



ISSN:1306-3111
e-Journal of New World Sciences Academy
2009, Volume: 4, Number: 3, Article Number: 3C0014

SOCIAL SCIENCES

Received: December 2008
Accepted: June 2009
Series : 3C
ISSN : 1308-7444
© 2009 www.newwsa.com

Esmeray Yogun
Cag University
yogune@yahoo.com
Mersin-Turkey

THE TRADITIONAL PROBLEM OF MODERN TECHNIQUE: ACCEPTANCE OF 360 DEGREE SYSTEM

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to examine the organization level peer, supervisor's reaction to 360 degree feedback method. Data were gathered from the white-collar employee's of the Adana Chamber of Commerce where 360 degree feedback technique has been in use for one year. The result of the study indicates that there is a significant difference between employees. Females are more open than their male counterparts to act based on supported feedback from 360 degree feedback technique. Another result of the study indicated that managers are more ready and open to get feedback from superiors than non managers.

Keywords: Performance Appraisal Technique, 360 Degree Feedback Acceptance, Acceptance of Feedback, Performance, Appraisal

MODERN YÖNTEMİN GELENEKSEL SORUNU: 360 DERECE PERFORMANS DEĞERLENDİRME SİSTEMİ

ÖZET

Bu çalışmanın temel amacı çalışanların ast ve üst olma durumuna göre 360 derece geribildirim sistemine verdikleri tepkileri ölçmektir. Çalışma Adana Ticaret odası çalışanları üzerinde anket yöntemi ile yapılmıştır. Çalışma sonuçlarına göre kadınlar ve yönetici durumunda olanlar diğerlerine göre geribildirim almaya daha açıktırlar ayrıca bu geribildirimlere karşı daha olumlu yaklaşmaktadırlar.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Performans Değerleme Tekniği, 30 Derece Geribildirim Tekniği, Geribildirim, Geribildirimın Kabulü, Performans, Değerlendirme



1. INTRODUCTION (GİRİŞ)

The basic goal of human resource management is "to increase employee's effectiveness". So to find a theoretical background for performance appraisal models, a path will be open to productivity aim of management. All human resource function's main aim is to increase the employee's effectiveness which makes the performance appraisal process so important and crucial.

By following theoretical developments, acceptability problem can be placed into perception topic especially in performance appraisal theory. Once effectiveness has been aimed, it is important to do more accurate and objective appraising. To support employees with objective feedback, managers need multi-source appraising instead single-source feedback. Thus multi-source techniques become the management scene contemporaneously with increased demand for multi-source feedback.

Thus human resource experts are more closely to consider the multi-source approaches (such as customer, peer and subordinate) in performance appraisal system than only-superior based systems. Modern human resource approaches recommend getting feedbacks from different aspects of the organizations which is fundamental for the 360 degree feedback technique (Beatty, 1993). In Turkey 360 degree feedback system is getting increased attention from a number of theorists (Barutçugil, 2002; Coşkun, 2007; Fındıkçı, 2000; Savaş, 2005; Sabuncuoğlu, 2000), the basic aim of the 360 degree feedback system is to provide employees with wider feedback approaches to increase his/her performance and make the appraising process more objective.

But the development of new techniques would not be finished by introducing new techniques into the process. Beside, it is followed by "acceptability" issue of the new techniques. The concept of the acceptability is developed by Bretz, Milkovich and Read (1992) as validity and usefulness of appraising process.

2. RESEARCH SIGNIFICANCE (ÇALIŞMANIN ÖNEMİ)

The significance of the study is based on the critical importance of the acceptance. Researchers suggest that employee's reaction to feedback is critically important whether that person will take action (attendance to training etc.) to improve his or her performance or not (Ilgen, Fischer and Taylor, 1979). Therefore acceptability or reaction to 360 degree system has more importance than the system's itself. Unless the HRM is not set up the systems which are not accepted by the employees it is not possible to expect positive attitude and result at the workplace.

Thus this study aimed to gather interest of the HRM practitioners' on the acceptance issue.

