



## ASSESSING TEAM WORK COMPETENCY OF ASPIRING MANAGERS: A PRELIMINARY STUDY

**Anand Bhardwaj**, Assistant Professor, KIIT College of Engineering, Gurgaon (Haryana) and Research Scholar, Haryana School of Business, Guru Jambheshwar University of Science and Technology, Hisar (Haryana)

---

### **Abstract:**

**Purpose-** Objective of this research paper is to assess team work competency of Aspiring Managers.

**Research Methodology-** 300 Respondents were selected by using random sampling method from various parts of Haryana. Structured questionnaire was designed to assess team work competency of aspiring managers. Statistical tools like mean, t-test, F-test (ANOVA) were applied on the data using SPSS.

**Findings-**From the results it is apparent that demographic variables like age, gender, income, education, marital status etc. are not found to be significantly differentiating the various groups of respondents while analyzing team work competency of Aspiring Managers.

**Implications-** It is obvious that aspiring managers from Haryana are at the average level for team work competency, which indicates some limitation with the current system of education. It focuses more on theoretical learning rather than practical learning. This limitation may be overcome by making the professional education more industry oriented, mentoring, role playing, developing team skills and soft skills etc.

**Keywords:** Managerial competencies, Team work, Performance, Assessment, Development

### **INTRODUCTION**

In today's competitive environment, every organization needs effective and successful managers in order to survive and grow. Effective managers are essential for any organization's success, regardless of its type and size. A manager may be defined as a person who plans, organizes, directs and controls the human, material, financial resources etc. in order to achieve organizational goals (Hellriegel et al., 2005). It is essential for an organization to recognize, develop, and keep talented employees.

A manager has to guide and direct fellow employees in order to accomplish assigned task. Good managers know their employees well and understand how they can be motivated.



They know each individual is different and can be motivated in a different manner. A good manager understands the need of his fellow employees.

Every successful manager possesses several competencies that enable him to carry out his work efficiently and effectively at different managerial positions. According to Boyatzis (1982) competencies may be defined as “the underlying characteristics of a person that lead to or cause effective and outstanding performance”. Hellriegel et. al. (2005) described managerial competencies as the combination of knowledge, skills, behaviors, and attitudes that a manager needs to be effective in different managerial positions.

Teams have increasingly become the primary means for organising work in modern business world. An important function of a manager is to create team spirits among subordinates. Hellriegel et al. (2005) define team work competency as the successful completion of assigned job through people in small groups who are jointly responsible for end results and whose job needs coordination and cooperation. Team work can also be described as working effectively with others to achieve organisational goals. Team work is also important in identifying and resolving problems. One needs to develop collaborative skills in order to work with different stakeholders. A manager needs team work competency in order to coordinate and collaborate with other employees in order to achieve organizational objectives.

## **REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

The study of Abraham et al. (2001) identified leadership skills, customer focus, result orientation, problem solving, communication skills, and team leadership as the six most critical competencies that are needed to be an effective manager. Hellriegel et. al. (2005) emphasized that to be a successful and effective manager one should possess following competencies:

1. Communication Competency,
2. Planning and Administration Competency,
3. Managing Team Competency,
4. Strategic Action Competency,
5. Global Awareness Competency, and
6. Self-Management Competency.



Ram Charan (2007) identified Ambition, Appetite for learning, Drive and tenacity, Psychological openness, Realism and Self-confidence the main personal characteristic that one should develop to be successful in 21<sup>st</sup> century.

The study of Qiao and Wang (2008) has revealed that continual learning, communication, team building, coordination and execution are the most essential managerial competencies for middle level managers in China. Shirazi and Mortazavi (2009) found that effective communication, team building, responsiveness, proactiveness, decisiveness, and negotiation are the main characteristics of an effective manager.

The competencies are usually assessed through three diverse methodologies: Self-evaluation; Peer-evaluation; the critical incident interview technique (Comutto and Gerli, 2004). Robinson et. al. (2007) proposed preliminary interviews, questionnaires, and critical incident interview technique as the three phased methodology to forecast the future competency requirements. Homer (2001) recommended that organizations should develop capabilities to assess competencies and find out skill gaps, so that effective training programme may be designed to bridge the gap and improve team performance and as well to select better employees.

