



ASSESSING SELF-MANAGEMENT COMPETENCY OF WORKING MANAGERS: AN EMPIRICAL STUDY

Anand Bhardwaj

Assistant Professor, KIIT College of Engineering, Gurugram (Haryana)

ABSTRACT

Purpose- Objective of this research paper is to assess self-management competency of Working Managers.

Research Methodology- 273 Respondents were selected by using random sampling method from various parts of Delhi-NCR. Structured questionnaire was designed to assess self-management competency of working managers. Statistical tools like mean, t-test, F-test (ANOVA) are used to analyze data with the help of SPSS.

Findings: Results show that variables like work experience, relevant qualification for job and position in the organization have emerged as a significant differentiators for self-management competency for working managers. Demographical variable like gender, age, serving sectors don't bring significant difference in the self-management competency of working managers.

Implications- Managers should have clear personal and professional goals. They should take responsibility for professional and personal life decisions. Working managers should accept responsibility. They are also supposed to develop strategies and look for opportunities which would help them in achieving professional and personal long term growth.

Keywords: Managerial Competencies, Self-Management Competency, Assessing.

INTRODUCTION AND REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Effective managers are those who take responsibility for their professional and personal life. According to Hellriegel et al. (2005), “Taking responsibility for your life at work and beyond is a manager’s self-management competency.” Often when things go wrong, people are likely to blame others for bad situations. Good managers take full responsibility of their work life and do not engage in such practices. Managers who are good at self-management competency enjoy their professional and personal life.

The self-management competency consists of the following dimensions:

- Integrity and Ethical Conduct
- Personal Drive and Resilience
- Balancing Work and Life Issues and
- Self-Awareness and Development (Hellriegel et al., 2005).

Integrity and Ethical Conduct

Flanagan and Finger (2004) defined integrity as “honesty, soundness, uprightness, trueness to self or stated values, beliefs or ethics.” An organization can grow only when its integrity is reflected in its management. A manager should have clear standards for integrity and ethical conduct in professional as well as in personal life. He should admit his mistakes and doesn’t hesitate to accept responsibility for his own behavior and actions (Singla, 2014).

Personal Drive and Resilience

Personal drive and resilience are principally important when someone faces setbacks and failures in life (Hellriegel et al., 2005). It shows one ability and determination to bounce back from the failures. A manager with strong personal drive and resilience becomes the asset for an organization. They show consistent perseverance in the face of difficulties and learn lessons from failures.

Balancing Work and Life Issues

Managers must be able to enjoy lives at professional as well as personal front. Good managers prioritize task and accordingly establish work and life related goals (Hellriegel et al., 2005). A manager should know how to enjoy the leisure time to refresh him for the next assignment.

Self-Awareness and Development

The awareness about self and initiating development effort are instrumental for a dynamic and ever changing work environment. Managers who entertain development and training opportunities learn much more as compared to those who don't (Hellriegel et al., 2005).

Good managers always accept responsibility and engage themselves in continuous learning and development. They also develop strategies and look for opportunities which would help them in achieving personal long term growth (Singla, 2014).

Following table shows the key skills/competencies which are possessed by successful managers as per the different studies and therefore needed to be developed:

Table1: Managerial Competencies Needed To Be an Effective and Successful Manager

No.	Author(s)	Year	Managerial Competencies
1	Pandit	2001	commitment, persistence, risk-taking, curiosity, difference, values, learning, persuasiveness, focus, humility
2	Hellriegel et. al.	2005	Communication, planning and administration, teamwork, strategic action, global awareness, and self-management
3	Ram Charan	2007	Ambition, appetite for learning, drive and tenacity, psychological openness, realism, self-confidence
4	Hopkins and Bilimoria	2008	self-confidence, achievement-orientation, inspirational leadership, change catalyst

*Authors' own work adapted from Bhardwaj and Punia (2013).

The present study focuses on assessment of self-management competency for working managers.

