

**USING 360 DEGREE FEEDBACK SYSTEM  
TO COMPLEMENT THE MALAYSIAN PUBLIC SERVICE  
PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SYSTEM:  
AN EXPLORITARY STUDY ON THE INSTRUMENTS OF  
360 DEGREE FEEDBACK SYSTEM IN THE  
NATIONAL INSTITUE OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION (INTAN)**

**A thesis submitted to the Graduate School in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of Masters in Science (Management)**

**By**

**MOHAMED NASSER BIN ABDUL RAZAK**

**UNIVERSITI UTARA MALAYSIA**

**October 2003**

**© Mohamed Nasser Bin Abdul Razak, 2003. All rights reserved.**



**Sekolah Siswazah  
(Graduate School)  
Universiti Utara Malaysia**

**PERAKUAN KERJA KERTAS PROJEK  
(Certification of Project Paper)**

Saya, yang bertandatangan, memperakukan bahawa  
*(I, the undersigned, certify that)*

MOHAMED NASSER BIN ABDUL RAZAK


calon untuk Ijazah  
*(candidate for the degree of)* SARJANA SAINS PENGURUSAN

telah mengemukakan kertas projek yang bertajuk  
*(has presented his/her project paper of the following title)*

Using 360 Degree Feedback System to complement the Malaysian Public  
Service Performance Appraisal System: An Exploratory Study on the Instruments  
of 360 Degree Feedback System in the National Institute of Public Administration  
(INTAN) seperti yang tercatat di muka surat tajuk dan kulit kertas projek  
*(as it appears on the title page and front cover of project paper)*

bahawa kertas projek tersebut boleh diterima dari segi bentuk serta kandungan,  
dan meliputi bidang ilmu dengan memuaskan.  
*(that the project paper acceptable in form and content, and that a satisfactory  
knowledge of the field is covered by the project paper).*

Nama Penyelia  
*(Name of Supervisor)* : MOHAMED YUSADDIK BIN ABDUL MAJID

Tandatangan  
*(Signature)* : 

Tarikh  
*(Date)* : 17 MEI 2004

## **PERMISSION TO USE**

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Post Graduate degree from the Universiti Utara Malaysia, I agree that the Library of this University make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for the copying of this thesis in any manner, in whole or in part, for scholarly purposes may be granted by my superior(s) or, in their absence, by the Dean of the Graduate School where my thesis was done. It is understood that any copying or publication or use of this thesis or parts thereof for financial gain shall be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to the Universiti Utara Malaysia in any scholarly use of any material in this thesis.

Requests for permission to copy or to make other use of material in this thesis in whole or in part should addressed to:

Dean of Graduate School,  
Universiti Utara Malaysia,  
060100 Sintok,  
Kedah Darul Aman.

## ABSTRAK

Maklumbalas 360 Darjah merupakan satu sistem penilaian prestasi yang direka untuk menilai kecekapan dan kebolehan pekerja melalui pengumpulan sumber maklumat secara kolektif daripada pelbagai pihak termasuk pengurusan atasan, penyelia, kumpulan sokongan, rakan sekerja dan daripada diri sendiri. Sektor perkhidmatan awam, Malaysia telah mengamalkan sistem penilaian prestasi pekerja sejak tahun 1992. Sistem tradisional ini telah dikritik kerana terdapatnya beberapa kelemahan terutamanya melibatkan penilaian yang tidak adil. Oleh yang demikian, kajian ini ingin melihat dan menerima pakai satu lagi sistem alternatif yang inovatif dikenali sebagai Sistem Maklumbalas 360 Darjah. Ianya akan melengkapi sistem yang sedia ada untuk mempertingkatkan cara penilaian yang lebih baik. Tujuan kajian ini adalah untuk mengukur keberkesanan pelaksanaan sistem ini di INTAN. Sejumlah 90 (71.4 peratus) pegawai INTAN (JUSA, Gred 1,2 dan 3) telah dinilai oleh 2 orang ketua, 5 rakan sekerja, 13 orang staf sokongan dan juga diri mereka sendiri (n = 605). Satu borang kaji selidik yang mengandungi 45 soalan mengenai prestasi tingkah laku pekerja disediakan yang kemudiannya dibahagikan kepada 7 dimensi iaitu mengurus organisasi, mengurus diri, mengurus sumber, kepimpinan, motivasi, pembangunan sumber manusia dan kerja berpasukan. Skala Likert 1 – 10 digunakan merangkumi dari 1 – lemah hingga 10 – terbaik bagi menilai prestasi tingkah laku. Min, median dan mode bagi 7 dimensi dianalisa dengan menggunakan perisian ‘Microsoft Excel Spreadsheets’. Keputusan menunjukkan keseluruhan min bagi keseluruhan 7 dimensi adalah sejumlah 7.0 yang menunjukkan keseluruhan prestasi tingkah laku bagi pekerja INTAN adalah baik. Kajian juga