Competencies in human beings can be developed. Boyatzis and Saatcioglu, (2008) stressed that developing human talent can be viewed as a three step process:

- i. To help individuals to learn knowledge;
- ii. To develop understanding of how to use this knowledge;
- iii. To make them realize why to use this knowledge and competencies.

The objective of development efforts is to assist people to become more efficient and effective. As per result of different studies, competencies can be developed through training and development programs, coaching sessions and workshops, mentoring, performance reviews, and by studying.

## **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

The research methodology designed and followed in the current study has been discussed under the following sub-heads:



### ***Objectives of the Study***

The main objective of this study is to assess the team work competency of aspiring managers. The specific sub-objectives of the study are as following:

1. To assess team work competency of aspiring managers.
2. To suggest workable guidelines if needed for improving the team work competency of aspiring managers.

### ***Hypothesis of the Study***

3. There is no significant difference across various age categories of aspiring managers for the team work competency.
4. There is no significant difference for the level of team work competency among aspiring managers having different academic stream at Graduation Level.
5. There is no significant difference between aspiring managers of different gender for the team work competency.
6. There is no significant difference between aspiring managers of different marital status for the team work competency.
7. There is no significant difference between aspiring managers of different nature of present Institution for the team work competency.
8. There is no significant difference between aspiring managers of different place of Schooling for the team work competency.

### ***Research Design***

Since the current study is related to identification of the team work competency of aspiring managers, so exploratory cum descriptive research design has been used in the current study.

### ***Sampling Design and data collection***

In the current study researcher used the random sampling method to select sample items from the entire population. To make the study viable and truly representative of the population sample size for the present study was restricted to 525 aspiring managers across various parts of Haryana.

### ***Research Instrument***

To collect the relevant data for the current study from the respondents the researcher utilized systematically developed and validated scale developed by Don Hellriegel, Susan E. Jackson, and John W. Slocum (Jr.).



### Data Analysis and Interpretation

Statistical tools like mean, t-test, F-test (ANOVA) were applied on the data using SPSS. Test of significance has been used to check the significance of hypothesis assumed. In addition to this assistance of Microsoft office has been availed for the purpose of word Processing, tabulation and illustrations.

**Table 1 ANOVA test statistics of Aspiring Managers for Team work competency on the basis of age of the respondents**

| Competency Dimensions             | Comparison of aspiring managers competencies on the basis of age (Mean values comparison) |          |          |          |          | ANOVA test statistics |      |
|-----------------------------------|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------------------|------|
|                                   | 20 years  | 21 years | 22 years | 23 years | 24 years | F                     | Sig  |
| Designing team                    | 3.2625  | 3.4450   | 3.4000   | 3.5541   | 3.5630   | .900                  | .534 |
| Creating a supporting environment | 3.3750  | 3.4725   | 3.4871   | 3.5836   | 3.6148   | .504                  | .887 |
| Managing a Team Dynamics          | 3.3250  | 3.5750   | 3.4594   | 3.6197   | 3.5926   | .914                  | .521 |
| Team work competency              | 3.3208  | 3.4975   | 3.4488   | 3.5859   | 3.5901   | .742                  | .685 |

Source: Primary data

\*significant at .05 level of significance

Table 1 shows the result of analysis of variance (ANOVA) for team work competency and its three sub-dimensions namely designing team, creating a supporting environment, and managing a team dynamics. It indicates that whether age brings any significant variation in the competency level of aspiring managers on the 'team work competency' dimension. Mean scores and grand mean scores are also shown to explain the direction and extent of the significant differences. The comparison of mean values across different ages indicate that the competency level of aspiring managers does not vary so much, which means that aspiring managers of different age groups possess similar level of team work competency. Further, F-statistics also indicates that the competency level of aspiring managers does not have a significant difference among different ages. Also, there are no significant differences among the three sub-dimensions of team work competency i.e. designing team, creating a supporting environment, and managing a team dynamics. Hence, the above table reveals



that age has no significant contribution in the competency levels of aspiring managers on the 'team work competency' dimension.

