

A Study on Effectiveness of Competency Mapping among the Faculty Members of Business Schools in India

¹Dr. J. Krithika, ²P. Pooja, ³Dr. P. Priyadarsini

¹Xavier Institute of Management & Entrepreneurship, Chennai

²III B.Com, VIT Business School, Chennai

³Professor, Tagore Engineering College, Chennai

Abstract:

Competency Mapping is essential for every organization to assess the competency of their employees. Competency mapping focusing on identifying right person, utilising the man power effectively and analysing how these competencies will enhance business and individual performances. Hence an attempt was made to study about the existing competency mapping practices in educational Institutions with special references to the B schools.

Key words: Competency, organization, performance, mapping and B schools

Introduction:

“An underlying characteristic of an individual that is causally related to criterion referenced effective and/or superior performance in a job or a situation is called competency.”

-McClelland-

Competent human resources are essential for an organisation's success and utilising those competencies from man power planning to succession planning is called as competency mapping. Competency mapping focusing on identifying right person, utilising the man power effectively and analysing how these competencies will enhance business and individual performances.

Competency Mapping is essential for every organization to assess the competency of their employees. Because skilled employees can contribute for better productivity and semi skilled employees can get adequate training support for gaining needed competencies.

Hence an attempt was made to study about the existing competency mapping practices in educational Institutions with special references to the B schools. The mismatch between the expectations from MBA/PGDM(Post graduate Diploma in Management) graduates and their original performance increases the concern on the competencies of the faculty members working in B schools. In current Era, Business school faculty members are in the position to adopt themselves to the new technologies and the pressing social imperative. Hence the need for upgrading the skills and abilities are unavoidable for the faulty members of B schools.

Review of Literature:

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Alarage et al(2015) | Researchers expressed in their article that competency mapping is very critical factor to assess the employees and HR department should hold the clarity on the differences between the competent and non-competent. |
| krishnaveni J. (2013) | Through competency mapping, assessing any individual's strengths, which helps to indicate whether professional development efforts are needed or not. The study was conducted in order to identify the competencies essential for efficient working in Health sector. |
| R. Cellia & M. Karthick (2012) | This article state that a competency contains information, aptitudes, and behaviors of an individual which he or she will exhibit in their assigned duties. A standard competency profile includes both core competencies and the administrative competencies need to be prepared and circulated.Competency may be a person's capacity to appropriately perform a assignment. |
| Zulfiqar Murtaza(2015) | This paper tries to distinguish the gap between existing competencies and competencies required for tourism division representatives to operate ideally. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | It makes a difference the workers to superior understand the method and the prerequisites of the division and hence could be a coordinate offer assistance in creating the preparing program is way better suited to the requirements of the representatives and the department. |
| Jim Paul (2016) | <p>Jim Paul states in his article that competency mapping rather than work portrayals is the unused buzzword in every industry and isn't as complicated because it could appear.</p> <p>At the heart of each fruitful work could be a competency or ability. This article clarifies what competencies are required to excel in an organization</p> |
| Mily Velayudhan and Dr. Maran K. (2009) | <p>Researchers state in their article that Competency Mapping could be a procedure of recognizing the key competencies for a company or institution as well as the jobs and capacities inside the company.</p> <p>Each well-managed organization required a set of competencies enlisted, which are expected to be performed.</p> |
| S.V.Sreedevi (2013) | <p>Author, in her article depicts that the portrayal of employees' competency qualities, relationship competencies and recommendations for moving forward their competency level.</p> <p>The most thought is to discover out the existing competence level of workers.</p> |
| M. Maran, K. Thiagarajan (2016) | Researchers discussed on the competency level of workers in a driving belt fabricating company in Madurai, Tamilnadu, India, conjointly compare the competencies of representatives in other offices of the same company . |
| Sinchu.P, S.Bhuvaneswary | Authors of this article focused on the competency evaluation for worker improvement. Distinguishing and creating competencies in an organization empowers way better execution of administration .In addition, competency mapping may be a key HR system for observing performance. |
| Sinchu.P, S.Bhuvaneswary (2015) | Identifying and developing competencies in an organization enables better performance management and reward and recognition systems leading to career and succession planning programs. |
| Rymbai, (2011). | A administration teacher's work in higher instruction is vast and quality based teaching is the major challenge within the higher instruction framework. Beside this, educating must be supported by investigate, experimentation, and development |
| Jaideep Kaur & Vikas Kumar (2013) | Jaideep Kaur & Vikas Kumar (2013) in their article state that competency mapping may be a handle of distinguishing key competencies for a company or institution and the employments and functions inside the organization. The competencies required for a specific work depend on numerous variables like culture, environment, structure, obligations, assigned activities etc., |

METHODOLOGY:

Descriptive research design was adopted with 100 as a sample size. Judgemental sampling technique was adopted and the full time faculty members of the B schools in India working in the different levels as Assistant professor, Associate professors and professors were considered as the respondents. Appropriate statistical tools were utilised to interpret the data collected and analysed.

