

**360-DEGREE FEEDBACK IN THE CONTEXT OF
LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT IN THE ADO**

Ruth Rohan-Jones with Steve Rohan-Jones

December 2003

Introduction

“ *The greatest loss to any organisation is the inability to tap the full measure of human potential.*”¹

Toffler and Toffler identify three epochs of warfare: the might of the sword during the Agrarian Age, the mass destruction of the Industrial Age and the dominance of information and knowledge in the Post-Industrial or Information Age.² In a recent paper, Martin Burke further divides the components of the third epoch into data, information, knowledge, will and feeling.³ The Australian Defence Organisation (ADO) invests significant amounts in information and knowledge systems as part of capital expenditure.⁴ Moreover, material capability plans stretch to at least 2010.⁵ Why is the same not done for people capability?

With some exceptions, the ADO devotes a comparatively small effort to develop will and feeling systems. The development of these systems is essential to tap the full measure of human and organisational potential; for these systems also underpin the ‘human’ component of leadership development. Group and team emotion provides power, while group will produces volition.⁶ Effective leadership taps into emotion and will systems to produce a synergy with data, information and knowledge systems culminating in a distinct warfighting advantage.

A range of tools exist to develop the human emotion and will systems. Self-assessment and 360-degree feedback are two instruments that are increasingly being utilised. These instruments provide a utilitarian measure to develop the self-awareness and behaviour of leaders and the concomitant strategies needed to alter behavioural patterns and attitudes. Of these two tools, 360-degree feedback represents a potentially powerful weapon in the struggle to enhance leadership processes.

This paper discusses the role of 360-degree feedback in leadership development within the ADO. Accordingly, it will examine the need to develop self-awareness and emotional intelligence as a critical element of leadership development. Next, the paper explains the utility of 360-degree feedback within leadership development, and in particular transformational leadership development. It will also describe how to implement 360-degree feedback within a leadership development program. Further consideration is given to the benefits, limitations, validity and effectiveness of 360-degree feedback instruments. Finally, the paper provides a set of guidelines to maximise the effectiveness of 360-degree feedback. Firstly though, what does the term 360-degree feedback mean?

360-degree feedback has military origins. Professor Mark Edwards who first coined the term 360-degree feedback was originally a US Navy pilot. The term “360-degree”

¹ Hall, M. PhD., ‘Changing The Way We Assess Leadership’, *Acquisition Quarterly Review*, Fall, p 402.

² Toffler & Toffler, 1993, in Burke, M. 2000, *Thinking Together: New Forms of Thought Systems For Revolution in Military Affairs*, DSTO RR-0173, Salisbury, SA., pp1-3.

³ loc-cit.

⁴ Defence total capital expenditure for 02/03 was \$3.75b. *The Defence Report 2003*, 2003, Commonwealth of Australia, p 269.

⁵ Defence White Paper 2000 *Our Future Defence Force*, Commonwealth of Australia, 2000, 8.1.

⁶ Burke, op cit, p 28-33.

coming from the visual check made by a pilot before take off.⁷ His idea for the process was based upon the peer review common in US military institutions and universities in the 1970s. The process was then developed further within the field of industrial and organisational psychology.⁸

Any formal feedback process involving more than one person is collectively termed multi-rater feedback - this includes 360-degree feedback. 360-degree feedback now refers to the feedback received from a circle of people including a supervisor, peers, direct reports (or subordinates), and clients or customers. These people are collectively called raters. The person being rated is referred to as the ratee or target leader and also completes a questionnaire. This part is termed self-assessment. There are many instruments that only utilise self-assessment. The terms 360-degree feedback and multi-rater feedback are used interchangeably throughout this paper.

SELF AWARENESS AND EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE

“Knowing others, and knowing oneself, in one hundred battles, no danger. Not knowing the other and knowing oneself, one victory for one loss. Not knowing the other and not knowing oneself, in every battle certain defeat.”⁹

A number of ancient philosophers including Sun Tzu espoused the importance of self-awareness over thousands of years. The Greeks referred to the concept of “knowing thyself” as the foundation of all learning.¹⁰ “Knowing thyself” is the ancient term for self-awareness. Self-awareness is the quality, condition or fact of being aware or conscious of one’s character, feelings and motives.¹¹ Self-awareness provides a mindfulness; an ability to observe and reflect upon our own feelings and thoughts, behaviour and actions as if independent from ourselves. This is the first step in reflecting and evaluating our own behaviour to determine if changes are necessary. This is the basis for developing emotional intelligence.

A number of definitions for Emotional Intelligence (EI) exist. Mayer and Salovey define EI as the “ability to perceive and express emotion, assimilate emotion in thought, understand and reason with emotion, and regulate emotion in self and others.”¹² Bar-On states that EI is “an array of non-cognitive capabilities, competencies, and skills that influence one’s ability to succeed in coping with environmental demands and pressures.”¹³

However, Goleman significantly raised the profile of emotional intelligence, and provides a more concise definition of emotional intelligence;

⁷ Shea, T.H. 1999, “360-Degree Feedback: A Look From All Sides”, *Sun Sentinel*, 25 Oct 1999, p 6.

⁸ Tornow, W.W. & CCL Associates, 1998, *Maximising the Value of 360-degree Feedback*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, Chapter 1.

⁹ Sun Tzu, 2002, *The Art Of War*, Demma Translator Group, Boston, Shambhala, p 110.

¹⁰ Walsh, J. PhD, Cox, M. 2002, *Leadership Development and Knowledge Transfer*, University of Guelph, Ontario, p14.

¹¹ Brown, L. (Ed), 1993, *The New Shorter Oxford Dictionary*, Vol 2, Clarendon Press, Oxford, p 2763.

¹² Mayer, J.D. Salovey, P. & Caruso, D. Competing Models of Emotional Intelligence in Sternberg, R.J. (Ed) 1993 *Handbook of Human Intelligence* (2nd Ed.), New York, Cambridge, P28.

¹³ Bar-On, R. 1997, *The Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-I): Technical Manual*. Toronto, Canada: Multi Health Systems, p14.

“The capacity for recognising our own feelings and those of others, for motivating ourselves, and for managing emotions well in ourselves and our relationships.”¹⁴

Goleman’s emotional competence framework (Enclosure 1) illustrates the links between personal competence (self-awareness, self-regulation and motivation) and social competence (empathy and social skills).¹⁵ Self-awareness is the basis for developing personal competence and, subsequently, social competence. A leader needs to be aware of their emotional intelligence competence as a precursor to reshaping and building competencies according to their leadership development requirements.

LEADERSHIP AND EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE

Leadership requires an individual to effectively influence others in a given situation. Such influence is a synergistic product of that individual’s knowledge, skills and attitudes. Post-industrial concepts of leadership, such as transactional and transformational leadership, place greater emphasis on the nature of the influence relationship between leaders and followers. A considerable body of research exists in relation to transformational and transactional leadership.¹⁶ Burns defined transformational leadership as a process where ‘... Leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality’.¹⁷ Transformational leaders act as strong role models (Idealised Influence), communicate high expectations and inspire followers through a shared vision (Inspirational Motivation), stimulate followers to be creative and innovative (Intellectual Stimulation) and listen carefully to followers in a supportive climate (Individualised Consideration).¹⁸ This involves leaders engaging the motivation and feelings of attachment of followers. Outcomes from this type of leadership exceed expectations.

