



## A STUDY TO ASSESS THE KNOWLEDGE ON 360 DEGREE PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AMONG FACULTY OF SRM COLLEGE OF NURSING, KATTANKULATHUR.

Nancy Grace<sup>1</sup> and Abirami.P<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>PhD scholar, <sup>2</sup>Associate Professor, SRM College of Nursing

\*Corresponding Author Email: [abiramikarnamurthy@gmail.com](mailto:abiramikarnamurthy@gmail.com)

### ABSTRACT

360 degree feedback, also known as 'multi-rater feedback', is the most comprehensive appraisal where the feedback about the employees' performance comes from all the sources that come in contact with the employee on his job. An appraisal made by the top management, immediate superior, peers, subordinates, self and customers is called 360 degree appraisal. This method is very reliable because evaluation is done by many different parties. These parties are in the best position to evaluate the employee or manager because they are continuously interacting and working with him. It is also used to evaluate other qualities such as talents, behaviors, values, ethical standards, tempers, loyalty. The aim of the study was to assess the level of knowledge on 360 degree performance appraisal among faculty and to associate the level of knowledge of faculty on 360 degree performance appraisal with their selected demographic variables. Research design was descriptive in nature, and the Research approach adopted was quantitative approach. The tool used for the data collection consisted of 2 parts: Part A: demographic variables and Part B: structured questionnaire. The study was conducted at SRM College of Nursing, Kattankulathur. The study comprised of the entire faculty who fulfill the inclusion criteria. The analysis of frequency and percentage distribution of the level of knowledge on 360 degree performance appraisal among faculty shows 17(56.6%) had moderate knowledge, 8(26.7%) had inadequate knowledge and 5(16.7%) had adequate knowledge. There is a Statistical significance association between age group, experience, teaching assignment, exposure and knowledge levels at 95% [  $P < 0.05$  ]. The study concluded that the faculty of S.R.M. College of nursing Kattankulathur have moderately adequate knowledge regarding 360 degree performance appraisal.

### KEY WORDS

360 degree performance appraisal, Multi-rater feedback, Performance appraisal.

### INTRODUCTION

The process of conducting any type of employee review can be costly to an organization. Organizational leaders anticipate the cost of performance reviews to include the labor for supervisors to gather information to complete an evaluation and the time it takes to compose and deliver the feedback to the employee. 360 degree feedback is the most comprehensive and costly type of appraisal. It has become a growing trend in corporate world. 360 degree reviews establish a culture for continuous learning and provide more global feedback for employees, which lead to improved performance. According to Human Resource Consultant, William M. Mercer, forty percent of

American companies used 360 degree feedback in 1995; by 2000 this number had jumped to sixty-five percent. In 2002, 90% of Fortune 500 companies were using a 360 degree performance review process<sup>1</sup>.

360 degree respondents for an employee can be his/her peers, managers(i.e. superior), subordinates, team members, customers, suppliers/vendors anyone who comes into contact With the employee and can provide valuable insights and information or feedback regarding the "on-the -job" performance of the employee. 360-degree feedback, also known as multi-rater feedback, multi source feedback, or multi source assessment, is feedback that comes from members of an employee's immediate work circle. Most often, 360-degree feedback will include direct feedback from

an employee's subordinates, peers, and supervisor(s), as well as a self-evaluation. It can also include, in some cases, feedback from external sources, such as customers and suppliers or other interested stakeholders. It may be contrasted with "upward feedback," where managers are given feedback only by their direct reports, or a "traditional performance appraisal," where the employees are most often reviewed only by their managers.<sup>2</sup>

A 360 degree performance review is a formalized process whereby an individual receives feedback from multiple individuals or "raters" who regularly interact with the person being reviewed, commonly referred to as "the learner". The objective is to provide the learner with feedback on their performance behaviors and outcomes as well as their potential, while identifying and establishing development goals. As a result of this feedback, the learner is expected to be able to set goals for self development which will support the advancement of their careers and in turn benefit the organization. The raters typically represent the learner's boss, peers, subordinates, customers and sometimes even their significant others. Their own self assessments complete the circle<sup>3</sup>.

