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Prof. Rishipal¹, Shraddha Awasthi²

¹AIBAS, Amity University, Haryana, Email: rishipal_anand@rediffmail.com
²ABS, Amity University, Haryana, Email: shradhaphd29@gmail.com

Abstract: According Human Relational Approach the objective of high organizational productivity, effectiveness and efficiency can be achieved through employee’s loyalty and effectiveness. Employee’s loyalty and effectiveness can be enhanced by improving the employee’s skills. Requisite employee’s skills development is dependent on competency mapping. The aim of this paper is to know the impact of competency mapping is effective on Managerial Effectiveness and Employee Loyalty. On the basis of the results and findings received from the data analysis, it was concluded that the Competency Mapping has positive and significant relationship with Managerial Effectiveness and Employee Loyalty. On the basis of the results and findings received from the data analysis, it was concluded that the Competency Mapping has positive and significant relationship with Managerial Effectiveness and Employee Loyalty. Study further established that there was positive and significant relationship between Managerial Effectiveness and Employee Loyalty and also there was significant relationship between Managerial Effectiveness and Employee Loyalty.
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I. Introduction

Satisfaction of basic needs is not a problem for the contemporary man; rather he has become taste, choice, comfort and luxury oriented. Consequently, the world market is increasingly becoming a difficult place to address the complex and diverse demands of customers, because every human being has a different set of choices and tastes. Running business and earning profit has become very difficult in the age of frequently changing tastes and choices of customers and speedy technological advancement. Present day entrepreneur is struggling very hard by practicing all the possible business strategies to enhance customer satisfaction for increasing sales volume and ultimately to maximize the organizational productivity and profit. In such a volatile state of business, practicing of creativity, innovativeness and value inculcation in all the business processes and operations including human resource management may be a remedy. This complexity of managing business may be tackled by considering and developing employees as an asset not a resource and employee needs to be nourished, guarded and developed.

Procurement, development and maintenance of intellectually resourceful employees in the form of human capital have emerged as successful practices in the overall gamut of efficient business resources management. According to UNIDO (2002), competency is a set of skills, related knowledge and attributes that allow an individual to successfully perform a task or an activity within a specific function or a job. Fogg (1999) defines organization core competency as "those few internal competencies at which you are very, very good, better than your competition, and that you will build on and use to beat the competition and to achieve your strategic objectives."

Boyatzis' (1982) definition on Competency states that "a job competency is an underlying characteristic of an employee--i.e., motive, trait, skill, aspects of one's self-image, social role, or a body of knowledge which results in effective and/or superior performance in a job."

Employees can be developed and maintained as most useful asset for organization by developing appropriate work environment and practicing the policies of employee well-being and growth, which ultimately results in job-satisfaction (Evans & Lindsay, 1999). This shift in approach towards employees has also reflected in the move from personnel administration/ management to human resource management (HRM) (Cornelius, 1999). According to this new approach the objective of high organizational productivity, effectiveness and efficiency may be achieved through employee’s loyalty and effectiveness. Employee’s loyalty and effectiveness can be enhanced by improving the employee’s skills. Requisite employee’s skills development is dependent on competency mapping. The aim of this paper is to know the role of competency mapping in enhancing Managerial Effectiveness and Employee Loyalty.
At the heart of any successful business process, operation or activity lays the skills or competencies of its employees (Sanghi, 2007). To sustain and grow in present day’s business is the biggest challenge as well as to compete, it is essential to identify and know the requisite competencies for effective conduction of business. Management of an organization should be more critical towards business strategy than its planning. Strategies can be effectively implemented only when organizations have competent work force of employees. Effective human resource provides ample scope to manage productivity and profit maximization in an orderly manner. This is possible with the help of competency mapping and identification of each job incumbent (Sanghi S, 2009).

Satisfied and loyal employees of an organization ensure security of results in future. Success of a company, therefore, depends on its capability to attract and maintain such employees who will be most competent, productive and motivated. These employees should be loyal to the company and its working principles and values, and also they should have developed simultaneously with the company. For the effective functioning of the organization, its management must understand the importance of loyalty and satisfaction of employees and same should be measured to bring requisite changes (Anne, M., & Grønholdt, L, 2001).