2.1. 360 Degree Feedback System (360 Derece Geribildirim Sistemi)

In recent years there has been a vast interest in 360 degree feedback system and it has become popular term both in theoretical and practical realms (Beatty and London, 1993; Geake, Farrell, and Oliver, 1998; Toweers, 1996; Kaplan and Palus; Ilgen, Fischer and Taylor, 1979; Bretz, Milkovich and Read, 1992, Dessler, 2000; Sabuncuoğlu, 2000)). It is reported that almost all Fortune 500 companies are now using 360 degree feedback for development and/or appraisal (Mabey, 2001, Handy, et all, 1996; Geake et all, 1998; Toolan, 1998).

360 degree feedbacks provide to involve multiple perceptions such as supervisors, subordinates, peers, and customers to support individual development of employees. Data should obtained with this



method are collected from everyone who has close working relationships with ratee is seen as an effective person to provide insight. Since multisource data involved in the process, this method is deemed as fairer, reliable, and better method than the conventional appraisal methods that only superior carried out the appraisal process (Bernardin, Dahmus, and Redmon, 1993; Milliman., Zawacki., Norman, Powel, Kirksey, 1994).

In the 360 degree feedback appraisal method, appraised employee is interrogated continuously by the multi-source means like manager, peers, internal and external customers who have close relationship with the appraised employee (Tornow, 1998). The performance tool is created by taking options of the 360 degree relations group, of which the employee is placed at the center, when determining the performance of any employee at any positions (Debare, 1997).

2.2. Acceptability Problem of 360 Degree Feedback (360 Derece Geribildirimin "Kabul" Sorunu)

Despite increasing interest in the system both from theoretical and practical perspectives, little research has been offered to argue the problem of acceptability of 360 degree feedback model. Acceptability can explain whether people are willing to get feedback from multi sources or not and the extent to which they are ready to benefit from feedbacks. It is more specifically defined by Walman and Bowen as either the willingness to provide unbiased input data (in the case of raters) or to receive and utilize 360 degree feedback data.

As a concept, "acceptability" was argued by Bretz, Milkovich and Read (1992) as being increasingly important in relation to the validity and usefulness of appraisal process in general. By looking deeply into feedback theory it is clearly understood that acceptability problem is more important matter than the method itself.

Considering both alternative usages (decision making usage such as promotion or salary; and developmental usage such as training, action taken by HR department) of 360 degree feedback it is seen that the system is utilized only when it is accepted by participant employees.

Feedback research and theory suggest that an individual's reaction to feedback is a critical determinant of whether that person will subsequently take actions to improve performance or not (Ilgen, Fisher and Taylor, 1979). Acceptability is also important to perform effective implementation of 360 degree method in the firm (Waldman and Bowen, 1998). Waldman and Bowen indicate that once participant is not accepting the system, it is not possible to get objective feedbacks from him/her about others.

However it is also important to define the acceptability accurately. Waldman and Bowen (1998) assert that a better understanding of predictors of acceptability would allow organizations to perform the 360 degree feedback more precisely.

2.3. Basic Factors Influencing the Acceptability of 360 Degree Appraisal by Employees (Çalışanların 360 Derece Geribildirimi Kabulünü Etkileyen Temel Faktörler)

360 degree feedback is not generally viewed as acceptable method by employees. But few studies' results show positive attitudes about 360 degrees feedback (Tornow, 1998; Bernardin et all, 1993). Traditional appraisal methods constitute the most accepted norm for both subordinates and managers. Some of the common factors that are



related to acceptability of 360 degree feedback techniques in workplaces (Ilana, 1997).

