

THE HANDBOOK OF STRATEGIC 360 FEEDBACK

Edited by

Allan H. Church
David W. Bracken
John W. Fleenor

and

Dale S. Rose

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

NY 2019

/// 3/// BEST PRACTICES WHEN USING 360 FEEDBACK FOR PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

EMILY D. CAMPION, MICHAEL C. CAMPION,
AND MICHAEL A. CAMPION

The **360 Feedback** process was originally created for the sole purposes of managerial development (Hazucha, Hezlett, & Schneider, 1993). Defined as the solicitation of anonymous performance ratings of one individual from multiple sources (e.g., peers, subordinates, bosses, and customers), 360 Feedback (360s) is capable of examining the breadth and depth of a worker's capabilities within his or her assigned roles. More recently, organizations have implemented this powerful tool as a performance management (PM) mechanism. However, some scholars warn against using 360s for anything more than development, citing the system's poor criterion-related validity, misalignment between the goals of PM and the characteristics of 360 Feedback (DeNisi & Kluger, 2000), potential social costs of inviting others into a high-stakes decision (Funderburg & Levy, 1997), and the risk of ineffectively using and communicating the information gathered about an employee (Tornow, 1993). It is not surprising, though, that managers would be inclined to use 360s to gain a clearer picture of their employees' performance when making pay or promotion decisions, and there is no doubt managers will continue to do so despite the warnings of researchers. Therefore, in an effort to respond to this need and extend Campion, Campion, and Campion's (2015) article on

why organizations should be using 360s for PM, in this chapter we provide a “how-to” resource by reviewing the literature on 360s and presenting a list of 56 research-supported best practices to effectively use them for PM.

DESIGN OF REVIEW AND DATA COLLECTION METHODOLOGY

We conducted an exhaustive review of the research and professional literature accumulated to date on the topic of 360s using PsycINFO, Business Source Premiere databases, and Google Scholar. Our search yielded 221 articles or book chapters on this topic. This chapter includes the professional literature because not all topics have been subjected to research analysis, and professional practice has valuable insight that is not represented in the current body of research literature. The result is a list of 56 best practices explaining how to conduct and use 360s for the purposes of PM.

We define best practices as recommendations deriving from research findings, recommendations from professionals, or clear inferences from the literature regarding how to incorporate 360s into PM systems in organizations. It is important to note that these are not minimum expectations or required industry standards, but instead are ideal standards that well-run organizations might aspire to achieve. It is not expected that an organization will meet all of these best practices, and it does not mean that failing to meet a best practice indicates a fault with the organization’s process. Sometimes, best practices are not applicable in a given context, not necessary, too expensive, or otherwise discretionary. These best practices are divided in terms of major topic areas (e.g., strategic considerations, item content, rating scales, administration, etc.). The best practices are identified and summarized in Box 3.1, which also presents all the supporting citations in order to illustrate the magnitude of support and to direct interested readers and future researchers to the source documents.

BEST PRACTICES FOR USING 360S FOR PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT

Box 3.1 lists 56 best practices for implementing 360s for PM. For ease of understanding, the practices are grouped into nine categories: strategic considerations, items, scales, raters, administrations, training/instruction, interpretation of feedback, development, and review. In the sections that follow, we define and address the importance of each category, briefly discuss practices illustrative of each category, and propose future work needed to further elaborate on the practices within each category.

BOX 3.1

BEST PRACTICES FOR USING 360 FEEDBACK FOR PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT

BEST PRACTICE IN 360 FEEDBACK

Strategic Considerations

1. The process should be integrated with other human resource (HR) systems, such as compensation or promotion.

Antonioni (1996); Atwater, Brett, and Charles (2007); Atwater and Waldman (1998); Atwater, Waldman, and Brett (2002); Bancroft et al. (1993); Bernardin (1986); Bernardin and Beatty (1987); Bernardin, Dehmus, and Redmon (1993); Bozeman (1997); Bracken (1994); Bracken and Rose (2011); Bracken and Timmreck (1999); Bracken, Timmreck, Fleenor, and Summers (2001); Brutus and Derayeh (2002); Carson (2006); Church and Bracken (1997); Church and Waclawski (2001); Fleenor, Taylor, and Chappelow (2008); Ghorpade (2000); Gillespie (2005); Heidemeier and Moser (2009); Herold and Fields (2004); R. Hoffman (1995); Johnson and Ferstl (1999); Lepsinger and Lucia (1997); London and Beatty (1993); London, Smither, and Adsit (1997); London, Wohlers, and Gallagher (1990); McCarthy and Garavan (2007); McEvoy and Buller (1987); Metcalfe (1998); Morgan, Cannan, and Cullinane (2005); Nowack and Mashihi (2012); Peiperl (2001); Rogers, Rogers, and Metlay (2002); 3D Group (2013); Toegel and Conger (2003); Tornow (1993a); Tyson and Ward (2004); van Hooft, Flier, and Minne (2006); Vinson (1996); Waldman and Atwater (2001); Waldman, Atwater, and Antonioni (1998); Wimer and Nowack (1998)

2. The concept of using 360 Feedback should be consistent with the culture of the organization to ensure readiness and fit (e.g., open communication, open to feedback, peer review valued, not overly hierarchical, learning and development oriented, low fear of reprisal, etc.).

Atwater et al. (2002, 2007); Atwater and Waldman (1998); Bancroft et al. (1993); Bracken (1994); Bracken, Dalton, Jako, McCauley, Pollman, and Hollenbeck (1997); Carson (2006); Church and Waclawski (2001); Conway, Lombardo, and Sanders (2001); Drew (2009); Fleenor, Smither, Atwater, Braddy, and Sturm (2010); Fleenor et al. (2008); Funderburg and Levy (1997); Furnham and Stringfield (1994); Gillespie (2005); Heidemeier and Moser (2009); Hezlett (2008); R. Hoffman (1995); Lepsinger and Lucia (1997); London and Beatty (1993); London and Smither (2002); London et al. (1990); Metcalfe (1998); Morgan et al. (2005); Ng, Koh, Ang, Kennedy, and Chan (2011); Peiperl (2001); Robertson (2008); Salam, Cox, and Sims (1997); Seifert, Yukl, and McDonald (2003); Smither, London, and Reilly (2005); Waldman (1997); Waldman and Bowen (1998); Westerman and Rosse (1997); Wimer (2002); Wimer and Nowack (1998)

3. The process should be developed with the input of subject matter experts (e.g., incumbents, managers, users of the system, etc.) to ensure that it meets their needs and expectations, and that they will be committed to its implementation.

Antonioni (1996); Bancroft et al. (1993); Bernardin et al. (1993); Bracken (1994); Bracken and Rose (2011); Church and Waclawski (2001); Drew (2009); Gillespie (2005); Heslin and Latham (2004); R. Hoffman (1995); Johnson and Ferstl (1999); Lepsinger and Lucia (1997); London and Beatty (1993); London et al. (1990, 1997); McEvoy and Buller (1987); Salam et al. (1997); Smither (2008); Smither et al. (1995); 3D Group (2013); Toegel and Conger (2003); van der Heijden and Nijhof (2004); Waldman (1997); Waldman and Atwater (2001); Waldman et al. (1998); Walker and Smither (1999); Westerman and Rosse (1997); Wimer and Nowack (1998); Woehr, Sheehan, and Bennett (2005)

4. The purpose, policies, procedures, uses of the data, and other aspects of the process should be clearly defined and communicated to managers and employees.

Atwater et al. (2007); Atwater and Waldman (1998); Bernardin (1986); Bernardin and Beatty (1987); Bernardin, Konopaske, and Hagan (2012); Bracken (1994); Bracken and Timmreck (1999); Bracken et al. (2001); Brutus et al. (2006); Church and Bracken (1997); Church and Waclawski (2001); Fleenor et al. (2008); Garbett, Hardy, Manley, Titchen, and McCormack (2007); R. Hoffman (1995); Kanouse (1998); London and Beatty (1993); Maylett (2009); McCarthy and Garavan (2001, 2007); Metcalfe (1998); Morgan et al. (2005); Peiperl (2001); Pollack and Pollack (1996); Redman and Snape (1992); Robertson (2008); Smith and Fortunato (2008); Testa (2002); 3D Group (2013); Waldman and Atwater (2001); Waldman et al. (1998); Westerman and Rosse (1997); Wimer (2002); Wimer and Nowack (1998)

5. The process and performance indicators (items) rated should be linked to the organizational strategy and aligned with business goals and objectives.

Bracken and Timmreck (1999); Bracken et al. (2001); Brutus and Derayah (2002); Carson (2006); Church and Waclawski (2001); Drew (2009); Fleenor et al. (2008); Hezlett (2008); R. Hoffman (1995); Kanouse (1998); London and Beatty (1993); London et al. (1990); Maylett (2009); Morgan et al. (2005); Nowack and Mashihi (2012); Rogers et al. (2002); Smither et al. (1995); Waldman et al. (1998)

6. The performance expectations (including the performance indicators) should be clearly communicated and agreed on with employees at the beginning of the evaluation period.

Bracken and Timmreck (1999); Church and Waclawski (2001); Dominick, Reilly, and McGourty (1997); Fleenor et al. (2008); Lepsinger and Lucia (1997); London and Beatty (1993); London and Smither (1995); London et al. (1990, 1997); Nowack and Mashihi (2012); Reilly, Smither, and Vasilopoulos (1996); Tornow (1993a); Williams and Johnson (2000)

7. The process should have the support of top management.

Bracken and Timmreck (1999); Bracken et al. (1997, 2001); Church (1995); Church and Waclawski (2001); Fleenor et al. (2008); Kanouse (1998); McCarthy and Garavan (2001); McCauley and Moxley (1996); Pollack and Pollack (1996); Rogers et al. (2002); Waldman et al. (1998)

Items

8. The items rated should be highly job related (based on a job analysis or other evidence, or related to generic job requirements applicable to the jobs, such as leadership) so that they will be valid.

Antonioni (1996); Atkins and Wood (2002); Atwater, Ostroff, Yammarino, and Fleenor (1998); Atwater, Roush, and Fischthal (1995); Bailey and Austin (2006); Bailey and Fletcher (2002); Bancroft et al. (1993); Bernardin and Beatty (1987); Bernardin et al. (2012); Bracken (1994); Bracken et al. (1997, 2001); Bracken and Rose (2011); Bracken and Timmreck (1999); Carson (2006); Church (1995); Conway (1996); Dai, De Meuse, and Peterson (2010); Fleenor et al. (2008); Flint (1999); Furnham and Stringfield (1994); Garbett et al. (2007); Gillespie (2005); Herold and Fields (2004); Heslin and Latham (2004); R. Hoffman (1995); B. J. Hoffman et al. (2012); B. J. Hoffman and Woehr (2009); Johnson and Ferstl (1999); Kaiser and Craig (2005); Lepsinger and Lucia (1997); London and Beatty (1993); London and Smither (1995); London et al. (1990); Luthans and Peterson (2003); Manning, Pogson, and Morrison (2009); Maylett (2009); McCarthy and Garavan (2007); McEvoy and Buller (1987); Morgan et al. (2005); Mount, Judge, Scullen, Sytsma, and Hezlett (1998); Reilly et al. (1996); Salam et al. (1997); Smither (2008); Smither et al. (1995); Testa (2002); 3D Group (2013); Toegel and Conger (2003); van Hooft et al. (2006); Viswesvaran, Schmidt, and Ones (2002); Waldman and Atwater (2001); Waldman et al. (1998); Walker and Smither (1999); Westerman and Rosse (1997); Wimer and Nowack (1998); Woehr et al. (2005); Yammarino and Atwater (1997); Yukl and Lepsinger (1995)

9. The items should use the language of the organization (or written by those with organizational knowledge).

Bailey and Austin (2006); Bracken and Rose (2011); Bracken et al. (2001); Fleenor et al. (2008); Garbett et al. (2007); Gillespie (2005); Johnson and Ferstl (1999); Kaiser and Craig (2005); Lepsinger and Lucia (1997); London and Beatty (1993); Maylett (2009); 3D Group (2013); Waldman and Atwater (2001); Walker and Smither (1999); Wimer and Nowack (1998); Yammarino and Atwater (1997)

10. The items should be behavior (observable) to the extent possible, and they should be specific rather than general.

Antonioni (1996); Atkins and Wood (2002); Atwater et al. (1995); Atwater and Van Fleet (1997); Atwater and Waldman (1998); Bailey and Austin (2006); Bernardin (1986); Bernardin and Beatty (1987); Bernardin et al. (1993); Bracken (1994); Bracken and Rose (2011); Bracken and Timmreck (1999); Brutus and Facticeau (2003); Church (1995); Fleenor

et al. (2008); Garbett et al. (2007); Ghorpade (2000); Gillespie (2005); Heidemeier and Moser (2009); Herold and Fields (2004); Heslin and Latham (2004); B. J. Hoffman et al. (2012); Jelley and Goffin (2001); Johnson and Ferstl (1999); Kaiser and Craig (2005); London and Beatty (1993); London and Smither (1995); London et al. (1997); Luthans and Peterson (2003); McCarthy and Garavan (2007); Nowack and Mashihi (2012); Redman and Snape (1992); Rogers et al. (2002); Salam et al. (1997); Toegel and Conger (2003); Viswesvaran et al. (2002); Waldman and Atwater (2001); Walker and Smither (1999); Woehr et al. (2005); Yammarino and Atwater (1997); Yukl and Lepsinger (1995)

11. A broad range of items should be considered, including citizenship-related performance.

Antonioni (1996); Atwater and Van Fleet (1997); Bracken (1994); Funderburg and Levy (1997); Garbett et al. (2007); Heidemeier and Moser (2009); Heslin and Latham (2004); London and Beatty (1993); Luthans and Peterson (2003); McCarthy and Garavan (2007); Smither et al. (1995); Thomason, Weeks, Bernardin, and Kane (2011); 3D Group (2013); Waldman and Atwater (2001); Waldman et al. (1998); Waldman and Bowen (1998); Walker and Smither (1999)

12. The behavior reflected by the items should be under the control of the employee and amenable to change (i.e., actionable).