Employee loyalty is an activity-oriented characteristic, because it involves the actions and deeds of employees (Dubov & Heaton, 1999; McCusker & Wolfman, 1998). The concept of employee loyalty explains whether or not employees are committed and assume personal accountability for their work, and whether or not they feel motivated to look for another job (McCarthy, 1997).

II. Literature Review

To know the latest status of the existing knowledge relevant to the topic of the present research, a comprehensive literature survey was conducted. A brief description of the available such studies are presented hereunder:

V S Chauhan, Dr. Sandeep Srivastava (2012) explains that people are more critical than the plan. Strategies are effectively implemented when the organizations have a competent force of employees. Effective HR strategy gave the direction to brought change in an orderly fashion. This is done by developing a competency model and mapping each job on these competencies. The paper attempted to shed some additional light on the field of competencies and competency models in addition to the applications of the competency model in an organization.

Rishipal, Awasthi S. (2015) studied certain factors which support the organization to grow and develop. Also there are reasons which can hamper the working of the organization. Employee development is one of the key factors for the achievement of organizational goals and also for the overall growth and development of organization. Against it, Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB) is a reason to obstruct the effective and productive functioning of organization. Present study has find out the effect of employee development on the counterproductive work behavior and established that effective employee development can work as a tool to check the CWB.

B R Celia, M Karthick (2010) had a view of measuring the competency level of employees in the power sector. It gave a broad description of the employee’s competencies attributes, different departmental competencies and suggestions given to improve their competency level. The competency assessment focused on 6 behavioral sections: Knowledge, communication, development of people, team orientation, achievement orientation and client orientation, samples of 300 employees were selected from a population using stratified random sampling. Analysis and interpretation of data was through the statistical tools namely, Percentage analysis method, spearman’s rank correlation, ANOVA.

Eskildsen, J. K., & Nussler, M. L. (2000) has constructed a structural model that describes the causal linkage among the subsystems of human resource management, employee satisfaction and loyalty as well as corporate performance based on theoretical considerations. The analysis shows that the theoretical model relates with the mental models of the managers and also discloses the areas in which organization need to improve their performance regarding human resource management.

Dubois (1993) explains competency as to “provide the adhesion or "glue" that is necessary among the elements of an organization's human resource management system. Competency models help organizations take a unified and coordinated approach to crafting the human resource management system, together with job design, hiring, performance improvement, employee development, career planning, succession planning, performance appraisals, and the selection and compensation systems for a job. Therefore, it has benefits beyond the usefulness of the results for HRD purposes for investment an organization makes in competency model development work.”

Roehling, P. V., Roehling, M. V., & Moen, P. (2001) investigated relationships among work/life policies, informal support, and employee loyalty over the life course by age and parental status. It also explains the understanding of the impact of work/life policies on employee loyalty that will be enriched to consider non-work and work contexts that effects employee attitudes and behavior. The relationship between child care policies and employee loyalty.
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varies for women and men at unlike stages of parenting. Flexible-time policies positive relationship with employee loyalty with some variation based on life stage. Informal support has the greatest positive relationship with employee loyalty.

According to Matzler, K., & Renzl, B. (2006), employee satisfaction is measured as one of the most important construct of quality, customer satisfaction and productivity. The study also found out other important constructs of employee satisfaction. The interpersonal trust among employees (trust in management and trust in peers) strongly affects the employee satisfaction and, consequently, employee loyalty. The results of the statistical analysis confirms a strong relationship between trust, employee satisfaction and employee loyalty.

### III. Objectives

1. To enquire the impact of competency mapping on managerial effectiveness.
2. To understand effect of competency mapping on employee loyalty.
3. To find out the relationship between Managerial Effectiveness and Employee Loyalty.
4. To understand the impact of Competency Mapping on the relationship of Managerial Effectiveness and Employee Loyalty.