In Avolio’s Full Range Leadership Model, transactional leadership precedes transformational leadership.¹⁹ In transactional leadership, the exchange between leader and follower requires less power sharing as the leader provides contingent reward for the follower to meet the agreed outcome. A versatile leader can select the required leader behaviour from the full range of transactional and transformational leader behaviours.

The chaotic and increasingly complex Defence environment requires versatile leaders. These leaders need to exhibit the necessary flexibility and adaptability to deal with a range of operational circumstances from warfighting to peacekeeping. A range of studies assert that transformational leaders are more effective than transactional leaders.²⁰ Transformational leadership utilises a higher degree of emotional

¹⁴ Goleman, D. 1999, *Working with Emotional Intelligence*, Bloomsbury, London, p317

¹⁵ *ibid*, p 24

¹⁶ Avolio, B.J. 1998, ‘Examining a full range leadership development system.’ in *Management theory and practice: moving to a new era*, Griffin, G (Ed) 1995, Hong Kong: MacMillan Education Australia.

Bass, B.M. 1996, ‘Two Decades of Research and Development in Transformational Leadership’, *European Journal of Work and Organisational Psychology*, 8(1), pp 9-33.

¹⁷ Burns, J.M. 1978, *Leadership*, New York, Harper & Row, p 20. in Stevenson, E. 2003, *Command Presence*, CDCLMS Leadership Paper 2/2003, p 4

¹⁸ Stevenson, E. 2003, *Command Presence*, CDCLMS Leadership Paper 2/2003, p4

¹⁹ Avolio, *loc cit*.

²⁰ Fuller, J.B., Patterson, C.E., Hester, K. & Stringer, D.Y. 1996, A Quantitative review of research on Charismatic Leadership. *Psychological Reports*, 78, 271-287. Lowe, K.B., Kroek, K.G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. 1996, Effectiveness correlates of Transformational and Transactional

intelligence to influence followers to extend and reach their potential. Transformational leadership theory indicates there is an emotional attachment that occurs between the leader and their followers.²¹ Whereas transactional leadership can be taught as a technical process, which is more outcome focussed. Researchers emphasise the effectiveness of transformational leadership behaviours in military and para-military environments.²² Interestingly, research conducted by Stevenson indicates that middle and senior ADF leaders utilise more transactional leadership behaviours.²³

A higher level of self-awareness and emotionally intelligent transformational leadership is concomitant with developing a greater level of moral and ethical leadership. The exigencies of modern operations demand military leaders display a greater competence in ethical and moral leadership. The complex and chaotic operational environments can place a leader in an ethical and moral dilemma, where sets rules and procedures are insufficient, barely providing enough of a guideline. In recognition of the need for further developing moral and ethical leadership, the Australian Defence College in 2003 added a military ethics component to the leadership modules.

LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT AND 360-DEGREE FEEDBACK

Stevenson contends that the key to effective leadership development lies in individuals developing effective cognitive models for managing complex behavioural decisions involved in the process of leadership.²⁴ An important aspect of developing such cognitive models is to develop a versatile range of appropriate leader behaviours. Therefore, an individual must understand their own behaviour and its effects on other people. When a leader is able to adapt and change their behaviour they are developing the versatility to continually evaluate themselves and adapt accordingly; a process essential to lifelong learning and continual leadership development.

360-degree feedback tools provide an effective starting point for increasing self-awareness and assisting adaptation of behaviours to enhance leadership development. Leadership development programs rely on a number of different tools and approaches. 360-degree feedback offers one effective instrument in the leadership development toolkit. In practice, 360-degree feedback relies on the use of other methods for its effectiveness as a leadership development tool.

Leadership: A Meta-Analytic Review of the MLQ literature. *Leadership Quarterly*, 7, 385-425. In Livingstone, H., Nadjiwon-Foster, M. & Smithers, S 2002, *Emotional Intelligence & Military Leadership*, Canadian Forces Leadership Institute, Ontario. p 28.

²¹ Livingstone et al. op cit p 29.

²² Bass, B.M., 1990, 'From Transactional to Transformational Leadership: Learning to Share the Vision', *Organisational Dynamics*, 18, 19-31. Bass, B.M., 1998, 'Transformational Leadership: Industry, military and Educational Impact. In Livingstone, op cit p 29.. Kane, T.D. & Tremble, T.R., 2000, 'Transformational Leadership Effects at Different Levels of the Army', *Military Psychology*, 12, pp 137-160. Yammarino, F.J. & Bass, B.M., 1990, 'Transformational Leadership at Multiple Levels of Analysis', *Human Relations*, 43, pp 975-995. In Livingstone op cit p 29.

²³ Stevenson, E., 2003, op cit. p 21.

²⁴ Stevenson, E., 2002, Leadership Development: A Case of Teaching Individuals to Juggle Complexity, CDCLMS 2002. p 1.

Many development programs also utilise self-assessment for developing self-awareness. A self-assessment instrument is any questionnaire in which the leader answers questions only about themselves. Consequently, these tools are relatively simple to administer. Most self-assessment tools, such as the Myers-Briggs personality-typing questionnaire, require the participant to complete a 30 to 60 minute questionnaire. The questionnaire is scored by the participant to provide useable data within a short period of time.

Conversely, 360-degree feedback processes are far more complex and time consuming to administer than self-awareness instruments. 360-degree feedback collects information via questionnaires from a whole range of raters to provide multiple perspectives for the target leader. Raters include supervisors, peers, direct reports and often clients or customers. The target leader also completes a self-assessment questionnaire. The administrator of the tool collates and analyses the data to produce a feedback report. Trained facilitators give the feedback to recipients either within a workshop environment or during an individual session.

360-degree feedback offers a more comprehensive assessment of a leader's behaviour due to the greater number of perspectives provided than self-assessment. This is the main reason 360-degree feedback is preferred to self-assessment. Self-assessment provides only one perspective, and this may be exaggerated positively or negatively. Further, Atkins and Woods indicate that self-perception is not as valid as raters' perceptions.²⁵

360-degree feedback identifies any difference between how a person assesses themselves and how others assess their behaviour. For example, it is common for a person to rate themselves either significantly higher or lower on all leader behaviours in comparison to other raters. Consequently, feedback from others may disclose a gap between how leaders see themselves and how others rate their behaviour.

The way in which other people perceive a leader will determine how that leader influences others and, hence, will have a direct bearing on that leader's effectiveness. Developing an understanding of how others perceive a leader is integral to how an effective leader maintains influence. A leader must, therefore, increase their awareness of their own behaviour to understand how their behaviour affects other people, and how to influence others' behaviour. The greater this self-awareness, the less of a gap there is between the leader's perception of them self and their raters perception. Atwater et al. found those with inflated self-perceptions, when retested, significantly reduced their self-evaluations and significantly improved their leadership.²⁶ Therefore, 360-degree feedback becomes a powerful tool for identifying and motivating for behavioural change to enhance leadership.

Traditional single perspective feedback between a leader and their immediate supervisor encourages predominantly transactional leadership behaviour. Such

²⁵ Atkins, P.W.B., & Wood, R.E. 2002, Self Versus others' ratings as Predictors of Assessment Centre Ratings: Validation Evidence for 360-degree Feedback Programs. *Personnel Psychology*. Durham: Winter, Vol. 55, Iss, 4; pp 871-905.

