educativa y Social). Her main research topics include educational and socio-educational assessment and training, as well as evaluation and family programmes.

MARIA DE LLUC NEVOT CALDENTY. Graduate in Social Work. Pre-doctoral Lecturer in the Department of Pedagogy and Specific Didactics at the University of the Balearic Islands. She is a member of GIFES research group (Grupo de Investigación y Formación Educativa y Social). Her research focuses on elders' autonomy promotion and prevention of child and youth risk behaviors with evidence-based interventions.