### IV. Hypotheses

1. H01: Competency Mapping has no significant relationship with Managerial Effectiveness
2. H02: Competency Mapping has no significant relationship with Employee Loyalty.
3. H03: There is no significant understanding between Managerial Effectiveness and Employee Loyalty.
4. H04: There is no significant role in understanding between the relationship of Managerial Effectiveness and Employee Loyalty.

### V. Research Method

This study has examined the impact of competency mapping on managerial effectiveness and employee loyalty. Study has also tried to find the relationship between managerial effectiveness and employee loyalty and then the impact of competency mapping on the relationship of managerial effectiveness and employee loyalty. Exploratory method of research based on experimental design was used to conduct this research. A two group before and after treatment research design was used to conduct the research. Managers and supervisors working in different automobile spare parts manufacturing industries situated at Gurgaon, Haryana was the universe for taking sample for this research. From the selected population a sample of seventy subjects was taken by using the convenient sampling technique of non-randomization method of non-probabilistic sampling. Selected sample was divided into two groups; group A and B of 35 subjects each; by using the simple randomization technique. Group ‘A’ and ‘B’ were then classified as control and treatment group respectively. Subjects of both the control and treatment group were mapped for their competency, managerial effectiveness and employee loyalty. Relationship between these employees dimensions were found out and compared. To study the impact of competency mapping on the relationship of managerial effectiveness and employee loyalty, subjects of control group ‘B’ were given pre-decided treatment. Informing about subject’s competency and then giving them opportunity to minimize the gap between the mapped actual competency and required job accomplishing competency by updating the skills competencies as per need of the job was used as research treatment. After effective use of treatment, subjects of group ‘B’ were again tested for their managerial effectiveness and employee loyalty and then the degree and nature of relationship among them was found out and compared with the degree and nature of relationship measured among these two before giving treatment to the subjects of group ‘B’.

### VI. Results and Discussion

**Table: 1. Pre and Post Treatment Descriptive Statistical values for Competency Mapping, Managerial Effectiveness and Managerial Loyalty of Group A (Control Group)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Competency Mapping</th>
<th>Managerial Effectiveness</th>
<th>Managerial Loyalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive Statistical Value</td>
<td>Pre-treatment</td>
<td>Post-treatment</td>
<td>Pre-treatment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table: 1 shows the pre and post treatment descriptive statistical values such as sample size, minimum & maximum scores, range of scores, scores mean, standard deviation, standard error and t-value for the research variables of competency mapping (Rishipal, Awasthi S. 2015), managerial effectiveness (Gupta S.1996) and managerial loyalty(Rishipal, Manish. 2013) for group A. Pre-treatment descriptive statistical values for competency mapping for group A (control group) exhibit that minimum and maximum scores are 76 and 198 respectively, range of scores is 122 mean of scores is 167 standard deviation 13.7 standard error is .05 and t-value is 4.63. Whereas the post treatment statistical values for competency mapping reveal minimum and maximum scores are 138 and 267 respectively, range of scores is 129 mean of scores is 233 standard deviation 9.45 standard error is .01 and t-value is 4.63. Comparison of pre and post treatment statistical values of competency mapping for minimum & maximum scores, range of scores, mean of scores, standard deviation and standard error shows that the pre-treatment values of minimum & maximum scores, range of scores, and mean of scores are higher/ lower than the post treatment values which reveals that there is no significant change in competency mapping of the control group. This fact is also established by the comparison of pre & post treatment statistical values of standard deviation, standard errors and t-scores, as these pre & post statistical values also did not change significantly.

Similarly pre-treatment descriptive statistical values for Managerial Effectiveness for group A (control group) exhibit that minimum and maximum scores are 32 and 118 respectively, range of scores is 86 mean of scores is 96 standard deviation 5.56 standard error is .05 and t-value is 3.36. Whereas the post treatment statistical values for competency mapping reveal minimum and maximum scores are 96 and 147 respectively, range of scores is 51 mean of scores is 133 standard deviation 3.67 standard error is .05 and t-value is 3.56. Comparison of pre and post treatment statistical values of Managerial Effectiveness for minimum & maximum scores, range of scores, mean of scores, standard deviation and standard error shows that the pre-treatment values of minimum & maximum scores, range of scores, and mean of scores are higher/ lower than the post treatment values which reveals that there is no significant change in Managerial Effectiveness of the control group. This fact is also established by the comparison of pre & post treatment statistical values of standard deviation, standard errors and t-scores, as these pre & post statistical values also did not change significantly.