- **Open Culture:** Like TQM fundamentals, some cultures are more sensitive to accept employees as internal customers while others are not. So, 360 degree feedback system requires more participation in the feedback process to get acceptance from employees who are already in the rating process for others (Dean and Bowen, 1994).
- **Perception of Organizational Change:** During day-to-day organizational activities, cynicism often accrues with regard to new initiatives such as 360 degree feedback.
- **Usage Field of Ratings:** Evaluation can be used for both positive and negative purposes such as promotion and demotion. Especially using ratings for evaluative purposes, would damage the organizational atmosphere.
- **Provide Anonymity of Ratings:** In the traditional appraisal programs anonymity is not a problem but it becomes a problem in the 360 degree system. In this process employees may have a fear of repercussions which will damage their objectivity during appraising.
- **Type of Job Design:** In some job designs such as, the team based types, possibility of peer's interpersonal relationship is very high. So in such job designs, acceptance would vary against 360 degree feedback.
- **Perceived Competence of Raters:** Some of organizational skills and competence have unseen characteristics. Sometimes managers may not trust the feedback of non-managers because of rater's competency level.

3. METHODOLOGY OF STUDY (YÖNTEM)

The purpose of this study is to examine the extent to which the reactions of the employees vary toward 360 degree appraising system. Different methods of research such as interviews, case studies and questionnaires were considered in the methodology planning stage. But questionnaire was found to be most appropriate measure to examine proposed relations.

In this study, a questionnaire was used to gather needed data. The questionnaire was distributed by HR staff of the chamber to each employee and was returned to the researcher without the name of the respondents. Thus the anonymity of the feedbacks were secured. The questionnaire used in this research was adopted from Ozdemir's study (2006). Cronbach Alpha (.903) for the instrument shows that the internal consistency and reliability of the items are very high.

Only two demographic variables of the study are gender and position of the respondents. There are nine questions to understand the perceptions of the employees about 360 degree feedback appraisal system.

Research questionnaire is consisted of three basic perceptual aspects of the employees about 360 degree feedback system: truthfulness and usefulness of feedback system and participant readiness to receive feedback from subordinates, peers and superiors. Thus acceptance is measured by truthfulness, usefulness and readiness to take action based on the feedbacks provided by 360 degree method. Survey is included basically items such as:

- I believe that the feedback provided from superior, peer, subordinate is true,



- I believe that the feedback provided from superior, peer, subordinate is useful for my self-development,
- I am ready to take action according to feedback provided by subordinates, peer and superior.

3.1. Limitations of the Study (Çalışmanın Sınırları)

One limitation of the study is sample size. There are limited number of respondents since the entire number of employees are small, employed by the chamber of commerce. There are 54 of the white collar employees and only 8 of them are managers. Another limitation of the study is anonymity issue: employees show concern about disclose their views. Despite the explanation of their names would not be revealed at all.

3.2. Population and Sample (Evren ve Örneklem)

The population of the study consists of all white-collar employees of chamber, 74. The sample of the research consisted of eight managers, 14 chief, ten experts and 22 officers.

4. ANALYSIS OF RESEARCH QUESTIONS (ARAŞTIRMA SORULARININ ANALİZİ)

In order to analyze the data gathered from the employees SPSS 13.0 version was used. The research has aimed to examining the way employees' response varied about multi-source feedback in relation to gender and position. The first research question

Table 1. Descriptive of Statistics for 360 Degree System by Gender
(Tablo 1. (Cinsiyete Göre Tanımlayıcı İstatistikler))