**Table 2 ANOVA test statistics of Aspiring Managers for Team work competency on the basis of academic stream at graduation level of the respondents**

| Competency Dimensions             | Comparison of aspiring managers competencies on the basis of academic stream at graduation (Mean values comparison) |         |          |              |        | ANOVA test statistics |      |
|-----------------------------------|---|---------|----------|--------------|--------|-----------------------|------|
|                                   | Arts/ Humanities  | Science | Commerce | Professional | Total  | F                     | Sig  |
| Designing team                    | 3.2273  | 3.5379  | 3.4383   | 3.6328       | 3.4720 | 1.803                 | .147 |
| Creating a supporting environment | 3.1364  | 3.4138  | 3.5426   | 3.6144       | 3.5153 | 1.900                 | .130 |
| Managing a Team Dynamics          | 3.1818  | 3.6690  | 3.5436   | 3.6295       | 3.5467 | 1.783                 | .151 |
| Team work competency              | 3.1818  | 3.5402  | 3.5082   | 3.6262       | 3.5113 | 1.885                 | .132 |

Source: Primary data

\*significant at .05 level of significance

Table 2 shows the result of analysis of variance (ANOVA) for team work competency and its three sub-dimensions namely designing team, creating a supporting environment, and managing a team dynamics. Above table indicates that whether different academic stream (i.e. arts/humanities, science, commerce, and professional) in graduation brings any significant variation in the competency level of aspiring managers on 'team work competency' dimension. Further, the comparison of mean values across different academic stream groups indicate that team work competency level of aspiring managers is almost same. This means that aspiring managers having different academic stream in graduation possess similar level of team work competency.

Furthermore, F-statistics also indicates that the team work competency level of aspiring managers does not have significant differences among different academic groups. This difference is also not significant for the three sub-dimensions of team work competency. So, the above table reveals that variation in academic stream in graduation does not contribute to any significant variation in the team work competency levels of aspiring managers.



**Table 3 t-test statistics of Aspiring Managers for Team work competency on the basis of gender of the respondent**

| Competency Dimensions             | Mean values of competency level of Aspiring managers |        | Mean Difference | t-test for Equality of Means |                 |
|-----------------------------------|--|--------|-----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|
|                                   | Male   | Female |                 | T                            | Sig. (2-tailed) |
| Designing Team                    | 3.4248   | 3.5161 | -.09130         | -1.018                       | .310            |
| Creating A Supporting Environment | 3.4717   | 3.5561 | -.08440         | -.845                        | .399            |
| Managing A Team Dynamics          | 3.4759   | 3.6129 | -.13704         | -1.407                       | .160            |
| Team work competency              | 3.4575   | 3.5617 | -.10425         | -1.191                       | .234            |

Source: Primary data

\*significant at .05 level of significance

Table 3 shows varying dimensions relating to 'team work competency' by applying t-test, means, and grand means. It indicates that whether gender (i.e. male and female) brings any significant variation in the competency level of aspiring managers on 'team work competency' dimension. Managing team competency has three sub-dimensions i.e. designing team, creating a supporting environment, and managing a team dynamics. The comparison of mean values between male and female aspiring managers indicates that 'managing team competency' and its three sub-dimension does not vary so much, which means that aspiring managers of both genders possess similar level of team work competency.

Furthermore, T statistics also indicates that competency level of aspiring managers does not have significant differences among male and female aspiring managers on 'team work competency' dimension and its three sub-dimensions.

Table 4 shows different dimensions relating to 'team work competency' by applying t-test, means, and grand means. It indicates that whether marital status brings any significant variation in the competency level of aspiring managers on 'team work competency' dimension and its three sub-dimensions namely designing team, creating a supporting environment, and managing a team dynamics.