The 360 degree review process is purported to be superior to traditional forms of evaluation and feedback because it provides more complete and accurate assessment of the employee's competencies, behaviors and performance outcomes. A traditional performance review, where one supervisor assesses a subordinate, is no longer seen as an effective means of obtaining accurate feedback for employees. With traditional reviews, employees are rated by a single person, who may be biased or have an incomplete view of their work. (Tool pack Consulting) Standard performance evaluations have been criticized for being ineffective for a variety of reasons such as the potential biases of the rater and the potential subjectivity of ratings. 360 degree feedback is viewed as more accurate because, by nature of the process, it offers feedback on observed behaviors and performance from a circle of raters, as opposed to subjective viewpoints from a single individual. Multiple raters offering similar feedback will send a reinforced message to the learner about what is

working well and what needs to be improved. Feedback is more difficult to ignore when it is repeatedly offered by multiple sources.<sup>4</sup>

**Thomas R.Parker**, conducted study to collect information regarding fair, accurate, honest and objective method of performance appraisal, the results of this research project confirmed that most organizations are using the traditional supervisor to subordinate appraisal. It also concludes that multi assessors increase validity and that subordinates and peers are in a better position to provide accurate feedback to their supervisors and co-workers. The survey concluded that personnel are dissatisfied with the traditional performance appraisal and are willing to evaluate their superiors, peers and subordinates.<sup>5</sup>

An honest method of performance appraisal is needed in each and every institution for the satisfaction of the manager and the co-workers, the knowledge regarding that become more necessary so, we have chosen the topic to assess the knowledge of performance appraisal in the faculty groups.

#### OBJECTIVES

1. To assess the level of knowledge on 360 degree performance appraisal among faculty.
2. To associate the level of knowledge on 360 degree performance appraisal with their demographic variables

#### HYPOTHESIS

H1: There is no significant association of knowledge on 360 degree performance appraisal with their demographic variables of SRM, CON.

---

#### MATERIALS AND METHODS:

The study was conducted in S.R.M College of nursing, Kattankulathur. The sample size is 30 faculty of SRM college of Nursing and Non probability convenient sampling technique was adopted to select the study samples. The investigator collected the data within the stipulated time; a brief explanation was given explaining the purpose of the study with their consent so as to gain their co operation during the process of data collection. Using the structured questionnaire, [section-A demographic data of the faculty were collected and using section-B the knowledge of faculty

regarding 360 degree performance appraisal were assessed] respectively. A stipulated time of 15 minutes was provided to complete the questionnaire.

## RESULTS

### SECTION A

**Table 1: Frequency and percentage distribution of demographic variables respect to faculty members of SRM College of Nursing**

| Demographic Variables                        |                                   | Frequency | Percentage |
|--|-----------------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Age  | 21-25 years                       | 2         | 6.7        |
|  | 26-30 years                       | 8         | 26.7       |
|  | > 30 years                        | 20        | 66.6       |
| Sex  | Male                              | 0         | 0          |
|  | Female                            | 30        | 100.0      |
| Education                                    | Undergraduate in Nursing          | 5         | 16.6       |
|  | Postgraduate in Nursing           | 20        | 66.6       |
|  | Currently pursuing PhD in nursing | 5         | 16.6       |
| Income                                       | Rs < 1520                         | 0         | 0          |
|  | Rs 1520 - 4555                    | 0         | 0          |
|  | Rs 4556- 7593                     | 2         | 6.7        |
|  | Rs 7594- 11361                    | 9         | 30.0       |
|  | Rs 11361- 15187                   | 2         | 6.7        |
|  | Rs 15188- 30374                   | 16        | 53.3       |
|  | Rs > 30374                        | 1         | 3.3        |
| Experience                                   | < 5 years                         | 7         | 23.3       |
|  | 5-10 years                        | 8         | 26.7       |
|  | 11-15 years                       | 15        | 50.0       |
|  | > 15 years                        | 0         | 0          |
| Teaching Assignment                          | Diploma Nursing                   | 4         | 13.3       |
|  | Post Basic B.Sc Nursing           | 4         | 13.3       |
|  | B.Sc Nursing                      | 13        | 43.4       |
|  | M.Sc Nursing                      | 9         | 30.0       |
| Exposure to 360 degree performance appraisal | Yes                               | 7         | 23.3       |
|  | No                                | 23        | 76.7       |

Considering the age majority of them 66.6% belong to the category of more than 30 years, all the faculty are female and majority of them 66.6% of them were postgraduate in Nursing and 53.3% of them income were between the category of Rs 15188- 30374, 50 %

of the were having between 11 to 15 years of experience and most of the faculty 43.4% teaching assignment were BSc (Nursing).76.7% of them does not have exposure to 360 degree performance appraisal