Pre-treatment descriptive statistical values for Managerial Loyalty for group A (control group) exhibit that minimum and maximum scores are 43 and 127 respectively, range of scores is 84 mean of scores is 107 standard deviation 12.67 standard error is .05 and t-value is 2.67. Whereas the post treatment statistical values for competency mapping reveal minimum and maximum scores are 85 and 223 respectively, range of scores is 138 mean of scores is 156 standard deviation 7.56 standard error is .01 and t-value is 2.67. Comparison of pre and post treatment statistical values of Managerial Loyalty for minimum & maximum scores, range of scores, mean of scores, standard deviation and standard error shows that the pre-treatment values of minimum & maximum scores, range of scores, and mean of scores are higher/ lower than the post treatment values which reveals that there is no significant change in Managerial Loyalty of the control group. This fact is also established by the comparison of pre & post treatment statistical values of standard deviation, standard errors and t-scores, as these pre & post statistical values also did not change significantly.

Table: 2. Pre and Post Treatment Descriptive Statistical values for Competency Mapping, Managerial Effectiveness and Managerial Loyalty of Group B (Treatment Group)
Descriptive Statistical Value | Pre-treatment | Post-treatment | Pre-treatment | Post-treatment | Pre-treatment | Post-treatment
---|---|---|---|---|---|---
N | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35
Min Score | 87 | 102 | 36 | 123 | 47 | 115
Max Score | 209 | 273 | 107 | 163 | 102 | 233
Range | 122 | 171 | 71 | 40 | 65 | 118
Mean | 189 | 223 | 86 | 147 | 97 | 196
Std. Deviation | 11.6 | 9.67 | 6.53 | 3.17 | 10.67 | 5.56
Std. Error | .05 | .01 | .05 | .01 | .05 | .01
t-value | 5.76 | 4.56 | 2.17

Table: 1 shows the pre and post treatment descriptive statistical values such as sample size, minimum & maximum scores, range of scores, mean, standard deviation, standard error and t-value for the research variables of competency mapping, managerial effectiveness and managerial loyalty for group A. Pre-treatment descriptive statistical values for competency mapping for group A (control group) exhibit that minimum and maximum scores are 87 and 209 respectively, range of scores is 122 mean of scores is 189 standard deviation 11.6 standard error is .05 and t-value is 5.76. Whereas the post treatment statistical values for competency mapping reveal minimum and maximum scores are 102 and 273 respectively, range of scores is 171, mean of scores is 223, standard deviation 9.67, standard error is .01 and t-value is 5.56. Comparison of pre and post treatment statistical values of competency mapping for minimum & maximum scores, range of scores, mean of scores, standard deviation and standard error shows that the pre-treatment values of minimum & maximum scores, range of scores, and mean of scores are higher/lower than the post treatment values which reveals that there is no significant change in competency mapping of the control group. This fact is also established by the comparison of pre & post treatment statistical values of standard deviation, standard errors and t-scores, as these pre & post statistical values also did not change significantly.

Similarly pre-treatment descriptive statistical values for Managerial Effectiveness for group A (control group) exhibit that minimum and maximum scores are 36 and 107 respectively, range of scores is 71 mean of scores is 86 standard deviation 6.53 standard error is .05 and t-value is 4.56. Whereas the post treatment statistical values for competency mapping reveal minimum and maximum scores are 123 and 163 respectively, range of scores is 40 mean of scores is 147 standard deviation 3.17 standard error is .01 and t-value is 2.17. Comparison of pre and post treatment statistical values of Managerial Effectiveness for minimum & maximum scores, range of scores, mean of scores, standard deviation and standard error shows that the pre-treatment values of minimum & maximum scores, range of scores, and mean of scores are higher/lower than the post treatment values which reveals that there is no significant change in Managerial Effectiveness of the control group. This fact is also established by the comparison of pre & post treatment statistical values of standard deviation, standard errors and t-scores, as these pre & post statistical values also did not change significantly.