**Table 4 t-test statistics of Aspiring Managers for Team work competency on the basis of Marital Status of the respondents**

| Competency Dimensions             | Mean values of competency level of Aspiring managers |           | Mean Difference | t-test for Equality of Means |                 |
|-----------------------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|
|                                   | Married  | Unmarried |                 | T                            | Sig. (2-tailed) |
| Designing Team                    | 3.6111   | 3.4631    | .14799          | .784                         | .434            |
| Creating A Supporting Environment | 3.5556   | 3.5128    | .04279          | .203                         | .839            |
| Managing A Team Dynamics          | 3.4889   | 3.5504    | -.06147         | -.299                        | .765            |
| Team work competency              | 3.5519   | 3.5087    | .04310          | .234                         | .815            |

Source: Primary data

\*significant at .05 level of significance

The comparison of mean values between married and unmarried aspiring managers indicates that all the sub-dimensions of 'team work competency' does not vary so much, which means that the marital status of the aspiring managers does not produce variation in level of team work competency. Further, t-test is used to determine whether marital status brings any significant differences or not. The results of T statistics indicate that the competency level of aspiring managers does not bring significant differences between married and unmarried aspiring managers on 'team work competency' dimension and its three sub-dimensions.

**Table 5 t-test statistics of Aspiring Managers for Team work competency on the basis of Place of Schooling of the respondent**

| Competency Dimensions             | Mean values of competency level of Aspiring managers |        | Mean Difference | t-test for Equality of Means |                 |
|-----------------------------------|--|--------|-----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|
|                                   | Urban  | Rural  |                 | T                            | Sig. (2-tailed) |
| Designing Team                    | 3.4800   | 3.4034 | .07661          | .665                         | .506            |
| Creating A Supporting Environment | 3.5278   | 3.4678 | .06001          | .464                         | .643            |
| Managing A Team Dynamics          | 3.6020   | 3.4271 | .17483          | 1.401                        | .162            |
| Team work competency              | 3.5366   | 3.4328 | .10382          | .918                         | .359            |

Source: Primary data

\*significant at .05 level of significance



Table 5 exhibits a number of interesting facts regarding team work competency level of aspiring managers from urban and rural place of schooling. Above table indicates that whether place of schooling of the aspiring managers brings any significant variation in the competency level of aspiring managers on 'team work competency' dimension and its three sub-dimensions namely designing team, creating a supporting environment and managing a team dynamics. Mean scores and grand mean scores are used to explain the direction and extent of the significant differences. The mean values of urban and rural place of schooling of aspiring managers is almost same on 'team work competency' dimension and its three sub-dimensions, which means that aspiring managers having different place of schooling possess similar level of team work competency .

T statistics also indicates that competency level of aspiring managers does not have significant differences between urban and rural place of schooling of aspiring managers on 'team work competency' dimension. Additionally, there are no significant differences on all the three sub-dimensions of team work competency. So, the above table reveals that variation in the place of schooling of the aspiring managers does not contribute significant variation in team work competency levels of aspiring managers.

**Table 6 t-test statistics of Aspiring Managers for Team work competency on the basis of Nature of present Institution of the respondents**

| Competency Dimensions             | Mean values of competency level of Aspiring managers |                                | Mean Difference | t-test for Equality of Means |                 |
|-----------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|
|                                   | University Teaching department                       | Private Autonomous Institution |                 | T                            | Sig. (2-tailed) |
| Designing Team                    | 3.4415   | 3.5567                         | -.12517         | -1.308                       | .192            |
| Creating A Supporting Environment | 3.4768   | 3.5959                         | -.11903         | -1.116                       | .265            |
| Managing A Team Dynamics          | 3.5034   | 3.6371                         | -.13367         | -1.284                       | .200            |
| Team work competency              | 3.4706   | 3.5966                         | -.12596         | -1.348                       | .179            |

Source: Primary data

\*significant at .05 level of significance

Table 6 exhibits some interesting facts regarding team work competency level of aspiring managers belonging to university teaching department and private autonomous institution. Team work competency has three sub-dimensions namely designing team, creating a



supporting environment and managing a team dynamics. Mean scores and grand mean scores are used to explain the direction and extent of the significant differences. The perusal of mean values show that the competency level of aspiring managers studying in university teaching department and private autonomous institution is almost same on the 'team work competency' dimension as well as on its three sub-dimension. This indicates that aspiring managers having diverse nature of present institution possess similar level of team work competency.