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 paper is to assess the self-management competency of working managers. The specific sub-objectives of the study are as following:

1. To assess self-management competency of working managers.
2. To suggest workable guidelines for improving the self-management competency of working managers.

Hypothesis of the Study

1. There is no significant difference in across various age groups of working managers for the self-management competency.
2. There is no significant difference between working managers of different gender for the self-management competency.
3. There is no significant difference across various experienced groups of working managers for the self-management competency.
4. There is no significant difference in self-management competency of working managers on the basis of relevant qualification for job.
5. There is no significant difference between working managers having different positions in organisations for the self-management competency.
6. There is no significant difference in self-management competency of working managers serving different sectors.

Research Design

In the present study, exploratory cum descriptive research design has been used.

Sampling Design and data collection

Random sampling method is used to collect data from 273 working managers across various parts of Delhi-NCR.

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.

Table 2 examines the association between age and self-management competency of working managers. Self-management competency has four sub-dimensions namely ‘integrity and ethical conduct’, ‘personal drive and resilience’, ‘balancing work and life issues’, and ‘self awareness and development’. Comparison of mean values across different age groups indicates that competency level of working managers does not differ much, which means that working managers of different age groups possess similar level of self-management competency. F-statistics also indicates that competency level of working managers does not have a significant difference among different age groups. So the table 2 reveals that age does not contribute any significant variation in self-management competency levels of working managers across different age groups.

Table 2: Self-Management Competency on the basis of Age of Working Managers

Particulars	Mean values comparison						ANOVA test statistics	
	21-26 years	27-30 years	31-35 years	36-40 years	more than 40 years	Total	F-value	Sig.
N (Number of respondents)	29	99	97	34	14	273		
Integrity and Ethical Conduct	3.5931	3.7051	3.7381	3.7118	3.8286	3.7121	.262	.902
Personal Drive and Resilience	3.6690	3.7556	3.7753	3.6765	3.9286	3.7524	.325	.861
Balancing Work and Life Issues	3.5241	3.6747	3.5258	3.7000	3.6286	3.6066	.611	.655
Self Awareness and	3.8621	3.9697	3.8948	3.8647	3.7286	3.9062	.402	.807

Development								
Self-Management Competency	3.6621	3.7763	3.7335	3.7382	3.7786	3.7443	.169	.954

Source: Primary data

Table 3: Self-Management Competency on the basis of Gender of Working Managers

Particulars	Mean values		Mean Difference	t-test for Equality of Means	
	Male	Female		t-value	Sig. (2-tailed)
N (Number of respondents)	160	113			
Integrity and Ethical Conduct	3.7650	3.6372	.12783	1.309	.192
Personal Drive and Resilience	3.8225	3.6531	.16940	1.687	.093
Balancing Work and Life Issues	3.5825	3.6407	-.05821	-.588	.557
Self Awareness and Development	3.9363	3.8637	.07253	.763	.446
Self-Management Competency	3.7766	3.6987	.07789	.918	.360

Source: Primary data

The table 3 indicates that whether gender brings any significant variation in competency level of working managers for self-management competency and its sub-dimensions. Comparison of mean values between male and female working managers indicates that competency level of male and female working managers for all the dimensions of self-management competency does not vary so much, which means that working managers of both genders possess similar level of self-management competency. The t-statistics also indicates that competency level of working managers does not have a significant difference between male and female working managers for self-management competency.