²⁶ Atwater, L., Roush, P. & Fishthal, A., 1993, *The impact of upward Feedback on self and Follower Ratings of Leaders*, Centre for Creative Leadership, New York. In Garavan, T.N., Morley & Flynn, M. 1997 '360-Degree Feedback: Its Role in Employee Development' *The Journal of Management Development*. Vol 16, No 2 pp 134-147.

feedback places the imperative upon achieving the agreed outcomes determined by the leader's immediate supervisor, at the expense of achieving outcomes determined by peers and subordinates. 360-degree feedback helps bring the priorities back into balance by emphasising the perspectives of peers and subordinates. This facilitates transformational leadership development. As previously described, the essential factors in transformational leadership are inspirational leadership, individual consideration, intellectual stimulation and idealised influence. When receiving 360-degree feedback, a leader is given a clear indication of how their behaviour influences the inspiration, motivation, intellectual stimulation and personal development of peers and subordinates. The development of transformational leadership therefore relies on considering multiple perspectives. A large number of organisations recognise a unique advantage in utilising multiple perspectives, for leader development.

An increasing number of organisations utilise 360-degree feedback instruments, even though the investment in time and money required is greater than self-assessment tools. In 1992, the amount of money spent in the US on 360-degree feedback was \$US 152 million.²⁷ A 2003 survey of 101 large Canadian companies, indicated 43% were using 360-degree feedback and a further nine were considering introducing the instrument.²⁸ An Australian Institute of Management study found that 27% of organisations used 360-degree tools for individual management development.²⁹ A British study found 60% of organisations used some form of multi rater instrument.³⁰

360-degree processes should not completely supersede self-assessment tools. They may be chosen ahead of 360-feedback when resources restrict the use of 360-degree feedback, or they can be used in conjunction with 360-degree feedback processes to address different aspects of leader development. Many organisations surveyed in the Canadian 2003 study found that 360-degree feedback processes cost too much time and money.³¹

The 360-degree feedback process provides a greater impetus for personal change because of the added dimension of multiple perspectives. Self-assessment tools can increase self-awareness and awareness of others. However, as the next section considers, 360-degree feedback can provide the disequilibrium necessary to motivate a person to change their behaviour. The rest of this discussion paper will focus on the use of 360-degree feedback processes.

IMPLEMENTATION OF 360-DEGREE FEEDBACK INSTRUMENT

360-degree feedback tools are only effective if utilised in conjunction with other leadership development tools and methods. An effective leadership development program utilises 360-degree feedback in conjunction with other methods such as:

- Personal development or action plan
- Executive coach or mentoring program

²⁷ Garavan et al. *ibid* p 2

²⁸ Debrayen, M. 7 Brutus S. 2003 'Learning From Others' 360-degree Experience', *Canadian HR Reporter*. Toronto: Feb 10, Vol. 16, Iss. 3, p 18-20

²⁹ Australian Institute of 2003, *Management Development Practice in Australia*, P 11

³⁰ European Foundation for Management Development Conference Report, 1999 *Journal of European Industrial Training*, Vol 23, No9.

³¹ Debrayen et al. *Ibid* p 18- 28

- Targeted developmental workshops
- Reflective journal
- Re-testing after six months has elapsed

Palus and Drath propose a leadership development model that incorporates five stages; experience, disequilibrium, equilibrium, construction and potentiation.³² This model illustrates the theoretical context for a supporting development program around the use of a 360-degree feedback tool.

A person's daily familiar experience provides meaning structures that tend to be self-confirming, and therefore provides no impetus for change. A leader development experience must actively engage and challenge a person's meaning structures. This is called disequilibrium. A 360-degree feedback removes a person from the comfort of their everyday experience into disequilibrium. The state of disequilibrium can be a most creative state, and leads to the potential for fundamental development.³³

The state of disequilibrium experienced when receiving feedback from a 360-degree process can create feelings of confusion, threat, anxiety and even fear or pain. Others, however, may find the disequilibrium experience exhilarating, and for some, a sense of relief is felt.³⁴ Hence, a supportive development process is an essential addition to the delivery of a 360-degree tool in order to assist in establishing equilibrium. This means affirming existing modes of being as well as affirming newer, potentially more adaptive modes of being. Ideally, a trained facilitator should conduct feedback in a one-to-one session. Such feedback validates a person's feelings and assists them to establish equilibrium.

Another alternative is to provide feedback within a small workshop setting. Some programs offer the feedback within a residential program, away from the normal workplace. This provides a less threatening environment for developing leaders to explore behavioural change. In a workshop, the optimal number of facilitators is two; one to go through the reports in general terms and the second to monitor individual's responses and attend to individual questions. Facilitators ensure that developing leaders are provided with a balance between affirming existing behaviours that are beneficial and identifying new behaviours to explore. They then assist a leader to develop their action plan, which is part of the construction phase.

*“Between the idea and the reality
Between the motion and the act
Falls the Shadow”*

TS Eliot³⁵

³² Palus, C.J. & Drath, W.H. 1995, *Evolving Leaders: A Model for Promoting Leadership Development in Programs*, Centre for Creative Leadership, North Carolina, p 14.

³³ Bridges, W. 1988, *Transitions: Making Sense of Life's Changes*. Reading, MA., Addison Wesley.
Kelly, G.A., 1995, *The Psychology of Personal Constructs*. New York: Norton. Mezirow, J. 1991, *Transformative Dimensions of Adult Learning*. San Francisco, Josey-Bass. Palus, C.J., 1993. *Transformative experiences of Adulthood: A new look at the seasons of life*. Perry, W.G. 1981, *Cognitive and Ethical Growth: The making of meaning*. in *ibid* p 16.

³⁴ Kelly, loc cit.

³⁵ Eliot, T.S. 1888- 1965 *The Hollow Men*, in *A Dictionary of Famous Quotations*, Hyman, R. (Ed) 1973, Pan Books, London.

An action plan for change requires a developing leader to identify the necessary steps to adopt the new behaviours. During this transition, the developing leader may well pass through Eliot's shadow. At this point, experienced facilitators and appropriate activities are utilised to cross the shadow of the knowing and doing gap and ensure the 360-degree feedback process remains effective. An action plan must provide concrete steps for a developing leader to explore new behaviours and some support mechanisms. The use of a coach or a mentor is an effective way to support a person in their plan. Preferably, the coach or mentor remains independent of any performance evaluation of the person.³⁶

An action plan is not something that is written initially and followed in neat linear steps to achieve an end point. Leadership development is far from a linear process, it involves non-linear processes and this leads to the developmental concept of potentiation. Potentiation refers to the increased possibility of future sustained change in meaning structures.³⁷ Following a disequilibrium experience, a person constructs and has a taste of a new behaviour with a new set of meaning structures, but often reverts to their original perspective. However, they retain a greater potential for achieving a new set of meaning structures.

A reflective learning journal enhances potentiation and provides support to developing leadership. A journal enables a developing leader to critically review their own experiences throughout the process, enhance cognitive linkages and make greater sense of the new meaning structures they are endeavouring to build. A learning journal supports a developing leader to make linkages in the chaotic patterns of human interaction to produce a deeper understanding of themselves and the process they have undergone.