		N	Mean	SD	Min	Max
TRUTHFULNESS						
FEEDBACK FROM SUBORDINATES	Female	23	1,5652	,72	1,00	4,00
	Male	31	4,1290	,76	2,00	5,00
	Total	54	3,0370	1,47	1,00	5,00
FEEDBACK FROM SUPERIOR	Female	23	2,6957	1,10	1,00	4,00
	Male	31	2,6452	1,25	1,00	4,00
	Total	54	2,6667	1,18	1,00	4,00
FEEDBACK FROM PEERS	Female	23	1,8261	,70	1,00	3,00
	Male	31	4,4516	,71	1,00	2,00
	Total	54	2,6111	1,41	1,00	3,00
USEFULNESS						
FEEDBACK FROM SUBORDINATES	Female	23	1,7391	,68	1,00	4,00
	Male	31	4,3548	,66	3,00	5,00
	Total	54	3,2407	1,46	1,00	5,00
FEEDBACK FROM SUPERIOR	Female	23	3,1304	1,35	1,00	5,00
	Male	31	2,7419	1,48	1,00	5,00
	Total	54	2,9074	1,43	1,00	5,00
FEEDBACK FROM PEERS	Female	23	1,4783	,71	1,00	2,00
	Male	31	4,5806	,74	1,00	3,00
	Total	54	2,5370	,60	1,00	3,00
READINESS						
FEEDBACK FROM SUBORDINATES	Female	23	1,3043	,47	1,00	2,00
	Male	31	4,3548	,70	3,00	5,00
	Total	54	3,0556	1,64	1,00	5,00
FEEDBACK FROM SUPERIOR	Female	23	2,5652	1,19	1,00	5,00
	Male	31	2,7742	1,45	1,00	5,00
	Total	54	2,6852	1,34	1,00	5,00
FEEDBACK FROM PEERS	Female	23	1,4783	,71	1,00	2,00
	Male	31	4,3516	,70	1,00	2,00
	Total	54	2,4630	1,40	1,00	2,00



Is there any difference between males and females concerning their acceptance of 360 degree feedback system?

One-way ANOVA method was used to examine whether there are any statistically significant difference between genders. Table 1 shows means, standard deviations and other measures of 360 degree feedback system.

Table 2 shows the ANOVA result for gender differences. As seen in the Table 2 here is a statistically significant difference between female and male responses concerning acceptance of feedback from subordinates.

In the first row of the Table1, the mean for female perception on truthfulness of feedback from superior is approximately 1,5 and 4,1 for male. Male perceptions are far more reactive for truthfulness of feedback from superiors. (1=completely agree, 2=agree 3= No comment, 4= Disagree, 5=completely disagree).

With regard to usefulness of feedback from superiors females have a mean score of 1.7 and males have a score of 4.3. These mean scores show that females perceive the feedback from superiors positively while males approach the usefulness of feedback from superiors negatively.

Males and females mean response scores are also different concerning readiness to accept feedback from subordinates. With a mean score of 1.3 females seem to be more willing to accept feedback from subordinate and males with a mean score of 4.3 are highly hesitant to accept feedback from subordinate.

Concerning to readiness to receive feedback from superior females has a mean score of 2.5 and males mean score is 2.7. Female in this regard are still more open to receive feedback from their superiors.

But when compared in terms of mean score s of readiness to receive feedback from peers based on 360 degree feedback system, females are more positive ($\bar{x}=1.$) than males ($\bar{x}=4.3$).

All in all, examining of Table 1 reveal that females are more positive and willing to change their behavior than males in light of the feedback provided by 360 degree performance appraisal system. So it is obviously seen that females are more ready to change their organizational behavior according to provided feedback.

In order to see whether there is differences between males and females responses to acceptance of 360 degree feedback system are statistically significant a one-way ANOVA is conducted. Table 2 shows the result of ANOVA for the first research question which is "are there any differences between males and females concerning their acceptance of 360 degree feedback system?"



Table 2. One-way ANOVA analysis for research question one (N=54)
 (Tablo 2. Birinci araştırma sorusu için ANOVA Analizi)

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
TRUTHNESS						
Feedback From Subordinate	Between Groups	86,790	1	86,790	154,897	,000*
	Within Groups	29,136	52	,560		
	Total	115,926	53			
Feedback From Superior	Between Groups	,034	1	,034	,024	,878
	Within Groups	73,966	52	1,422		
	Total	74,000	53			
Feedback From Peers	Between Groups	1,852	1	1,852	155,202	,002*
	Within Groups	12,982	52	,250		
	Total	14,833	53			
USEFULNESS						
FEEDBACK FROM SUBORDINATE	Between Groups	90,339	1	90,339	199,631	,000*
	Within Groups	23,532	52	,453		
	Total	113,870	53			
FEEDBACK FROM SUPERIOR	Between Groups	1,993	1	1,993	,973	,329
	Within Groups	106,544	52	2,049		
	Total	108,537	53			
FEEDBACK FROM PEERS	Between Groups	,138	1	138,577	158,257	,001*
	Within Groups	19,288	52	,371		
	Total	19,426	53			
READINESS						
FEEDBACK FROM SUBORDINATE	Between Groups	122,867	1	122,867	319,993	,000*
	Within Groups	19,966	52	,384		
	Total	142,833	53			
FEEDBACK FROM SUPERIOR	Between Groups	,577	1	,577	,315	,577
	Within Groups	95,072	52	1,828		
	Total	95,648	53			
FEEDBACK FROM PEERS	Between Groups	120,867	1	174,009	152,306	,002*
	Within Groups	13,966	52	,258		
	Total	136,833	53			

