

ASSESSMENT OF EMPLOYEE'S PERFORMANCE USING 360 FEEDBACK: CASE STUDY OF GOODYEAR ROMANIA

Nicoleta CHICU¹

ABSTRACT

Nowadays, we understand that 360 ° evaluation plays an important role in the life of companies and, more exactly, at the workplace. Today, most companies use advanced techniques of evaluation for their employees, by determining which are the factors of professional success and factors that need to be improved. The 360° assessment provides a complete picture of the employee, with several perspectives: the employee's ability to grow faster, self-motivation and performance-oriented career path. This article outlines the concept of the employee behavior at the workplace, which is another factor in the 360° assessment and has a direct influence on productivity, as well as on its ability to reach the objectives previously set. The conclusions are based on a study conducted in the company Goodyear Romania.

KEYWORDS: *evaluation, self-motivation, performance, employee-behavior.*

1. INTRODUCTION

All organizations are interested in their employee's good performances at work. For this reason, people who work in companies are regularly assessed on their professional performance. Similarly, candidates who come to be selected for a position are assessed on the basis of mental and/or physical health characteristics, the ones that relate to their job performance.

In the literature that studies human resources, it is widely recognized that the promotion of motivation of workers, be it private or public organizations, leads to optimum performances in relation to human resources. The significance of combining good human resource performance approaches is becoming more and more important for managers, as it encourages employees to perform better. The satisfaction of workers is a focal point for both private and public organizations and so is human resources management. A popular management paradigm, its importance in the greater scheme of a company and in this increasing competitive world is steadily growing and proving its success through results and examples.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Performance appraisal is a process that examines whether the work is performed by the employees of the company. The action itself is known as the evaluation of the employees. The evaluation of human resources has three distinct activities: behavior assessment: assessing potential development and capacity: performance evaluation. This very general information on the evaluation of professional performance is used for: wage determination, adequate distribution of work and organization of training and professional development.

Some authors have pointed out that the term evaluation could be associated with the term of feedback, which was described as a key process in the life of an organization. (Bear, J.B., et al, 2017). In addition, feedback enables workers to understand the opportunities and expectations of

¹ University of Economic Studies, Romania, chicu_nicoleta@yahoo.com

reward in their workplace (Van Velsor, McCauley, Moxley, 1998), giving them a chance to improve their performance (Smither and al., 1995, Wohlers, Hall & London, 1993).

In the specific literature, feedback is defined as a tool to serve performance, being a powerful managerial lever that can be used without any restriction. The manager has the opportunity to encourage the efforts made, to acknowledge the results and reinforce the degree of involvement and accountability.

In the recent years, 360 degree feedbacks have been increasingly used and their implementation continues to increase in an impressive way (Facteau et al., 1995). Applied cautiously, the feedback process is able to provide useful answers to both the organization and the people involved. Improper use of 360 degree feedbacks, however, could lead to negative feelings, increased anxiety, and even key staff leave. In a case study, Carson (2006) presents the key findings of best practices research for the use of the 360 feedback process and pointed out the alignment of performance measures with organizational goals, selection and training of participants. Now there are several reasons to use 360 degree feedback programs, but there are consequences with the use of this plan.

Another authors studied various factors associated with managers' reactions to 360 degree feedback using a sample of 220 supervisory leaders of a general public. They collected data in three steps, including pre-test, performance and post-test evaluations, and took into account that overall scores, organizational support and perceived sensor capacity could be positively associated with four criteria of reaction. The results indicated that the overall scores were associated with the acceptance of peer and subordinate feedback, but were less associated with perceptions of the usefulness of feedback.

The purpose of the Employee 360 Assessment research is to examine employee perceptions at the Goodyear company, starting from three dimensions: the manager's assessment, the self-assessment (the employee's own assessment) and the evaluation made by his/her colleagues. Goodyear is one of the world's leading tire companies, turning its history from a simple rubber production company to a recognized brand everywhere.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research proposes one of the first steps to demonstrate the usefulness of evaluation 360 in the development of work which is a rather important topic within a company, but which also affects the professional life of the employee. In attempting to see employees' perceptions on self-assessment, the manager's assessment, and the assessment made by the colleagues, there were sheets designed for each subject included in the study, with those 10 characteristics that been proposed to the focus group. The methodology used in this study is a quantitative research because there are a large number of persons interviewed, the collected data being analyzed from a statistical point of view. To this methodology is added a focus group which has led us to advance the following characteristics: ambitious, protective, competent, determined, forward-looking, honest, creative, motivated, loyal and organized. The evaluation sheets were created in Excel and they were distributed among the associates from the Goodyear Company. After the data was collected, the sheets were used to analyze the results, to generate graphs and to quantify the responses received from the participants. **The hypotheses of this research:**