Developing leaders require varying degrees of potentiation to produce lasting changes in their leadership behaviours. Many developing leaders will achieve lasting change after undergoing one 360-degree feedback process and targeted developmental workshops based upon action learning. However, others will require greater potentiation and need subsequent 360-degree feedback processes. Even those who have experienced substantial change will still greatly benefit from subsequent 360-degree processes. Subsequent 360-degree feedback provides its own measurement of change in leadership behaviour to allow a person to track their development. This is also an important aspect of assessing effectiveness of 360-degree feedback processes.³⁸ Leadership development has no distinct end, it is by its very nature a continual process and should be viewed as part of continual ongoing professional military education and part of a long-term strategy for people development.

BENEFITS

The use of 360-degree feedback instruments within leadership development programs benefits both individuals (leaders and followers) and organisations. Perhaps the most powerful aspect of the tool is its ability to provide multiple perspectives of a leader's behaviour. This enhances individual leadership and contributes to organisational effectiveness. Other major benefits include:

³⁶ For guidance on the use of mentors see CDCLMS Leadership Paper 3/2003; Mentoring in the ADO

³⁷ Drath & Palus, op cit, p 18.

³⁸ Tornow & Associates op cit, Chapter 9

- Individually tailored learning
- Developing a Learning culture
- Strategic planning and evaluation of leadership effectiveness

Individually tailored learning

Many leadership development interventions adopt a one-size-fits-all approach. These programs match individuals to set criteria rather than evaluating individual behaviour. A 360-degree feedback approach facilitates modification of behaviour and requires multiple perspectives to construct an *individually* tailored program. Consequently, a 360-degree feedback process inherently provides greater motivation for learning because it caters for individual learning needs.

The type of 360-degree feedback instrument can be selected or developed for specific leadership development requirements. For example, the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire is specifically designed to measure the use of transactional and transformational leadership.³⁹ The Leadership Versatility Index measures the degree of versatility in utilising opposing sets of leadership behaviours.⁴⁰ The Swinburne University Emotional Intelligence Test (SUEIT)⁴¹ and the Emotional Intelligence Competence Inventory, (ECI360) specifically measure emotional intelligence competencies.⁴² The ECI360 is currently utilised by Defence Renewal's 'Results Through People Program'. The Leader Behaviour Analysis II (LBAlI) is based upon the Hersey Blanchard Situational Leadership model. Defence leadership courses that utilise this model could benefit from implementing the LBAlI.⁴³

360-Degree Feedback tools can also be developed internally, with the help of a psychologist, to ensure the instrument reflects such characteristics as organisational values or an internally developed leadership model. An example of this is the Defence 360-degree Appraisal developed by the Directorate of Leadership Development (previously part of Directorate of Senior Officer Management, DSOM) based upon the Defence Leadership Model utilised by the Senior Leadership Group. The use of this appraisal extends to some parts of Defence such as RAAF Wagga.⁴⁴

³⁹ Avolio, B.J, Bass, B.M, & Jung, D.I, 1999, 'Re-Examining the Components of Transformational and Transactional Leadership Questionnaire', *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 72, pp 441-462.

⁴⁰ Kaplan, R.E. & Devries, R.B. 2003, 'Developing Versatile Leadership', *MIT Sloan Management Review*, Summer.

⁴¹ Swinburne university PhD student Ben Palmer, an organisational psychologist has developed the SUEIT, an Australian Emotional Intelligence measure specifically designed for the workplace. See URL: <http://www.swin.edu/bioscieleceng/neuropsych/eq.htm>.

⁴² The ECI360 is developed by the Hay group in the US, based upon Goleman's emotional intelligence framework. See www.haygroup.com.

⁴³ Leslie, J.B. & Fleenor, J.W 1998 *Centre for Creative Leadership, North Carolina* pp 113-123. The Australian Defence Force Academy, the RAN Leadership and Management and Personal Development School and the RAAF School of Post Graduate Studies all utilise the Hersey Blanchard Situational Leadership model in their leadership training.

⁴⁴ Use of such instruments will be discussed further detail in the Part Two; A Report on the use of 360-degree feedback instruments in the ADO.

Developing a Learning Culture

360-degree feedback can be an important aspect of developing a culture of lifelong learning. The US Army Training and Leadership Development Panel is exploring the use of three meta-competencies; self-awareness, adaptability and lifelong learning. A meta-competency is one so powerful, it improves a person's ability to acquire other competencies. The Panel states that feedback via 360-degree processes is important to develop these meta-competencies and is critical element in leadership development programs.⁴⁵

The 360-degree feedback instrument called 'Prospector' measures a leader's capacity to extrapolate significant personal learning from experience in order to develop leadership.⁴⁶ The Learning Architect assesses the willingness and ability to learn new competencies in order to perform under pressure in first time, tough or different conditions.⁴⁷

Including factors in a 360-degree feedback questionnaire that target a leader's ability to learn encourage development of a learning culture. The questionnaire emphasises the importance of habitual adaptation and learning. Subsequent re-testing of an instrument provides concrete evidence of a leader's ability to change and develop behaviours. This sense of achievement will motivate leaders to maintain the habit of personal development through lifelong learning.

Strategic Planning and Evaluation of Leadership Effectiveness

360-degree feedback is not only used to develop leadership but also to assess the effectiveness of leadership development programs. Re-testing after 6 months was one of the activities suggested previously as part of a supporting program for 360-degree processes. This provides a measure of development effectiveness not only for the individual, but also for the administrators who have to justify the expense of the program.

Data collected from the program provides a valuable resource for strategic planning. For example, the Baseline Officer Leadership Development Study (BOLDS) is a longitudinal study of US Military Academy cadets incorporating 360-degree feedback using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. The BOLDS research compiles ratings of leadership effectiveness for the 1998 class over time to determine what factors either facilitate or impede effective development.⁴⁸

360-degree feedback tools can be used to provide an indication of the cultural climate of an organisation and how this changes over time depending upon the leadership of the organisation.⁴⁹ Such research is then utilised to strategically plan either future leadership development, or how to transform organisational climate.

⁴⁵ Schwartzman, R.D. LTCOL, US, 2003, 'Transforming Leader Development Through Lifelong Learning', *Military Review*, May-June, p 63.

⁴⁶ McCall, Spreitzer & Mahoney, 1996. In Tornow & Associates, op cit, Chapter 9.

⁴⁷ Lombardo & Eichinger, 1996 in Tornow loc cit.

⁴⁸ The latest technical report 1127 for BOLDS is available from the USMA website at www.dean.usma.edu/bsl/

⁴⁹ Most instruments have the versatility to produce an overall set of data as well as individual. This provides an indication of any cultural change over time following re-testing. The Defence 360

LIMITATIONS

The main limitation for the implementation of 360-degree feedback is a constraint on resources. The 360-degree feedback process often needs a considerable investment in time and money. In terms of time, leaders have to identify ratees; questionnaires have to be sent out and completed; responses have to be collated and feedback reports produced. Simply getting ratees to complete and submit their questionnaires by the date specified is a common problem. The coordinator may have to spend a significant amount of time reminding ratees to complete and submit questionnaires.

Personnel involved in the 360-degree processes have to either be suitably qualified or trained as facilitators for specific tools. The limitation then becomes either finding suitably qualified staff or providing the funding and time away for staff to undergo facilitator training. The number of trained facilitators limits the numbers of leaders that can undergo a 360-degree process at any one time. The larger the number of course members, the more difficult it is to maintain the factors that increase the effectiveness of 360-degree feedback such as one-to-one facilitation.