Table 4: Self-Management Competency on the basis of Work Experience of Working Managers

Particulars	Mean values comparison						ANOVA test statistics	
	1-3 years	4-6 years	7-9 years	10-12 years	more than 12 years	Total	F-value	Sig.
N (Number of respondents)	15	155	68	17	18	273		
Integrity and Ethical Conduct	3.0133	3.6568	3.9412	3.5529	4.0556	3.7121	5.889	.000*

Personal Drive and Resilience	3.3600	3.6671	3.9676	3.6118	4.1333	3.7524	3.685	.006*
Balancing Work and Life Issues	3.3867	3.5600	3.7206	3.6000	3.7667	3.6066	.927	.448
Self Awareness and Development	3.5867	3.8284	4.1294	3.9412	3.9667	3.9062	2.546	.040*
Self-Management Competency	3.3367	3.6781	3.9397	3.6765	3.9806	3.7443	3.736	.006*

Source: Primary data

*significant at .05 level of significance

Table 4 gauges self-management competency of working managers across various experience groups. Comparison of mean values across different experience groups indicates that competency level of working managers vary for the ‘integrity and ethical conduct’, ‘personal drive and resilience’, and ‘self awareness and development’ dimensions which means that working managers having different levels of experience possess different level of self-management competency for these dimensions. For fourth dimension ‘balancing work and life issues’, all the working managers irrespective of their level of experience possess similar level of competence. Working managers having more experience are more competent in self-management skills than lesser experienced working managers. F-statistics indicates that competency level of working managers have a significant difference among differently experienced groups. This difference is not significant for the sub- dimension ‘balancing work and life issues’, whereas for other dimensions this difference is significantly different. So the table 4 reveals that level of experience contributes a significant variation in competency levels of working managers for self-management competency.

Table 5: Self-Management Competency on the basis of Relevant Qualification for Job of Working Managers

Particulars	Mean values		Mean Difference	t-test for Equality of Means	
	Technical/ Professional	General		t-value	Sig. (2-tailed)
N (Number of respondents)	202	71			
Integrity and Ethical Conduct	3.7644	3.5634	.20098	1.838	.067

Personal Drive and Resilience	3.8228	3.5521	.27066	2.413	.016*
Balancing Work and Life Issues	3.6990	3.3437	.35535	3.255	.001*
Self Awareness and Development	3.9703	3.7239	.24635	2.330	.021*
Self-Management Competency	3.8141	3.5458	.26833	2.853	.005*

Source: Primary data

*significant at .05 level of significance

Table 5 indicates that whether educational background produces variation in competency level between working managers for self-management competency. Mean values comparison between working managers indicates that level of self-management competency varies between working managers possessing different educational background for all the dimensions of self-management competency except for 'integrity and ethical conduct' dimension. The t-statistics also indicates that educational qualification brings a significant variation for all the dimensions of self-management competency except for 'integrity and ethical conduct' in working managers. It means that working managers possessing technical/professional education are more competent than working managers possessing general education for self-management competency.

Table 6: Self-Management Competency on the basis of Position of Working Managers in the Organization

Particulars	Mean values		Mean Difference	t-test for Equality of Means	
	Managerial	Supervisory		t-value	Sig. (2-tailed)
N (Number of respondents)	219	54			
Integrity and Ethical Conduct	3.7735	3.4630	.31055	2.595	.010*
Personal Drive and Resilience	3.8192	3.4815	.33770	2.742	.007*
Balancing Work and Life Issues	3.6429	3.4593	.18366	1.505	.134
Self Awareness and Development	3.9461	3.7444	.20167	1.724	.086

Self-Management Competency	3.7954	3.5370	.25840	2.486	.014*
-----------------------------------	--------	--------	--------	-------	-------

Source: Primary data

*significant at .05 level of significance

Table 6 examines self-management competency of working managers working at managerial and supervisory positions. Mean values comparison between managerial and supervisory working managers indicates that competency level of managerial and supervisory working managers does not vary much for ‘balancing work and life issues’ and ‘self awareness and development’ dimensions, which means that managers working in different positions in the organization possess similar level of ‘balancing work and life issues’ and ‘self awareness and development’ competency. For the remaining dimensions ‘integrity and ethical conduct’, ‘personal drive and resilience’ and for overall self-management competency managerial and supervisory working managers possess different levels of competency. Comparison of mean values also indicates that working managers at managerial position are more competent than working managers at supervisory position for ‘integrity and ethical conduct’, ‘personal drive and resilience’ and for overall self-management competency.