1. The perception of self-assessment is different than the perception of the evaluation carried out by the manager.
 2. The perception on the manager's assessment has had greater impact than the evaluation of colleagues.
 3. The perception on the evaluation of colleagues is different than the perception of self-evaluation.
- Out of a total of 92 employees, 34 are men and 58 are women. The age distribution in the Goodyear company is the following: there are 25 persons in the 19-24 age group; 30 persons in the interval 25-30 age group; 27 persons in the interval between 31-36; 9 persons between 37-42 and just 1

person who is over 43 years old. The subjects that were interviewed are from 7 different departments, all working in accounting and financial areas.

4. RESULTS

Each employee has been evaluated by the manager, his/her colleague and also self-evaluated. After collecting the data, one had the following results: T&E Department had 6 self-evaluations that were overstated, 1 overvaluation from the colleagues' part and 1 overvaluation from the manager. In what undervaluations are concerned, 3 were provided by the manager and there was 1 personal undervaluation. From a total of 15 employees at the T&E Department, there was only one evaluation that had similar scores in all 3 evaluations.

GA1 Department had the following results: 3 over self-valuations, 1 carried by the manager. In the case of undervaluations – 3 came from the colleagues' part and 1 from the manager. The rate of correct evaluations is higher than the one from the T&E Department – the GA1 scored 5 matching evaluations.

The GA2 Department had the following results : 7 over self-valuations and 2 from the manager's part. There was 1 undervaluation from the manager's part, while there were 3 matching evaluations. The Procurement Department had 1 overvaluation from the manager's part and 4 undervaluations coming from the colleagues. In this case, one sees the absence of a correct evaluation at department level.

The Sales Department had these scores – 1 overvaluation from the manager. There were 6 undervaluations from the colleagues' part, 1 self-valuation and 1 from the manager. There were 6 matching evaluations, which shows that there is a clear balance at the level of this department.

The FP&A Department had the following results – there were 5 over self-valuations and 2 coming from the manager. There were also 5 undervaluations provided by colleagues and 3 matching evaluations.

The AP Department had the following scores – 2 over self-valuations, 3 undervaluations provided by colleagues and only 1 matching evaluation.

The FOS Department had only undervaluations, coming from colleagues, with the score of 4. This result draws attention on the employees' strictness and their lack of confidence in each other, by giving the others low scores.

5. CONCLUSIONS

At the company level, most colleague assessments tend to be underestimations, while personal evaluations are very close, being overvalued by employees. From a total of 84 evaluations, 19 evaluations tend to be correct, this means that the scores of these evaluations are in agreement and the employees know how to evaluate in an efficient way. 10 evaluations from the manager tend to be underestimations and 5 are overvaluations, which invalidates hypothesis no. 1. For self-assessments and evaluations from colleagues, it is clear that hypothesis no. 2 is overturned, with a larger score for evaluations received from colleagues. For the evaluation of the colleagues and the self-evaluation, one notices that hypothesis no.3 is confirmed, thus one has a difference between these 2 perceptions.

The novelty of employee evaluations is carried out by the human resources department, in line with the company's business scope, the company's workforce, the employee's self-development capacity. The use of platforms that play the intermediate role between the employee and the manager can lead to better results.

The usefulness of evaluations comes from the fact that companies want their employees to be "monitored" from the point of view of performance in the workplace. Each individual has an evaluation at the end of the year which aims at seeing what performances have been achieved and

what is the action plan for the future. This type of evaluation shows the individual's ability to motivate and help improve the company's processes.

The limits for this kind of assessments can be found at the level of the relations between the employees: there are employees who may have been too subjective, while the others were objective. It also takes into account the fact that people have been influenced one by another and that the grades given to the certain characteristics do not reflect 100% truthfulness. There is also a degree of mistrust among respondents because this was the first time they responded to this type of assessment and they were not confident that the results will be confidential.

REFERENCES

- Bear, J., B., Cushenbery, L., London, M., Sherman, G., D. (2017). Performance feedback, power retention, and the gender gap in leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 28(6), 721-740. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2017.02.003.
- Facteau, J., D., Dobbins, G., H., Russell, J., E., A., Ladd, R., T. & Kudisch, J., D. (1995). The influence of general perceptions of the training environment on pretraining motivation and perceived training transfer. *Journal of Management*, 21 (1), 1-25.
- McCauley, C., D., Van Velsor, E. (2004). *Handbook of leadership development*. Greensboro: The Center for Creative Leadership.
- 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), 1-34. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.1995.tb01744.x.