Antonioni (1996); Atkins and Wood (2002); Bracken (1994); Bracken and Timmreck (1999); Fleenor et al. (2008); Garbett et al. (2007); London and Beatty (1993); Luthans and Peterson (2003); McCarthy and Garavan (2007); Smither, London, and Reilly (2005); Smither et al. (1995); Tornow (1993a); Vecchio and Anderson (2009)

13. The items should be clear and understandable to everyone involved (e.g., raters, ratees, managers, etc.).

Antonioni (1996); Bracken (1994); Bracken et al. (2001); Brutus and Fecteau (2003); Church (1995); Fleenor et al. (2008); Garbett et al. (2007); Gillespie (2005); Herold and Fields (2004); Kaiser and Craig (2005); Lepsinger and Lucia (1997); London and Smither (1995); Luthans and Peterson (2003); Nowack and Mashihi (2012); Smither et al. (1995); Waldman and Atwater (2001); Wohlers and London (1989)

14. The items should generate reliable data (e.g., sufficient number of items, sound statistical properties, such as internal consistency, good factor structure, etc.).

Bracken and Timmreck (1999); Fleenor et al. (2008); Fletcher, Baldry, and Cunningham-Snell (1998); Penny (2003); Yammarino (2003)

Scales

15. The rating scale should be clear that performance is being evaluated.

Antonioni (1996); Atwater and Waldman (1998); Bracken (1994); Bracken and Rose (2011); Bracken and Timmreck (1999); Dai et al. (2010); DeNisi and Kluger (2000); Farh, Cannella, and Bedeian (1991); Fleenor et al. (2008); Greguras, Robie,

Schleicher, and Goff (2003); Harris, Smith, and Champagne (1995); Heidemeier and Moser (2009); Kanouse (1998); Maylett (2009); Nowack and Mashihhi (2012); Peiperl (2001); Toegel and Conger (2003); van der Heijden and Nijhof (2004); Waldman et al. (1998); Westerman and Rosse (1997); Wimer and Nowack (1998)

16. The rating scales (e.g., types, levels, etc.) should be tailored to distinguish between levels of performance.

Antonioni (1996); Atkins and Wood (2002); Bailey and Fletcher (2002); Bernardin et al. (1993); Bracken and Rose (2011); Bracken and Timmreck (1999); Bracken et al. (2001); Carson (2006); Dai et al. (2010); Eichinger and Lombardo (2004); Furnham and Stringfield (1994); Gillespie (2005); Herold and Fields (2004); B. J. Hoffman et al. (2012); Jelley and Goffin (2001); Johnson and Ferstl (1999); London and Beatty (1993); London et al. (1990); Luthans and Peterson (2003); Maylett (2009); Mount et al. (1998); Nowack and Mashihhi (2012); Peiperl (2001); Salam et al. (1997); Smither et al. (1995); 3D Group (2013); van Hooft et al. (2006); Waldman and Atwater (2001); Woehr et al. (2005)

17. The rating scale should be clear and understandable to everyone involved (e.g., raters, ratees, managers, etc.).

Antonioni (1996); Atkins and Wood (2002); Bailey and Fletcher (2002); Bernardin et al. (1993); Bracken (1994); Bracken and Rose (2011); Bracken and Timmreck (1999); Bracken et al. (2001); Carson (2006); Craig and Hannum (2006); Dai et al. (2010); Fleenor et al. (2010); Furnham and Stringfield (1994); Gillespie (2005); Herold and Fields (2004); B. J. Hoffman et al. (2012); Jelley and Goffin (2001); Johnson and Ferstl (1999); London and Beatty (1993); Luthans and Peterson (2003); Maylett (2009); Mount et al. (1998); Nowack and Mashihhi (2012); Peiperl (2001); Salam et al. (1997); Smither et al. (1995); 3D Group (2013); van Hooft et al. (2006); Waldman and Atwater (2001); Woehr et al. (2005)

18. Narrative comments should also be collected.

Antonioni (1996); Bailey and Austin (2006); Bernardin and Beatty (1987); Bracken (1994); Bracken and Rose (2011); Bracken and Timmreck (1999); Carson (2006); Fleenor et al. (2008, 2010); Garbett et al. (2007); Gillespie (2005); Johnson and Ferstl (1999); Lepsinger and Lucia (1997); London et al. (1990); McEvoy and Buller (1987); Ng et al. (2011); Nowack (2009); Nowack and Mashihhi (2012); Peiperl (2001); Pollack and Pollack (1996); Smither and Walker (2004); Smither et al. (1995); 3D Group (2013); Tornow (1993a); Vinson (1996); Waldman et al. (1998); Yukl and Lepsinger (1995)

Raters

19. Multiple rating sources (e.g., peers, subordinates, managers, customers) should be included, as appropriate.

Albright and Levy (1995); Atkins and Wood (2002); Atwater et al. (1995, 1998, 2002, 2007); Bailey and Austin (2006); Bailey and Fletcher (2002); Bancroft et al. (1993);

Bernardin and Beatty (1987); Bernardin et al. (1993, 2012); Bracken (1994); Bracken and Rose (2011); Bracken et al. (2001); Brutus et al. (2006); Carson (2006); Church and Bracken (1997); Conway et al. (2001); Craig and Hannum (2006); DeNisi and Kluger (2000); J. D. Facticeau and Craig (2001); Farh et al. (1991); Fleenor et al. (2008); Fletcher and Baldry (2000); Furnham and Stringfield (1994); Garbett et al. (2007); Gillespie (2005); Greguras, Ford, and Brutus (2003); Greguras, Robie, et al. (2003); Greller and Herold (1975); Guenole, Cockerill, Chamorro-Premuzic, and Smillie (2011); Harris and Schaubroeck (1988); Heidemeier and Moser (2009); B. J. Hoffman, Bynum, and Gentry (2010); B. J. Hoffman and Woehr (2009); R. Hoffman (1995); Holzbach (1978); Johnson and Ferstl (1999); Lance, Hoffman, Gentry, and Baranik (2008); LeBreton, Burgess, Kaiser, Atchley, and James (2003); Lepsinger and Lucia (1997); London and Smither (1995); London et al. (1990); Luthans and Peterson (2003); Manning et al. (2009); McCauley and Moxley (1996); Metcalfe (1998); Mount, Barrick, and Strauss (1994); Mount et al. (1998); Ng et al. (2011); Nowack (2009); Nowack and Mashihi (2012); Peiperl (2001); Pollack and Pollack (1996); Sala and Dwight (2002); Salam et al. (1997); Seifert and Yukl (2010); Siegel (1982); Smither, Brett, and Atwater (2008); Stone and Stone (1984); Testa (2002); 3D Group (2013); Toegel and Conger (2003); Tornow (1993a); van der Heijden and Nijhof (2004); Vecchio and Anderson (2009); Vinson (1996); Waldman and Atwater (2001); Wohlers and London (1989); Yammarino (2003); Yammarino and Atwater (1993); Yammarino and Atwater (1997); Yukl and Lepsinger (1995)

20. Self-ratings should also be included.

Albright and Levy (1995); Antonioni (1996); Atkins and Wood (2002); Atwater et al. (1995, 1998, 2002, 2007); Atwater and Van Fleet (1997); Atwater and Waldman (1998); Bailey and Austin (2006); Bailey and Fletcher (2002); Bernardin et al. (1993); Campbell and Lee (1988); Cheung (1999); Church (1995); Fleenor et al. (2008, 2010); Fletcher and Baldry (2000); Flint (1999); Furnham and Stringfield (1994); Goffin and Anderson (2007); Harris and Schaubroeck (1988); Heidemeier and Moser (2009); R. Hoffman (1995); Holzbach (1978); Johnson and Ferstl (1999); Lane and Herriot (1990); London and Beatty (1993); London and Smither (1995); Luthans and Peterson (2003); Metcalfe (1998); Morgan et al. (2005); Mount et al. (1994); Nowack (1992, 2009); Nowack and Mashihi (2012); Pollack and Pollack (1996); Reilly et al. (1996); Sala and Dwight (2002); Salam et al. (1997); Seifert and Yukl (2010); Shrauger and Kelly (1988); Shrauger and Terbovic (1976); Smither (2008); Smither, London, and Reilly (2005); Smither, London, and Richmond (2005); Smither et al. (1995); 3D Group (2013); Toegel and Conger (2003); Tornow (1993a); van der Heijden and Nijhof (2004); Vecchio and Anderson (2009); Van Velsor, Taylor, and Leslie (1993); Williams and Johnson (2000); Williams and Levy (1992); Wimer and Nowack (1998); Wohlers and London (1989); Wohlers, Hall, and London (1993); Yammarino and Atwater (1993); Yammarino and Atwater (1997); Yukl and Lepsinger (1995)

21. Raters should be anonymous, but ratings may sometimes be nonanonymous, depending on the purpose of the process (e.g., when it is important to know that the feedback is from specific sources).

Antonioni (1994, 1996); Atwater et al. (2002, 2007); Atwater and Waldman (1998); Bancroft et al. (1993); Bernardin (1986); Bernardin and Beatty (1987); Bracken (1994); Bracken et al. (1997, 2001); Bracken and Timmreck (1999); Carson (2006); Church and Bracken (1997); Eichinger and Lombardo (2004); Fleenor et al. (2008); Garbett et al. (2007); Herold and Fields (2004); Heslin and Latham (2004); Kanouse (1998); Lepsinger and Lucia (1997); London and Beatty (1993); London et al. (1990, 1997); Luthans and Peterson (2003); McCarthy and Garavan (2007); Metcalfe (1998); Redman and Snape (1992); Robertson (2008); Rogers et al. (2002); Smither (2008); 3D Group (2013); van der Heijden and Nijhof (2004); Vinson (1996); Waldman et al. (1998); Waldman and Bowen (1998); Westerman and Rosse (1997); Wimer (2002); Yammarino and Atwater (1997)

22. Sufficiently large samples of raters (with high enough response rates) should be obtained for each source to ensure anonymity of raters and interrater reliability.

Antonioni (1996); Atwater et al. (1995, 1998, 2007); Atwater and Waldman (1998); Bernardin and Beatty (1987); Bernardin et al. (2012); Bozeman (1997); Bracken (1994); Bracken and Rose (2011); Bracken and Timmreck (1999); Bracken et al. (2001); Carson (2006); Church (1995); Church and Bracken (1997); Church, Rogelberg, and Waclawski (2000); Church and Waclawski (2001); Conway (1996); Conway et al. (2001); Dai et al. (2010); Fleenor et al. (2008); Fletcher et al. (1998); Greguras, Robie, et al. (2003); Hensel, Meijers, Leeden, and Kessels (2010); Hezlett (2008); Jellema, Visscher, and Scheerens (2006); Johnson and Ferstl (1999); Lepsinger and Lucia (1997); London and Beatty (1993); London and Smither (1995); London and Wohlers (1991); London et al. (1990); Luthans and Peterson (2003); Maylett (2009); Metcalfe (1998); Mount et al. (1998); Nowack (2009); Nowack and Mashihhi (2012); Pollack and Pollack (1996); Redman and Snape (1992); Robertson (2008); Scullen (1997); Seifert and Yukl (2010); Smither et al. (1995); Testa (2002); 3D Group (2013); Tornow (1993b); van Hooft et al. (2006); Vinson (1996); Waldman et al. (1998); Waldman and Bowen (1998); Westerman and Rosse (1997); Wimer and Nowack (1998); Yammarino (2003); Yukl and Lepsinger (1995)

23. Selection of raters within source should consider the opportunity to observe performance, skill in evaluating performance, credibility, motivation to provide accurate judgments of performance, and the avoidance of biasing factors or gaming the system (e.g., friendships, competitors for promotion, special interests, unexpected events, etc.).

Albright and Levy (1995); Antonioni (1996); Atwater and Waldman (1998); Bernardin (1986); Bernardin and Beatty (1987); Bernardin et al. (1993, 2012); Bracken (1994); Bracken and Rose (2011); Bracken and Timmreck (1999); Bracken et al. (2001); Carson

(2006); Cederblom and Lounsbury (1980); Church (1995); Conway (1996); Conway et al. (2001); Eichinger and Lombardo (2004); Fleenor et al. (2008, 2010); Flint (1999); Garbett et al. (2007); Ghorpade (2000); Hannum (2007); B. J. Hoffman et al. and (2010); Jellema et al. (2006); Johnson and Ferstl (1999); Lepsinger and Lucia (1997); Lewin and Zwany (1976); Maylett (2009); McCarthy and Garavan (2001); Metcalfe (1998); Nowack and Mashihi (2012); Redman and Snape (1992); Rogers et al. (2002); Sala and Dwight (2002); Smith and Fortunato (2008); Smither et al. (1995); Tornow (1993a); van Hooft et al. (2006); Vinson (1996); Waldman and Bowen (1998); Westerman and Rosse (1997); Wimer (2002); Woehr et al. (2005); Yammarino (2003); Yukl and Lepsinger (1995)

24. Selection of raters should follow a standardized process that is similar for everyone (with minimal potential for biased selection).

Antonioni (1996); Atkins and Wood (2002); Bernardin et al. (2012); Bracken (1994); Bracken and Rose (2011); Bracken and Timmreck (1999); Bracken et al. (2001); Brutus et al. (2006); Fleenor et al. (2010); Fox, Ben-Nahum, and Yinon (1989); Garbett et al. (2007); Gillespie (2005); Jellema et al. (2006); Lewin and Zwany (1976); London et al. (1990); McCarthy and Garavan (2007); McEvoy and Buller (1987); Metcalfe (1998); Mount et al. (1998); Nowack and Mashihi (2012); Robertson (2008); Rogers et al. (2002); Seifert and Yukl (2010); 3D Group (2013); Wimer and Nowack (1998); Yukl and Lepsinger (1995)

25. Ratees should have input, but there should also be oversight in the selection of raters (e.g., by manager, HR, etc.) to ensure consistency and following the correct procedures.

Antonioni (1996); Atkins and Wood (2002); Bernardin and Beatty (1987); Bernardin et al. (2012); Bracken (1994); Bracken and Rose (2011); Bracken and Timmreck (1999); Bracken et al. (2001); Brutus and Derayeh (2002); Carson (2006); Fleenor et al. (2008, 2010); Flint (1999); Gillespie (2005); Lewin and Zwany (1976); Maylett (2009); Nowack (2009); Nowack and Mashihi (2012); Redman and Snape (1992); Rogers et al. (2002); Seifert and Yukl (2010); 3D Group (2013); Toegel and Conger (2003)

26. When necessary, there should be statistical adjustments or other control for outliers and average score differences by various factors (e.g., rating source, organizational unit, etc.).