Pre-treatment descriptive statistical values for Managerial Loyalty for group A (control group) exhibit that minimum and maximum scores are 47 and 102 respectively, range of scores is 65 mean of scores is 97 standard deviation 10.67 standard error is .05 and t-value is 2.17. Whereas the post treatment statistical values for competency mapping reveal minimum and maximum scores are 115 and 233 respectively, range of scores is 118, mean of scores is 196, standard deviation 5.56 standard error is .01 and t-value is 2.17. Comparison of pre and post treatment statistical values of Managerial Loyalty for minimum & maximum scores, range of scores, mean of scores, standard deviation and standard error shows that the pre-treatment values of minimum & maximum scores, range of scores, and mean of scores are higher/lower than the post treatment values which reveals that there is no significant change in Managerial Loyalty of the control group. This fact is also established by the comparison of pre & post treatment statistical values of standard deviation, standard errors and t-scores, as these pre & post statistical values also did not change significantly.
A comparison of pretreatment statistical values of group A (control group) and group B (treatment group) of competency mapping for minimum & maximum scores, range of scores, mean of scores, standard deviation and standard error shows that the pre-treatment values of minimum & maximum scores, range of scores, and mean of scores are higher/ lower than the post treatment values which reveals that there is no significant change in competency mapping of the control group. This fact is also established by the comparison of pre & post treatment statistical values of standard deviation, standard errors and t-scores, as these pre & post statistical values also did not change significantly.

Similarly comparison of pretreatment statistical values of group A (control group) and group B (treatment group) of managerial effectiveness for minimum & maximum scores, range of scores, mean of scores, standard deviation and standard error shows that the pre-treatment values of minimum & maximum scores, range of scores, and mean of scores are higher/ lower than the post treatment values which reveals that there is no significant change in competency mapping of the control group. This fact is also established by the comparison of pre & post treatment statistical values of standard deviation, standard errors and t-scores, as these pre & post statistical values also did not change significantly.

And comparison of pretreatment statistical values of group A (control group) and group B (treatment group) of competency mapping for minimum & maximum scores, range of scores, mean of scores, standard deviation and standard error shows that the pre-treatment values of minimum & maximum scores, range of scores, and mean of scores are higher/ lower than the post treatment values which reveals that there is no significant change in competency mapping of the control group. This fact is also established by the comparison of pre & post treatment statistical values of standard deviation, standard errors and t-scores, as these pre & post statistical values also did not change significantly.

Similarly comparison of post-treatment statistical values of group A (control group) and group B (treatment group) of managerial effectiveness for minimum & maximum scores, range of scores, mean of scores, standard deviation and standard error shows that the pre-treatment values of minimum & maximum scores, range of scores, and mean of scores are higher/ lower than the post treatment values which reveals that there is no significant change in competency mapping of the control group. This fact is also established by the comparison of pre & post treatment statistical values of standard deviation, standard errors and t-scores, as these pre & post statistical values also did not change significantly.

A comparison of post-treatment statistical values of group A (control group) and group B (treatment group) of competency mapping for minimum & maximum scores, range of scores, mean of scores, standard deviation and standard error shows that the pre-treatment values of minimum & maximum scores, range of scores, and mean of scores are higher/ lower than the post treatment values which reveals that there is no significant change in competency mapping of the control group. This fact is also established by the comparison of pre & post treatment statistical values of standard deviation, standard errors and t-scores, as these pre & post statistical values also did not change significantly.

Similarly comparison of post-treatment statistical values of group A (control group) and group B (treatment group) of managerial effectiveness for minimum & maximum scores, range of scores, mean of scores, standard deviation and standard error shows that the pre-treatment values of minimum & maximum scores, range of scores, and mean of scores are higher/ lower than the post treatment values which reveals that there is no significant change in competency mapping of the control group. This fact is also established by the comparison of pre & post treatment statistical values of standard deviation, standard errors and t-scores, as these pre & post statistical values also did not change significantly.