In the current Defence environment of greater financial accountability, quantifying a return of investment is necessary. Otherwise the use of a 360-degree feedback instruments within leadership programs will be limited to select areas if a return on investment cannot be shown. A second round of 360-degree feedback six months later may incur further cost, however it provides quantifiable data to evaluate a return on investment.

Organisations can become “feedback weary”; overloaded by the number of feedback questionnaires that staff complete. The greater the number of questionnaires a ratee has to complete, the greater tendency there is to take less consideration of the answers given. This degrades the quality of the feedback.⁵⁰ One way around this difficulty is to use software that keeps track of how many questionnaires a ratee receives and set a limit. Leaders submitting their list of selected ratees will receive a notice stating that a particular ratee has reached their limit and to select another ratee.

A target leader who is highly rated by all respondents will receive a feedback report that is of little developmental value. No developmental aspects can be identified. In these cases the target leader already has a high degree of self-awareness, and confidence in their leadership abilities and the 360-degree feedback simply provides validation. Cases in which 360-degree feedback provides validation rather than identifying developmental opportunities are more likely to occur at the higher levels of an organisation such as the Defence Senior Leadership Group.⁵¹ While it is important to introduce 360-degree feedback at senior levels initially to provide higher level support for such a process, the most crucial time to administer 360-degree feedback is as soon as the leader has had some experience in a position of substantial leadership responsibility. A junior leader is more open to developmental opportunities

Appraisal for example provides an overall set of data to indicate the cultural climate and changes over time for the Senior Leadership Group.

⁵⁰ Braken, D.W. & Fleenor, J, Summers, L. 1998., ‘High Tech 360’. *Training and Development*, Vol 52, No 8, Aug.

⁵¹ Interviews with SLG members; see Part Two Report

at this point and would find the feedback more beneficial than receiving it at a later stage.

The next two sections discuss the validity and effectiveness of 360-degree feedback instruments. Further limitations of 360-degree feedback will be discussed in the context of overcoming limitations to maximise validity and effectiveness.

VALIDITY

The validity of 360-degree feedback tools can limit the effectiveness of a 360-degree assessment tool. This section outlines factors to ensure validity when selecting or developing an instrument.⁵² Most commercially available tools ensure validity through extensive psychometric testing. 360-degree feedback tools designed with stringent psychometric standards have proven to be valid when tested in comparison to a psychological assessment centre. Atkins and Wood concluded:

“the high correlations between the assessment centre scores and the aggregated 360-degree ratings from the observers provide strong validation evidence for the 360-degree feedback survey process”⁵³

Factors in ensuring validity of a tool include:

- Identifying relevant performance factors
- Valid questions
- Face validity
- Test-retest reliability
- Respondent correlation

Identifying relevant performance factors

The performance factors measured must match those factors required for leadership development. Some commercially produced instruments may include performance measures that are irrelevant or even undesirable. In this case it is worth investigating whether the questionnaire can be tailored to suit your needs. Identification of relevant factors via a job analysis or utilising a theoretical leadership model is necessary, particularly when developing the instrument.

Valid questions

Identifying relevant performance factors provides a sound basis to develop valid questions. Questions must be clear, uni-dimensional, and based upon observable

⁵² A concise guide to considerations of validity when choosing or developing a 360-degree instruments. is “Choosing 360; A Guide to Evaluating Multi-rater Feedback Instruments for Management Development” by Velsor, Leslie and Fleenor. Velsor, Leslie and Fleenor have also produced a review and comparison of commercially available multi-rater instruments called “Feedback to Managers”. Annex A provides the relevant tables of comparison from this book.

⁵³ Atkins & Wood, loc cit.

behaviours. A question that refers to one behaviour only is uni-dimensional. For example, the question “Does the person listen attentively and provide guidance?” is asking about two separate behaviours. This question also does not involve an observable behaviour. The question “Does the person maintain eye contact?” asks directly about a single observable behaviour. In this example, a number of questions on observable behaviours would be correlated to produce a score for whether a person listens attentively.

Face Validity

Face validity is a quick way of checking questions. You simply imagine applying the question to someone you know and see if the item makes sense.

Test-re-test reliability

Test-retest reliability refers to the stability of questionnaire items over short periods of time. If the test re-test reliability is high, then given no change in a leader’s skills and behaviour, raters will respond similarly to the questionnaire items at different times. A high test-retest reliability indicates questions are unambiguous and cannot be interpreted in different ways.⁵⁴

Respondent Correlation

Another approach to validity is to assess the correlation between respondents. However, this can be a misleading measurement of validity. A reduced correlation between respondents may indicate poor test reliability or it can reflect a valid difference of opinion based upon raters having witnessed different.⁵⁵ Therefore, respondent correlation must be considered in conjunction with test-retest reliability.

A valid and reliable feedback tool is a factor in enhancing feedback processes.⁵⁶ However, the effectiveness of 360-degree feedback is a complex issue and greatly depends upon how it is used.

EFFECTIVENESS

The impact of validity, although an important factor in determining is overemphasised in comparison to the developmental support programs.⁵⁷ A highly valid 360-degree feedback instrument is simply a tool. As with any tool, the effectiveness of 360-degree feedback depends upon how it is used. The most important factor determining effectiveness is how the tool is used in conjunction with other development programs.

Research literature reports a wide variation in effectiveness.⁵⁸ This reflects the variation in 360-degree feedback processes rather than the validity of the instruments.

⁵⁴ Tornow & Associates, op cit, Chapter 7

⁵⁵ Atkins & Wood, loc cit.

⁵⁶ Tornow & Associates, op cit, p 76

⁵⁷ Handley, C., 2001 Feedback Skills, p57. In *The Feedback Project; Improving Performance Through Effective Feedback*; University of Roehampton, Spring

⁵⁸ A study of 145 global organisations found 21.5% found 360-degree feedback to be of high benefit, 57% moderates benefit and 21.5% low benefit. The higher organisations provide a model of best practices for 360-degree feedback implementation. Rogers, E., Rogers, C.W & Metlay, W, 2002 *Improving the Pay off From 360-Degree Feedback*, Human Resource Planning, Vol 25, Iss 3.

For example, one review of 360-degree feedback studies found that only one third reported improvements in performance, another third reported negative changes in performance, while the final third reported no impact.⁵⁹ Considering one review of feedback processes found that only 40% of organisations linked 360-degree feedback to a specific developmental activity, it is apparent there is room to greatly improve the effectiveness.⁶⁰

Most factors determining effectiveness are controllable. The degree of effectiveness of a 360-degree feedback process can be maximised by following best practice guidelines (Enclosure 3). Utilising a supporting development program incorporating methods such as facilitation and mentoring will greatly increase the effectiveness of 360-degree feedback. For example, one study found the inclusion of coaching with 360-degree feedback accounted for increases in leadership effectiveness by as much as 60%.⁶¹ A Canadian research project of 101 large companies found the majority of organisations reporting success of 360-degree feedback processes used facilitation.⁶² The next section discusses six other main factors determining effectiveness of 360-degree feedback.

Maurer, Mitchell, & Barbeiti, in an examination of 150 managers found: "More than 90 % of managers being assessed by the same group... are perceived to have improved some leadership skills". Maurer, T.J., Mitchell, R.D. & Barbeiti, Predictors of Attitudes Towards a 360-Degree Feedback System and Involvement in Post Feedback Management Development Activity. *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology*, Mar 2002.