Atwater and Waldman (1998); Bernardin and Beatty (1987); Bracken and Timmreck (1999); Ghorpade (2000); Lepsinger and Lucia (1997); McEvoy and Buller (1987); Ng et al. (2011); Nowack and Mashihi (2012)

Administration

27. Standardized procedures should be used for administration to help ensure reliability.

Bernardin and Beatty (1987); Bracken and Timmreck (1999); Bracken et al. (2001); Church and Bracken (1997); Craig and Hannum (2006); Fleenor et al. (2008); Gillespie (2005); Heslin and Latham (2004); R. Hoffman (1995); Johnson and Ferstl (1999);

Kanouse (1998); London and Beatty (1993); London et al. (1990); McEvoy and Buller (1987); Tornow (1993a)

28. The 360 process should be conducted routinely, usually on an annual basis, and near in time to when the data are used for personnel decisions (e.g., pay increases).

Antonioni (1996); Atwater et al. (2007); Bancroft et al. (1993); Bracken (1994); Bracken and Rose (2011); Bracken and Timmreck (1999); Bracken et al. (2001); Brutus and Derayeh (2002); Brutus et al. (2006); Carson (2006); DeNisi and Kluger (2000); London and Beatty (1993); London and Smither (1995); London et al. (1990, 1997); McEvoy and Buller (1987); Nowack (2009); Pollack and Pollack (1996); Reilly et al. (1996); Seifert and Yukl (2010); Smither (2008); Smither et al. (1995); 3D Group (2013); Wimer and Nowack (1998)

29. There should be a follow-up, such as a midyear or other intermediate review to ensure progress is being made and to provide guidance.

Antonioni (1996); Atwater et al. (2007); Bracken (1994); Bracken and Timmreck (1999); Church (1995); Church and Waclawski (2001); Fleenor et al. (2008); London and Beatty (1993); London et al. (1990); McEvoy and Buller (1987); Nowack (2009); Reilly et al. (1996); Smither (2008); Smither et al. (2008); 3D Group (2013); Walker and Smither (1999); Westerman and Rosse (1997); Wimer (2002); Wimer and Nowack (1998); Yukl and Lepsinger (1995)

30. Administration and use of the process should be monitored by HR.

Bernardin (1986); Bernardin and Beatty (1987); Fleenor et al. (2008); Ghorpade (2000);

31. The feedback and all related data should be kept confidential.

Bracken and Timmreck (1999); Church (1995); Church and Waclawski (2001); Fleenor et al. (2008); Ghorpade (2000); McCarthy and Garavan (2001); Pollack and Pollack (1996); Testa (2002); Wimer (2002); Wimer and Nowack (1998)

32. The process should not be unduly burdensome in terms of time, costs, and so on.

Bracken and Timmreck (1999); Bracken et al. (2001); Brutus and Derayah (2002); Fleenor et al. (2008); Westerman and Rosse (1997)

Training/Instruction

33. Raters should be trained or well instructed.

Antonioni (1996); Atkins and Wood (2002); Atwater et al. (2002, 2007); Atwater and Waldman (1998); Bernardin (1986); Bracken (1994); Bracken et al. (1997, 2001); Bracken and Rose (2011); Bracken and Timmreck (1999); Carson (2006); Church and Bracken (1997); Diefendorff, Silverman, and Greguras (2005); Fleenor et al. (2008, 2010); Ghorpade (2000); Gillespie (2005); Guenole et al. (2011); Heslin and Latham (2004); Hezlett (2008); R. Hoffman (1995); Kanouse (1998); Lepsinger and Lucia

(1997); London and Beatty (1993); London et al. (1997); McCarthy and Garavan (2007); Ng et al. (2011); Nowack (1992); Nowack and Mashihhi (2012); Peiperl (2001); Pollack and Pollack (1996); Redman and Snape (1992); Robert and Shipper (1998); Rogers et al. (2002); 3D Group (2013); Waldman and Atwater (2001); Waldman et al. (1998); Westerman and Rosse (1997); Yammarino and Atwater (1997); Yukl and Lepsinger (1995)

34. Employees receiving the feedback should be trained or well instructed.

Antonioni (1996); Atwater et al. (2002, 2007); Atwater and Waldman (1998); Bancroft et al. (1993); Bracken (1994); Bracken et al. (1997, 2001); Bracken and Timmreck (1999); Church and Bracken (1997); Fleenor et al. (2008); R. Hoffman (1995); Kanouse (1998); London and Beatty (1993); London et al. (1990, 1997); Luthans and Peterson (2003); McCarthy and Garavan (2001); Metcalfe (1998); Peiperl (2001); Pollack and Pollack (1996); Robert and Shipper (1998); Rogers et al. (2002); Seifert et al. (2003); Smither (2008); Smither, London, and Reilly (2005); 3D Group (2013); Toegel and Conger (2003); Tornow (1993b); Tyson and Ward (2004); van der Heijden and Nijhof (2004); Waldman and Atwater (2001); Westerman and Rosse (1997); Yammarino and Atwater (1997); Yukl and Lepsinger (1995)

35. Managers using the 360 results should be trained or well instructed.

Antonioni (1996); Atwater et al. (2002); Bracken (1994); Bracken et al. (1997); Bracken and Timmreck (1999); Carson (2006); Fleenor et al. (2008); R. Hoffman (1995); London and Beatty (1993); London et al. (1997); Nowack and Mashihhi (2012); O'Reilly and Furth (1994); Peiperl (2001); Rogers et al. (2002); 3D Group (2013); Wimer (2002); Yammarino and Atwater (1997)

Interpretation of Feedback

36. Feedback should be detailed (including statistics showing central tendency and dispersion), and there should be standardized guidance on interpreting the feedback (e.g., instructions, graphics, etc.).

Antonioni (1996); Atkins and Wood (2002); Atwater and Brett (2006); Atwater et al. (2007); Bernardin (1986); Bernardin and Beatty (1987); Bernardin et al. (1993); Bracken (1994); Bracken et al. (1997, 2001); Bracken and Rose (2011); Bracken and Timmreck (1999); Brutus et al. (2006); Church and Waclawski (2001); DeNisi and Kluger (2000); Fleenor et al. (2008, 2010); Gillespie (2005); Hezlett (2008); Johnson and Ferstl (1999); Lepsinger and Lucia (1997); London and Beatty (1993); London and Smither (1995); London et al. (1990); Luthans and Peterson (2003); Maylett (2009); McEvoy and Buller (1987); Morgan et al. (2005); Mount et al. (1998); Nowack (2009); Nowack and Mashihhi (2012); Pollack and Pollack (1996); Reilly et al. (1996); Robertson (2008); Seifert et al. (2003); Smither (2008); 3D Group (2013); Vinson (1996); Waldman and Atwater (2001); Westerman and Rosse (1997); Yammarino and Atwater (1997); Yukl and Lepsinger (1995)

37. There should be coaching of employees on the use of 360 (e.g., by manager or trainer).

Antonioni (1996); Atwater and Brett (2006); Atwater et al. (2002, 2007); Bancroft et al. (1993); Bracken (1994); Bracken and Rose (2011); Bracken and Timmreck (1999); Brett and Atwater (2001); Brutus and Derayeh (2002); Brutus et al. (2006); Carson (2006); Church (1995); Church and Waclawski (2001); Craig and Hannum (2006); Dai et al. (2010); DeNisi and Kluger (2000); Drew (2009); Fleenor et al. (2008); Fletcher, Taylor, and Glanfield (1996); Garbett et al. (2007); Gillespie (2005); Heslin and Latham (2004); Hezlett (2008); R. Hoffman (1995); Lepsinger and Lucia (1997); London and Beatty (1993); London et al. (1990, 1997); Luthans and Peterson (2003); Manning et al. (2009); McCarthy and Garavan (2001); McCarthy and Garavan (2007); McCauley and Moxley (1996); McEvoy and Buller (1987); Metcalfe (1998); Morgan et al. (2005); Nowack (2009); Nowack and Mashihi (2012); Peiperl (2001); Pollack and Pollack (1996); Robertson (2008); Rogers et al. (2002); Seifert and Yukl (2010); Seifert et al. (2003); Smither (2008); Smither et al. (2008); Smither, London, Flautt, Vargas, and Kucine (2003); Testa (2002); 3D Group (2013); Tyson and Ward (2004); Vinson (1996); Waldman and Atwater (2001); Wimer (2002); Wimer and Nowack (1998); Yukl and Lepsinger (1995)

38. Interpretation should consider the individual differences of employees in responses to feedback.

Antonioni (1996); Atwater et al. (2002, 2007); Atwater and Van Fleet (1997); Atwater, Waldman, Atwater, and Cartier (2000); Bailey and Austin (2006); Beyer (1990); Bowen, Swim, and Jacobs (2000); Brett and Atwater (2001); Church and Bracken (1997); Church and Waclawski (1998); Craig and Hannum (2006); Drew (2009); Fleenor et al. (2010); Fletcher and Baldry (2000); Fletcher et al. (1996); Funderburg and Levy (1997); Goffin and Anderson (2007); Guenole et al. (2011); Hensel et al. (2010); Heslin and Latham (2004); Lepsinger and Lucia (1997); London and Smither (1995); London and Smither (2002); London and Wohlers (1991); London et al. (1990); Luthans and Peterson (2003); McCarthy and Garavan (2007); McEvoy and Buller (1987); Nilsen and Campbell (1993); Nowack (2009); Nowack and Mashihi (2012); Ostroff, Atwater, and Feinberg (2004); Shrauger and Kelly (1988); Shrauger and Terbovic (1976); Smither (2008); Smither, London, and Reilly (2005); Smither, London, and Richmond (2005); Thomason et al. (2011); Tornow (1993a, 1993b); Vecchio and Anderson (2009); Van Velsor et al. (1993); Waldman (1997); Waldman and Atwater (2001); Waldman and Bowen (1998); Williams and Johnson (2000); Williams and Levy (1992); Wohlers et al. (1993); Wohlers and London (1989); Yammarino and Atwater (1993); Yammarino and Atwater (1997)

39. Results should be interpreted with consideration of potential biasing factors (e.g., types of job, business conditions, opportunity to perform, unexpected events, other constraints, etc.).

Antonioni (1996); Bernardin and Beatty (1987); Bernardin et al. (1993); Herold and Fields (2004); Johnson and Ferstl (1999); Metcalfe (1998); Nowack (2009); Toegel and Conger (2003); Yammarino and Atwater (1997)

40. The meaningfulness of differences in feedback from the different sources and between self and others should be interpreted.

Albright and Levy (1995); Antonioni (1996); Atkins and Wood (2002); Atwater et al. (1995, 1998, 2002, 2007); Atwater and Van Fleet (1997); Atwater and Waldman (1998); Bailey and Austin (2006); Bailey and Fletcher (2002); Baril, Ayman, and Palmiter (1994); Bass and Yammarino (1991); Bernardin and Beatty (1987); Beyer (1990); Bowen et al. (2000); Bozeman (1997); Brett and Atwater (2001); Campbell and Lee (1988); Carless, Mann, and Wearing (1998); Cheung (1999); Church and Bracken (1997); Church and Waclawski (1998); Conway (1996); Conway et al. (2001); Craig and Hannum (2006); Eichinger and Lombardo (2004); C. L. Fecteau, Fecteau, Schoel, Russell, and Poteet (1998); J. D. Fecteau and Craig (2001); Farh et al. (1991); Farh and Dobbins (1989); Fleenor, McCauley, and Brutus (1996); Fleenor et al. (2008, 2010); Flint (1999); Fox et al. (1989); Furnham and Stringfield (1994); Furnham and Stringfield (1998); Garbett et al. (2007); Gioia and Sims (1985); Goffin and Anderson (2007); Greguras, Ford, et al. (2003); Greguras, Robie, et al. (2003); Greller and Herold (1975); Hannum (2007); Harris and Schaubroeck (1988); Hazucha, Hezlett, and Schneider (1993); Heidemeier and Moser (2009); Herold and Fields (2004); B. J. Hoffman et al. (2010); B. J. Hoffman and Woehr (2009); Holzbach (1978); Jellema et al. (2006); Johnson and Ferstl (1999); Kaiser and Craig (2005); Lance et al. (2008); LeBreton et al. (2003); Lepsinger and Lucia (1997); Levy, Cawley, and Foti (1998); London and Beatty (1993); London and Smither (1995); London and Wohlers (1991); London et al. (1997); Luthans and Peterson (2003); Maurer, Raju, and Collins (1998); Maylett (2009); McEvoy and Buller (1987); Metcalfe (1998); Morgan et al. (2005); Mount et al. (1994, 1998); Ng et al. (2011); Nilsen and Campbell (1993); Nowack (1992, 2009); Nowack and Mashihhi (2012); Ostroff et al. (2004); Penny (2003); Pollack and Pollack (1996); Riggio and Cole (1992); Salam et al. (1997); Schrader and Steiner (1996); Scullen (1997); Seifert and Yukl (2010); Seifert et al. (2003); Shrauger and Kelly (1988); Siegel (1982); Smither (2008); Smither et al. (2008); Smither, London, and Reilly (2005); Smither et al. (1995); Stone and Stone (1984, 1985); Testa (2002); Thomason et al. (2011); Tornow (1993a, 1993b); van der Heijden and Nijhof (2004); van Hooff et al. (2006); Van Velsor et al. (1993); Varela and Pemeaux (2008); Vecchio and Anderson (2009); Vinson (1996); Viswesvaran et al. (2002); Waldman and Atwater (2001); Williams and Johnson (2000); Williams and Levy (1992); Woehr et al. (2005); Wohlers et al. (1993); Wohlers and London (1989); Yammarino (2003); Yammarino and Atwater (1993); Yammarino and Atwater (1997); Yukl and Lepsinger (1995)

41. Additional assistance should be provided in the interpretation of negative feedback and large self–other differences.