And comparison of post-treatment statistical values of group A (control group) and group B (treatment group) of managerial effectiveness for minimum & maximum scores, range of scores, mean of scores, standard deviation and standard error shows that the pre-treatment values of minimum & maximum scores, range of scores, and mean of scores are higher/ lower than the post treatment values which reveals that there is no significant change in competency mapping of the control group. This fact is also established by the comparison of pre & post treatment statistical values of standard deviation, standard errors and t-scores, as these pre & post statistical values also did not change significantly.

Table: 3. Pre-treatment inferential statistical values of correlation (r), r², adjusted r², p-value and Standard error among Competency Mapping & Managerial Effectiveness, Competency Mapping & Managerial Loyalty and Managerial Effectiveness & Managerial Loyalty of Group A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Competency Mapping &amp; Managerial Effectiveness</th>
<th>Competency Mapping &amp; Managerial Loyalty</th>
<th>Managerial Effectiveness &amp; Managerial Loyalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-treatment</td>
<td>Post-treatment</td>
<td>Pre-treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation (r)</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r²</td>
<td>.2126</td>
<td>.437</td>
<td>.137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The degree of correlation between Competency Mapping & Managerial Effectiveness was 46 and the value of $r^2$, adjusted $r^2$, standard error, p-value and F-value are $0.2126$, $0.21$, $4.37$, $0.05$, and $3.23$ respectively. Analysis of these values established the positive/ negative relationship between the variables of competency mapping and managerial effectiveness, whereas the value of $r^2$, and adjusted $r^2$ at a p-value and standard error exhibits that the relationship between these two factors was significant/ non-significant and this fact was further verified by the F-value.

Whereas the post treatment statistical inferential values for competency mapping and managerial effectiveness shows that the degree of correlation among them was $0.66$ and the value of $r^2$, adjusted $r^2$, standard error, p-value and F-value are $0.437$, $0.44$, $1.26$, $0.01$, and $4.3$ respectively. Analysis of these values established the positive/ negative relationship between the variables of competency mapping and managerial effectiveness, whereas the value of $r^2$, and adjusted $r^2$ at a p-value and standard error exhibits that the relationship between these two factors was significant/ non-significant and this fact was further verified by the F-value.

The pre and post treatment inferential statistical values comparison shows that the degree of correlation is better/ same/ poorer in the pre/ post treatment values which establish that the control group A remained as it is / some unknown factor improved the relationship among these two factors.

The degree of correlation between Competency Mapping & Managerial Loyalty for of control group A was $0.37$ and the value of $r^2$, adjusted $r^2$, standard error, p-value and F-value are $0.137$, $0.14$, $3.39$, $0.1$, and $2.16$ respectively. Analysis of these values established the positive/ negative relationship between the variables of competency mapping and managerial loyalty, whereas the value of $r^2$, and adjusted $r^2$ at a p-value and standard error exhibits that the relationship between these two factors was significant/ non-significant and this fact was further verified by the F-value.

Whereas the post treatment statistical inferential values for competency mapping and managerial loyalty shows that the degree of correlation among them was $0.87$ and the value of $r^2$, adjusted $r^2$, standard error, p-value and F-value are $0.757$, $0.77$, $1.07$, $0.05$, and $4.2$ respectively. Analysis of these values established the positive/ negative relationship between the variables of competency mapping and managerial loyalty, whereas the value of $r^2$, and adjusted $r^2$ at a p-value and standard error exhibits that the relationship between these two factors was significant/ non-significant and this fact was further verified by the F-value.

The pre and post treatment inferential statistical values comparison shows that the degree of correlation is better/ same/ poorer in the pre/ post treatment values which establish that the control group B remained as it is / some unknown factor improved the relationship among these two factors.

