

A Study on 360-Degree Feedback In Educational University With Reference To Bhubaneswar, Odisha, India

Uttam Kumar Das¹, Jayakrushna Panda²

¹P. G. Department of Business Administration, Utkal University, Vani vihar, Bhubaneswar-751004, Odisha, India

² Professor, P. G. Department of Business Administration, Utkal University, Vani vihar, Bhubaneswar-751004, Odisha, India

Abstract: *Managers and leaders within organizations use 360-degree feedback surveys to get a better understanding of their strengths and weaknesses. The 360-degree feedback system automatically tabulates the results and presents in a format that helps the 360-degree feedback recipient create a development plan and individual responses. 360-degree feedback gives the employee a clear picture of his/her greatest overall strengths. Through 360-degree performance appraisal the employee has the chance to review the supervisor an element that is not practiced with top down performance appraisals. This paper contributes primary study of 360 –degree feedback need to link leader assessment and development efforts to individual, team, and organization results and need for educational University.*

Keyword: performance appraisal, 360-degree feedback system, employee development

1. Introduction

360-degree evaluations consist of measurement tools completed by multiple people in an individual's sphere of influence and are known as multisource feedback, multirater assessment, full-circle appraisal, and peer evaluation. This method of providing developmental feedback is used to assess competency and behaviour rather than personality. 360-degree evaluations can potentially assess the six core competencies, but may be especially useful in assessing interpersonal skills, communications skills, and professionalism.

360-degree feedback has many uses; there are generally two reasons for using it to evaluate employees for the purpose of making personnel decisions, and/or for training and development of employees. According to a recent survey conducted by the editors of Compensation and Benefits, more than 90-percent of companies that have adopted 360-degree feedback use it in the evaluation process. Typically, 360-degree evaluations involve making personnel decisions involving promotions, pay increases, assignments, and selections for training/development programs. 360-degree feedback for evaluation purposes individuals providing feedback change their minds to affect a particular outcome.

360 Degree Feedback is a system or process in which employees receive confidential, anonymous feedback from the people who work around them. This typically includes the employee's manager, peers, and direct reports. A mixture of about eight to twelve people fill out an anonymous online feedback form that asks questions covering a broad range of workplace competencies. The feedback forms include questions that are measured on a rating scale and also ask raters to provide written comments. The person receiving feedback also fills out a self-rating survey that includes the same survey questions that others receive in their forms.

360 Feedback can also be a useful development tool for people who are not in a management role. Strictly speaking,

a "non-manager" 360 assessment is not measuring feedback from 360 degrees since there are no direct reports, but the same principles still apply. 360 Feedback for non-managers is useful to help people be more effective in their current roles, and also to help them understand what areas they should focus on if they want to move into a management role.

The use of 360 degree instruments has exploded during the past ten to fifteen years. The 360 degree appraisal takes information from more than one source. This assessment collects information from peers, subordinates, and superiors so that the person can get a well-rounded or 360 degree, view of their performance. "Here the traditional source for performance appraisals - the individual's manager is supplemented by other sources who has significant perspectives to provide which the manager may not have" (Tornow 1993, 212).

2. Review of Literature

This study came about because of a desire to discover more about the place of 360-degree feedback in leadership and management development. The study is set in the higher education leadership environment, and is timely in a period of accelerated age-related attrition in the global tertiary leadership sector currently, placing pressure on succession leadership planning and development (Boyatzis et al., 2002).

Smither, London, Flautt, Vargas, and Kucine (2003), investigated the association between 360-feedback and participation in executive coaching – and impact upon subsequent 360-feedback ratings. All found variability in feedback outcomes, which could be attributed to certain individual differences and/or situational variables. This study contributes to the literature, by investigating over time the role of self-efficacy and perceptions of the importance of feedback.

Bono and Colbert (2005) highlighted that motivation to change behaviour following 360 feedback is related to personality (core self-evaluations). Specifically, they found that individuals with high levels of core self-evaluations (those with high self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, internal locus of control and low neuroticism) will be most motivated to change behaviour when they receive discrepant feedback and those with low levels of core self-evaluations will be most motivated when others' ratings are most similar to their own. These results suggest the potential value of coaching to assist individuals to understand their potentially complex feedback and to increase motivation to set developmental goals.