Albright and Levy (1995); Antonioni (1996); Atkins and Wood (2002); Atwater and Brett (2006); Atwater et al. (1995, 1998, 2002, 2007); Atwater and Van Fleet (1997); Atwater and Waldman (1998); Bailey and Austin (2006); Beyer (1990); Bowen et al. (2000); Brett and Atwater (2001); Campbell and Lee (1988); Carless et al. (1998); Carson (2006); Cheung (1999); Diefendorff et al. (2005); C. L. Fecteau et al. (1998); Fleenor et al. (1996, 2008, 2010); Furnham and Stringfield (1994); Furnham and Stringfield (1998); Garbett et al. (2007); Gioia and Sims (1985); Hazucha et al. (1993); Heidemeier and Moser (2009); Johnson and Ferstl (1999); Lepsinger and Lucia (1997); Levy et al. (1998); London and Beatty (1993); London and Smither (1995); London et al. (1990); Luthans and Peterson (2003); McEvoy and Buller (1987); Metcalfe (1998); Morgan et al. (2005); Ng et al. (2011); Nilsen and Campbell (1993); Nowack (1992, 2009); Nowack and Mashihi (2012); Schrader and Steiner (1996); Smither (2008); Smither, London, and Reilly (2005); Stone and Stone (1984, 1985); Tornow (1993a, 1993b); van der Heijden and Nijhof (2004); Vecchio and Anderson (2009); Van Velsor et al. (1993); Vinson (1996); Waldman and Atwater (2001); Yammarino and Atwater (1993); Yammarino and Atwater (1997); Yukl and Lepsinger (1995)

42. Normative information should be provided to help interpret the feedback.

Atwater and Brett (2006); Atwater et al. (2007); Atwater and Van Fleet (1997); Bernardin and Beatty (1987); Bernardin et al. (1993); Bracken and Timmreck (1999); Bracken et al. (2001); DeNisi and Kluger (2000); Drew (2009); Fleenor et al. (2008, 2010); Herold and Fields (2004); Johnson and Ferstl (1999); London and Beatty (1993); London, Smither, and Adsit (1997); London et al. (1990); Ng et al. (2011); Nowack and Mashihi (2012); Smither et al. (1995); 3D Group (2013); Yukl and Lepsinger (1995)

43. Feedback should include both an absolute performance evaluation (e.g., compared to expectations) and a relative performance evaluation (e.g., compared to other employees).

Antonioni (1996); Heidemeier and Moser (2009); Kane and Lawler (1978); London and Smither (1995); Maylett (2009); Nowack and Mashihi (2012)

44. Objective performance data also should be considered in the overall evaluation of performance, if applicable (e.g., sales, profits, productivity, errors, etc.).

Atwater et al. (1998); Bernardin (1986); Bernardin and Beatty (1987); Bracken and Timmreck (1999); Eichinger and Lombardo (2004); Farh and Dobbins (1989); Gillespie (2005); Hannum (2007); C. C. Hoffman, Nathan, and Holden (1991); London and Smither (1995); London et al. (1990); Luthans and Peterson (2003); Ostroff et al. (2004); Sala and Dwight (2002); Schrader and Steiner (1996); Van Velsor et al. (1993); Waldman and Bowen (1998)

45. Narrative comments should normally be made anonymously if needed and otherwise made more useful for feedback purposes (e.g., by summarizing, interpreting, or eliminating identifying information).

Bernardin and Beatty (1987); Bracken (1994); Church and Waclawski (2001); Gillespie (2005); London and Beatty (1993); London et al. (1990); Nowack and Mashihhi (2012)

46. Narrative comments should be interpreted along with the ratings and other information on the employee's performance.

Bracken (1994); Bracken and Timmreck (1999); Bracken et al. (2001); Johnson and Ferstl (1999); London et al. (1990); Nowack (2009); Nowack and Mashihhi (2012); Smither and Walker (2004); Smither et al. (1995); Vinson (1996); Waldman et al. (1998)

47. Employees receiving the feedback should be allowed to suggest interpretations of the feedback before the performance review is finalized.

Flint (1999); Luthans and Peterson (2003); Smither (2008); Yukl and Lepsinger (1995)

48. In some situations, it is useful for ratees to meet with raters (e.g., manager, subordinates, peers, etc.) to help interpret the results and create action plans.

Antonioni (1996); Atwater et al. (2002, 2007); Atwater and Waldman (1998); Bancroft et al. (1993); Bracken et al. (1997, 2001); Bracken and Rose (2011); Bracken and Timmreck (1999); Fleenor et al. (2008); Flint (1999); Ghorpade (2000); Johnson and Ferstl (1999); Lepsinger and Lucia (1997); London and Beatty (1993); London et al. (1990, 1997); Metcalfe (1998); Morgan et al. (2005); O'Reilly and Furth (1994); Pollack and Pollack (1996); Rogers et al. (2002); Smither (2008); Smither, London, Reilly, Flautt, Vargas, and Kucine (2004); Smither et al. (1995); Waldman and Atwater (2001); Walker and Smither (1999)

Development

49. The process should be used for performance development as well as for performance evaluation, and resources for development should be provided.

Antonioni (1994, 1996); Atkins and Wood (2002); Atwater et al. (2002, 2007); Atwater and Waldman (1998); Bailey and Austin (2006); Bailey and Fletcher (2002); Bancroft et al. (1993); Bozeman (1997); Bracken (1994); Bracken et al. (1997, 2001); Bracken and Timmreck (1999); Brutus et al. (2006); Carson (2006); Church (1995); Church and Bracken (1997); Church and Waclawski (2001); Craig and Hannum (2006); Dai et al. (2010); Drew (2009); Farh et al. (1991); Fleenor et al. (2008, 2010); Garbett et al. (2007); Gillespie (2005); Hazucha et al. (1993); Heidemeier and Moser (2009); Hensel et al. (2010); Herold and Fields (2004); Hezlett (2008); R. Hoffman (1995); Johnson and Ferstl (1999); Lepsinger and Lucia (1997); London and Beatty (1993); London and Smither (1995); London et al. (1990, 1997); Luthans and Peterson (2003); Maylett (2009); McCarthy and Garavan (2001); McCarthy and Garavan (2007); McCauley and Moxley (1996); McEvoy and Buller (1987); Metcalfe (1998); Morgan et al. (2005); Mount et al. (1998); Ng et al. (2011); Pollack and Pollack (1996); Robertson (2008); Rogers et al. (2002); Seifert et al. (2003); Smither, London, and Reilly (2005); Testa

(2002); 3D Group (2013); Tornow (1993a, 1993b); Tyson and Ward (2004); van Hooff et al. (2006); Waldman et al. (1998); Walker and Smither (1999); Westerman and Rosse (1997); Wimer (2002); Wimer and Nowack (1998)

50. The performance evaluation process should usually include a plan for future performance, especially if performance improvement is needed, preferably with the participation of the employee to ensure commitment.

Antonioni (1996); Atwater et al. (2002, 2007); Bailey and Austin (2006); Bancroft et al. (1993); Bracken (1994); Bracken et al. (1997); Bracken and Rose (2011); Brutus et al. (2006); Carson (2006); Dai et al. (2010); Drew (2009); Fleenor et al. (2008); Flint (1999); Gillespie (2005); Hazucha et al. (1993); Herold and Fields (2004); Hezlett (2008); R. Hoffman (1995); Lepsinger and Lucia (1997); London et al. (1990); Luthans and Peterson (2003); McCarthy and Garavan (2001); McCauley and Moxley (1996); Metcalfe (1998); Morgan et al. (2005); Nowack (2009); Nowack and Mashihi (2012); O'Reilly and Furth (1994); Peiperl (2001); Pollack and Pollack (1996); Redman and Snape (1992); Rogers et al. (2002); Seifert et al. (2003); Smither, London, and Reilly (2005); Smither et al. (2003); Testa (2002); 3D Group (2013); Vinson (1996); Walker and Smither (1999); Westerman and Rosse (1997); Yukl and Lepsinger (1995)

51. The performance evaluation process should usually include a goal-setting component, preferably with the participation of the employee to ensure commitment.

Antonioni (1996); Atwater et al. (2007); Atwater and Waldman (1998); Bancroft et al. (1993); Bernardin et al. (2012); Brutus, London, and Martineau (1999); Carson (2006); Church (1995); Dai et al. (2010); DeNisi and Kluger (2000); Fleenor et al. (2008); Hezlett (2008); Lepsinger and Lucia (1997); London and Smither (1995); Maylett (2009); McCarthy and Garavan (2001); Nowack (2009); Nowack and Mashihi (2012); Reilly et al. (1996); Seifert et al. (2003); Smither et al. (2003); Smither, London, and Reilly (2005); Waldman et al. (1998)

52. The performance evaluation process should usually include a discussion and possibly a plan for career development.

Carson (2006); Hazucha et al. (1993); R. Hoffman (1995); Metcalfe (1998); Wohlers et al. (1993)

Review

53. The performance evaluation should be reviewed with the next higher level of management to get input on performance, ensure the process is administered consistently, gain approval, and other reasons.

Although noted in only one literature source (3D Group, 2013), this best practice is common and expected, but an unnecessary topic to research.

54. The performance evaluation should be documented, including the ratings, narrative comments, action plans, comments, dates of meetings, etc.

This is an obvious best practice for any HR data, but an unnecessary topic to be the subject of research.

55. An appeal mechanism should be allowed for incumbents to raise concerns to a higher level or outside authority if needed.

Barrett and Kernan (1987); Cascio and Bernardin (1981); Catano, Darr, and Campbell (2007); DeNisi (2011); Folger, Konovsky, and Cropanzano (1992); Gilliland and Langdon (1998); Grote (2000); Kleiman and Durham (1981); Kline and Sulsky (2009); Latham, Almost, Mann, and Moore (2005); Martin, Bartol, and Kehoe (2000); Martin, Bartol, and Levine (1986); Mobley (1982)

56. The process itself should be reviewed on some regular basis to determine if it is effective and to identify improvements.

Bracken and Timmreck (1999); Church and Waclawski (2001); DeNisi and Kluger (2000); Fleenor et al. (2008); Rogers et al. (2002); Wimer and Nowack (1998)

APPENDIX: REFERENCES FOR BOX 3.1

- Albright, M. D., & Levy, P. E. (1995). *The effects of source credibility and performance rating discrepancy on reactions to multiple raters*. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 25, 577–600.
- Antonioni, D. (1994). *The effects of feedback accountability on upward appraisal ratings*. *Personnel Development*, 47, 349–356.
- Antonioni, D. (1996). *Designing an effective 360-degree appraisal feedback process*. *Organizational Dynamics*, 25(2), 24–38.
- Atkins, P. W., & Wood, R. E. (2002). *Self- versus others' ratings as predictions of assessment center ratings: Validation evidence for 360-degree feedback programs*. *Personnel Psychology*, 55, 871–904.
- Atwater, L., & Brett, J. (2006). *Feedback format: Does it influence manager's reactions to feedback?* *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 79, 517–532.
- Atwater, L. E., Brett, J. F., & Charles, A. C. (2007). *Multisource feedback lessons learned and implications for practice*. *Human Resource Management*, 46(2), 285–307.
- Atwater, L. E., Ostroff, C., Yammarino, F. J., & Fleenor, J. W. (1998). *Self-other agreement: Does it really matter?* *Personnel Psychology*, 51, 577–598.
- Atwater, L., Roush, P., & Fischthal, A. (1995). *The influence of upward feedback on self- and follower ratings of leadership*. *Personnel Psychology*, 48, 35–59.
- Atwater, L. E., & Van Fleet, D. D. (1997). *Another ceiling? Can males compete for traditionally female jobs?* *Journal of Management*, 23, 603–626.
- Atwater, L., & Waldman, D. (1998). *Accountability in 360 degree feedback*. *HR Magazine*, 43(6), 1–7.
- Atwater, L. E., Waldman, D. A., Atwater, D., & Cartier, P. (2000). *An upward feedback field experiment: Supervisors' cynicism, reactions, and commitment to subordinates*. *Personnel Psychology*, 53, 275–297.
- Atwater, L. E., Waldman, D. A., & Brett, J. F. (2002). *Understanding and optimizing multisource feedback*. *Human Resource Management*, 41(2), 193–208.
- Bailey, C., & Austin, M. (2006). *360 degree feedback and developmental outcomes: The role of feedback characteristics, self-efficacy and importance of feedback dimensions to focal managers' current role*. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 14(1), 51–66.

- Bailey, C., & Fletcher, C. (2002). *The impact of multiple source feedback on management development: Findings from a longitudinal study*. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23, 853–867.
- Bancroft, E., Friedman, L., Gyr, H., Halling, C., Moravec, M., & Stoneman, K. (1993). *A 21st century communication tool*. *HR Magazine*, 38(7), 77–81.
- Baril, G. L., Ayman, R., & Palmiter, D. J. (1994). *Measuring leader behavior: Moderators of discrepant self and subordinate descriptions*. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 24(1), 82–94.
- Barrett, G. V., & Kernan, M. C. (1987). *Performance appraisal and terminations: A review of court decisions since Brito V. Zia with implications for personnel practices*. *Personnel Psychology*, 40, 489–503.
- Bass, B. M., & Yammarino, F. J. (1991). *Congruence of self and others' leadership ratings of naval officers for understanding successful performance*. *International Association of Applied Psychology*, 40(4), 437–454.
- Bernardin, J. H. (1986). *Subordinate appraisal: A valuable source of information about managers*. *Human Resource Management*, 25(3), 421–439.
- Bernardin, J. H., & Beatty, R. W. (1987). *Can subordinate appraisals enhance managerial productivity?* *Sloan Management Review*, 28(4), 63–73.
- Bernardin, J. H., Dahmus, S. A., & Redmon, G. (1993). *Attitudes of first-line supervisors toward subordinate appraisals*. *Human Resource Management*, 32(2&3), 315–324.
- Bernardin, J. H., Konopaske, R., & Hagan, C. M. (2012). *A comparison of adverse impact levels based on top-down, multisource, and assessment center data: Promoting diversity and reducing legal challenges*. *Human Resource Management*, 51(3), 313–341.
- Beyer, S. (1990). *Gender differences in the accuracy of self-evaluations of performance*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59(5), 960–970.
- Bowen, C.-C., Swim, J. K., & Jacobs, R. R. (2000). *Evaluating gender biases on actual job performance or real people: A meta-analysis*. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 30(10), 2194–2215.
- Bozeman, D. P. (1997). *Interrater agreement in multi-source performance appraisal: A commentary*. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 18, 313–316.
- Bracken, D. W. (1994). *Straight talk about multirater feedback*. *Training & Development*, 48(9), 44–51.
- Bracken, D. W., Dalton, M. A., Jako, R. A., McCauley, C. D., Pollman, V. A., & Hollenbeck, G. P. (1997). *Should 360-degree feedback be used only for developmental purposes?* Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.
- Bracken, D. W., & Rose, D. S. (2011). *When does 360-degree feedback create behavior change? And how would we know it when it does?* *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 26, 183–192.
- Bracken, D. W., & Timmreck, C. W. (1999). *Guidelines for multisource feedback when used for decision making*. *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist*, 36(4), 64–74.
- Bracken, D. W., Timmreck, C. W., Fleenor, J. W., & Summers, L. (2001). *360 feedback from another angle*. *Human Resource Management*, 40(1), 3–20.
- Brett, J. F., & Atwater, L. E. (2001). *360-degree feedback: Accuracy, reactions, and perceptions of usefulness*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 930–942.

