

Competency Mapping of the Employees- A Study

Mily Velayudhan T.K

St. Mary's School of Management Studies, Chennai, India.

Affiliated to University of Madras, Chennai, India.

Abstract. Competency mapping, the buzz word in any industry is not complicated as it may appear. At the heart of any successful activity lies a competence or skill. In the recent years, various thought leaders in business strategy have emphasized the need to identify what competencies a business needs, in order to compete in a specific environment. Competency mapping is a strategic HR framework for monitoring the performance and development of human resource in organizations. Regardless of whatever happens to the future of software in India, the people who are outstanding in their performance will continue to be in demand and will keep rising and for this the human resource of each organization should develop the competencies which they have in order to compete with the highly competitive market. In this paper the researcher has collected data from 195 software employees. Where in 145 employees were from Cognizant Technology Solutions (CTS) and the rest 150 respondents were from Hindustan Technology Limited (HCL) and their competencies were studied in depth to bridge the gap of the lacking competency which would help the employees to outshine which would help the organization to lead its goal through its objectives.

Keywords: Competency, competency mapping.

1. Introduction

The current globalization of economy necessitates innovative approaches in managing the work force. The fast changes happening in the demography and social systems thereof have given breathing space for various HR practices enhancing the employee productivity and growth. And one of the most commonly used HR practice is competency mapping for development of the employees. Identifying and development of the competencies in organization enable better performance management as well as reward and recognition systems leading to career and succession planning programmes. Also competency mapping is a strategic HR frame work for monitoring the performance.

2. Objective of the Study

To identify the competency gap that exists between the employee's current performance level and the expected level of the employees.

3. Conceptual Framework

John Flanagan (1954) grounded Critical Incidents Technique as a precursor to the key methodology used in rigorous competency studies. The idea of testing the competencies, required for efficient performance at a position, was proposed by David McClelland in the early 1970's. The term competency has been interpreted by various authors/researchers with their unique way of giving meaning to it. Some of the definitions are given below. Boyatzis (1982) described competencies as underlying characteristic of an individual, which are causally (change in one variable cause change in another) related to effective job performance.

4. Competency Mapping

To assess the competency of the employees of two software companies researcher has identified **147** competencies which is relating to **20** broad categories and the dimensions are Drive for results, Process

management, Functional expertise, Personal effectiveness & ability to influence, Innovation, Team effectiveness, Customer service, Self development orientation, Analytical thinking, Physical ability, Knowledge, Aptitude, Motivation, Communication, Leadership, Managerial ability, Negotiations, Personal values, Social skills, Technical competence. Simple random method was used to collect the data from the respondents. Tools like t test were used to identify the present competency levels and the competency gap.

5. Result and Discussion

Table 1: **t- test** for Competency (performance) levels of the respondent’s present position in each one of the 20 dimensions as assessed by the respondents themselves, compared with two different companies.

Name of the organization								
Dimensions	CTS (N = 145)			HCL (N = 150)			t-test for Equality of Means	
	Mean	SE	SD	Mean	SE	SD	t	Sig. (2-tailed)
Drive for results	77.43	1.01	12.14	74.53	.85	10.36	2.211	.028*
Process management	77.43	1.01	12.14	74.53	.85	10.36	2.211	.028*
Functional expertise	79.52	1.17	14.06	76.20	1.00	12.24	2.163	.031*
Personal effectiveness & ability to influence	77.43	1.02	12.27	74.56	.91	11.13	2.108	.036*
Innovation	79.03	1.11	13.35	75.27	.97	11.91	2.560	.011*
Team effectiveness	77.07	.96	11.60	74.83	.86	10.58	1.731	.085
Customer service	78.32	1.04	12.52	74.56	.95	11.69	2.665	.008*
Self development orientation	79.45	1.11	13.37	76.76	.88	10.83	1.904	.058
Analytical thinking	78.00	1.32	15.93	74.33	1.10	13.43	2.134	.034*
Physical ability	75.72	1.20	14.47	76.33	1.05	12.82	-.382	.703
Knowledge	80.90	1.12	13.43	75.20	1.01	12.35	3.793	.000*
Aptitude	80.64	1.09	13.18	75.73	.82	10.08	3.586	.000*
Motivation	96.07	.05	.59	96.26	.04	.55	-2.884	.004*
Communication	96.10	.05	.60	96.24	.04	.51	-2.117	.035*
Leadership	96.14	.05	.64	96.29	.05	.56	-2.127	.034*
Managerial ability	78.75	.91	10.94	76.52	.78	9.59	1.860	.064
Negotiations	77.79	1.07	12.89	74.49	1.00	12.25	2.257	.025*
Personal values	79.26	.94	11.32	74.75	.91	11.13	3.449	.001*
Social skills	77.91	.96	11.55	75.76	.74	9.12	1.772	.077
Technical competence	78.55	1.20	14.43	77.00	1.04	12.68	.982	.327

Source: Primary Data; Note:* - Indicates Significant at 5% Level.