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION:**Table 1 :Table showing the competency “Adaptability” among the respondents**

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| SA | 43 | 42.6 | 42.6 | 42.6 |
| A | 10 | 9.9 | 9.9 | 52.5 |

| | | | | |
|-------|-----|-------|-------|-------|
| NADR | 29 | 28.7 | 28.7 | 81.2 |
| DA | 9 | 9.4 | 9.9 | 91.1 |
| SDA | 9 | 8.7 | 8.7 | 100.0 |
| Total | 100 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

(A- Agree, NADR-Neither agree nor disagree, DA-Dis agree, SDA-Strongly disagree)

42% of the B school faculty members strongly opined that they possess the adaptability competency.

TABLE NO: 2- Table shows Communication competency of the respondents

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| SA | 18 | 17.5 | 17.5 | 17.5 |
| A | 29 | 28.6 | 28.6 | 45.6 |
| NADR | 20 | 19.4 | 19.4 | 65 |
| DA | 22 | 21.4 | 21.4 | 86.4 |
| SDA | 11 | 10.6 | 10.6 | 100 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | |

94% of the respondents feel that they have a adaptability skills to cope up with modern teaching technologies and 72% of them are confident on their communication skills.

TABLE NO: 3-Table shows initiative competency of the respondents

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid SA | 33 | 33.0 | 33.0 | 33.0 |
| A | 16 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 49.0 |
| NADR | 34 | 34.0 | 34.0 | 83.0 |
| DA | 13 | 13.0 | 13.0 | 96.0 |
| SDA | 4 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 100.0 |
| Total | 100 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

33% of the respondents felt that they possess the essential Initiative competency.

TABLE NO 4- Table showing the competency-"good at planning"

32% of the respondents felt that they possess the competency called -good at planning

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid SA | 33 | 32.6 | 32.6 | 32.6 |
| A | 16 | 15.7 | 15.7 | 48.0 |
| NADR | 29 | 28.6 | 28.6 | 76.5 |
| DA | 13 | 12.7 | 12.7 | 89.2 |
| SDA | 9 | 8.8 | 8.8 | 100.0 |
| Total | 100 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

ABLE NO 5- Table showing the competency-“Problem solving”

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| SA | 35 | 35.2 | 35.2 | 35.7 |
| A | 14 | 14.3 | 14.3 | 50 |
| NADR | 28 | 28.4 | 28.4 | 78.6 |
| DA | 14 | 14.2 | 14.2 | 90.8 |
| SDA | 9 | 9.2 | 9.2 | 100 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | |

35% of the B s

chool faculty members felt that they possess the competency ”Problem solving”

ANOVA :

AGE

H10: There is no significant difference between Age and use of technology,planning,problemsolving,adaptability,productivity,commuication,inititative.

H1A: There is a significant difference between Age and use of technology,planning,problemsolving,adaptability,productivity,commuication,inititative.

GENDER:

H20: There is no significant difference between Gender and use of technology,planning,problemsolving,adaptability,productivity,commuication,inititative.

H2A: There is significant difference between Gender and use of technology,planning,problemsolving,adaptability,productivity,commuication,inititative..

MARITAL STATUS

H30: There is no significant difference between Martial status and use of technology,planning,problemsolving,adaptability,productivity,commuication,inititative .

H3A: There is significant difference between Martial status and use of technology,planning,problemsolving,adaptability,productivity,commuication,inititative.

DESIGNATION:

H40: There is no significant difference between Designation and use of technology,planning,problemsolving,adaptability,productivity,commuication ,inititative

H4A: There is significant difference between Designation and use of technology,planning,problemsolving,adaptability,productivity,commuication ,inititative.