- Brutus, S., & Derayeh, M. (2002). *Multisource assessment programs in organizations: An insider's perspective*. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 13(2), 187–202.
- Brutus, S., Derayeh, M., Fletcher, C., Bailey, C., Velazquez, P., Shi, K., et al. (2006). *Internationalization of multi-source feedback systems: A six-country exploratory analysis of 360-degree feedback*. *Human Resource Management*, 17(11), 1888–1906.
- Brutus, S., & Fecteau, J. (2003). *Short, simple, and specific: The Influence of item design characteristics in multi-source assessment contexts*. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 11(4), 313–325.
- Brutus, S., London, M., & Martineau, J. (1999). *The impact of 360-degree feedback on planning for career development*. *Journal of Management Development*, 18(8), 676–693.
- Campbell, D. J., & Lee, C. (1988). *Self-appraisal in performance evaluation: Development versus evaluation*. *Academy of Management Review*, 13(2), 302–314.
- Carless, S. A., Mann, L., & Wearing, A. J. (1998). *Leadership, managerial performance and 360-degree feedback*. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 47(4), 481–496.
- Carson, M. (2006). *Saying it like it isn't: The pros and cons of 360-degree feedback*. *Business Horizons*, 49, 395–402.
- Cascio, W. F., & Bernardin, J. H. (1981). *Implications of performance appraisal litigation for personnel decisions*. *Personnel Psychology*, 34, 211–226.
- Catano, V. M., Darr, W., & Campbell, C. A. (2007). *Performance appraisal of behavior-based competencies: A reliable and valid procedure*. *Personnel Psychology*, 60, 201–230.
- Cederblom, D., & Lounsbury, J. W. (1980). *An investigation of user acceptance of peer evaluations*. *Personnel Psychology*, 33, 567–579.
- Cheung, G. W. (1999). *Multifaceted conceptions of self-other ratings disagreement*. *Personnel Psychology*, 52, 1–36.
- Church, A. H. (1995). *First-rate multirater feedback*. *Training & Development*, 49(8), 42–43.
- Church, A. H., & Bracken, D. W. (1997). *Advancing the state of the art of 360-degree feedback*. *Group & Organization Management*, 22(2), 149–161.
- Church, A. H., Rogelberg, S. G., & Waclawski, J. (2000). *Since when is no news good news? The relationship between performance and response rates in multirater feedback*. *Personnel Psychology*, 53, 435–451.
- Church, A. H., & Waclawski, J. (1998). *The relationship between individual personality orientation and executive leadership behavior*. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 71, 99–125.
- Church, A. H., & Waclawski, J. (2001). *A five-phase framework for designing a successful multisource feedback system*. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 53(2), 82–95.
- Conway, J. M. (1996). *Analysis and design of multitrait-multirater performance appraisal studies*. *Journal of Management*, 22, 139–162.
- Conway, J. M., Lombardo, K., & Sanders, K. C. (2001). *A meta-analysis of incremental validity and nomological networks for subordinate and peer rating*. *Human Performance*, 14(4), 267–303.

- Craig, B. S., & Hannum, K. (2006). *Research update: 360-degree performance assessment*. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 58(2), 117-122.
- Dai, G., De Meuse, K. P., & Peterson, C. (2010). *Impact of multi-source feedback on leadership competency development: A longitudinal field study*. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 22(2), 197-219.
- DeNisi, A. S. (2011). *Managing performance to change behavior*. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management*, 31, 262-276.
- DeNisi, A. S., & Kluger, A. N. (2000). *Feedback effectiveness: Can 360-degree appraisals be improved?* *Academy of Management Executive*, 14(1), 129-139.
- Diefendorff, J. M., Silverman, S. B., & Greguras, G. J. (2005). *Measurement equivalence and multisource ratings for non-managerial positions: Recommendations for research and practice*. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 19(3), 399-425.
- Dominick, P. G., Reilly, R. R., & McGourty, J. W. (1997). *The effects of peer feedback on team member behavior*. *Group & Organization Management*, 22(4), 508-520.
- Drew, G. (2009). *A "360" degree view for individual leadership development*. *Journal of Management Development*, 28(7), 581-592.
- Eichinger, R. W., & Lombardo, M. M. (2004). *Patterns of rater accuracy in 360-degree feedback*. *Human Resource Planning*, 7(4), 23-25.
- Facteau, C. L., Facteau, J. D., Schoel, L. C., Russell, J. E., & Poteet, M. L. (1998). *Reactions of leaders to 360-degree feedback from subordinates and peers*. *Leadership Quarterly*, 9(4), 428-448.
- Facteau, J. D., & Craig, B. S. (2001). *Are performance appraisal ratings from different rating sources comparable?* *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 215-227.
- Farh, J. L., Cannella, A. A., & Bedeian, A. G. (1991). *Peer ratings: The impact of purpose on rating quality and user acceptance*. *Group & Organization Studies*, 16(4), 367-386.
- Farh, J. L., & Dobbins, G. H. (1989). *Effects of comparative performance information on the accuracy of self-ratings and agreement between self- and supervisor ratings*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 606-610.
- Fleenor, J. W., McCauley, C. D., & Brutus, S. (1996). *Self-other rating agreement and leader effectiveness*. *Leadership Quarterly*, 7(4), 487-506.
- Fleenor, J. W., Smither, J. W., Atwater, L. E., Braddy, P. W., & Sturm, R. E. (2010). *Self-other rating agreement in leadership: A review*. *Leadership Quarterly*, 21, 1005-1034.
- Fleenor, J. W., Taylor, S., & Chappelow, C. (2008). *Leveraging the impact of 360-degree feedback*. San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer.
- Fletcher, C., & Baldry, C. (2000). *A Study of individual differences and self-awareness in the context of multi-source feedback*. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 73, 303-319.
- Fletcher, C., Baldry, C., & Cunningham-Snell, N. (1998). *The psychometric properties of 360-degree feedback: An empirical study and a cautionary tale*. *Psychometric Properties of 360 Degree Feedback*, 6(1), 19-34.

- Fletcher, C., Taylor, P., & Glanfield, K. (1996). Acceptance of personality questionnaire feedback: The role of individual difference variables and source of interpretation. *Personal Individual Differences, 20*(2), 151–156.
- Flint, D. H. (1999). The role of organizational justice in multi-source performance appraisal: Theory-based applications and directions for research. *Human Resource Management Review, 9*(1), 1–20.
- Folger, R., Konovsky, M. A., & Cropanzano, R. (1992). A due process metaphor for performance appraisal. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 14*, 129–177.
- Fox, S., Ben-Nahum, Z., & Yinon, Y. (1989). Perceived similarity and accuracy of peer ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74*, 781–786.
- Funderburg, S. A., & Levy, P. E. (1997). The influence of individual and contextual variables on 360-degree feedback system attitudes. *Group & Organization Management, 22*(2), 210–235.
- Furnham, A., & Stringfield, P. (1994). Congruence of self and subordinate ratings of managerial practices as a correlate of supervisor evaluation. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 67*, 57–67.
- Furnham, A., & Stringfield, P. (1998). Congruence in job-performance ratings: A study of 360-degree feedback examining self, manager, peers, and consultant ratings. *Human Relations, 51*(4), 217–530.
- Garbett, R., Hardy, S., Manley, K., Titchen, A., & McCormack, B. (2007). Developing a qualitative approach to 360-degree feedback to aid understanding and development of clinical expertise. *Journal of Nursing Management, 15*, 342–347.
- Ghorpade, J. (2000). Managing five paradoxes of 360-degree feedback. *Academy of Management Executive, 14*(1), 140–150.
- Gillespie, T. L. (2005). Internationalizing 360-degree feedback: Are subordinate ratings comparable? *Journal of Business and Psychology, 19*(3), 361–382.
- Gilliland, S. W., & Langdon, J. C. (1998). Creating performance management systems that promote perceptions of fairness. In J. W. Smither (Ed.), *Performance appraisal: State of the art in practice* (pp. 209–243). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gioia, D., & Sims, H. P., Jr. (1985). Self-serving bias and actor-observer difference in organizations: An empirical analysis. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 15*(6), 547–563.
- Goffin, R. D., & Anderson, D. W. (2007). The self-rater's personality and self-other disagreement in multi-source performance ratings. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 22*(3), 271–289.
- Greguras, G. J., Ford, J. M., & Brutus, S. (2003). Manager attention to multisource feedback. *Journal of Management Development, 22*(4), 345–361.
- Greguras, G. J., Robie, C., Schleicher, D. J., & Goff III, M. (2003). A field study of the effects of rating purpose on the quality of multisource ratings. *Personnel Psychology, 56*, 1–21.
- Greller, M. M., & Herold, D. M. (1975). Sources of feedback: A preliminary investigation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 13*, 244–256.
- Grote, D. (2000). Public sector organizations: Today's innovative leaders in performance management. *Public Personnel Management, 29*, 1–20.

- Guenole, N., Cockerill, T., Chamorro-Premuzic, T., & Smillie, L. (2011). Evidence for the validity of 360 dimensions in the presence of rater-source factors. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 63(4), 203–218.
- Hannum, K. M. (2007). Measurement equivalence of 360-degree assessment data: Are different raters rating the same constructs? *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 15(3), 293–301.
- Harris, M. M., & Schaubroeck, J. (1988). A meta-analysis of self-supervisor, self-peer, and peer-supervisor ratings. *Personnel Psychology*, 41, 43–62.
- Harris, M. M., Smith, D. E., & Champagne, D. (1995). A field study of performance appraisal purpose: Research- versus administrative-based ratings. *Personnel Psychology*, 48, 151–160.
- Hazucha, J. F., Hezlett, S. A., & Schneider, R. J. (1993). The impact of 360-degree feedback on management skills development. *Human Resource Management*, 32(2/3), 325–351.
- Heidemeier, H., & Moser, K. (2009). Self-other agreement in job performance ratings: A meta-analytic test of a process model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94, 353–370.
- Hensel, R., Meijers, F., Van Der Leeden, R., & Kessels, J. (2010). 360 degree feedback: How many raters are needed for reliable ratings on the capacity to develop competences, with personal qualities as developmental goals? *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 21(15), 2813–2830.
- Herold, D. M., & Fields, D. L. (2004). Making sense of subordinate feedback for leadership development: Confounding effects of job role and organizational rewards. *Group & Organization Management*, 29, 686–703.
- Heslin, P. A., & Latham, G. P. (2004). The effect of upward feedback on managerial behavior. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 53(1), 23–37.
- Hezlett, S. A. (2008). Using multisource feedback to develop leaders: Applying theory and research to improve practice. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 10(5), 703–720.
- Hoffman, B. J., Gorman, A. C., Blair, C. A., Meriac, J. P., Overstreet, B., & Atchley, K. E. (2012). Evidence for the effectiveness of an alternative multisource performance rating methodology. *Personnel Psychology*, 65, 531–563.
- Hoffman, B. J., Lance, C. E., Bynum, B., & Gentry, W. A. (2010). Rater source effects are alive and well after all. *Personnel Psychology*, 63, 119–151.
- Hoffman, B. J., & Woehr, D. J. (2009). Disentangling the meaning of multisource performance rating source and dimension factors. *Personnel Psychology*, 62, 735–765.
- Hoffman, C. C., Nathan, B. R., & Holden, L. M. (1991). A comparison of validation criteria: Objective versus subjective performance measures and self- versus supervisor ratings. *Personnel Psychology*, 44, 601–619.
- Hoffman, R. (1995). Ten reasons you should be using 360-degree feedback. *HR Magazine*, 40(4), 1–5.
- Holzbach, R. L. (1978). Rater bias in performance ratings: Superior, self-, and peer ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 63, 579–588.

- Jellema, F., Visscher, A., & Scheerens, J. (2006). *Measuring change in work behavior by means of multisource feedback*. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 10(2), 121–139.
- Jelley, B. R., & Goffin, R. D. (2001). *Can performance-feedback accuracy be improved? Effects of rater priming and rating-scale format on rating accuracy*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 134–144.
- Johnson, J. W., & Ferstl, K. (1999). *The effects of interrater and self-other agreement on performance improvement following upward feedback*. *Personnel Psychology*, 52, 271–303.
- Kaiser, R. B., & Craig, B. S. (2005). *Building a better mouse trap: Item characteristics associated with rating discrepancies in 360-degree feedback*. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 57(4), 235–245.
- Kanouse, D. (1998, January). *Why multi-rater feedback systems fail*. *Performance Management*, p. 3.
- Kleiman, L. S., & Durham, R. L. (1981). *Performance appraisal, promotion, and the courts: A critical review*. *Personnel Psychology*, 34, 103–121.
- Kline, T. J., & Sulsky, L. M. (2009). *Measurement and assessment issues in performance appraisal*. *Canadian Psychology*, 50, 161–171.
- Lance, C. E., Hoffman, B. J., Gentry, W. A., & Baranik, L. E. (2008). *Rater source factors represent important subcomponents of the criterion construct space, not rater bias*. *Human Resource Management Review*, 18, 223–232.
- Lane, J., & Herriot, P. (1990). *Self-ratings, supervisor ratings, positions and performance*. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 77–88.
- Latham, G. P., Almost, J., Mann, S., & Moore, C. (2005). *New developments in performance management*. *Organizational Dynamics*, 34(1), 77–87.
- LeBreton, J. M., Burgess, J. R., Kaiser, R. B., Atchley, K. E., & James, L. R. (2003). *The restriction of variance hypothesis and interrater reliability and agreement: Are ratings from multiple sources really dissimilar?* *Organizational Research Methods*, 6(1), 80–128.
- Lepsinger, R., & Lucia, A. D. (1997). *360-degree feedback and performance appraisal*. *Training*, 34(9), 1–5.
- Levy, P. E., Cawley, B. D., & Foti, R. J. (1998). *Reactions to appraisal discrepancies: Performance ratings and attributions*. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 12(4), 437–455.
- Lewin, A. Y., & Zwany, A. (1976). *Peer nominations: A model, literature critique and a paradigm for research*. *Personnel Psychology*, 29, 423–447.
- London, M., & Beatty, R. W. (1993). *360-degree feedback as a competitive advantage*. *Human Resource Management*, 32(2&3), 353–372.
- London, M., & Smither, J. W. (1995). *Can multi-source feedback change perceptions of goal accomplishment, self-evaluations, and performance-related outcomes? Theory-based applications and directions for research*. *Personnel Psychology*, 48, 803–839.
- London, M., & Smither, J. W. (2002). *Feedback orientation, feedback culture, and the longitudinal performance management process*. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12, 81–100.
- London, M., Smither, J. W., & Adsit, D. J. (1997). *Accountability: The Achilles' heel of multisource feedback*. *Group & Organization Management*, 22(2), 162–184.