The table provides Competency levels found among the different levels of competency of respondents in each one of the 20 dimensions. All statements listed in each one of the twenty dimensions are assessed using a five point Likert Scale. The averages of all the statements listed under each dimension are computed and compared for two different software companies.

H0: The competency level in each one of the 20 dimensions is same among IT Professionals with two different software companies.

H1: The competency level in each one of the 20 dimensions is not the same among IT Professionals with two different software companies.

Null hypothesis are tested using t- test The above table provides Mean gaps, Standard Errors of the means of the respondents’ on the competency levels of the employees of the two IT companies in the twenty dimensions considered. The table also provides t values and the Significance of the mean scores. From the above table it is apparent that the significance value is less than 0.05 in the following dimensions: Drive for Results(0.028), Process Management(0.028), Functional Expertise(0.031) , Personal Effectiveness and ability to influence(0.036), Innovation(0.011), Customer Service(.008), Analytical Thinking(0.034), Knowledge (0.000),Attitude (0.000),Motivation(0.004), Communication(0.035), Leadership(0.034), Negotiation(0.025), Personal Values(0.001). So it is inferred that the mean levels are not the same among the IT professional with different companies. Also from the table it is clear that Null Hypotheses are not to be rejected in the following dimension: Team effectiveness, Self Development orientation, Physical ability, Social skills, Technical Competency, since the significant value is more than 0.005.In all the dimensions where significant differences are found, the employees of CTS scored higher values compared to HCL employees.

Table No: 2: t- test for the competency Gap in each one of the 20 dimensions among the IT Professionals in two different companies

Dimensions	Name of the organization						t-test for Equality of Means	
	CTS (N = 145)			HCL (N = 150)			t	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	SE	SD	Mean	SE	SD		
Drive for results	22.57	12.14	1.01	25.47	10.36	.85	-2.211	.028*
Process management	22.57	12.14	1.01	25.47	10.36	.85	-2.211	.028*
Functional expertise	20.48	14.06	1.17	23.80	12.24	1.00	-2.163	.031*
Personal effectiveness & ability to influence	22.57	12.27	1.02	25.44	11.13	.91	-2.108	.036*
Innovation	20.97	13.35	1.11	24.73	11.91	.97	-2.560	.011*
Team effectiveness	22.93	11.60	.96	25.17	10.58	.86	-1.731	.085
Customer service	21.68	12.52	1.04	25.44	11.69	.95	-2.665	.008*
Self development orientation	20.55	13.37	1.11	23.24	10.83	.88	-1.897	.059
Analytical thinking	22.00	15.93	1.32	25.67	13.43	1.10	-2.134	.034*
Physical ability	24.28	14.47	1.20	23.67	12.82	1.05	.382	.703
Knowledge	19.10	13.43	1.12	24.80	12.35	1.01	-3.793	.000*
Aptitude	19.36	13.18	1.09	24.27	10.08	.82	-3.586	.000*
Motivation	3.93	.59	.05	3.74	.55	.04	2.884	.004*
Communication	3.90	.60	.05	3.76	.51	.04	2.117	.035*
Leadership	3.86	.64	.05	3.71	.56	.05	2.127	.034*
Managerial ability	21.25	10.94	.91	23.48	9.59	.78	-1.860	.064
Negotiations	22.21	12.89	1.07	25.51	12.25	1.00	-2.257	.025*
Personal values	20.74	11.32	.94	25.25	11.13	.91	-3.449	.001*
Social skills	22.09	11.55	.96	24.24	9.12	.74	-1.772	.077
Technical competence	21.45	14.43	1.20	23.00	12.68	1.04	-.982	.327

Source: Primary Data; Note:* - Indicates Significant at 5% Level.