A study by Personnel Decisions International and Personnel Decisions Research Institute showed improved leadership and management over a twenty six month period when they used 360 degree feedback embedded in a whole development program. Sweeney, T. 360(degree) Feedback Leads to Improved Productivity. *Credit Union Management*. Madison, Aug 2002. Vol 25. Iss 8, p50.

Other research demonstrates the negative impacts of 360-degree feedback. For example, Watson Wyatt's 2001 Human Capital Index, an ongoing study into the linkages between specific HR practices and shareholder value at 750 large companies found that 360 degree feedback programs were associated with a 10.6% decrease in shareholder value. However, shareholder value is not a valid indicator in the context of leadership development. Pfau, B, Kay, I., Nowack, K.M. Ghorpade, J. Does 360-Degree Feedback Negatively Effect Performance? *HR Magazine*. Alexandria, Jun 2002 Vol 47, Iss 6, p 54-60.

⁵⁹ Kluger, A.N. & De Nisi, A. 1996 The Effects of Feedback Interventions on Performance: A Historical review, a meta-analysis, and preliminary feedback theory. *Psychological Bulletin*, 119, p254-284.

⁶⁰ London, M. & Smither, J.W., 1995, Can Multi-Source Feedback Change Self-Evaluations, Skill Development, and Performance? Theory Based applications and directions for research. *Personnel Psychology*, Vol 48, p 803-839.

⁶¹ Thach in a study of 281 executives determined that, in conjunction with coaching, multi-rater feedback accounted for increases in leadership effectiveness by as much as 60 %. Thach, L. 2002, 'The Effect of Executive Coaching and 360 Feedback on Leadership Effectiveness', *Leadership & Organisational Development journal*, Vol 23, p 4.
Kluger and De Nisi found that feedback with goal setting and subsequent support results in larger gains than simply administering feedback. Kluger and De Nisi, loc cit.

⁶² Debrayen & Brutus loc cit.

Other Factors determining effectiveness

Organisational Readiness. The implementation of 360-degree feedback processes can have a negative impact on an organisation not sufficiently mature enough to handle such feedback. The organisational culture must support the feedback process. Organisations with a culture that encourages learning and regularly use other feedback methods are more readily able to accept feedback from a 360-degree process.

Part of the ADF fits this profile as an organisation with a formalised procedure for reporting and giving feedback via its Performance Appraisal Report (PAR) system. Defence personnel accept that such feedback is part of service life. Most organisational members become comfortable with repeated exposure to an institutionalised process of having others evaluate their work.⁶³

Resistance to implementing 360-degree feedback is more noticeable in organisations with resistive or unadaptive cultures.⁶⁴ A paradox exists with respect to the readiness of the ADO to adopt 360-degree feedback. While Defence is more comfortable with feedback as part of its formal reporting process, the Defence culture has some characteristics of being unadaptive, and therefore accepting a new type of feedback throughout Defence may be difficult.⁶⁵ For example, the Australian Command and Staff Course is very hesitant to pilot a 360-degree feedback process for 2004, whereas some senior leaders support the use of 360-degree feedback much earlier in a leader's career.⁶⁶

Trialing a 360-degree feedback process with the senior leaders of an organisation is an important aspect of ensuring an organisation is ready for wider implementation. The Defence Report states "A 360-degree feedback instrument has been developed and implemented across senior levels of Defence".⁶⁷ The report also states the outcome, "develop and implement a coordinated approach to 360-degree feedback reporting across Defence", has been achieved.⁶⁸ As will be discussed in Part Two of this project, the 250 members of the Senior Leadership Group and a small number of feeder groups have undertaken 360-degree feedback processes over the last two years, however, the process is yet to be fully evaluated. It is taking time for the process to filter down to 06/EL1 level.

Educating raters and targets. Part of ensuring organisational readiness is educating raters and target personnel. When a rater is informed about the process and how their responses are utilised, they are more likely to make more considered responses and the data collected is therefore of a better quality.⁶⁹ Many raters simply receive a

⁶³ Church & Waclawski, loc cit.

⁶⁴ Loc cit

⁶⁵ Jans' describes the ADF culture as "slow to recognise the requirement to change and reluctant to undertake reform". Jans, N with Schmidtchen, D, 2002, *The Real C-Cubed: Culture, Careers and Climate and How They Affect Capability*. Canberra Papers on Strategy and Defence, No 143, Australian National university, Canberra.

⁶⁶ Interview with MCAUST.,. RADM R. Gates stated 360-degree feedback would be beneficial around the stage where officers are for example the XO of a Fremantle Class Patrol Boat.

⁶⁷ *Defence Annual Report 2002-03*, Australian Government, Department of Defence. P 422.

⁶⁸ loc cit.

⁶⁹ Boorman, W.C., 1991, 'Job Behaviour, Performance & Effectiveness' in M. Dunnette & L.Hough (Eds) *Handbook of Industrial & Organisational Psychology*, 2nd Ed., Vol. 2, p105-124.

questionnaire without any warning or any description of the process and what their role is within that process. Part of educating people involved in the process is also making them aware of the purpose of the instrument.

Clear purpose to fit goals. An organisation must be clear about the purpose of a program before undertaking a 360-feedback process. Clearly defining the goal of a program provides a basis for choosing or developing the best instrument to suit the needs of the organisation. For example, instruments specifically designed for leadership development are usually based upon a particular leadership model. The leadership model used by the organisation will therefore have an impact upon the instrument used. If the instruments available on the market do not fit the intended purpose it is better to develop the instrument internally to reflect the desired outcome of the program.

Communicate clearly the limits of confidentiality and anonymity. Everyone involved in the process must be able to trust the process. The greater the degree of trust, the greater the benefit derived from the process. Communicating clearly the degree of confidentiality and anonymity involved is one way of increasing the level of trust. Sternbergh suggests that confidentiality of an individual's data is paramount and the data received should not be shared with the organisation. One exception is when an individual chooses to share their information.⁷⁰ Deciding on the levels of confidentiality and anonymity brings to bear the question of using a process delivered by an independent external consultant or utilising internal personnel. Some organisations choose to utilise external consultants initially to increase participants' perception of confidentiality and anonymity. Once the process is established and many initial fears have been overcome, personnel are then more open to having the instrument administered internally.⁷¹

Raters chosen by the target manager. Using an independent person to choose a range of raters provides a balanced range of perspectives on a target leader. However, Anne Grey states that leaders who choose their own raters are significantly more motivated to change as a result of receiving feedback. Choosing raters provides a target leader with a degree of control over the process and, therefore, a greater investment in taking appropriate steps to change as a result of the feedback.

Using feedback for developmental purposes rather than assessment

"Self development is a journey and 360-degree feedback tools are a compass for that journey"
Anon.

In the short term, 360-degree feedback tools should remain as self-development tools. Organisational readiness determines the likelihood of transitioning the tool from development to assessment. At present, few organisations would be ready to make the transition from utilising 360-degree feedback processes for development to utilising such an instrument for PAR.

⁷⁰ Tornow & Associates, op cit. Chapter 2.