- London, M., & Wohlers, A. J. (1991). Agreement between subordinate and self-ratings in upward feedback. *Personnel Psychology*, 44, 375–390.
- London, M., Wohlers, A. J., & Gallagher, P. (1990). A feedback approach to management development. *Journal of Management Development*, 9, 17–31.
- Luthans, F., & Peterson, S. J. (2004). 360-degree feedback with systematic coaching: Empirical analysis suggests a winning combination. *Human Resource Management*, 42(3), 243–256.
- Manning, T., Pogson, G., & Morrison, Z. (2009). Interpersonal influence in the workplace: Influencing behavior and 360-degree assessments. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 41(5), 258–269.
- Martin, D. C., Bartol, K. M., & Kehoe, P. E. (2000). The legal ramifications of performance appraisal: The growing significance. *Public Personnel Management*, 29, 379–405.
- Martin, D. C., Bartol, K. M., & Levine, M. J. (1986). The legal ramifications of performance appraisal. *Employee Relations Law Journal*, 12, 370–396.
- Maurer, T. J., Raju, N. S., & Collins, W. C. (1998). Peer and subordinate performance appraisal measurement equivalence. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 693–702.
- Maylett, T. (2009). 360-degree feedback revisited: The transition from development to appraisal. *Compensation & Benefits Review*, 41, 52–59.
- McCarthy, A. M., & Garavan, T. N. (2001). 360[degree] feedback process: Performance, improvement, and employee career development. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 25(1), 5–32.
- McCarthy, A. M., & Garavan, T. N. (2007). Understanding acceptance of multisource feedback for management development. *Personnel Review*, 36(6), 903–917.
- McCauley, C. D., & Moxley, R. S., Jr. (1996). Developmental 360: How feedback can make managers more effective. *Career Development International*, 1, 15–19.
- McEvoy, G. M., & Buller, P. F. (1987). User accepting of peer appraisals in an industrial setting. *Personnel Psychology*, 40, 785–797.
- Mobley, W. H. (1982). Supervisor and employee race and sex effects on performance appraisals: A field study of adverse impact and generalizability. *Academy of Management Journal*, 25, 598–606.
- Morgan, A., Cannan, K., & Cullinane, J. (2005). 360-degree feedback: A critical enquiry. *Personnel Review*, 34(6), 663–680.
- Mount, M. K., Judge, T. A., Scullen, S. E., Sytsma, M. R., & Hezlett, S. A. (1998). Trait, rater and level effects in 360-degree performance ratings. *Personnel Psychology*, 51, 557–576.
- Mount, M. K., Barrick, M. R., & Strauss, P. J. (1994). Validity of observer ratings of the big five personality factors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 272–280.
- Ng, K.-Y., Koh, C., Ang, S., Kennedy, J. C., & Chan, K.-Y. (2011). Rating leniency and halo in multisource feedback ratings: Testing cultural assumptions of power distance and individualism-collectivism. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96, 1033–1044.
- Nilsen, D., & Campbell, D. P. (1993). Self-observer rating discrepancies: Once an overrater, always an overrater? *Human Resource Management*, 32(2&3), 265–281.
- Nowack, K. M. (1992). Self-assessment and rater-assessment as a dimension of management development. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 3(2), 141–155.

- Nowack, K. M. (2009). *Leveraging multirater feedback to facilitate successful behavioral change*. Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 61(4), 280–297.
- Nowack, K. M., & Mashih, S. (2012). *Evidence-based answers to 15 questions about leveraging 360-degree feedback*. Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 64(3), 157–182.
- O'Reilly, B., & Furth, J. (1994). *360 feedback can change your life*. Fortune, 130(8), 93–100.
- Ostroff, C., Atwater, L. E., & Feinberg, B. J. (2004). *Understanding self-other agreement: A look at rater and ratee characteristics, context, and outcomes*. Personnel Psychology, 57, 333–375.
- Peiperl, M. A. (2001). *Getting 360-degree feedback right*. Best Practice, 79(1), 142–147, 177.
- Penny, J. A. (2003). *Exploring differential item functioning in a 360-degree assessment: Rater source and method of delivery*. Organizational Research Methods, 6(1), 61–79.
- Pollack, D. M., & Pollack, L. J. (1996). *Using 360-degree feedback in performance appraisal*. Public Personnel Management, 25, 507–528.
- Redman, T., & Snape, E. (1992). *Upward and onward: Can staff appraise their managers?* Personnel Review, 21(7), 32–46.
- Reilly, R. R., Smither, J. W., & Vasilopoulos, N. L. (1996). *A longitudinal study of upward feedback*. Personnel Psychology, 49, 599–612.
- Riggio, R. E., & Cole, E. J. (1992). *Agreement between subordinate and superior ratings of supervisory performance and effects on self and subordinate job satisfaction*. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 65, 151–158.
- Robertson, C. (2008). *Employee development: Getting the information you need through a 360-degree feedback report*. Chemical Engineering, 115(4), 63–66.
- Rogers, E. E., Rogers, C. W., & Metlay, W. (2002). *Improving the payoff from 360-degree feedback*. Human Resource Planning, 25(3), 44–54.
- Rosti, R. T., & Shipper, F., Jr. (1998). *A study of the impact of training in a management development program based on 360 feedback*. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 13(1), 77–89.
- Sala, F., & Dwight, S. A. (2002). *Predicting executive performance with multirater surveys: Whom you ask makes a difference*. Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 54(3), 166–172.
- Salam, S., Cox, J. F., & Sims, H. P., Jr. (1997). *In the eye of the beholder: How leadership relates to 360-degree performance ratings*. Group & Organization Management, 22(2), 185–209.
- Schrader, B. W., & Steiner, D. D. (1996). *Common comparison standards: An approach to improving agreement between self and supervisory performance ratings*. Journal of Applied Psychology, 81, 813–820.
- Schuler, R. S., & Jackson, S. E. (1987). *Linking competitive strategies with human resource management practices*. Academy of Management Executive, 1, 207–219.
- Scullen, S. E. (1997). *When ratings from one source have been average, but ratings from another source have not: Problems and solutions*. Journal of Applied Psychology, 82, 880–888.
- Seifert, C. F., & Yukl, G. (2010). *Effects of repeated multi-source feedback on the influence behavior and effectiveness of managers: A field experiment*. The Leadership Quarterly, 21, 856–866.

- Seifert, C. F., Yukl, G., & McDonald, R. A. (2003). *Effects of multisource feedback and a feedback facilitator on the influence behavior of managers toward subordinates*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 561–569.
- Shrauger, S. J., & Kelly, R. J. (1988). *Global self-evaluation and changes in self-description as a function of information discrepancy and favorability*. *Journal of Psychology*, 56(4), 709–728.
- Shrauger, S. J., & Terbovic, M. L. (1976). *Self-evaluation and assessments of performance by self and others*. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 44(4), 564–572.
- Siegel, L. (1982). *Paired comparison evaluations of managerial effectiveness by peers and supervisors*. *Personnel Psychology*, 35, 843–852.
- Smith, A. F., & Fortunato, V. J. (2008). *Factors influencing employee intentions to provide honest upward feedback ratings*. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 22, 191–207.
- Smither, J. W. (2008). *What do leaders recall about their multisource feedback*. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 14(3), 202–212.
- Smither, J. W., Brett, J. F., & Atwater, L. E. (2008). *What do leaders recall about their multisource feedback?* *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 14(3), 202–218.
- Smither, J. W., London, M., Flautt, R., Vargas, Y., & Kucine, I. (2003). *Can working with an executive coach improve multisource feedback ratings over time? A quasi-experimental field study*. *Personnel Psychology*, 56, 23–44.
- Smither, J. W., London, M., & Reilly, R. R. (2005). *Does performance improve following multisource feedback? A theoretical model, meta-analysis, and review of empirical findings*. *Personnel Psychology*, 58, 33–66.
- Smither, J. W., London, M., Reilly, R. R., Flautt, R., Vargas, Y., & Kucine, I. (2004). *Emerald article: Discussing multisource feedback with raters and performance improvement*. *Journal of Management Development*, 23(5), 456–468.
- Smither, J. W., London, M., & Richmond, K. R. (2005). *The relationship between leaders' personality and their reactions to and use of multisource feedback*. *Group & Organization Management*, 30(2), 181–210.
- Smither, J. W., London, M., Vasilopoulos, N. L., Reilly, R. R., Millsap, R. E., & Salvemini, N. (1995). *An examination of the effects of an upward feedback program over time*. *Personnel Psychology*, 48, 1–34.
- Steiner, D. D., & Rain, J. S. (1989). *Immediate and delayed primacy and recency effects in performance evaluations*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74(1), 136–142.
- Stone, E. F., & Stone, D. L. (1984). *The Effects of multiple sources of performance feedback and feedback favorability on self-perceived task competence and perceived feedback accuracy*. *Journal of Management*, 10, 371–378.
- Testa, M. R. (2002). *A model for organization-based 360 degree leadership assessment*. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 23(5), 260–268.
- Thomason, S. J., Weeks, M., Bernardin, J. H., & Kane, J. (2011). *The differential focus of supervisors and peers in evaluations of managerial potential*. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 19(1), 82–97.

- 3D Group. (2013). *Current practices in 360 degree feedback: A benchmark study of North American companies*. Emeryville, CA: Author.
- Toegel, G., & Conger, J. A. (2003). *360-Degree assessment: Time for reinvention*. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 2(3), 297–311.
- Tornow, W. W. (1993a). *Editor's note: Introduction to special issue on 360-degree feedback*. *Human Resource Management*, 32(2), 211–219.
- Tornow, W. W. (1993b). *Perceptions or reality: Is multi-perspective measurement a means or an end?* *Human Resource Management*, 32(2), 221–229.
- Tyson, S., & Ward, P. (2004). *The use of 360 degree feedback technique in the evaluation of management development*. *Management Learning*, 35(2), 205–223.
- van der Heijden, B. I., & Nijhof, A. H. (2004). *The value of subjectivity: Problems and prospects for 360-degree appraisal systems*. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 15(3), 493–511.
- van Hooft, E. A., van der Flier, H., & Minne, M. R. (2006). *Construct validity of multi-source performance ratings: An examination of the relationship of self-, supervisor, and peer-ratings with cognitive and personality measures*. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 14(1), 67–81.
- Van Velsor, E. V., Taylor, S., & Leslie, J. B. (1993). *An examination of the relationships among self-perception accuracy, self-awareness, gender, and leader effectiveness*. *Human Resource Management*, 32(2), 249–263.
- Varela, O. E., & Premeaux, S. F. (2008). *Do cross-cultural values affect multisource feedback dynamics? The case of high power distance and collectivism in two Latin American countries*. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 16(2), 134–142.
- Vecchio, R. P., & Anderson, R. J. (2009). *Agreement in self-other ratings of leader effectiveness: The role of demographics and personality*. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 17(2), 165–179.
- Vinson, M. N. (1996). *The pros and cons of 360-degree feedback: Making it work*. *Training & Development*, 50(4), 11–12.
- Viswesvaran, C., Schmidt, F. L., & Ones, D. S. (2002). *The moderating influence of job performance dimensions on convergence of supervisory and peer ratings of job performance: Unconfounding construct-level convergence and rating difficulty*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 345–354.
- Waldman, D. A. (1997). *Predictors of employee preferences for multirater and group-based performance appraisal*. *Group & Organization Management*, 22(2), 264–287.
- Waldman, D. A., & Atwater, L. E. (2001). *Attitudinal and behavioral outcomes of an upward feedback process*. *Group & Organization Management*, 26(2), 189–205.
- Waldman, D. A., Atwater, L. E., & Antonioni, D. (1998). *Has 360 degree feedback gone amok?* *Academy of Management Executive*, 12(2), 86–94.
- Waldman, D. A., & Bowen, D. E. (1998). *The acceptability of 360 degree appraisals: A customer-supplier relationship perspective*. *Human Resource Management*, 37(2), 117–129.
- Walker, A. G., & Smither, J. W. (1999). *A five-year study of upward feedback: What managers do with their results matters*. *Personnel Psychology*, 52, 393–423.