menunjukkan bahawa skor min penyelia (min skor 6.7) dan skor min kumpulan sokongan (min skor 6.3) adalah lebih rendah daripada skor min rakan sekerja (min skor 7.0) dan penilaian ke atas diri sendiri (min skor 7.2). Ini menunjukkan bahawa masih terdapat ruang bagi para pegawai untuk meningkatkan prestasi. Daripada temubual yang dijalankan menunjukkan bahawa ramai yang menerima kadar skor min yang diberikan oleh penilai dan bersedia untuk berbincang dan memperbaiki kelemahan sediaada dengan bantuan pihak atasan mereka atau memperbaiki diri sendiri. Melalui kajian ini, jelas bahawa sektor awam Malaysia harus menerima pakai Sistem Penilaian Maklumbalas 360 Darjah ini untuk meningkatkan lagi kecekapan dan keberkesanan sistem serahan kepada rakyat.

## ABSTRACT

360-degree feedback is a appraisal tool designed to quantify the competencies and skills of fellow employees by tapping the collective experience of their superiors, subordinates, and peers. The Malaysian civil service has established and implemented performance appraisal system since 1992. Yet the system has been criticised because of several drawbacks namely rater bias and its reward system. Therefore, this study would like to benchmark at another innovative appraisal system to complement the existing performance appraisal called the 360 degree feedback system. This research will try to evaluate the effectiveness of its implementation in INTAN and if it could be proven that it could play a complementary role in improving the implementation of the performance appraisal system in INTAN. A total of 90 (71.4 per cent) INTAN officers (JUSA, Grade 1,2 and 3) were rated by their 2 supervisors, 5 colleagues, 13 subordinates and they themselves (n=605). A self-administered questionnaire consists of 45 observable performance behavior expectations item were grouped into 7 dimension, namely, managing the organization, managing self, managing resources, leadership, motivating people, developing people and teamwork. The 1-10 point Likert Scale was used ranging from 1-poor to 10-excellent performance behavior. Frequency distribution of the responses of the raters and the mean, median and mode of seven variables were analysed by using the Microsoft Excel spreadsheets. The result showed overall mean scores of the entire seven dimension was 7.0, which means the overall rates performance behavior expectations/competencies is good. The study also showed supervisors (mean score 6.7) and subordinates(mean score 6.3) rate lower than colleagues(mean score 7.0) and self rating(mean score 7.2). This showed that there is a lot of room the officers to further improve their performance behavior either with the help from the organisation management or by self improvement. From the interview conducted indicated that many employees accept the mean score rating given by the ratees and committed to discuss and improve either by with the help of their supervisors or by self improvement. Finally, it is strongly suggested in

this study that the Malaysian Public Sector should adopt the 360 degree feedback appraisal system to further improve their efficiency and effectiveness of Government's delivery system.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

ALHAMDULILLAHIRABBIL'AALAMIN. Grace be upon Allah the Almighty and the Merciful for enabling me to complete this thesis. At the same time, I would like to convey my sincere gratitude to my supervisor, Encik Mohamed Musaddik bin Abdul Majid for his guidance, patience and endurance throughout this research study.

