



## “PROFICIENCY BASED EXPLORATION” AMONG EMPLOYEES IN TRACTOR INDUSTRY COIMBATORE

**MS.M.MUTHUMANI**

Assistant Professor, Department of Management Studies, KIT-Kalaignarkaranidhi Institute of Technology, Coimbatore.

**MS.P.Revathi**

Assistant Professor, Department of Management Studies, KIT-Kalaignarkaranidhi Institute of Technology, Coimbatore.

**Dr.K.Gunasundari**

Assistant Professor, Department of Management Science, PSG College of Arts & Science, Coimbatore

### ABSTRACT

In globalized era, success of the organisation solely relies on the intangible ability and capability of human capital not on physical and financial assets. Employee proficiency is an intangible resource and this is the only one resource which can be forward by the company. Competencies have become the code words for the human resources management practices of recruiting, selecting, placing, leading, directing, training and evaluating employee performance. Primary competencies include reading, writing, computation, listening, questioning, speaking, cognitive, individual accountability, self-respect, resources like men, material, money, information, interpersonal, information and technological. Competency Mapping is processes of identifying key competencies for an organization and /or a job and incorporating those competencies all over the various processes (i.e. job evaluation, training, recruitment) of the organization. This study mainly dwells on the linkage of employee competencies with their performance. The researcher mainly focuses on tractor industry because these industrial workers need very good spotlight with more knowledge & skills to perform their job. The data are collected through the questionnaire with statistical tools like Percentage analysis, One way ANOVA, Friedman Test & Kruskal-Wallis Test. Based on the results findings were made. Suggestions have been given which if it is implemented it helps to know their competency level in an organisation.

### KEYWORDS

Competency, Human capital, Performance, Spotlight

Competency mapping is an excellent tool if it is used efficiently & effectively in the dynamics of the organization. It can help organizations have a focused approach in performance management, training and development, frame work of succession planning, Career planning and development etc. The result of having the right people for the right jobs will be improved competence and direct collision in the organizational expansion & development. Competency models are being used in other areas of human resources management to support the goals of an organization and talents of its personnel. This model describes what an individual employee must perform constantly to achieve the goals of the organization. Competency mapping helps to analyze the various strength of workers in different field and to fabricate the successful teams and the premier quality of work.

### OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- Identify and establish a match between the skills required to perform a job and actual talent of job holder.
- Design and conduct competency mapping exercise for a set of roles played by the employees in the organization.
- Make out and build competencies of individuals as efficient and effective employee.

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

**Ashworth and Saxton (1990)** explain that framing competencies as an outcome can ignore the mental and personal processes that are utilized in developing and exhibiting skills and utilizing knowledge. **Delamare Le Deist and Winterton (2005)** explain that the difference between each concept has become fuzzy in both literature and practice. Competency models also are being used to organize the business needs and directional strategy, convey the values and mission of a company, and reward those workers who learn and demonstrate the identified organizational competencies. A competency model is a descriptive tool that identifies the competencies needed to operate in a specific role within a(n) job, occupation, organization, or industry. Simply stated, a competency model is a behavioral job description that must be defined by each occupational function and each job (**Fogg, 1999**). **Rothwell (2002)** explains that there are core

competencies that are required of all workers. This would include knowledge, skills and abilities (commonly referred to as KSAs), as well as soft skills or behaviors (**Lucia & Lepsinger, 1999; and Rodriguez, Patel, Bright, Gregory, & Gowing, 2002**). **Smita Nigam, Poonam Pandey, Dhruv Kumar Pandey (2009)** in their research paper entitled 'Competence Mapping: An Innovative Management Practice Tool', expounds that employee competency mapping is one such innovative practice that is widely being used by organizations today. Competency mapping is about assessing the value of human capital and its development. Care needs to be taken to ensure the involvement of the entire organization. The need to map and monitor the competence is perceived by most organizations as a tool to add value to their key resource areas as observed by the authors. **Lucian Cernusca, Cristina Dima (2007)** in their research essay explained the concept of competency and how competency is linked to performance and one's career development. The authors also look into some models of competency mapping and appraisal tools for performance management. A business might possess extremely capable human resources, but they might not work on the position that suits them. This is where competency mapping and the appraisal tools come to help the HR experts choose who should work on what position.

### METHODOLOGY

In this study, Descriptive Research Design has adopted because is the one that simply describes something such as demographic characteristics of certain people who use something. So the design used for sampling is "Probability convenience sampling technique". This Survey is conducted in Tractor Industry, Coimbatore. Total population of the study is 400. The Sample size is 150.