- Westerman, J. W., & Rosse, J. G. (1997). *Reducing the threat of rater nonparticipation in 360-degree feedback systems*. *Group & Organization Management*, 22(2), 288–309.
- Williams, J. R., & Johnson, M. A. (2000). *Self-supervisor agreement: The influence of feedback seeking on the relationship between self and supervisor ratings of performance*. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 30(2), 275–292.
- Williams, J. R., & Levy, P. E. (1992). *The effects of perceived system knowledge on the agreement between self-ratings and supervisor ratings*. *Personnel Psychology*, 45, 835–847.
- Wimer, S. (2002). *The dark side of 360-degree feedback*. *Training and Development*, 56(9), 37–42.
- Wimer, S., & Nowack, K. M. (1998). *13 common mistakes using 360-degree feedback*. *Training and Development*, 52(5), 69–80.
- Woehr, D. J., Sheehan, K. M., & Bennett, W., Jr. (2005). *Assessing measurement equivalence across rating sources: A multitrait-multirater approach*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 592–600.
- Wohlrs, A. J., Hall, M. J., & London, M. (1993). *Subordinates rating managers: Organizational and demographic correlates of self/subordinate agreement*. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 66, 263–275.
- Wohlrs, A. J., & London, M. (1989). *Ratings of managerial characteristics: Evaluation difficulty, co-worker agreement, and self-awareness*. *Personnel Psychology*, 42, 235–261.
- Yammarino, F. J. (2003). *Modern data analytic techniques for multisource feedback*. *Organizational Research Methods*, 6(1), 6–14.
- Yammarino, F. J., & Atwater, L. E. (1993). *Understanding self-perception accuracy: Implications for human resource management*. *Human Resource Management*, 32(2), 231–247.
- Yammarino, F. J., & Atwater, L. E. (1997). *Implications of self-other rating agreement for human resources management*. *Organizational Dynamics*, 35–44.
- Yukl, G., & Lepsinger, R. (1995). *How to get the most out of 360 degree feedback*. *Training*, 45–50.

Strategic Considerations

Strategic considerations include practices that ensure 360s are used to link PM to other important elements within the organization that influence whether the organization's strategy—both its overall business strategy and its talent management strategy—can be effectively pursued. Aligning PM practices with organizational strategy is important because well-conducted PM dictates effective succession planning and setting the stage for organizations to meet long-term goals. There are three notable practices in this category.

First and foremost, 360s should be integrated with other human resource management (HRM) systems, such as compensation or promotion. This is the most researched best practice in this category, with 43 citations. Secondary to this, with 35 citations, is making sure that the use of 360s is aligned with the organizational culture. For example, organizations with cultures focused on learning and development where there is a high level of trust and cohesion among employees and supervisors will be more successful

using 360s than cultures that are more siloed or competitive (Moravec, Gyr, & Friedman, 1993). Finally, clearly defining the purpose, policies, procedures, and uses of data for managers and employees will help quell concerns. Transparency around potentially sensitive processes will lessen concerns of distributive or procedural injustice.

Future research is needed to expand this category. For example, an interesting research direction would be to consider the jobs, industries, or organizational types in which 360s are not ideal. This type of assessment generally requests that raters reflect on behaviors of the focal leader (London, Wohlers, & Gallagher, 1990); however, many jobs are completed for the most part, if not entirely, in isolation (e.g., truck drivers, car salespeople). These jobs leave little to be evaluated beyond objective outputs and communication response rates (e.g., responding to emails in a timely manner). Using data from O*NET OnLine, future research should look at occupations with little human interaction to begin to explore ways in which these individuals can be evaluated. Building on this, the sheer number of independent workers and small business owners may render the use of 360s illogical. This evaluation method caters to the more traditional perception of what an organization is while inadvertently neglecting nontraditional workers (e.g., startups). It is unlikely that these workers do not want to be evaluated or developed so much as they do not have the resources to do it themselves. Therefore, future research should examine alternative strategies for emerging companies.

Items

The second category, items, includes practices specific to how items are developed, their content and psychometric properties, and so on. Consistent with research on developing questions for interviews, it is critical that the items for 360s used for PM are grounded in theory, requiring that raters reflect on behaviors strictly related to the job an employee performs, not traits such as his or her level of likeability.

Not surprisingly, the most researched practice of this category, with 58 citations, is that items must be highly job related to support the validity of using 360s. This can be accomplished by basing 360 items on a job analysis, on a competency model, or at the very least on generic job requirements applicable to the job (e.g., leadership). This best practice may be the most important one of the entire 56 listed in this chapter. Without valid items, the entire process is useless. Second, with 41 citations, is that the items need to refer to specific and observable behaviors to limit raters from extrapolating beyond how the employee acts. Finally, items should include a broad range of behaviors to capture

the scope of the individual's performance within his or her job, and it is ideal if the items can be written with the language generally used in the organization to ensure common understanding across raters.

Opportunities for future research in this area are rife. Specifically, one major contribution would be to find an effective, practical, and empirically supported way to integrate the legal and psychometric considerations of 360s with the limitations of organizations. For example, theory would suggest that 360s would benefit from examining how to best translate a job description into behaviorally anchored items from the various perspectives of the sources given that successful performance of a task may look one way to the supervisor and another way to a peer.

It should be noted, however, that while creating items tailored to each job is most psychometrically sound, it may be impractical. Similar to traditional performance appraisals, items tend to be standardized across positions, and designing items specific to a job can be time consuming and costly. As such, while it is optimal items be created directly from job descriptions to ensure validity, it may be more practical to revise items according to functional area or department so they can be used across a larger number of employees while maintaining some job specifics.

Scales

One of the main issues with traditional PM approaches is that they do not allow for differentiation among employees. To create an effective PM system using 360s, then, it is worth spending time considering the scales used to ascertain differentiation and increase variance in scores across employees.

Of great importance is the type of scales used to distinguish between levels of performance. There is evidence to suggest that relative scoring, where raters are asked to compare the focal leader to another employee, is superior to using absolute rating scales (Goffin & Olson, 2011). Similarly, Hoffman et al. (2012) found that providing frame-of-reference scales (FORSSs) for raters with specific behaviors on the scales, rather than just on the anchors, resulted in less measurement error and less overlap. Further, in line with existing research on best practices for PM, it is necessary that the rating scale is clearly understood by everyone involved to ensure reliability, validity, and perceptions of fairness (also see Chapter 15).

While there are obvious concerns regarding using another employee as a referent (e.g., similar to grading on a curve, you are measuring relative ability vs. actual ability), future research should expand on existing work to provide a clearer referent by which

raters can evaluate the focal leader (Hoffman et al., 2012). Moreover, it may be useful to utilize a number of different scales (e.g., FORS, absolute) to derive the most information on the focal leader.

Raters

What sets 360s apart from traditional evaluation systems—whether designed for development or PM—is that it attempts to increase reliability of ratings by triangulating among several viewpoints and allows for a more comprehensive illustration of the focal leader’s performance. Thus, raters are a critical component in the successful implementation of 360s, and choosing raters to participate is one of the most important decisions.

In addition to there being several raters, as the name of the system implies, they should be appropriately included such that managers should carefully consider whether an individual’s perspective will contribute above and beyond the existing perspectives. Traditionally, raters include peers, subordinates, supervisors, and customers. However, it is crucial employees are afforded the opportunity to rate themselves. Not only does this increase perceptions of fairness, but also discrepancies between self and other ratings provide an opportunity for the focal leader to develop greater self-awareness. Finally, rater anonymity is encouraged but can vary depending on the purpose of the 360s. For example, a majority of research on 360s states that raters should, in no uncertain terms, be anonymous to allow raters to be completely honest without fear of retribution (Bracken, Timmreck, Fleenor, & Summers, 2001). The use of software to collect 360s ratings now makes anonymity difficult, so it is recommended that feedback remains confidential. However, there are instances in which knowing the source allows for more specific feedback (Antonioni, 1996).

An overlooked occurrence in the 360 literature is the assumption that raters, given anonymity and a proper understanding of the process, will be sufficiently motivated to participate. As is commonplace in data collection in the social sciences (e.g., Rose, Sidle, & Griffith, 2007), incentives may have a place in 360s should there be difficulty obtaining raters, particularly customer ratings. Research on customer surveys suggest that customers self-select into surveys, potentially introducing a systematic error due to the lack of representativeness in the sample (Lin & Jones, 1997). This problem could be reduced by offering meaningful incentives that appeal to a larger demographic, potentially yielding a more representative sample and a higher response rate (Cobanoglu & Cobanoglu, 2003).

Administration

Administration refers to the procedure of implementing 360s. Using 360s for PM purposes is a substantial endeavor. From identifying raters and training appropriate parties to managing the data and interpreting feedback, 360s cost organizations time, for which they will never be reimbursed if 360s are administered poorly and ineffectively. In this category are best practices that address the frequency with which 360s should be implemented, the burden they place on workers, and ways to maintain perceptions of procedural justice.

Timing of 360s administration is perhaps the most important consideration for several reasons. First, 360s should be conducted at a time when the data will be used for personnel decisions, such as promotions or pay increases. Doing so allows the most up-to-date information regarding performance to be examined and applied in these decisions. Further, the link between performance and outcomes for employees will be clearer given the recent nature of the appraisal, which can help to increase perceptions of procedural fairness in pay and promotion decisions. Second, it is important 360s are conducted with regularity because development is incremental and a function of the frequency of feedback. While 360s are time consuming and should be administered on an annual basis, there should be midyear follow-ups and other intermediate reviews to maintain progress toward goals set as a result of the 360s (Antonioni, 1996). For example, in a field study of managerial development, Seifert and Yukl (2010) found that supervisors who received repeated feedback were rated as more effective managers than those who did not. Finally, those in charge of administering 360s should make sure the process is not unduly burdensome. For example, consider a manager who has 10 subordinates. Asking the manager to rate all 10 subordinates requires his or her time and energy. Instead, scholars suggest that should the feedback not be used for pay and promotion decisions in the immediate future, managers should stagger administration so they do not have to rate all 10 employees at once (Brutus & Derayeh, 2002).

While there is a general understanding that 360s cost time, money, and energy, this has not been thoroughly examined by researchers (Atwater, Brett, & Charles, 2007). We suggest future research analyzes the costs associated with 360s and maps them onto behavioral differences (e.g., skill development) as a result of the feedback and midyear reviews. This will provide further evidence that the investment of 360s pays off over time and yields increased pay and promotions, as well as increased productivity for the organization. It may be that focal employees or raters who do not take the system seriously, or do not engage in the process fully, will be more committed if they were aware of the exact costs and value of participating in 360s.

Training/Instruction

As noted, 360s are a complex evaluation mechanism with many moving parts. Therefore, proper training on how to implement, complete, and interpret data is required for the program to be successful and for the information collected to be useful. There are three key groups that require training: the individuals managing the process, the raters, and the focal leaders.

To lessen the burden of 360s on raters and focal leaders, well-trained managers of the process will be able to streamline it more effectively, find solutions to issues during administration, and ideally decrease the amount of time between ratings and interpretation. Further, by training the raters and the employees receiving feedback, organizations reduce the chance of large discrepancies between self- and other ratings, which have several potential negative consequences. First, employees may be less likely to trust the procedure, the information gathered, and their supervisors if ratings among raters (i.e., self vs. other, other vs. other) differ too much. A critical factor in the success of 360s is employee buy-in (Atwater et al., 2007), so it is important that managers of the process be trained to seek explanations regarding why differences occur by meeting with other raters. Understanding discrepancies in ratings will be beneficial when communicating feedback to the focal leader being evaluated. Second, inaccuracies in ratings may not provide enough useful information to pinpoint areas of possible development, marking a missed opportunity for the employee and the organization (Atkins & Wood, 2002). Therefore, training raters on the instruments—and more specifically creating a common mental model of the scales used—increases reliability of the responses (Guenole, Cockerill, Chamorro-Premuzic, & Smillie, 2011).

Research on training and instruction is fairly straightforward: Make sure everyone involved in the process is well trained. However, scholars remain concerned that raters may still suffer from emotional responses to the focal leader (Robbins & DeNisi, 1994). As such, biases such as leniency and halo remain threats to the effectiveness of the 360 system. Perhaps including items after the evaluation that are related to the raters' relationships to the ratee (e.g., How long have you two worked together? Do you spend time together outside work? Do you consider this person a friend?) would allow those who analyze the data to control for such biases. While this concept is in direct contradiction to the best practice of ensuring 360s remain anonymous or at least confidential (perceived or actual) from the perspective of the rater, interestingly, it may serve as a safeguard for organizations, allowing them to control for social context issues affecting accuracy after the fact, and it may ensure raters provide more accurate ratings to begin with as questions such as these may suggest to them that these factors are being taken into account. Comparing

organizations that consider social effects with organizations that adhere to more traditional 360s that maintain rater anonymity is an area with many possibilities for future research and would make an important contribution to the theory and practice of 360s.

Interpretation of Feedback

Of all the categories from our literature review, interpretation of feedback comprises the most recommendations, with 13 practices (the second most populated category is raters). The best practices in this category include various approaches not only to help employees understand the information from raters, but also to ensure that it is received well enough to be internalized and used to help the employee develop and perform better.

Yielding more than 110 citations, the most commonly researched practice is meaningfully interpreting differences in feedback from different sources and between self and others. As mentioned, discrepancies between self- and other ratings, particularly where other ratings are notably more negative than self-ratings, risk poor reception. However, meaningful interpretation alone is potentially not sufficient to guarantee positive outcomes. Paired with other best practices, such as considering the focal leader's individual differences or coaching, can significantly increase the effectiveness of 360s (e.g., Bono & Colbert, 2005; Luthans & Peterson, 2003). Finally, while in general the feedback provided to employees about their performance is helpful, including information about where the employee stands relative to other employees can aid in their interpretation of feedback. Humans are social creatures who naturally compare themselves to others (Festinger, 1954). Therefore, by placing the employees' results of the 360s within the context of other important factors (e.g., coworker performance; Antonioni, 1996) and objective performance data (e.g., sales, errors; Eichinger & Lombardo, 2004), managers can create a more complete picture of their employees' performance. This allows focal leaders to identify which steps they need to take to be more productive (Carver & Scheier, 1982) and introduces potential role models (i.e., high-performing coworkers).

Future research is needed to expand this category. Building from work by Shipper, Hoffman, and Rotondo (2007), as well as Eckert, Ekelund, Gentry, and Dawson (2010), scholars should explore interpretation across national cultures. While feedback has overwhelmingly been considered an important mechanism for employee development and performance (e.g., Hackman & Oldham, 1975), this finding is likely specific to Western ideals. Cultures generally have strong norms regarding expectations of feedback. For example, the idea of "saving face" is a central tenet of Asian cultures, yielding a sensitivity to raw personal feedback that could reflect poorly on one's family or community (Kim & Nam, 1998). It may be that multinational enterprises (MNEs) or multicultural

organizations within the United States need to accommodate the diverse set of values by taking steps such as guaranteeing restricted access to 360 results, limiting meetings about results to essential personnel, or providing feedback in writing before consulting the focal leader in person to allow him or her the chance to emotionally process the information in private.