I am most indebted to the Jabatan Perkhidmatan Awam (Jabatan Perkhidmatan Awam) for awarding me the scholarship for this Master programme. To Y. Bhg. Dato' Dr. Zulkurnain Hj. Awang, Director, at the Malaysian Institute of Public Administration (INTAN), I thank you for the support. For the co-operation shown by all those involved in the study survey, I would like to express my utmost appreciation.

To my loved ones at home Norazura, Nasraan Shah and Tasleem Shah, I thank you for your prayer, sacrifice, understanding, motivating force but most important of all, I thank you for always being there for me, through my moments of sadness and joy.

I shall always cherish my days in INTAN Bukit Kiara, and Universiti Utara Malaysia. To all my lecturers, colleagues, and support staff of all the above Institutions, I thank you all for making my stay such a memorable experience. May Allah bless each and every one of us.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Permission to Use	i
Abstract	ii
Acknowledgement	iv
Table of Contents	v
List of Tables	viii
List of Figures	ix

### CHAPTER ONE:

#### INTRODUCTION

Problem Statement	3
What is 360 degree Feedback System?	5
Applications for 360 Degree Feedback System	8
Benefit of Using 360 Degree System	11
Study Objectives	14
Study Limitations	14
Conclusion	16

CHAPTER TWO:	ORGANISATIONAL BACKGROUND	
	Introduction	17
	Challenges of a Dynamic Institute	18
	Mission, Objective and Functions	19
	Training Centres	26
	Regional Campus	26
	International collaboration	27
	Conclusion	27
CHAPTER THREE:	LITERATURE REVIEW	
	Introduction	29
	Importance of Feedback Model	31
	Usage of 360 Degree Feedback	33
	Successes of 360° Feedback System	35
	Benefits Of 360-Degree Feedback	38
	Organisational Culture and Performance	40
	Self-Ratings	44
	Supervisors Rating	46
	Peers Rating	47
	Subordinate Ratings	49
	Performance dimensions	50

CHAPTER FOUR:	METHODOLOGY	
	Study Instrument and Variable Measurements	56
	Scale	57
	Validity and Reliability	58
	Data Collection	58
	Data Analysis	58
CHAPTER FIVE:	RESEARCH FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION	
	Research findings	60
	Recommendation	71
	Suggestions for Future Research	72
BIBLIOGRAPHY		
APPENDIX		

## **LIST OF TABLES**

Table 1: Data Collection Summary

Table 2: Overall Scores by Dimension

Table 3: Scores Feedback on Managing the Organisation

Table 4: Scores Feedback on Managing Self

Table 5: Scores Feedback on Managing Resources

Table 6: Scores Feedback on Motivating People

Table 7 : Scores Feedback on Developing People

Table 8: Scores Feedback Teamwork

Table 9: Scores Feedback on Leadership

## **LIST OF FIGURES**

Figure 1: Single-Source versus Multi-Source Feedback Systems.

Figure 2: Organisational Chart

Figure 3: Coding

Figure 4: Overall Feedback by Dimension

Figure 5: Feedback on Managing the Organisation

Figure 6: Feedback on Managing Self

Figure 7: Feedback on Managing Resources

Figure 8: Feedback on Motivating People

Figure 9: Feedback on Developing People

Figure 10: Feedback on Teamwork

Figure 11: Feedback on Leadership

## **CHAPTER ONE**

### **INTRODUCTION**

The field of human resource management has changed tremendously in recent years. Being the key resource of an organisation, people should be managed effectively to enable organisation achieve the objectives. One the most important aspect of human resource management towards this end is the performance appraisal.

Performance appraisal is said as the key to effective human resources management. In their influential discussion of performance appraisal, Latham and Wexley (1994) identified selection, appraisal, training and motivation as the four key systems necessary for insuring the proper management of an organization's human resources. Of these four, they argue, performance appraisal is the most important because it is "the prerequisite for establishing the other three". (Edwards, 1989; Fox 1991; Nalbandian 1981; Roberts, 1995).