Further, T statistics also indicates that competency level of aspiring managers does not have significant differences between aspiring managers studying in university teaching department and private autonomous on 'team work competency' dimension. Additionally, there are no significant differences on all the three sub-dimensions of team work competency. So, the above table reveals that variation in nature of present institution does not contribute significant variation in team work competency levels of aspiring managers.

## **CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION**

Data analysis has revealed that irrespective of demographics of the respondents team work competency possessed by all the aspiring managers are at the similar level. Team work competency has three sub-dimensions designing team, creating a supporting environment and managing a team dynamics. Findings are similar for the sub dimensions of team work competency. All the aspiring managers are at the similar level for team work competency irrespective of the demographics of the respondents. It can be seen from the results that for team work competency aspiring managers are at the average level.

## **MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS**

Findings of the study clearly point out that aspiring managers are lacking in team work competency. It indicates some sort of drawbacks of current system of teaching methodologies, which primarily focuses on theoretical learning which is no doubt important for aspiring managers, but at the other hand soft skills, practical knowledge, leadership qualities are also important for the aspiring managers. Aspiring managers are supposed to work in teams and ultimately it is expected from them to be a good team member and thereafter a good lead leader, who can inspire not only himself but also his teammates in order to successfully achieve organizational objectives.

It is the need of hour that we must emphasize on learning practical skills demanded by the industry from the professionals. It is also expected from the aspiring managers that they



emphasizes more on practical learning, developing team skills because it will help them to get a suitable position in the industry and to achieve their desired goals. So, educational institutes must emphasize on developing soft skills and team work skills in the aspiring managers in order to make them competent working managers.

## REFERENCES

1. Abraham, S.E., Kams, L.A., Shaw, K. and Mena, M.A. (2001), "Managerial competencies and the managerial performance appraisal process", *Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 20, No 10, pp. 842-852.
2. Bhardwaj, Anand and Punia, B.K.(2013), "Managerial Competencies and their influence on Managerial Performance- A Literature Review", *International Journal of Advance Research in Management and Social Sciences*, Volume 2, Issue 5, pp 70-84.
3. Boyatzis, R.E. (1982), *The Competent Manager: A Model for Effective Performance*, John Wiley & Sons, New York, NY.
4. Boyatzis, R.E. and Saatioglu, A. (2008), "A twenty year view of trying to develop emotional, social and cognitive intelligence competencies in graduate management education", *Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 27, No. 1, pp. 92-108.
5. Comutto, A. and Gerli, F. (2004), "An integrated competency based approach to management education: an Italian MBA case study", *International Journal of Training and Development*, Vol. 8, No. 4, pp. 240-257.
6. Hellriegel, Don, Jackson S.E., and Slocum J.W., Jr., (2005), *Management a competency-based approach*, Cengage Learning, New Delhi.
7. Homer, (2001), "Skills and competency management", *Industrial and Commercial Training*, Vol. 33, No. 2, pp. 59-62.
8. Qiao Xuejun June and Wang Wei (2009), "Managerial competencies for middle managers: some empirical findings from China", *Journal of European Industrial Training*, Vol. 33, No. 1, pp. 69-80.
9. Ram Charan (2007), *Know -How: The eight skills that separate people who perform from those who don't*, Crown Business, New York.
10. Robinson, Mark, Sparrow, Paul, Clegg, Chris and Birdi, Kamal (2007). "Forecasting future competency requirements: a three-phase methodology", *Personal Review*, Vol. 36, No. 1, pp. 65-90.
11. Shirazi Ali and Mortazvi Saeed (2009), "Effective management performance a competency based perspective", *International Review of Business Research Papers*, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 1-10.