Examination of Table 2 shows that significant differences between males and females in terms of their perceptions as to the truthfulness of feedback from subordinates and from peers. Concerning feedback from superiors no significant difference is observed between males and females.

Likewise males and females perceptions differ in terms of usefulness of feedback from subordinates and from peers significantly. But no significant differences exist on usefulness of feedback from superiors between sexes.

Finally, male and female difference is also significant in terms of readiness to accept feedback from subordinates and from peers at a statistically significant level. No significant difference is seen in addition to readiness to accept feedback from superiors between males and females.

4.1. Employee Position and Acceptance of Feedback From 360 Degree System (Çalışanların Ünvanına Göre 360 Derece Geribildirimi Kabullemeleri)

The second research question of this study is reads "is there statistically significant difference between non managers and managers in terms of their perceptions of acceptance of feedback from 360 degree system?"

Table 3 shows the means and standard deviations of acceptance of feedback from 360 degree system for managers and non-managers. In terms of truthfulness of feedback from subordinates non-managers have higher scores than managers. Likewise, non-managers have higher mean



scores in terms of receiving feedback from superiors and from peers. It can be said that in all three sources of accepting feedback (subordinates, peers, superiors) non-managers are more likely to be cautious than managers. That is managers when compared to non-managers seem to be more supportive of 360 degree feedback system.

In relation to usefulness of feedback, again, non-managers have higher mean scores than managers for usefulness of feedback from subordinates, superiors and peers. Overall, this finding means that managers are more opt to receiving feedback provided by 360 degree system through different sources.

Concerning readiness to receive feedback from subordinates, superiors and peers also non-managers have higher mean scores than managers. Again this can be interpreted as managers have relatively higher tendency to receive feedback from different sources than managers.

In summary, Table 3 shows that managers are reacting favorably to perceive feedback provided by 360 degree system from superiors, subordinates and peers.

Table 3. Descriptive of ANOVA Variables for Research Question 2
 (Tablo 3. İkinci Araştırma Sorusu için Tanımlayıcı İstatistikler)

ITEMS		N	Mean	SD	Min	Max
TRUTHNESS						
FEEDBACK FROM SUBORDINATES	Managers	22	2,8182	1,53177	1,00	5,00
	Non-Managers	32	3,1875	1,44663	1,00	5,00
	Total	54	3,0370	1,47895	1,00	5,00
FEEDBACK FROM SUPERIOR	Managers	22	1,5455	,59580	1,00	3,00
	Non-Managers	32	3,4375	,80071	1,00	4,00
	Total	54	2,6667	1,18162	1,00	4,00
FEEDBACK FROM PEERS	Managers	22	1,5455	,50965	1,00	2,00
	Non-Managers	32	1,6563	,54532	1,00	3,00
	Total	54	1,6111	,52903	1,00	3,00
USEFULNESS						
FEEDBACK FROM SUBORDINATES	Managers	22	3,1364	1,58251	1,00	5,00
	Non-Managers	32	3,3125	1,40132	1,00	5,00
	Total	54	3,2407	1,46578	1,00	5,00
FEEDBACK FROM SUPERIOR	Managers	22	1,6818	,71623	1,00	4,00
	Non-Managers	32	3,7500	1,16398	1,00	5,00
	Total	54	2,9074	1,43104	1,00	5,00
FEEDBACK FROM PEERS	Managers	22	1,3182	,47673	1,00	2,00
	Non-Managers	32	1,6875	,64446	1,00	3,00
	Total	54	1,5370	,60541	1,00	3,00
READINESS						
FEEDBACK FROM SUBORDINATES	Managers	22	2,8182	1,70814	1,00	5,00
	Non-Managers	32	3,2188	1,60110	1,00	5,00
	Total	54	3,0556	1,64164	1,00	5,00
FEEDBACK FROM SUPERIOR	Managers	22	1,7727	1,15189	1,00	5,00
	Non-Managers	32	3,3125	1,09065	1,00	5,00
	Total	54	2,6852	1,34338	1,00	5,00
FEEDBACK FROM PEERS	Managers	22	1,3636	,49237	1,00	2,00
	Non-Managers	32	1,5313	,50701	1,00	2,00
	Total	54	1,4630	,50331	1,00	2,00