The above table: 2 provides Competency Gaps found among the respondents in each one of the 20 dimensions. All statements listed in each one of the twenty dimensions are assessed using a five point Likert Scale. The averages of all the statements listed under each dimension are computed and compared for two different software companies.

H0: The competency Gap in each one of the 20 dimensions is same among IT Professionals with two different software companies.

H1: The competency Gap in each one of the 20 dimensions is not the same among IT Professionals with two different software companies.

Null hypothesis are tested using t test The above table provides Mean gaps, Standard Errors of the means of the respondents' on the competency gaps in both the IT companies in the twenty dimensions considered. The table also provides t values and the Significance of the mean scores. From the above table it is apparent that the significance value is less than 0.05 in the following dimensions: Drive for results (.028), Process Management(.028), Functional Expertise(.031) , Personal Effectiveness and ability to influence(.036), Innovation(.011), Customer Service(.008), Analytical Thinking(.034), Knowledge (.000), Aptitude (.000),Motivation(.004), Communication(.035), Leadership(.035), Negotiation(.025), Personal Values(.001). So it is inferred that the mean levels are not the same among the IT professional in different companies. Also from the table it is clear that Null Hypotheses are not to be rejected in the following dimension: Team Effectiveness, Self Development orientation, Physical ability, Managerial ability, Social skills, and Technical Competence since the significant value is more than 0.005. In all the dimensions where significant differences are found. The gaps are found to be higher among the employees of HCL compared to the employees of CTS.

6. Conclusion

The present study has been attempted to identify gaps in the competency levels of IT professionals working in two IT firms in Chennai. A total of 20 dimensions have been used to assess the performance level and identify the gaps. It is found that the performance levels of CTS employees are higher when compared to the employees of HCL. The gaps are found to be high among the employees of HCL in most of the

dimensions. These could be developed by giving training and personality development classes for the employees.

7. References

- [1] Adelaide Wilcox King, Sally Fowler W. and Carl Zeithaml P. *Managing organizational competencies for competitive advantage: The middle-management edge*, The Academy of Management Executive. (2001), Vol.15, No.2, pp.95-106.
- [2] Adrian Furnham, *A Question of Competency*, Personnel Management (1990), Vol.22, No.6, p.37.
- [3] Alessandro Margherita and Giustina Secundo, *Competency management in support of organizational change*, International Journal of Manpower (2009), Vol.28, No.3/4, pp.260-275.
- [4] Amir Aczel D. and Jayavel Sounderpandian, *Complete Business Statistics*, Sixth Edition, Tata McGraw Hill Publishing Company Limited (2006), pp.375-381.
- [5] Amir Aczel D. and Jayavel Sounderpandian, *Complete Business Statistics*, Sixth Edition, Tata McGraw Hill Publishing Company Limited (2007), pp.278.
- [6] Anderson T.W., *Introduction to Multivariate Analysis*, John Wiley, New York (1998).
- [7] Andrew May, *Developing management competencies for fast – changing organization*, Career Development International (1999), Vol.4, No.6, pp.336-339.
- [8] Anne Lara E., *Using competency management as foundation for employee development in a global information technology company*, Proquest Thesis, Section 1517, Part 0688 (Ed. Dissertation), Wilmington University (Delaware), United States – Delaware, Publication Number: AAT 3362629 (2009), 100 pages.
- [9] Anup kumar Das, *A project report on Strategic issues in training and development in the IT service industry at Kolkata Region: A study*, Submitted to Indira Gandhi National Open University, http://etdindividuals.dlib.vt.edu:9090/303/1/Das_AK_MBA_Dissertation.pdf(2008)-accessed on 03-02-2008, (2005), pp.7-8
- [10] Aswathappa, *Organisational Behaviour*, Seventh Edition, Himalaya Publishing House(2007), pp.249-250.
- [11] Bai-Chuan Yang, Bing-Eng Wu, Pei-Gi Shu and Ming-Hsien Yang, *On establishing the core competency identifying model: A value-activity and process oriented approach*, Industrial Management and Data Systems (2006), Vol.106, No.1, pp.60-80.
- [12] Bergenhenegouwen G.J., Ten Horn H.F.K. and Mooijman E.A.M., *Competence development – a challenge for HRM professionals: core competences of organizations as guidelines for the development of employees*, Journal of European Industrial Training (1996), Vol.20/9, pp.29-35.