⁷¹ Corporate Leadership Council. *Key Literature Findings on 360 Tools for Leadership Development*, Sept 2003, p 5

The high acceptance of feedback via performance appraisal reporting in the ADF indicates a greater readiness than most organisations for the step towards utilising 360-degree feedback for performance appraisal. Colonel Hammes, United States Marine Corps, presents a strong case for the introduction of 360-degree assessment. He advocates the benefit of multiple perspectives in obtaining a more complete assessment of leadership effectiveness.⁷² On the other hand, the conservative and hierarchical nature of Defence works against the change from the current performance appraisal system to a radically new way of conducting appraisal.

Consider the limitations of the current performance appraisal system in comparison to the benefits of 360-degree performance appraisal. A supervisor often seeks input from other people before writing the routine PAR. However, the report is essentially written from only one perspective; that of the supervisor. This one perspective limits the range of observable behaviours utilised to write the report, leaving the process open to the criticism of being biased, despite the best intentions of the Reporting Officer. Utilising 360-degree feedback, PAR emphasises the importance of investing in subordinates' welfare and professional development, rather than encouraging the "please the boss at the expense of subordinates welfare" attitude. The multifaceted and interdependent nature of contemporary work suggests the only accurate assessment of individual behaviour at work demands a multi-rater perspective.⁷³

Organisations are also under increasing pressure to provide evidence of a valuable return on investment of a 360-degree feedback program by utilising instruments for performance appraisal in addition to development.⁷⁴ Use of 360-degree feedback in a development program is more likely to be approved if its utility in performance appraisal is also demonstrated, more clearly establishing a return on investment.

The use of 360-degree feedback for performance appraisal purposes would also enhance leadership development. A leader would be more motivated to take steps towards developing identified areas of concern if they were linked to performance appraisal.

However, research indicates the use of 360-feedback for performance appraisal produces some considerable negative effects. London and Smither demonstrate up to 35% of raters changed the way they rate, becoming more subjective and biased, when 360-degree feedback was used for performance appraisal. Changes are made primarily to keep the manager from trouble, or in some cases get the manager in trouble. In the worst cases, leaders fearing the results of such appraisal, intimidated feedback providers.⁷⁵

The use of 360-degree feedback is still in its infancy. Many people have difficulty coming to terms with its use for developmental purposes, let alone taking the next step and utilising it for performance appraisal. The majority of organisations are not culturally ready to utilise such processes for performance appraisal. The question, therefore, should not be development or appraisal, but when should appraisal be introduced? Most organisational members become comfortable with repeated

⁷² Hammes, COL T.X., 2002, 'Time for a 360', *Marine Corps Gazette*, April.

⁷³ Church & Wacklawski, loc cit

⁷⁴ Waldman, D.A., Atwater, L.E. & Antonioni, D 2002, 'Has 360 feedback Gone Amok' *Academy of Management Executive* Vol 12, No 2, p86-94

⁷⁵ Ghorpade, loc cit.

exposure to an institutionalised process of having others evaluate their work. After a few years of utilising such processes, difficulties associated with the process can be ironed out and organisational members can become better educated. The likelihood of the negative aspects of 360-degree feedback being experienced would be greatly diminished, facilitating a smooth transition to utilising 360-degree feedback for appraisal purposes.

A few of the most salient of factors to consider for maximising the effectiveness of 360-degree feedback have been discussed. Enclosure 3 provides a comprehensive set of guidelines for the implementation of 360-degree feedback. Paradoxes are endemic to organisational life and it is a leader's job to find ways of coping with them to attain desired ends. Rather than shy away from a particular method such as 360-degree feedback, because it is accompanied by undesirable consequences, it is imperative to minimise the negative aspects whilst maximising the benefits.⁷⁶

CONCLUSION

The ADO recognises the value of a systematic and structured leadership development program. The White paper states that improving leadership will remain one of Defence's highest priorities.⁷⁷ Consequently, the SLG development program utilises 360-degree feedback to develop the leadership ability of the SLG members. The use of such tools must be devolved to all levels of leadership and management in the ADO to ensure the optimal development of the next generation of ADO senior leaders.

The challenges of the post-industrial age demand the ADO maximise the potential of its people capability. Optimising people capability requires an investment in the will and feeling systems that underpin the human component of leadership. Leaders in this third age require the versatility to switch between a range of leader behaviours. These behaviours may range from transactional to transformational actions. Such adjustments provide leaders and their organisations the capacity to operate and succeed across the spectrum of conflict.

The development of this versatility is based upon the bedrock of self-awareness. The higher the level of self-awareness, the greater the opportunity to increase EI competencies that underscore leadership development for this age. An enhanced EI enables a leader to ideally influence, provide inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and give individualised consideration. These are the components of a leader with versatility and the ability to inspire followers to exceed expectations.

360-degree feedback contributes to the development of leadership versatility through accessing multiple perspectives of a leader's behaviour. With access to peer and subordinate viewpoints a leader develops a comprehensive picture of their behaviour and its application to a range of situations. However, 360-degree feedback is not a panacea for leadership development. The effectiveness of the 360-degree feedback relies on integration with other supporting developmental strategies. The 360-degree feedback tool provides a compass for the individual tailoring of such strategies to maximise learning outcomes.

⁷⁶ Ghorpade, loc cit.

⁷⁷ Defence White Paper *ibid*, p 63

In the post-industrial era where knowledge is gathered rapidly due to the speed of information and data networks, the time a leader has to make complex decisions is compressed. Leaders in Defence operate within volatile, uncertain, complex and ambiguous environments. A decision made in an operational environment can have immediate implications at the national and international level. The time provided for a leader to develop is, therefore, also compressed. 360-degree feedback must be utilised at all levels of leadership development if Defence is to tap the full measure of human potential.

ENCLOSURES:

1. The Emotional Intelligence Competence Framework Daniel Goleman. "Working with Emotional Intelligence". p 26-27
2. A Review and Comparison of Multi-rater Instruments, Leslie and Fleenor.
3. Best Practice Guidelines. Prof. Christine Farrell, University of Surrey, Roehampton.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Atkins, P.W.B, Wood, R.E. 2002, *Personnel Psychology*. Durham, Winter, Vol. 55, Iss. 4, p 871-905.

Avolio, B.J., Bass, B.M, & Jung, D.I, 1999, 'Re-Examining the Components of Transformational and Transactional Leadership Questionnaire', *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, Vol. 72, p 441-462.

Bar-On, R., 1997, *The Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-I): Technical Manual*. Toronto, Canada, Multi Health Systems.

Boorman, W.C., 1991, 'Job Behaviour, Performance & Effectiveness'. In M. Dunnette & L.Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial & Organisational Psychology*, 2nd Ed., Vol. 2, p 105-124.

Braken, D.W. & Fleenor, J, Summers, L. 1998, 'High Tech 360', *Training and Development*, Vol 52, No 8, Aug.

Brown, L. (Ed) 1993, *The New Shorter English Oxford Dictionary*. Vol 2 Clarendon Press Oxford.

Brutus, S. & Debrayen, M. 2003, *Canadian HR Reporter* Toronto: Feb 10, Vol. 16, Iss. 3, p 18-20.

Burke, Martin, 2000, *Thinking Together: New Forms of Thought System for a Revolution in Military Affairs*, Defence Science and Technology Organisation DSTO-RR-0173 Salisbury, SA.