Table 4 shows the results of one-way ANOVA conducted to test differences on feedback from 360 degree system b employee positions. Statistically significant differences are observed in relation to truthness of feedback from superiors ($F=88.8$; $p<.001$). Managers and non-managers perceptions to receive feedback from subordinates and peers on the other hand are not statistically significant.

Concerning readiness to receive According to table, managers of the chamber are more ready to get feedback from their superior while



non managers are not. Relating two tables result it is seen that mean degree of the managers are higher than non managerial positions.

Concerning the usefulness of feedback, significant differences exist in relation to feedback from superiors and from peers at p=.05 level. But there is no significant difference between managers and non-managers concerning feedback received from subordinates.

In terms of readiness to receive feedback manager and non-manager differences are observed for feedback provided by superiors. For readiness to receive feedback from subordinates and peers there are no statistically significant differences between managers and non-managers.

Result of the ANOVA analyses shows that managers are more ready to change their organizational behavior according to provided feedbacks from superior while non managers are not.

Table 4 One-way ANOVA Analyses for Research Question Two (N=54)
 (Tablo 4. İkinci Araştırma Sorusu için ANOVA Analizi)

ITEMS		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
TRUTHNESS						
FEEDBACK FROM SUBORDINATE	Between Groups	1,778	1	1,778	,810	,372
	Within Groups	114,148	52	2,195		
	Total	115,926	53			
FEEDBACK FROM SUPERIOR	Between Groups	46,670	1	46,670	88,800	,000*
	Within Groups	27,330	52	,526		
	Total	74,000	53			
FEEDBACK FROM PEERS	Between Groups	,160	1	,160	,567	,455
	Within Groups	14,673	52	,282		
	Total	14,833	53			
USEFULNESS						
FROM SUBORDINATES	Between Groups	,404	1	,404	,185	,669
	Within Groups	113,466	52	2,182		
	Total	113,870	53			
FROM SUPERIOR	Between Groups	55,764	1	55,764	54,948	,001*
	Within Groups	52,773	52	1,015		
	Total	108,537	53			
FROM PEERS	Between Groups	1,778	1	1,778	5,240	,026
	Within Groups	17,648	52	,339		
	Total	19,426	53			
READINESS						
FROM SUBORDINATES	Between Groups	2,092	1	2,092	,773	,383
	Within Groups	140,741	52	2,707		
	Total	142,833	53			
FROM SUPERIOR	Between Groups	30,910	1	30,910	24,827	,003*
	Within Groups	64,739	52	1,245		
	Total	95,648	53			
FROM PEERS	Between Groups	,366	1	,366	1,458	,233
	Within Groups	13,060	52	,251		
	Total	13,426	53			

5. DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

(TARTIŞMA VE GELECEK ÇALIŞMALAR İÇİN TAVSİYELER)

It is discovered that acceptability of multi-source feedback is an overlooked issue of the human resources management literature. An underlying aim of this empirical study is to prove that acceptability is more important than accuracy of the appraising system itself. If there is not acceptance on the part of participants feedback system would not work properly.