### TOOLS USED

- Percentage analysis
- One way ANOVA.
- Friedman Test
- Kruskal-Wallis Test

### 1. PERCENTAGE ANALYSIS

**TABLE NO: 1**  
**PERSONAL DETAILS WITH KNOWLEDGE LEVEL**

| S.NO                      | DESCRIPTION             | NO. OF RESPONDENTS |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|
| EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION | Schooling               | 93(62)             |
|                           | ITI                     | 44(29)             |
|                           | Diploma                 | 13(9)              |
| YEARS OF SERVICE          | 0 to 2 yrs              | 81(54)             |
|                           | 2 to 4 yrs              | 32(21)             |
|                           | 4 to 6 yrs              | 31(21)             |
|                           | Above 6 yrs             | 6(4)               |
| KNOWLEDGE LEVEL           | Not up to Standard      | 7(5)               |
|                           | Meets requirement       | 42(28)             |
|                           | Better than requirement | 80(53)             |
|                           | Far exceeds Standard    | 21(14)             |

(Source: Primary Data)

Majority of the respondents belongs to schooling group in educational qualification, (54%) of the respondents are belong to 0 – 2 yrs of service group and 53 % of the respondents belongs to the better than requirements group in their knowledge level

**2. ONE WAY ANOVA**

| Knowledge level competencies of the employees regarding qualification |                |     |             |       |      |
|---|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|------|
|   | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F     | Sig. |
| Between Groups  | 1.740          | 2   | .870        | 1.577 | .210 |
| Within Groups   | 81.094         | 147 | .552        |       |      |
| Total   | 82.833         | 149 |             |       |      |

(Source: Primary Data)

Null hypothesis gets to be rejected as “there is a significant difference in the opinion of respondents towards knowledge level competencies with respect to qualification”.

**3. FRIEDMAN TEST**

**TABLE NO: 3**  
**KEY RESULT AREAS OF PRODUCTION**

| Description         | Mean Rank | N           | 150     |
|---------------------|-----------|-------------|---------|
| Quality             | 3.75      |             |         |
| Process             | 4.78      |             |         |
| Cost Maintaining    | 1.92      | Chi-square  | 563.242 |
| Safety Knowledge    | 1.29      | Df          | 5       |
| Time Management     | 3.77      | Asymp. Sig. | .000    |
| Resource Management | 5.49      |             |         |

The above table no: 3 infers that safety knowledge has the lowest mean score when compared to other variables. It shows that safety knowledge rank highest in key result areas of production. It is clear that “there is a significant difference among the variables regarding key areas of production”.

**4. KRUSKAL-WALLIS TEST**

**TABLE NO: 4**  
**KEY RESULT AREAS OF PRODUCTION & YEARS OF SERVICE**

| key result areas of production & Years of service | Quality | Process | Cost maintaining | Safety knowledge | Time Management | Resource management |
|---|---------|---------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| Chi-square  | 8.486   | 11.429  | 38.716           | 36.092           | 19.858          | 73.148              |
| Df  | 3       | 3       | 3                | 3                | 3               | 3                   |
| Asymp. Sig.                                       | .037    | .010    | .000             | .000             | .000            | .000                |

The cost maintaining in 2 to 4 yrs has the lowest mean score when compared to other variables. It shows that cost maintaining in 2 to 4 yrs rank highest in key result areas of production. From the above table it is clear that “there is a significant difference among the variables regarding key result areas of production regarding years of service in the organization”.

**FINDINGS**

- Among the respondents majority of them belong to meets the requirement group in Knowledge level competencies.
- From the one way ANOVA Test, it is clear that there is a significant difference in the opinion of respondents towards knowledge level competencies with respect to qualification.
- Applying Friedman test, it is clear that there is a significant difference among the variables regarding key areas of production
- Using Kruskal-Wallis Test, It is clear that there is a significant difference among the variables regarding key result areas of production regarding years of service in the organization. It shows that cost maintaining in 2 to 4 yrs rank highest in key result areas of production.

**SUGGESTIONS**

- Management should frame the standard for the role of the employees played in the organization. This standard should be revised often based on the advancements in the job.
- The DAP (Development Action Plan) must be prepared and given to employees for further follow up from the side of employees and employees should be motivated to perform the task.
- Management should promote a participatory culture in which every employee in the organization will have a chance to express his suggestions and it would give a chance of generating type of training to be provided.
- Management can provide on the job training such as coaching, job instruction, committee assignment, etc.
- Management can use the competency model to identify the training need of the employees.

**CONCLUSION**

Competency models are a feasible tool that can be utilized to prepare the current and future workforce and retain skilled incumbent workers to meet the job requirements and various needs of employers. With this model helps to know the awareness of individuals competency and as well as their strengths and weaknesses and navigate their current chosen career path way. From this study the researcher found that half of the respondents of are having good knowledge & competency level to perform their work. Suggestions have been given which if it is implemented it helps to improve the Proficiency based Exploration with the help of management.

**Reference**

1. Ashworth, P.D., & Saxton, J. (1990). On 'competence.' Journal of Further and Higher Education, 14(2), 3-25.
2. Delamare Le Deist, F. & Winterton, J. (2005). What is competence? Human Resource Development International, 8(1), 27-46.
3. Fogg, C. D. (1999). Implementing your strategic plan: How to turn “intent” into effective action for sustainable change New York: American Management Association.
4. King, S. B., King, M., & Rothwell, W. J. (2001). The complete guide to training delivery: A competency-based approach New York: American Management Association.
5. Rothwell, W. J. (2002). The workplace learner: How to align training initiatives with individual learning competencies New York: American Management Association.
6. Rothwell, W., & Wellins, R. (2004). Mapping your future: Putting new competencies to work for you. Training and Development, 58(5), 94-102