



The Applicability of 360 Degree Feedback Performance Appraisal System: A Brigade Sample

Hakan TURGUT
Başkent University
hturgut@baskent.edu.tr

Menekşe Tarhan ÖZTOPRAK
Başkent University
tarhan@baskent.edu.tr

Introduction

In today's organizations, instead of the evaluation methods with only one perspective by supervisors, it is needed for an evaluation system that assesses the process of the performance as a whole in different ways, provides information flow to the process, guides the system to future and the organizational vision (Kaynak and Bülbül 2008:18), giving constructive and ongoing feedback to employees informs about the level of performance, more fair, identifies the capabilities needed for future (Salunke, 2010:32, Akdoğan and Demirtaş 2009:50).

In this context, it is assessed that the 360 Degree Feedback Performance Appraisal System (DFPAS) dissociates from traditional methods and meets the requirements. In this study applicability of the 360 DFPAS has been aimed as an example of a public sector in a brigade.

Method

The information used in this study have been obtained from a brigade personnel that represents the hierarchical structure of public. 370 personnel were administered a questionnaire in order to evaluate the performance of 74 lower and middle supervisors working in various departments in the organizational chart of the bridge in five different dimensions (supervisor, peers, subordinates, customers and self-evaluation). For participants, even if one questionnaire taken was not suitable, the other four rater answers were excluded from study. In this context, 250 participants' questionnaires were found appropriate.

In this study, as a model, US Army Research Institute and US Army pilot studies were translated (Bullis, 2000) and used along with the forms from State of Employee Registration Ordinance were used.

Findings

Determining the scores of the 360 DFPAS, the participants were asked what should be the ratio of the evaluation and from their answers the evaluative aspect ratios were determined as follows; supervisors 30%, the peers 20%, subordinates 20%, customers 10% and self-evaluation 20%.

In order to detect whether there is a significant difference between supervisor assessment note and the 360 DFM, a paired T-test was applied. According to the results a significant difference could not be identified. In addition, in order to strengthen this conclusion as a result of correlation analysis between traditional supervisors assessment notes and the 360 DFPAS, a statistically significant positive relation was founded at the level of 0,842.

Before investigating whether there are differences between dimensions, Mauchly's test of sphericity was performed in order to understand if variance and the covariance were homogeneous for repeated measurements. Cause the result was $P=0,072 > 0,05$, the assumption of homogeneity of variances has been obtained. Between dimensional reviews whether there significant differences, was tested with one-way analysis of variance and a significant difference has been seen at the level of significance ($P=0,00 < 0,05$).

In order to find the difference scale, The Matched Pairs Comparison was made by using Bonferroni Approach and with supervisors, peers, self-evaluation groups were significantly different between the evaluative dimensions of the customer.

Results and Conclusion

The research results which managed to reach 50% to the lower and the middle level managers, is considered to be used as a starting point for other studies. The highest ration for supervisors and the lowest ration for customers have been appreciated in the 360 DFPAS. And all the raters agree for this ratio. For this conclusion in the current evaluation system indication of the role of supervisors is appreciated by the others.

There were no significant differences between supervisor assessment note and the 360 DFPAS notes in pairwise comparison. In our country, in public sector the 360 DFPAS studies, we can imply that this system is not adopted enough (Murat and Bağrıaçık, 2011:21). In addition a significant relationship between the two methods is the result of the positive direction can be evaluated as follows;

The results of the 360 DFPAS not showing a difference from traditional supervisor evaluations is an indication of the objective basis of evaluation points. Because for many years, there was the supervisor in the lead in the process of evaluation in both private and public sectors.

Additionally, the result of a second hypothesis test, a significant difference has been identified between three dimensions, supervisor-customer, peers-customer, self-evaluation-customer.

It has been emerged that the difference dimension is customers. The reason for this can be counted as; customers do not recognize the employees, they only count the time period, different cultures. It is assessed that, additionally, because of the personnel in this dimension can remain under the influence of recent events, cannot know evaluated staff exactly. It is considered to be appreciated low ratio for customers in public sector.

As a result, the analysis of the existing framework there is no difference between the traditional supervisors notes and the 360 DFPAS notes. It is commented that the 360 DFPAS cannot be used for the current registration system, unless without the necessary legislative arrangements and the corporate culture become a high level.

But without giving any harm to the hierarchical structure, it is concluded that 360 DFPAS can be used in public sector for the lower and the middle level managers to improve their capabilities and potentials. It can be used as an open system as the transmission of feedback of evaluation results.