ANOVA 1-Age and competencies

| | | SOS | df | MS | F | Sig. |
|-----------------|----------------|---------|-----|--------|--------|-------|
| Adaptability | Between Groups | 84.525 | 2 | 42.263 | 28.324 | 0 |
| | Within Groups | 146.227 | 98 | 1.492 | | |
| | Total | 230.752 | 100 | | | |
| Communication | Between Groups | 86.012 | 2 | 43.006 | 46.949 | 0 |
| | Within Groups | 89.77 | 98 | 0.916 | | |
| | Total | 175.782 | 100 | | | |
| Initiative | Between Groups | 68.312 | 2 | 34.156 | 19.425 | 0 |
| | Within Groups | 172.322 | 98 | 1.758 | | |
| | Total | 240.634 | 100 | | | |
| Planning | Between Groups | 9.626 | 2 | 4.813 | 2.757 | 0.068 |
| | Within Groups | 171.067 | 98 | 1.746 | | |
| | Total | 180.693 | 100 | | | |
| Problem solving | Between Groups | 16.643 | 2 | 8.321 | 3.191 | 0.045 |

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------------|---------|-----|--------|--------|---|
| | Within Groups | 255.595 | 98 | 2.608 | | |
| | Total | 272.238 | 100 | | | |
| Productivity | Between Groups | 23.611 | 2 | 11.805 | 10.731 | 0 |
| | Within Groups | 107.815 | 98 | 1.1 | | |
| | Total | 131.426 | 100 | | | |
| Use of technology | Between Groups | 123.392 | 2 | 61.696 | 64.529 | 0 |
| | Within Groups | 93.697 | 98 | 0.956 | | |
| | Total | 217.089 | 100 | | | |

ANOVA 2- Gender and competencies

| | | SOS | Df | MS | F | Sig. |
|-------------------|----------------|---------|-----|--------|--------|-------|
| Adaptability | Between Groups | 30.978 | 1 | 30.978 | 14.144 | 0 |
| | Within Groups | 216.824 | 99 | 2.19 | | |
| | Total | 247.802 | 100 | | | |
| Communication | Between Groups | 49.17 | 1 | 49.17 | 35.955 | 0 |
| | Within Groups | 135.385 | 99 | 1.368 | | |
| | Total | 184.554 | 100 | | | |
| Initiative | Between Groups | 31.79 | 1 | 31.79 | 14.214 | 0 |
| | Within Groups | 221.418 | 99 | 2.237 | | |
| | Total | 253.208 | 100 | | | |
| Planning | Between Groups | 0.228 | 1 | 0.228 | 0.125 | 0.725 |
| | Within Groups | 181.218 | 99 | 1.83 | | |
| | Total | 181.446 | 100 | | | |
| Problem solving | Between Groups | 5.117 | 1 | 5.117 | 1.723 | 0.192 |
| | Within Groups | 293.972 | 99 | 2.969 | | |
| | Total | 299.089 | 100 | | | |
| Productivity | Between Groups | 47.628 | 1 | 47.628 | 52.153 | 0 |
| | Within Groups | 90.411 | 99 | 0.913 | | |
| | Total | 138.04 | 100 | | | |
| Use of technology | Between Groups | 36.96 | 1 | 36.96 | 20.313 | 0 |
| | Within Groups | 180.13 | 99 | 1.819 | | |
| | Total | 217.089 | 100 | | | |

ANOVA 3- Marital status and competencies

| | | SOS | Df | MS | F | Sig. |
|-------------------|----------------|---------|-----|---------|--------|------|
| Adaptability | Between Groups | 65.543 | 1 | 65.543 | 35.602 | .000 |
| | Within Groups | 182.259 | 99 | 1.841 | | |
| | Total | 247.802 | 100 | | | |
| Communication | Between Groups | 58.770 | 1 | 58.770 | 46.255 | .000 |
| | Within Groups | 125.785 | 99 | 1.271 | | |
| | Total | 184.554 | 100 | | | |
| Initiative | Between Groups | 104.426 | 1 | 104.426 | 69.486 | .000 |
| | Within Groups | 148.782 | 99 | 1.503 | | |
| | Total | 253.208 | 100 | | | |
| Planning | Between Groups | 24.676 | 1 | 24.676 | 15.583 | .000 |
| | Within Groups | 156.769 | 99 | 1.584 | | |
| | Total | 181.446 | 100 | | | |
| Problem solving | Between Groups | 39.468 | 1 | 39.468 | 15.050 | .000 |
| | Within Groups | 259.621 | 99 | 2.622 | | |
| | Total | 299.089 | 100 | | | |
| Productivity | Between Groups | 11.859 | 1 | 11.859 | 9.305 | .003 |
| | Within Groups | 126.180 | 99 | 1.275 | | |
| | Total | 138.040 | 100 | | | |
| Use of technology | Between Groups | 85.509 | 1 | 85.509 | 64.336 | .060 |
| | Within Groups | 131.580 | 99 | 1.329 | | |
| | Total | 217.089 | 100 | | | |