## SECTION B

Table 2: Frequency and percentage distribution of the level of knowledge on 360 degree performance appraisal among faculty; **N=30**

| S.NO | LEVEL OF KNOWLEDGE   | FREQUENCY | PERCENTAGE |
|------|----------------------|-----------|------------|
| 1    | Inadequate Knowledge | 8         | 26.7%      |
| 2    | Moderate Knowledge   | 17        | 56.6%      |
| 3    | Adequate Knowledge   | 5         | 16.7%      |

The first objective of the study was to assess the level of knowledge on 360 degree performance appraisal among faculty. The analysis of frequency and percentage distribution of the level of knowledge on

360 degree performance appraisal among faculty shows **17(56.6%) had moderate knowledge, 8(26.7%) had inadequate knowledge and 5(16.7%) had adequate knowledge.**

## SECTION C

Table 3: Association between the knowledge of faculty on 360 degree performance appraisal with selected demographic variables.

| Knowledge levels of faculty                  |                                   |            |      |          |      |          |     |            |          |
|--|-----------------------------------|------------|------|----------|------|----------|-----|------------|----------|
| Demographic Variables                        |                                   | Inadequate |      | Moderate |      | Adequate |     | Chi square | P Value  |
|  |                                   | n          | %    | n        | %    | n        | %   | Test       |          |
| Age  | 21-25 years                       | 2          | 25   | -        | -    | -        | -   | 10.579     | 0.032*S  |
|  | 26-30 years                       | 4          | 50   | 3        | 17.6 | 1        | 20  | 4df        |          |
|  | >30years                          | 2          | 25   | 14       | 82.4 | 4        | 80  |            |          |
| Sex  | Male                              | -          | -    | -        | -    | -        | -   | NA         | NA       |
|  | Female                            | 8          | 100  | 17       | 100  | 5        | 100 |            |          |
| Education                                    | Undergraduate in Nursing          | 0          | 0    | 5        | 29.4 | -        | -   | 8.106      | 0.088 NS |
|  | Postgraduate in Nursing           | 5          | 62.5 | 10       | 70.6 | 5        | 100 | 4df        |          |
|  | Currently pursuing PhD in Nursing | 5          | 62.5 | -        | -    | -        | -   |            |          |
| Income                                       | Rs<1520                           | -          | -    | -        | -    | -        | -   | 12.073     | 0.148 NS |
|  | Rs 1520-4555                      | -          | -    | -        | -    | -        | -   | 8df        |          |
|  | Rs 4556-7593                      | 2          | 25   | -        | -    | -        | -   |            |          |
|  | Rs7594-11361                      | 4          | 50   | 4        | 23.5 | 1        | 20  |            |          |
|  | Rs11362-15187                     | 1          | 12.5 | 1        | 5.9  | -        | -   |            |          |
|  | Rs15188-30374                     | 1          | 12.5 | 11       | 64.7 | 4        | 80  |            |          |
| Experience                                   | Rs>30374                          | -          | -    | 1        | 5.9  | -        | -   |            |          |
|  | <5 years                          | 4          | 50   | 1        | 5.9  | 2        | 40  | 9.541      | 0.049*S  |
|  | 5-10 years                        | 3          | 37.5 | 4        | 23.5 | 1        | 20  | 4df        |          |
|  | 11-15 years                       | 1          | 12.5 | 12       | 70.6 | 2        | 40  |            |          |
| Teaching assignment                          | >15 years                         | -          | -    | -        | -    | -        | -   |            |          |
|  | Diploma Nursing                   | -          | -    | 4        | 23.5 | -        | -   | 13.875     | 0.031*S  |
|  | Post Basic BSc Nursing            | 2          | 25   | 2        | 11.8 | -        | -   | 6df        |          |
|  | BSc Nursing                       | 6          | 75   | 6        | 35.3 | 1        | 20  |            |          |
| Exposure to 360 degree performance appraisal | MSc Nursing                       | -          | -    | 5        | 29.4 | 4        | 80  |            |          |
|  | Yes                               | -          | -    | 7        | 41.2 | -        | -   | 6.982      | 0.030*S  |
|  | No                                | 8          | 100  | 10       | 58.8 | 5        | 100 | 2df        |          |

The second objective of the study was to associate the level of knowledge of faculty on 360 degree performance appraisal with their demographic variables. There is a Statistical significance association between the level of knowledge on 360 degree performance appraisal among faculty members and demographic variables of age, experience, teaching assignment and exposure at 95% [ $P < 0.05$ ]. But there was no significant association found between the knowledge level and other demographic variables such as sex, education, income.