Further, t-statistics also indicates that competency level of working managers does not have a significant difference between managerial and supervisory working managers for ‘balancing work and life issues’, and ‘self awareness and development’ dimensions. This difference is significant for ‘integrity and ethical conduct’, ‘personal drive and resilience’ and for overall self-management competency. So the table 4.46 reveals that variation in position of the working managers at organization contributes significant variation in self-management competency level of working managers.

Table 7: Self-Management Competency on the basis of Serving Sector of Working Managers

Particulars	Mean values		Mean Difference	t-test for Equality of Means	
	Manufacturing	Service		t-value	Sig. (2-tailed)
N (Number of respondents)	90	183			
Integrity and Ethical Conduct	3.7911	3.6732	.11789	1.151	.251

Personal Drive and Resilience	3.9000	3.6798	.22022	2.099	.037*
Balancing Work and Life Issues	3.7578	3.5322	.22554	2.191	.029*
Self Awareness and Development	3.9800	3.8699	.11005	1.107	.269
Self-Management Competency	3.8572	3.6888	.16842	1.903	.058

Source: Primary data

*significant at .05 level of significance

Table 7 gauges the self-management competency of manufacturing and service sector working managers. Comparison of mean values between manufacturing and service sector working managers indicates that competency level does not differ much for ‘integrity and ethical conduct’, and ‘self awareness and development’ dimensions which means that working managers serving in different serving sectors possess similar level of competency for these dimensions. For the remaining dimensions ‘personal drive and resilience’, ‘balancing work and life issues’ and for overall self-management competency manufacturing and service sector working managers possess different level of self-management competency. Comparison of mean values also indicates that managers working in manufacturing sector are more competent than managers working in service sector for dimensions ‘personal drive and resilience’, ‘balancing work and life issues’ and for overall self-management competency.

The t-statistics also indicates that competency level of manufacturing and service sector working managers does not have a significant difference for ‘integrity and ethical conduct’ and ‘self awareness and development’ dimensions. This difference is significant for ‘personal drive and resilience’, ‘balancing work and life issues’ and for overall self-management competency. So the table 7 shows that the service sector of the working managers brings a significant variation in self-management competency level of working managers.

CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

Data analysis has revealed that variables like work experience, relevant qualification for job and position in the organization have emerged as a significant differentiators for self-management competency for working managers. Working managers having high experience

possess higher levels of self-management competency. Managers having technical/professional qualification are more competent in self-management competency as compare to managers having general qualifications. In the same way, managers working at managerial positions are more competent in self-management competency as compare to their counterparts working at supervisory positions. Demographical variable like gender, age, serving sectors don't bring significant difference in the self-management competency of working managers. It is also apparent from the results that working managers feel themselves at the above average level for self-management competency.

MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

Managers should have clear personal and professional goals. They should take responsibility for professional and personal life decisions. Working managers should accept responsibility and engage themselves in continuous learning and development. They are also supposed to develop strategies and look for opportunities which would help them in achieving professional and personal long term growth. Good managers always learn from their work and life experiences. So, it is very important for a manager to focus on self-management competency.

REFERENCES

- 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.
- Flanagan, N., & Finger, J. (2004). *The Management Bible*. Cape Town: Zebra Press.
- Hellriegel, Don, Jackson S.E., and Slocum J.W., Jr., (2005), *Management a competency-based approach*, Cengage Learning, New Delhi.
- Hopkins, M. and Bilimoria, Diana (2008), "Social and emotional competencies predicting success for male and female executive", *Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 27, No. 1, pp. 13-35.
- Pandit, Srinivas (2001), *Thought leaders*, Tata McGraw-Hill, New Delhi.

Ram Charan (2007), *Know -How: The eight skills that separate people who perform from those who don't*, Crown Business, New York.

Singla, Jagdeep (2014), *Management Concepts & Applications*, Thakur Publishers, Lucknow.

('This paper is extracted from my Ph.D Thesis')