When appraisals, feedback or decisions are based on a single-source, the organization may find itself in the position of defending the judgement of a single person. One person (supervisor), no matter how fair, may be subjected to claims of bias. On the other hand 360-degree feedback offers stronger legal protection because the model combines multiple perspectives (Edwards, 1996). Atwater, Roush and Fischthal (1995), opined that subordinates' ratings of leadership were significantly higher following feedback from subordinates under which a highly structured session is there where leaders discussed the feedback results with subordinates. Anu Wakhlu (2003) clarified that 360-degree appraisal and feedback system is totally developmental, and it can be linked to the overall performance of the business plans of the company and the individuals.

Savneet Kaur (2013) highlighted that The 360 degrees performance appraisal and how it can be implemented in organisations. Various benefits and disadvantages of introducing this method into organisations have also been listed down. The available literature provides an overview regarding how this method is beneficial for increasing the overall efficiency of the employee as an individual and the firm as a whole, and as a result performance improves and training and development leads to real opportunities for promotion within the company. Employees are also motivated and can have a positive knock-on effect in areas like customer service.

Boyatzis et al., (2002), studied that to discover more about the place of 360-degree feedback in leadership and management development. The study is set in the higher education leadership environment, and is timely in a period of accelerated age-related attrition in the global tertiary leadership sector currently, placing pressure on succession leadership planning and development.

Snyder et al. (2007), studied that the higher education management environment, similarly argue the importance of supportive institutional strategies to ensure appropriate integration of a 360-degree feedback mechanism. It is suggested; the 360-degree feedback interview should focus on relationship-building to create shared meaning and mutual understanding (Lewis and Slade, 2000) and should inspire self-motivation to learn (London, 2002). In a study published in 2004, a team of researchers were interested to discover the emphasis that raters placed on supportive and developmental forms of leadership.

3. Objectives

- To understand the current practice and 360-degree feedback implementation
- To study 360-degree feedback is usefulness to the employees in the educational university.
- To study most important part of 360-degree feedback for educational university
- To study 360-degree feedback as a development tool

4. Methodology

This study was a field-based, primary data was collected for using 360-degree feedback in the educational university. A systematic method was adopted for the collection of data .Both primary & secondary data were collected. The primary study included Administrative staff-15, Professor-15, Lecture-20, Technical staff-25, Clerical staff-25, recorded through 5 point Likert scale questionnaire method to know the exact impact of 360-degree feedback system in the educational University.

Table 1: Respondents willing to Performance appraisal system

Group	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No. of respondents
Administrative staff	10	05	00	00	00	15
Professor	10	05	00	00	00	15
Lecture	10	03	05	02	00	20
Technical staff	00	00	25	00	00	25
Clerical staff	00	01	04	02	18	25
Total	30	14	34	04	18	100

Source: Primary data

The above table shows that 100% administrative staffs are agreed with evaluation system in the university. 100% Professors are agreed with the evaluation system. 65% Lectures are agreed with the evaluation system, 25% Lectures neutral did not comment, 10% Lectures are not agreed. Technical staffs did not comment on evaluation system not aware in this system. 90% Clerical staffs are disagreed with the evaluation system.

Table 2: Respondents are satisfied with current performance appraisal system

Group	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No. of respondents
Administrative staff	00	10	00	00	05	15
Professor	02	02	05	06	00	15
Lecture	00	00	20	00	00	20
Technical staff	00	05	20	00		25
Clerical staff	00	00	25	00	00	25
Total	02	17	70	06	05	100

Source: Primary data

The above table shows that 66.67% administrative staffs are agreed and 33.33% not agreed with the current evaluation form and system. 26.66% professors are agreed, 33.33% neutral did not comment and 40% are not agreed with current evaluation system. Lectures did not comment on

current evaluation system. 20% Technical staffs are agreed, 80% technical staffs neutral with the current performance appraisal system. 100% clerical staffs are neutral did not comment on performance appraisal system.

Table 3: Respondents willing to evaluate superiors, peers and subordinates

Group	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Dis agree	Strongly disagree	No. of respondent.
Administrative staff	10	05	00	00	00	15
Professor	05	05	05	00	00	15
Lecture	15	05	00	00	00	20
Technical staff	10	00	15	00	00	25
Clerical staff	00	00	20	05	00	25
Total	40	15	40	05	00	100

Source: Primary data

The above table shows that 100% Administrative staffs are agreed with to evaluate superiors, peers and subordinates. 66.67% Professors are agreed and 33.33% neutral with to evaluate superiors, peers and subordinates. 100% lectures are agreed to evaluate superiors, peers and subordinates. 40% technical staffs are agreed and 60% neutral did not comment with to evaluate superiors, peers and subordinates. 80% Clerical staffs are neutral did not comment and 20% Clerical staffs are not agreed with to evaluate superiors, peers and subordinates.