Gender and position of employees are used to examine the variation of employee's acceptance of getting feedback from their superior, subordinates and peers. Like Auteri's (1994) study in providing upward feedback process, demographic variables have some



important role in acceptability perceptions. In this study acceptance is measured by truthfulness, usefulness, and readiness to change based on the provided feedback.

This study has examined 360 degree appraising system's acceptance by focusing on the employee's gender and position. The first research question of the study indicates that there is a statistically significant difference in relation to employee's gender to accept feedback from subordinates and peers. This is consistent with Tsu and Bary (1986) findings. According to Tsu and Bary study female employees are more open to get feedback from their subordinates, peers and superiors. Also in feminist theory it is emphasized that women are more open to get criticize and have positive attitude about other's feelings and perception. It also can relate to masculine work life. In the organizational life women usually underrate their efforts thus they are ready to get feedback from others and take action based on those feedback.

According to Beyer (1990, 1992) women significantly underrate their performance and recalling more task failure than had occurred. By correlating Beyer (1990, 1992) study results, we can explain why women are more ready to accept feedback from others. Sherman et al. (1997) found that females are more ready to get feedback from external sources. Finally gender is found as an explaining factor concerning provided feedback by subordinates and peers.

The second research question concerns with the position of employees to examine acceptance of feedback. Results of the analysis indicate that there is a significant difference between managerial and non-managerial positions concerning the acceptance of feedback from superiors. Manager's perception is significantly more positive than non-managers perception to get feedback from their superiors. According to Waldman and Bowen (1998), perceived competency of rater influences the acceptability of feedback gathered by 360 degree system. There were only eight managers who are participated in the research. So the rest 46 non manager employees do not perceive that they receive truthful and useful data gathered by 360 degree system and they are not willing to change their organizational behavior. Waldman and Bowen (1998) indicate that usage for evaluative purposes of the appraising would damage the perception of employees against the systems.

It is also influencing the proper functioning implication of the appraising system. Managers should use the result of the performance appraisal for developmental purposes (Christopher, 2001; Richard 1993). Administrative board of the Chamber of Commerce had already announced that employee's performance appraisal results will be used for evaluation process such as promotion decision and performance bonus.

Antonioni and Park (2001) indicate that perceived competence of raters influence the acceptance of 360 degree feedback system. Result of the ANOVA showed that in the chamber non-managers perceive their superior's appraising untruthful, useless and consequently they are not willing to take action according to feedback while manager's acceptance is highly positive about feedbacks provided by same method. It is clear that there is manager's positive perception and subordinate's negative perception about accepting feedback from superiors.

This result is prompting the question of "why superiors more open to accept feedback from their superiors while their subordinate are not". On a common sense it looks like that there should be some



extra linkages explanation about the promotion policy to discuss this emerging question deeply. Hazucha et all (1993) indicated that almost all human resource policies impact the perception of 360 degree feedback system.

6. IMPLICATIONS FOR HUMAN RESOURCE PRACTITIONERS AND FUTURE RESEARCH (İNSAN KAYNAKLARI UZMANALRI VE GELECEK ARAŞTIRMALAR İÇİN ÖNERİLER)

Practitioners in organizations who are using or planning to use 360-degree feedback system should not ignore acceptability issue. However, the results of this study provide empirical data suggesting that upward and peer 360-degree feedback vary according to employee's position and gender. Practitioners would be wise to consider influencing factors carefully, when they design and implement 360 degree appraisal system. If practitioners hope to benefit from theoretically known advantages of this popular appraising system they should be aware of acceptance problem (Waldman and Bowen, 1998).

Feedback is most meaningful when there is a genuine desire on both sides (employees and practitioners) for a meaningful and authentic exchange of perceptions. Walker (1995) stresses that for mutual understanding, it is essential to approach every organization uniquely so human resource service experts should be able to adapt the systems according to their organization's characteristics.

It would be very interesting to discuss the impact of other characteristics of the chamber such as hierarchical level and structure on the acceptance of model. This might enable the researchers to offer more valuable insights about acceptability issue.