## DISCUSSION

The findings reveal that the faculty of S.R.M. College of nursing Kattankulathur have moderately adequate knowledge regarding 360 degree performance appraisal. Antonette R. Lazaro-capones (2009) conducted a study regarding the adversity quotient and the performance level of selected middle managers of the different of the city of Manila as revealed by the 360 degree feedback system. The result of the study shows that among the raters of the 360-degree feedback system only between peer and supervisor, peer and subordinate, and peer and self have been found to have significant differences in rating the middle managers' level of performance and there is no significant relationship between the demographic variables such as age, gender, civil status, and length of service and adversity quotient similarly with performance ratings as revealed by the 360-degree feedback system<sup>6</sup>.

Dale Lepsinger R, Lucia A D explained 360 degree performance appraisal is effective for performance appraisal and advises on how to avoid some of the pitfalls that can undermine it. Summarizes some of the criticisms that have been made of using feedback in the formal performance appraisal process, balancing this by pointing to the advantages that are gained by using it. Advises on using 360 degree feedback effectively, explaining how to avoid problems such as rater bias and setting out of necessary organizational preconditions if 360 degree feedback is it work<sup>7</sup>.

In nursing sector 360 degree performance appraisal can be used to apprise the members of the organization and elsewhere in an honest manner

there by blinding bias. A study can be conducted on the effectiveness of I.E.C package on knowledge of faculty regarding 360 degree performance appraisal. There are limited literatures on 360 degree performance appraisal. The 360 degree feedback process is popular.

## CONCLUSION

The perceived benefits of implementing such a program will only be realized if it is utilized in the right organizational climate with the appropriate expectations for success. In the wrong environment, without the presence or proper training of feedback coaches and raters, the results can be detrimental. Organizations should carefully weigh all the costs, including process related as well as the cost of behavioral outcomes. Success of such a program is predicated on implementing and sustaining long term behavioral change and development. Careful consideration should be given to the design of the process as well as to the implementation in order for the process to drive performance behaviors and performance outcomes. The findings reveal that the faculty of S.R.M. College of nursing Kattankulathur have moderately adequate knowledge regarding 360 degree performance appraisal.

## REFERENCES

1. Kalisch, B.J.: "Nurse and Nurse Assistant Perceptions of Missed Nursing Care: What does it tell us about Team work?" *Journal of Nursing Administration*, 2009; 39(11), pp.485-493.
2. Wendy Demback Fitzgerald, "Performance Evaluation," in *Handbook for First Line Managers*, Joyce L. Schweiger, ed., John Wiley & Sons, 1986.
3. Bushart, S.C. and Fowler, A.R.: *Performance Evaluation Alternatives*, *Nursing Journal of Administration*, 1988; 18, pp.40-44.
4. Haar Linda P. and Hicks, J.R.: *Performance Appraisal: Derivation of Effective Assessment Tools*. *Journal of Nursing Administration*, 1976 (7), pp.20-29.
5. Thomas R Parkar, *Journal of industrial relation* 2013, A study to assess the fair, accurate, honest and objective method of performance appraisal in the selected industries Jan 5; 21(3):131-2
6. Antonette R. Lazaro-capones, the adversity quotient and the performance level of selected middle

managers of the different of the city of Manila as revealed by the 360 degree feedback system. Sept 30;33(5):212-215

7. Dale Lepsinger R, Lucia A D, Personnel, The management of people at Work, Fourth edition, Macmilan, New York, 1980, Pp 290.

**Internet Sources:**

1. [www.ajms.co.in/..../174](http://www.ajms.co.in/..../174)
2. [www.emeraldinsight.com/journals.htm...](http://www.emeraldinsight.com/journals.htm...)
3. [www.ukessays.com](http://www.ukessays.com)
4. [www.ccl.org/..](http://www.ccl.org/..)
5. [www.peaklearning.com/documents/](http://www.peaklearning.com/documents/)

**\*Corresponding Author:**  
**Nancy Grace and Abirami P\***  
Email: [abiramikarnamurthy@gmail.com](mailto:abiramikarnamurthy@gmail.com)