ANOVA 4- Designation and competencies

| | | SOS | Df | MS | F | Sig. |
|---------------|----------------|---------|-----|--------|--------|------|
| Adaptability | Between Groups | 132.224 | 4 | 33.056 | 31.023 | 0 |
| | Within Groups | 102.291 | 96 | 1.066 | | |
| | Total | 234.515 | 100 | | | |
| Communication | Between Groups | 37.596 | 4 | 9.399 | 6.53 | 0 |
| | Within Groups | 138.186 | 96 | 1.439 | | |
| | Total | 175.782 | 100 | | | |
| Intitative | Between Groups | 147.591 | 4 | 36.898 | 37.045 | 0.05 |
| | Within Groups | 95.617 | 96 | 0.996 | | |
| | Total | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------------|---------|-----|--------|--------|-------|
| | Total | 243.208 | 100 | | | |
| Planning | Between Groups | 108.081 | 4 | 27.02 | 34.839 | 0 |
| | Within Groups | 74.454 | 96 | 0.776 | | |
| | Total | 182.535 | 100 | | | |
| Problemsolving | Between Groups | 151.062 | 4 | 37.766 | 29.069 | 0.178 |
| | Within Groups | 124.72 | 96 | 1.299 | | |
| | Total | 275.782 | 100 | | | |
| Productivity | Between Groups | 38.843 | 4 | 9.711 | 9.793 | 0 |
| | Within Groups | 95.196 | 96 | 0.992 | | |
| | Total | 134.04 | 100 | | | |
| Use of technology | Between Groups | 107.575 | 4 | 26.894 | 23.07 | 0.063 |
| | Within Groups | 111.91 | 96 | 1.166 | | |
| | Total | 219.485 | 100 | | | |

INTERPRETATION:

There is no significant difference between the age and the competencies communication, Initiative, Productivity and Use of technology. But the difference was found in case of Initiative and planning competencies. Like Age, even in terms of gender the significance difference was found in terms of initiative and planning competencies.

There was no significant difference found between marital status and the competencies namely communication, Initiative, planning and problemsolving. But there was a significance difference between productivity and use of technology. The married respondents found it difficult to spend time on learning new technologies and utilising the same in their career. The significance difference was found between designation and the competencies Initiative, problem solving and use of technologies.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

This study reveals that the employees in the B schools are competitive, even though the management should adopt strategies to measure their performance and support them to compete with the present competitive environment. The competencies such as ability to adapt according to the work environment, communication, planning, productivity, problem solving, use of technology need to be focused much. Problem solving, Planning, use of technology are the competencies which need special concentration. The B school management can arrange for some faculty development program in these areas and the faculty mentor would be a better strategy, by that the needy teachers can learn from their mentors. Some specific courses can be recommended for the B school faculty members, which will enhance their use of technology competencies.

REFERENCE:

- [1] Krishnaveni J " A Study On Mapping Of Employees' Competency", Indian Journal of Economics
- [2] Maran.M, K.Thiagarajan," Competency Enhancement And Employee Empowerment In A TPM Organization - An Empirical Study ", International Journal of Advanced Engineering Technology,
- [3] Mily Velayudhan T.K, Dr. Maran K,"A study on Mapping Core Competencies and development of Employees for Excellence with reference to HCL Technologies ", Journal Of Contemporary

- [4] Mohammad Ahmed Abdullah Alsabri & Belqes Mutar Alaraqe “Core Competency Mapping and Skills of Employees for Enhancement in IBM, India”, Acme Intellects International Journal
- [5] Sawant and Avinash Dhavan article "Competency Mapping of the Employees” Global J. of Arts & Mgmt., 2012.
- [6] Sinchu.P, S.Bhuvaneshwary article"A Study on Competency Mapping of Employees in Hero Best Motors With Special Reference to Malappuram District", International Journal of Scientific Engineering and Applied Science (IJSEAS) - Volume-1, Issue-7,October 2015.
- [7] Sreedevi S.V., "A Study About Assessment On Competency Of Employees in Pharmaceutical Industry ", international journal of innovative research & development, May, 2013, Vol 2 , Issue 5.
- [8] Rymbai, Brinda Bazely. (2010). Need for Professionalism in Higher Education Teachers, University News, Association of Indian Universities, Vol.49 (25). 20 – 26. 16.
- [9] Mamun Mohammed Abdullah and Mohammed Ariffin Bin (2009), Management Education for Contemporary Challenges: The Role of Business School. European Journal of Scientific Research, Vol.30 (4), 649 – 661.
- [10] Yuvaraj.R," Competency Mapping – A Drive For Indian Industries ", International Journal of scientific & engineering research ,volume 2,Issuem8,August 2011