Church, A.H. & Waclawski, 1988, 'Making Multirater Feedback Systems Work', *Quality Progress*, American Society for Quality Control, Vol. 31, No. 4, April p 81-89.

Corporate Leadership Council. 2003, *Key Literature Findings on 360 Tools for Leadership Development*, Sept.

Garavan, T.N., Morley, M. & Flynn, M. 1997, '360 degree feedback; its role in employee development', *The Journal Of Management Development*, Vol. 16, No. 2, p 134-147.

Ghorpade, J. 'Managing Five Paradoxes of 360 degree feedback', *Academy of Management Executive*, Vol. 14, No. 1, p 140-150.

Ghorpade, J., Kay, I. Pfau, B. & Nowack, K.M. 2002, *HR Magazine*. Alexandria Jun Vol 47, Iss 6, p 54-60.

Gray, A. 2001, 'Individual Differences in 360-Degree Feedback'. in *The Feedback Project*, University of Roehampton, Surrey, Spring.

- Hammes, Colonel T. 'Time for a 360', *Marine Corps Gazette*. April 2002.
- Kaplan, R.E. & Kaiser, R.B., 2003, 'Developing Versatile Leadership', *MIT Sloan Management Review*, Summer, p 8-20.
- Hall, Mary-Jo. PhD., Changing the Way we Assess Leadership., *Acquisition Review Quarterly*. Fall 1997.
- Handley, C., 2001 'Feedback Skills'. In *The Feedback Project; Improving Performance Through Effective Feedback*; University of Roehampton, Spring.
- Hunt, J.W. 2002, 'Fertile Feedback: The views of colleagues on a manager's skills are a proven aid to Leadership Development', *Financial Times*, London, Jun 21.
- Jans, N with Schmidtchen, D, 2002, *The Real C-Cubed: Culture, Careers and Climate and How They Affect Capability*. Canberra Papers on Strategy and Defence, No.143, Australian National University, Canberra.
- Kluger, A.N. & De Nisi, A. 1996, 'The Effects of Feedback Interventions on Performance: A Historical review, a meta-analysis, and preliminary feedback theory'. *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol.119, p254-284.
- Leslie, J.B. & Fleener, J.W. 1998, *Feedback to Managers: A Review and Comparison of Multi-Rater Instruments for Management Development*. Centre for Creative Leadership, North Carolina.
- Livingstone, H., Nadjiwon-Foster, Maria & Smithers, S 2002, *Emotional Intelligence and Military Leadership*. Canadian Forces Leadership Institute.
- London, M. & Smither, J.W., 1995, 'Can Multi-Source Feedback Change Self-Evaluations, Skill Development, and Performance? Theory Based applications and directions for research', *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 48, p 803-839.
- Maurer, T.J., Mitchell, R.D. & Barbeiti, 2002, 'Predictors of Attitudes Towards a 360-Degree Feedback System and Involvement in Post Feedback Management Development Activity', *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology*, Mar.
- Mayer, J.D., Salovey, P. & Caruso, D., 1993, 'Competing Models of Emotional Intelligence'. In Sternberg, R.J. (Ed.). *Handbook of Human Intelligence* (2nd Ed.), New York, Cambridge.
- Pfau, B, Kay, I., Nowack, K.M. Ghorpade, J. 2002, 'Does 360-Degree Feedback Negatively Effect Performance?' *HR Magazine*. Alexandria, Jun, Vol. 47, Iss. 6, p 54-60
- Rogers, E., Rogers, C.W & Metlay, W., 2002 'Improving the Payoff From 360-Degree Feedback', *Human Resource Planning*, Vol. 25, Iss. 3.

Schwartzman, R.D. LTCOL, US, 2003, 'Transforming Leader Development Through Lifelong Learning', *Military Review*, May-June, p 63-67.

Shea, T.H., 1999, '360-Degree Feedback: A Look From All Sides', *Sun Sentinel*, 25 Oct.

Stevenson, E.J., 2003, *Leadership Development: a case of teaching individuals to juggle complexity*. Unpublished CDCLMS Paper.

Stevenson, E., 2003, *Command Presence*, CDCLMS Leadership Paper 2/2003.

Sweeney, T., 2002, '360(degree) Feedback Leads to Improved Productivity', *Credit Union Management*. Madison, Aug. Vol. 25. Iss. 8.

Thach, L., 2002, 'The Effect of Executive Coaching and 360 Feedback on Leadership Effectiveness', *Leadership & Organisational Development Journal*, Vol. 23.

Tornow, W.W., London, M & CCL, 1998 Associates, *Maximising the value of 360 degree Feedback. A Process for Successful Individual & Organisational Development*. Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco.

Van Velsor, E., Leslie, J.B. & Fleenor, J.W. 1997, *Choosing 360: A Guide to Evaluating Multi-Rater Feedback Instruments for management Development*. Centre for Creative Leadership, North Carolina.

Waldman, D.A., Atwater, L.E. & Antonini, David, 2002, "Has 360 degree Feedback gone Amok" Academy of Management Executive.

Walsh, J. PhD, Cox, M., 2002, *Leadership Development and Knowledge Transfer*, University of Guelph, Ontario.

**ENCLOSURE 1 TO
360-DEGREE FEEDBACK IN THE CONTEXT
OF LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT**

EMOTIONAL COMPETENCE FRAMEWORK

PERSONAL COMPETENCE

These competencies determine how we manage ourselves

Self-Awareness

Knowing one's internal states, preferences, resources, and intuitions

- **Emotional awareness:** Recognising one's emotions and their effects
- **Accurate self assessment:** Knowing one's strengths and limits
- **Self-confidence:** A strong sense on one's self worth and capabilities

Self Regulation

Managing one's internal states, impulses, and resources

- **Self-Control:** Keeping disruptive emotions and impulses in check
- **Trustworthiness:** Maintaining standards of honesty and integrity
- **Conscientiousness:** Taking responsibility for personal performance
- **Adaptability:** Flexibility in handling change
- **Innovation:** Being comfortable with novel ideas, approaches, and new information

Motivation

Emotional tendencies that guide or facilitate reaching goals

- **Achievement drive:** Striving to improve or meet the standard of excellence
- **Commitment:** Aligning with the goals of the group or organisation
- **Initiative:** Readiness to act upon opportunities
- **Optimism:** Persistence in pursuing goals despite obstacles and setbacks

SOCIAL COMPETENCE

These competencies determine how we handle relationships

Empathy

Awareness of other's feelings, needs, and concerns

- **Understanding others:** Sensing others' feelings and perspectives, and taking an active interest in their concerns
- **Developing others:** Sensing others' development needs and bolstering their abilities
- **Service orientation:** Anticipating, recognising and meeting customer's needs
- **Leveraging diversity:** Cultivating opportunities through different kinds of people
- **Political awareness:** Reading a group's emotional currents and power relationships

Social Skills

Adeptness at including desirable responses in others

- **Influence:** Wielding effective tactics for persuasion
- **Communication:** Listening openly and sending convincing messages
- **Conflict management:** Negotiating and resolving disagreements
- **Leadership:** Inspiring and guiding individuals or groups
- **Change catalyst:** Initiating or managing change
- **Building bonds:** Nurturing instrumental relationships
- **Collaboration and cooperation:** Working with others towards shared goals

- ***Team capabilities:*** Creating group synergy in pursuing collective goals

Goleman, Daniel. Working With Emotional Intelligence, 1998