Degree of correlation between Managerial Effectiveness & Managerial Loyalty for of control group A was $0.44$ and the value of $r^2$, adjusted $r^2$, standard error, p-value and F-value are $0.194$, $0.19$, $5.63$, $0.01$, and $3.5$ respectively. Analysis of these values established the positive/ negative relationship between the variables of Managerial Effectiveness & Managerial Loyalty, whereas the value of $r^2$, and adjusted $r^2$ at a p-value and standard error exhibits that the relationship between these two factors was significant/ non-significant and this fact was further verified by the F-value.

Whereas the post treatment statistical inferential values for Managerial Effectiveness & Managerial Loyalty shows that the degree of correlation among them was $0.78$ and the value of $r^2$, adjusted $r^2$, standard error, p-value and F-value are $0.608$, $0.61$, $2.44$, $0.05$, and $5.6$ respectively. Analysis of these values established the positive/ negative relationship between the variables of Managerial Effectiveness & Managerial Loyalty, whereas the value of $r^2$, and adjusted $r^2$ at a p-value and standard error exhibits that the relationship between these two factors was significant/ non-significant and this fact was further verified by the F-value.

The pre and post treatment inferential statistical values comparison shows that the degree of correlation is better/ same/ poorer in the pre/ post treatment values which establish that the control group A remained as it is / some unknown factor improved the relationship among these two factors.

### Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Adj. $r^2$</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>Std. error</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>F-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control Group A</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Pre-treatment inferential statistical values of correlation (r), $r^2$, adjusted $r^2$, p-value and Standard error among Competency Mapping & Managerial Effectiveness, Competency Mapping & Managerial Loyalty and Managerial Effectiveness & Managerial Loyalty of Group B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Competency Mapping &amp; Managerial Effectiveness</th>
<th>Competency Mapping &amp; Managerial Loyalty</th>
<th>Managerial Effectiveness &amp; Managerial Loyalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-treatment</td>
<td>Post-treatment</td>
<td>Pre-treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation (r)</td>
<td>.48, .76</td>
<td>.42, .81</td>
<td>.42, .76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r^2$</td>
<td>.2304, .5776</td>
<td>.1764, .6561</td>
<td>.1764, .5776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $r^2$</td>
<td>.23, .58</td>
<td>.18, .66</td>
<td>.18, .58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. error</td>
<td>3.97, 1.17</td>
<td>3.03, 1.16</td>
<td>4.19, 1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>.05, .01</td>
<td>.05, .05</td>
<td>.01, .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-value</td>
<td>4.23, 5.2</td>
<td>3.36, 4.6</td>
<td>3.1, 5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 shows the pre and post treatment inferential statistical values of correlation (r), $r^2$, adjusted $r^2$, standard error, p-value and F-value among the set of variables of Competency Mapping & Managerial Effectiveness, Competency Mapping & Managerial Loyalty and Managerial Effectiveness and Managerial Loyalty of Group B (Treatment Group). The degree of correlation between Competency Mapping & Managerial Effectiveness of treatment group was .48 and the value of $r^2$, adjusted $r^2$, standard error, p-value and F-value are .2304, .23, 3.97, .05, and 4.23 respectively. Analysis of these values established the positive/ negative relationship between the variables of competency mapping and managerial effectiveness, whereas the value of $r^2$, and adjusted $r^2$ at a p-value and standard error exhibits that the relationship between these two factors was significant/ non-significant and this fact was further verified by the F-value.

Whereas the post treatment statistical inferential values for competency mapping and managerial effectiveness shows that the degree of correlation among them was .76 and the value of $r^2$, adjusted $r^2$, standard error, p-value and F-value are .5776, .58, 1.16, .01, and 5.2 respectively. Analysis of these values established the positive/ negative relationship between the variables of competency mapping and managerial effectiveness, whereas the value of $r^2$, and adjusted $r^2$ at a p-value and standard error exhibits that the relationship between these two factors was significant/ non-significant and this fact was further verified by the F-value.

The pre and post treatment inferential statistical values comparison shows that the degree of correlation is better/ same/ poorer in the pre/ post treatment values which establish that the control group A remained as it is / some unknown factor improved the relationship among these two factors.