Development

While the original intent of 360s was for development purposes, over time the method has migrated to being used for PM (Maylett, 2009). However, scholars recommend that it is used simultaneously to assess and develop employees. To evaluate an employee's performance without the intent of developing him or her is a wasted opportunity for the employee and the organization. As such, this category includes best practices regarding the use of 360s for development.

For example, scholars suggest that it is a best practice that, even when 360s are used for PM, the employee should also receive resources for development. In so doing, focal leaders will be more likely to perceive organizational and managerial support of their role in the company and potentially strengthen their willingness to use feedback from 360s (Smither, London, & Reilly, 2005). Further, when identified as a competency for development and provided appropriate support and resources, research shows individuals will be more likely to focus on gaining those skills (Dai, De Meuse, & Peterson, 2010). Perhaps most critical to actual development, however, is planning. Assuming other best practices have been following—items and scales are clear, raters are trained, and employees are invested—the feedback only becomes actionable when employees work with their managers or coaches to create development goals (Smither, London, Flautt, Vargas, & Kucine, 2003).

This category could benefit from research that considers the employees' workplace network. Social capital is an incredibly powerful force that can be used to gain employment (Granovetter, 1973), access resources (Burt, 1992), harness needed social support, and provide access to alternative ideas, potentially yielding greater performance and creativity (Reagans, Zuckerman, & McEvily, 2004). Therefore, it is reasonable to theorize that an employee's connections at work can contribute to his or her development. While the best practices in this category offer recommendations regarding how managers can provide all needed resources for employee development, employees at the same level who reach out to each other for assistance in gaining a new skill or practicing an existing one may be better resources given equal status and similar experiences in the organization. Future research should examine how individuals armed with feedback from their

360s seek advice from their workplace networks and whether relying on the network yields more sustained behavioral changes.

Review

The final category includes practices related to sending the results to appropriate higher level managers and maintaining the system for future use. This category is important because it highlights oft-forgotten follow-ups that ensure procedural effectiveness and perceptions of executives not directly involved in PM that the system is working.

There are two best practices illustrative of this category. First, just as the 360 provides a mechanism for employees to reflect on their performance and set development goals, so should there be a mechanism to evaluate the effectiveness of the 360 system itself (Bracken & Timmreck, 1999). Second, given these data are recorded and stored for future reference, there should be an appeal mechanism for focal leaders to raise concerns about ratings or the process in general. Importantly, such an option increases perceptions of procedural justice (Latham, Almost, Mann, & Moore, 2005).

While there is some concern that employees who perceive unfairness in 360s, particularly when the outcomes are high stakes (e.g., increased pay or promotions), may consider legal action (Martin, Bartol, & Kehoe, 2000), the more prevalent threat resulting from perceived unfairness is reduced productivity or voluntary turnover. Luthans and Peterson (2003) found that with feedback and regular coaching, focal leaders' turnover intentions significantly decreased from before the 360s were conducted. It is possible, then, that poorly addressed discrepancies in self- and other ratings and a lack of meaningful interpretations can lead an employee to perceive procedural injustice. Future research should examine the consequences of perceived unfairness to assess potential outcomes. Such an exploration will help pinpoint weak points in the process and potentially assist individuals in identifying solutions when there are significant perceptions of injustice to reduce the probability of poor performance or intent to turnover.

DISCUSSION

Performance management is at the heart of HRM systems as it is responsible for managing and enhancing the use of an organization's human capital to achieve an organization's goals. Yet, despite its centrality to HRM, PM is plagued by three issues that limit its effective implementation and earning it the reputation of being the "Achilles heel" of HRM (Pulakos & O'Leary, 2011). First, performance ratings tend to be unreliable given that it is largely the duty of the manager to provide a rating about

an employee (Murphy & Cleveland, 1995). Second, ratings tend to be biased and do not differentiate employees (e.g., Roberson, Galvin, & Charles, 2007; Steiner & Rain, 1989). Finally, such bias leads to employee perceptions of unfairness and a lack of user acceptance (Folger, Konovsky, & Cropanzano, 1992). Moreover, by basing these evaluations on the input of a single respondent, the amount of information garnered and utilized is often low, neglecting potentially critical social and contextual factors relevant to the evaluation itself (Levy & Williams, 2004), as well as ignoring opportunities for development.

We propose that 360s offer a way in which organizations can overcome these shortcomings of traditional PM. Further, when used in a manner consistent with the best practices outlined in this chapter, we propose they may enable PM systems to better capture and create value in two important ways (Edwards & Ewen, 1996). First, their use, if it is consistent with these best practices, may allow an organization to derive more value by exploiting human capital resources (HCRs) already in existence within it. For example, this may include sending strong signals about which behaviors are desired, effectively measuring employee performance, and so on.

Second, a PM system may be able to better create value by rapidly altering the nature of HCRs within the organization (e.g., in response to environmental or organizational changes). For example, this may include the ability to quickly acquire information regarding changes in work requirements, redefine roles, and motivate individuals to acquire knowledge, skills, abilities, and other characteristics (KSAOs) relevant to enacting these roles. Consistent with March's (1991) argument that the most competitive firms strike a balance between exploitation and exploration, the best PM systems are likely capable of both, making them ambidextrous.

Finally, Ennen and Richter (2010) suggest that some complementarities among organizational practices exist by virtue of another factor. Here, we propose that if 360s are incorporated into PM in a manner consistent with the best practices, then they create a powerful complementarity between performance appraisal and training and development within the PM system. This enables it to impact individual and, potentially, unit-level outcomes more strongly. For example, 360s extract information from a greater number of role partners (e.g., supervisor, peers, subordinates, customers). Because of this, they are more precise about pinpointing which KSAOs are relevant to individual and unit-level outcomes and measure their behavioral demonstration more accurately. Similarly, 360s allow for less external attributions to be made by employees. Thus, they may more strongly motivate employees to develop desired behaviors, thus impacting the accessibility of their KSAOs to the unit in which they work and their capacities to perform.

CONCLUSION

In summation, the implementation of 360s is a well-researched topic that yields 56 best practices to most effectively use this system as a method for PM and a mechanism for development. The key insights from this chapter are as follows:

- Align the use of 360s with the organization's strategies.
- Create items that are job related and anchored in observable behaviors.
- Appropriately select raters and always allow focal leaders to rate themselves.
- Should results from 360s be used for pay and promotion decisions, conduct them as temporally close to those decisions as possible.
- Make sure ratings are confidential.
- Train managers of process to examine underlying reasons for notable discrepancies across raters.
- Train managers to provide meaningful interpretations for the focal leader.
- Do not forget to review the 360 system as a whole for inefficiencies.

REFERENCES

- Antonioni, D. (1996). Designing an effective 360-degree appraisal feedback process. *Organizational Dynamics*, 25(2), 24–38.
- Atkins, P. W., & Wood, R. E. (2002). Self- versus others' ratings as predictions of assessment center ratings: Validation evidence for 360-degree feedback programs. *Personnel Psychology*, 55, 871–904.
- Atwater, L. E., Brett, J. F., & Charles, A. C. (2007). Multisource feedback lessons learned and implications for practice. *Human Resource Management*, 46(2), 285–307.
- Bono, J. E., & Colbert, A. E. (2005). Understanding responses to multi-source feedback: The role of core self-evaluations. *Personal Psychology*, 58(1), 171–203.
- Bracken, D. W., & Timmreck, C. W. (1999). Guidelines for multisource feedback when used for decision making. *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist*, 36(4), 64–74.
- Bracken, D. W., Timmreck, C. W., Fleenor, J. W., & Summers, L. (2001). 360 feedback from another angle. *Human Resource Management*, 40(1), 3–20.
- Brutus, S., & Derayeh, M. (2002). Multisource assessment programs in organizations: An insider's perspective. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 13(2), 187–202.
- Burt, R. S. (1992). *Structural holes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Campion, M. C., Campion, E. D., & Campion, M. A. (2015). Improvements in performance management through the use of 360 feedback. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 8(1), 85–93.
- Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (1982). Control theory: A useful conceptual framework for personality-social, clinical, and health psychology. *Psychological Bulletin*, 92(1), 111–135.
- Cobanoglu, C., & Cobanoglu, N. (2003). The effect of incentives in web surveys: Application and ethical considerations. *International Journal of Market Research*, 45(4), 475–488.
- Dai, G., De Meuse, K. P., & Peterson, C. (2010). Impact of multi-source feedback on leadership competency development: A longitudinal field study. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 22(2), 197–219.
- DeNisi, A. S., & Kluger, A. N. (2000). Feedback effectiveness: Can 360-degree appraisals be improved? *Academy of Management Executive*, 14(1), 129–139.

- Edwards, M. R., & Ewen, A. J. (1996). *360 feedback: The powerful new model for employee assessment & performance improvement*. New York, NY: Amacom.
- Eckert, R., Ekelund, B. Z., Gentry, W. A., & Dawson, J. F. (2010). "I don't see you like you see me, but is that a problem?" Cultural influences on rating discrepancy in 360-degree feedback instruments. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 19*(3), 259–278.
- Eichinger, R. W., & Lombardo, M. M. (2004). Patterns of rater accuracy in 360-degree feedback. *Human Resource Planning, 7*(4), 23–25.
- Ennen, E., & Richter, A. (2010). The whole is more than the sum of its parts—Or is it? A review of the empirical literature on complementarities in organizations. *Journal of Management, 36*, 207–233.
- Festinger, L. (1954). A theory of social comparison processes. *Human Relations, 7*(2), 117–140.
- Folger, R., Konovsky, M. A., & Cropanzano, R. (1992). A due process metaphor for performance appraisal. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 14*, 129–177.
- Funderburg, S. A., & Levy, P. E. (1997). The influence of individual and contextual variables on 360-degree feedback system attitudes. *Group & Organization Management, 22*(2), 210–235.
- Goffin, R. D., & Olson, J. M. (2011). Is it all relative? Comparative judgments and the possible improvements of self-ratings and ratings of others. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 6*(1), 48–60.
- Granovetter, M. S. (1973). The strength of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology, 78*(6), 1360–1380.
- Guenole, N., Cockerill, T., Chamorro-Premuzic, T., & Smillie, L. (2011). Evidence for the validity of 360 dimensions in the presence of rater-source factors. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 63*(4), 203–218.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1975). Development of the job diagnostic survey. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 60*(2), 159–170.
- Hazucha, J. F., Hezlett, S. A., & Schneider, R. J. (1993). The impact of 360-degree feedback on management skills development. *Human Resource Management, 32*(2/3), 325–351.
- Hoffman, B. J., Gorman, A. C., Blair, C. A., Meriac, J. P., Overstreet, B., & Atchley, K. E. (2012). Evidence for the effectiveness of an alternative multisource performance rating methodology. *Personnel Psychology, 65*, 531–563.
- Kim, J. Y., & Nam, S. H. (1998). The concept and dynamics of face: Implications for organizational behavior in Asia. *Organization Science, 9*(4), 522–534.
- Latham, G. P., Almost, J., Mann, S., & Moore, C. (2005). New developments in performance management. *Organizational Dynamics, 34*(1), 77–87.
- Levy, P. E., & Williams, J. R. (2004). The social context of performance appraisal: A review and framework for the future. *Journal of Management, 30*, 881–905.
- Lin, B., & Jones, C. A. (1997). Some issues in conducting customer satisfaction surveys. *Journal of Marketing Practice: Applied Marketing Science, 3*(1), 4–13.
- London, M., Wohlers, A. J., & Gallagher, P. (1990). A feedback approach to management development. *Journal of Management Development, 9*, 17–31.
- Luthans, F., & Peterson, S. J. (2003). 360-degree feedback with systematic coaching: Empirical analysis suggests a winning combination. *Human Resource Management, 42*(3), 243–256.
- March, J. G. (1991). Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning. *Organization Science, 2*, 71–87.
- Martin, D. C., Bartol, K. M., & Kehoe, P. E. (2000). The legal ramifications of performance appraisal: The growing significance. *Public Personnel Management, 29*, 379–405.
- Maylett, T. (2009). *Understanding performance appraisal: Social, organizational, and goal-based perspectives*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Moravec, M., Gyr, H., & Friedman, L. (1993). A 21st century communication tool. *HR Magazine, 38*, 77–77.
- Murphy, K. R., & Cleveland, J. N. (1995). *Understanding performance appraisal: Social, organizational, and goal-based perspectives*. Sage.
- Pulakos, E. D., & O'Leary, R. S. (2011). Why is performance management broken? *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice, 4*, 146–164.
- Reagans, R., Zuckerman, E., & McEvily, B. (2004). How to make the team: Social networks vs. demography as criteria for designing effective teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 49*(1), 101–133.

- Robbins, T. L., & DeNisi, A. S. (1994). A closer look at interpersonal affect as a distinct influence on cognitive processing in performance evaluations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*(3), 341–353.
- Roberson, L., Galvin, B. M., & Charles, A. C. (2007). When group identities matter: Bias in performance appraisal. *Academy of Management Annals, 1*, 617–650.
- Rose, D. S., Sidle, S. D., & Griffith, K. H. (2007). A penny for your thoughts: Monetary incentives improve response rates for company-sponsored employee surveys. *Organizational Research Methods, 10*(2), 225–240.
- Seifert, C. F., & Yukl, G. (2010). Effects of repeated multi-source feedback on the influence behavior and effectiveness of managers: A field experiment. *The Leadership Quarterly, 21*, 856–866.
- Shipper, F., Hoffman, R. C., & Rotondo, D. M. (2007). Does the 360 feedback process create actionable knowledge equally across cultures? *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 6*(1): 33–50.
- Smither, J. W., London, M., Flautt, R., Vargas, Y., & Kucine, I. (2003). Can working with an executive coach improve multisource feedback ratings over time? A quasi-experimental field study. *Personnel Psychology, 56*, 23–44.
- Smither, J. W., London, M., & Reilly, R. R. (2005). Does performance improve following multisource feedback? A theoretical model, meta-analysis, and review of empirical findings. *Personnel Psychology, 58*, 33–66.
- Steiner, D. D., & Rain, J. S. (1989). Immediate and delayed primacy and recency effects in performance evaluations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74*(1), 136–142.
- Tornow, W. W. (1993). Editor's note: Introduction to special issue on 360-degree feedback. *Human Resource Management, 32*(2), 211–219.