Table 4: Respondents willing to accept 360-Degree feedback

Group	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Dis agree	Strongly disagree	No. of respondents
Administrative staff	10	05	00	00	00	15
Professor	08	02	05	00	00	15
Lecture	18	00	00	02	00	20
Technical staff	15	00	10	00	00	25
Clerical staff	10	00	00	05	10	25
Total	61	07	10	12	10	100

Source: Primary data

The above table shows that 100% Administrative staffs are agreed with to accept 360-Degree feedback system. 66.67% Professors are agreed and 33.33% neutral did not comment with 360-Degree feedback system. 90% Lectures are agreed and 10% lectures are not agreed with 360-Degree feedback. 60% Technical staffs are agreed and 40% neutral did not comment with 360-Degree feedback. 40% clerical staffs are agreed and 60% are not agreed with 360-Degree feedback system.

5. Conclusion

The primary studies find that all Senior Officials are having full knowledge about the performance appraisal system. The traditional evaluation is not so beneficial to the employees. Senior Officials are agreed with to evaluate Superiors, Peers, and Subordinates. All have agreed with 360-degree feedback is a good evaluation system and it is essential for educational university. 360 degree feedback gives a clear picture of employees and also helps to know strength and weakness. 360 Feedback can also be a useful development tool for people. It is the opinion that for

growth and development of personnel and the department will be more probable with the adoption of 360-degree feedback system. More so, the implementation of 360-degree performance appraisal systems in the organization is very much essential. 360-degree is the newest alternative for performance appraisals measurement system. 360-degree Feedback is almost always a sensitive subject and it is most essential for educational university.

References

- [1] G Kevin, MD Rodgers, DO Craig Manifold, "360-degree Feedback: Possibilities for Assessment of the ACGME Core Competencies for Emergency Medicine Residents," ACAD EMERG MED, 9(11), pp. 1300-1304, 2002.
- [2] R Thomas Parker, "EXPLORING 360-DEGREE FEEDBACK PERFORMANCE APPRAISA," the National Fire Academy, 1998.
- [3] S Wimer, K. M Nowak, "13 common mistakes using 360-degree feedback. Training & Development," 52 (5), pp. 69-78, 1998.
- [4] RE Boyatzis, EC Stubbs and SN Taylor, "Learning cognitive and emotional competencies through graduate management education", Academy of Management Learning and Education, 1 (2), pp. 150-62, 2002.
- [5] JW Smither, M London, R Flautt, Y Vargas and I Kucine, "Can working with an executive coach improve multisource feedback ratings over time? A quasi-experimental field study," Personnel Psychology, 56(1), 23-44, 2003.
- [6] J Bono, and Colbert, "A Understanding responses to multi-source feedback: The role of core self-evaluations", Personnel Psychology, 58, 171-203, 2005.
- [7] L Atwater, P Roush and A Fischtal, "The Influence of Upward Feedback on Self and Follower Ratings of Leadership," Personal Psychology, 48, pp. 35-59, 1995.
- [8] Wakhlu, Anu, "Leadership Development using 360-Degree Feedback Process -The Pragati Approach", in T.V. Rao and Raju Rao (Eds.), 360-Degree Feedback and Performance Management System, New Delhi, Excel Books, pp. 58-64, 2003.
- [9] Savneet Kaur, "360 Degrees Performance Appraisal-Benefits & Shortcoming", International Journal of Emerging Research in Management & Technology, 2(6), 83-88, 2013.
- [10] H Snyder, S Marginson and T Lewis, "An alignment of the planets: mapping the intersections between pedagogy, technology and management in Australian universities", Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 29 (2), pp. 1-16, 2007.

Author Profile



Uttam Kumar Das received the M.B.A degree in Human Resource Management from North Orissa University, Odisha in 2009. I am doing Ph.D on Human Resource Management at P. G. Department of Business Administration, Utkal University, Vani Vihar, Bhubaneswar-751004, Odisha, India