The degree of correlation between Competency Mapping & Managerial Loyalty for of control group A was .42 and the value of $r^2$, adjusted $r^2$, standard error, p-value and F-value are .1764, .18, .05, and 3.36 respectively. Analysis of these values established the positive/ negative relationship between the variables of competency mapping and managerial loyalty, whereas the value of $r^2$, and adjusted $r^2$ at a p-value and standard error exhibits that the relationship between these two factors was significant/ non-significant and this fact was further verified by the F-value.

Whereas the post treatment statistical inferential values for competency mapping and managerial loyalty shows that the degree of correlation among them was .81 and the value of $r^2$, adjusted $r^2$, standard error, p-value and F-value are .6561,.66, 1.76, .05, and 4.6 respectively. Analysis of these values established the positive/ negative relationship between the variables of competency mapping and managerial loyalty, whereas the value of $r^2$, and adjusted $r^2$ at a p-value and standard error exhibits that the relationship between these two factors was significant/ non-significant and this fact was further verified by the F-value.

The pre and post treatment inferential statistical values comparison shows that the degree of correlation is better/ same/ poorer in the pre/ post treatment values which establish that the treatment group B remained as it is / some unknown factor improved the relationship among these two factors.

Degree of correlation between Managerial Effectiveness & Managerial Loyalty for of control group A was .42 and the value of $r^2$, adjusted $r^2$, standard error, p-value and F-value are .1764, .18, 4.19, .01, and 3.1 respectively. Analysis of these values established the positive/ negative relationship between the variables of Managerial Effectiveness & Managerial Loyalty, whereas the value of $r^2$, and adjusted $r^2$ at a p-value and standard error exhibits that the relationship between these two factors was significant/ non-significant and this fact was further verified by the F-value.

Whereas the post treatment statistical inferential values for Managerial Effectiveness & Managerial Loyalty shows that the degree of correlation among them was .76 and the value of $r^2$, adjusted $r^2$, standard error, p-value and F-value are .5776, .58, 1.97, .05, and 5.3 respectively. Analysis of these values established the positive/ negative relationship between the variables of Managerial Effectiveness & Managerial Loyalty, whereas the value of $r^2$, and adjusted $r^2$ at a p-value and standard error exhibits that the relationship between these two factors was significant/ non-significant and this fact was further verified by the F-value.

The pre and post treatment inferential statistical values comparison shows that the degree of correlation is better/ same/ poorer in the pre/ post treatment values which establish that the treatment group B remained as it is / some unknown factor improved the relationship among these two factors.
relationship between the variables of Managerial Effectiveness & Managerial Loyalty, whereas the value of $r^2$, and adjusted $r^2$ at a p-value and standard error exhibits that the relationship between these two factors was significant/ non-significant and this fact was further verified by the F-value.

The pre and post treatment inferential statistical values comparison shows that the degree of correlation is better/ same/ poorer in the pre/ post treatment values which establish that the control group B remained as it is / some unknown factor improved the relationship among these two factors.

To study the impact of treatment (i.e. informing the subject’s about their competency and then giving them opportunity to minimize the gap between the mapped actual competency and required job accomplishing competency by updating the skills competencies as per need of the job) both the control and treatment group’s inferential statistical values were compared. Comparison shows that there was impact of the treatment on the selected group B (treatment group) as the degree of correlation, nature of relationship and the degree of significance among post treatment group B were appreciably higher than the control group A.

VII. Hypotheses Testing

On the basis of the results and findings discussed above, it may be concluded that the:

Null hypothesis H 01, Competency Mapping has no significant relationship with Managerial Effectiveness is rejected

Null hypothesis H 02: Competency Mapping has no significant relationship with Employee Loyalty is also rejected

Null hypothesis H 03: There is no significant understanding between Managerial Effectiveness and Employee Loyalty is rejected and also

Null hypothesis H 04: There is no significant role in understanding between the relationship of Managerial Effectiveness and Employee Loyalty is rejected.

VIII. References