REFERENCES (KAYNAKLAR)

- Antonioni, D. and Park, H., (2001). "The Relationship Between Rater Effect And Three Sources of 360-Degree Feedback Rating" *Journal of Management*, 27, 479-495.
- Auteri, E., (1994). "Upward feedback leads to culture change" *HR Magazine*, 78-80, 82, 84.
- Barutçugil, İ. (2002). *Performans Yönetimi, Kariyer Yayıncılık ve İletişim*, İstanbul.
- Bernardin, H.J., Dahmus, S.A., and Redmon, G., (1993). "Attitudes of first-line supervisors toward subordinate appraisals" *Human Resource Management*, 32, 315-324.
- Beyer, S., (1990). "Gender differences in accuracy of self-evaluations of performance" *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 59, 960-970.
- Beyer, S., (1992). "Self consistency and gender differences in the accuracy of self evaluations" *Research Paper presented at the APA conference*, Washington
- Bretz, R.D., Milkovich, G.T. and Read, W., (1992). "The current state of performance appraisal research and practice: Concerns, directions, and implications" *Journal of Management*, 18, 321-352.
- Christopher M., (2001). "Closing the circle: participant views of a 360 degree feedback programme", *Human Resource Management Journal*, Vol 11 No 1, pp:41-53
- Coşkun, A., (2006). *Stratejik Performans Yönetimi ve Performans Karnesi*, Literatür Yayıncılık, İstanbul
- Dessler, G., (2000). *Human Resources Management*, 8th ed., New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc



- Fındıkçı, İ. (2000) İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi, 2nd ed., İstanbul, Alfa Yayınevi
- Geake, A., Farrell, C. and Oliver, A., (1998). "A Survey of the Views of HR Practitioners on
- 360 Degree Processes" Thames Ditton: SHL(UK) Ltd.
- Hazucha, J, Hezlett, S. and Schneider, R., (1993). "The impact of 360 degree feedback on management skills development" Human Resource Management, 32: 2/3, 325-351.
- Ilana D. (1997), "360 Degree of Evaluation", San Francisco Chronicle, May
- Ilgen, D.R., Fisher, C.D., and Taylor, M.S., (1979). "Consequences of individual feedback on behavior in organizations" Journal of Applied Psychology, 64, 349-371
- Kaplan, R.E.; Palus, C.J., (1994). "Enhancing 360-Degree Feedback for Senior Executives : How to Maximize the Benefits and Minimize the Risks", Center for Creative Leadership, 167-168,189,243-257.
- Milliman, J.F., Zawacki, R. A., Norman, C., Powel, L.Kirksey, J., (1994). "Companies Evaluate Employees From All Perspectives", Personnel Journal, November.
- Richard W.B., (1993). "360-degree feedback as competitive advantage", Human Resource Management, ss:353-372.
- Sabuncuoğlu, Z., (2000). İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi, Ezgi Kitapevi Yayınları
- Savaş, T., (2005). 360 Derece Performans Değerlendirmesi ve Ücret Yönetimine Etkisi, İstanbul, Çantay Yayıncılık, 2005
- Sherman, A.C., Higgs, G.E. and Williams, R.T. (1997) "Gender differences in the locus of
- control construct" Psychology and Health, Vol. 12, 239-248
- Toolan, T., (1998). "The Power of Feedback: A Survey of Multi-source Assessment in the UK" London: Pilat.
- Tornow, W.W., (1998). "Maximizing the Value of 360-Degree Feedback : A Process for Successful Individual and Organizational Development", Jossey Bass Management Series, 153
- Towers, B., (1996). The handbook of Human Resource Management, 2nd edition, Blacwell, p.207
- Tsui, A.S. and Barry, B., (1986). "Interpersonal affect and rating errors" Academy of Management Journal, 29, 586-599
- Waldman, D. and Bowen, D., (1998). "The Acceptability of 360 degree Appraisals: A customer-supplier relationship perspective" Human Resource Management, 1998, Vol. 37, No. 2, pp:117-129
- Walker, M.U., (1995). "Moral Understandings, Alternative "Epistemology" for a Feminist Ethics", Boulder, CO: Westview Press, pp:139-52.