In a well-managed organization, performance appraisal is the single most important management tool. It is the only management process seems to have much influence over the employee's work and careers. Some organization claims that it is the most powerful instrument that they have to use in getting the energy of every employee towards achieving the company's mission, vision, value and strategic goals

The contents of  
the thesis is for  
internal user  
only

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Antonioni, D. (1996). Designing an effective 360-degree appraisal feedback process. *Organizational Dynamics*, 25(2), 24-38.
- Atwater, L. E., Ostroff, C., Yammarino, F. J., & Fleenor, J. W. (1998). Self-other rating agreement: Does it really matter. *Personnel Psychology*, 51, 576-597.
- 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., & Waldman, D. (1998). Accountability in 360 degree feedback. *HRMagazine*, 43, 96-104.
- Austin, M. L. (1992, November). Updating the performance review. *Working Woman*, 17(11), 32-35.
- 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. E., 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., & Yammarino, F. J. (1992). Does self-other agreement on leadership perceptions moderate the validity of leadership and performance predictions? *Personnel Psychology*, 45, 141 - 164.

- Bass, B. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook handbook of leadership*. New York: FreePress.
- Bernardin, H. J., & Beatty, R. W. (1987). Can subordinate appraisals enhance managerial productivity? *Sloan Management Review*, 63-73.
- Bernardin, J. H., & Beatty, R. W. (1987). Can subordinate appraisals enhance managerial productivity? *Sloan Management Review*, 28(4), 63-74.
- Bernardin, J. H., Dahmus, S. A., & Redmon, G. (1993). Attitudes of firstline supervisors toward subordinate appraisals. *Human Resource Management*, 32, 315-324.
- Bruzzese, A. (1996). Rave reviews. *Human Resource Executive*. 57-59.
- Church, A. H. (1995, August). First rate multi-rater feedback. *Training & Development*, 49, (8), 42-43.
- Church, A. H. (2000). Do higher performing managers actually receive better ratings? A validation of multirater assessment methodology. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 52, 99 - 116.
- Dalton, M. (1996). Multirater feedback and conditions for change. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 48, 12 - 16.
- DeNisi, A. S. & Mitchell, J. H. (1978). in Fedor & Bettenhausen, *Group and Organizational Studies*, 14 (2), June 1989, 182-197
- Einstein, W. O., & LaMere-LaBonte, J. (1989). Performance appraisal: Dilemma or design? *Advanced Management Journal*, (2), 26-30, 99-101, 129-131.
- Edwards, M. R. (1983). "Productivity Improvement through Innovations in Performance Appraisal." *Public Personnel Management*, 12(1), 13-24.

- Edwards, M. R. (1989). "Making Performance Appraisals Meaningful and Fair." *Business*, 17-24.
- Edwards, M. R. (1991). "Accurate Performance Measurement Tools." *HRMagazine*, 36(6), 95-98.
- Edwards, M. R., and Ewen, A. J. (1996). *360-degree Feedback: The Powerful New Model for Employee Assessment and Performance Improvement*. NY: Amacom Books.
- Fox, C. J. (1991). "Employee Performance Appraisal: The Keystone Made of Clay." Pp. 58-72 in C. Ban and N. Riccucci (eds.), *Public Personnel Management: Current Concerns -- Future Challenges*. White Plains, NY: Longman Publishing Group.
- Harris, M., & Schaubroeck, J., (1988). A meta-analysis of super-supervisor, self-peer, and peer-supervisor ratings. *Personnel Psychology*, 41, 43 - 62.
- Heera SinghMcEvoy, G. M., and Beatty, R. W. (1989). "Assessment Centers and Subordinate Appraisals of Managers: A Seven Year Examination of Predictive Validity." *Personnel Psychology*, 42, 37-52.
- Murphy, K. R., and Cleveland, J. N. (1991). *Performance Appraisal: An Organizational Perspective*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Nalbandian, J. (1981). "Performance Appraisal: If Only People Were Not Involved." *Public Administration Review*, 41(3), 392-96.
- Hegarty, W. H. (1974). Using subordinate ratings to elicit behavioral changes in managers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59, 764-766.

- Hoffman, R. (1995). Ten reasons you should be using 360-degree feedback. *HR Magazine*, 40, 82-85.
- Ilgel, D. R., Fisher, C. D. & Taylor, S. M. (1979). Consequences of individual feedback on behavior in organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 64, (4), 349-371.
- Jawahar & Williams (1997). *Personnel Psychology*, 50(4), 905-925.
- Nagel, R. (2000) *The 360-degree Feedback Avalanche*, International Personnel Management Association
- Johnson, J. F., & Ferstl, K. L. (1999). The effects of interrater and self-other agreement on performance improvement following upward feedback. *Personnel Psychology*, 52, 271-303.
- Lepsinger, R., & Lucia, A. D. (1997, September). 360 degree feedback and performance appraisal. *Training*, 34, 62-70.
- Lepsinger, Richard and Anntoinette D. Lucia. *The Art and Science of 360 Degree Feedback*. Pfeiffer/ Jossey-Bass Inc., San Francisco, 1997.
- Latham, G. P., and Wexley, K. N. (1994). *Increasing Productivity through Performance Appraisal*. (2nd Ed. ed.). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- London, M., & Beatty, R. W. (1993). 360-degree feedback as a competitive advantage. *Human Resource Management*, 32, 352-373.
- 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., Wohlers, A. J., & Gallagher, P. (1990). A feedback approach to management development. *Journal of Management Development, 9*(6), 17-31.
- McEvoy, G. M., & Buller, P. F. (1987). User acceptance of peer appraisals in an industrial setting. *Personnel Psychology, 40*, 785-797.
- Moravec, M., Gyr, H., & Friedman, L. (1993, July). A 21st century communication tool. *HR Magazine, 38*, 77-81.
- Mount, M. K., Judge, T. A., Scullen, T. E., Sytsma, M. R., & Hezlett, S. A. (1998). Trait, rater and level effects in 360-degree performance ratings. *Personnel Psychology, 51*, 557-576.
- McEvoy, G. M., and Beatty, R. W. (1989). "Assessment Centers and Subordinate Appraisals of Managers: A Seven Year Examination of Predictive Validity." *Personnel Psychology, 42*, 37-52.
- Murphy, K. R., and Cleveland, J. N. (1991). *Performance Appraisal: An Organizational Perspective*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Nalbandian, J. (1981). "Performance Appraisal: If Only People Were Not Involved." *Public Administration Review, 41*(3), 392-96.
- Roberts, G. E. (1995a). "Developmental Performance Appraisal in Municipal Government." *Review of Public Personnel Administration, 15*(3), 17-43.
- Roberts, G. E. (1995b). "Municipal Government Performance Appraisal System Practices: Is the Whole Less Than the Sum of Its Parts?" *Public Personnel Management, 24*(2), 197-222.

- Schmidt & Hunter (1998) *Psychological Bulletin*, 124(2), 262-274
- Wells, S.J. (Sept 1999). Traveling beyond 360-degree evaluations. *HR Magazine*, 44(9).
- 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.
- Tuckman, B.W. & Oliver, W.F. (1968). Effectiveness of feedback to teachers as a function of source. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 59, 297-301.
- Tornow, W. W. (1993a). Editor's note: Introduction to special issue on 360-degree feedback. *Human Resource Management*, 32, 211-219.
- Tornow, W. W. (1993b). Perceptions of reality: Is multi-perspective measurement a means or an end? *Human Resource Management*, 32, 221-230.
- Ulrich, D. (1993). Editors Note. *Human Resource Management*, 32 (2 & 3), 209-
- Vinson, M. N. (1996). The pros and cons of 360-degree feedback: Making it work. *Training & Development*, 50, 11-12.
- Waldman, D. A., Atwater, L. E., & Antonioni, D. (1998). Has 360 feedback gone amok? *Academy of Management Executive*, 12, 86-94.
- 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.
- Waldman, D. A., Atwater, L. E. & Antonioni, D. (1998). Has 360 degree feedback gone amok? *Academy of Management Executive*, 12, 86 - 94.