360 Degree Feedback: A Tale of Two Cultures.

Sanjay Bhattacharya[1*], Pooja Sharma[2]

[1,2]Symbiosis Centre for Management and Human Resource Development, SCMHRD, Symbiosis International (Deemed University), SIU, Hinjewadi, Pune, Maharashtra, India

ABSTRACT

360 - degree feedback is used as an HR Intervention in many leading organisations for a variety of purposes. It provides a mechanism for flow of feedback to employees from all the stakeholders they deal with. This research explores the factors that determines the effectiveness of implementation of 360 - degree feedback across two distinct and specific cultures - India and Germany. Ten employees (eight from India and two from Germany) having personally experienced 360-degree feedback in their organisations were interviewed. Through Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA), the research tries to find out the advantages and disadvantages of standardisation along with the difference in intent of using of 360 – degree feedback across these two cultures. From Hofstede's cultural dimensions' standpoint. Basis the findings certain recommendations have been made
which can be used to standardize 360 – degree feedback implementation across different cultures globally.

Introduction

While it is accepted generally that feedback with organisations is priceless, especially with regards to employee behaviour, research suggests that the flow of feedback in organisations is typically constrained [2]. In the context of international business, dimensions of culture are a very important facet. Understanding of how different features of a business is viewed in different cultures, helps managers and business leaders understand and sail successfully across international business markets. Organisations not factoring in cultural difference in their people management approaches miss out on opportunities to achieve organisational effectiveness. The most common dilemma with companies nowadays is standardizing global practices or substituting parallel adaptations of similar processes suited to the local cultures [8]. In the same context, standardisation of 360-degree feedback is a key concern area. Assuming the interpretation of 360 - degree feedback is similar in different cultures may be incorrect. The 360-degree feedback process is heavily dependent on the way feedback is perceived and processed. The nature of the 360 - degree feedback process, too, is in most cases, culturally dependent. 360- degree Feedback, also known as multi-rater feedback, upward appraisal, co-worker feedback or full-circle feedback, as defined by Industrial-Organisational Psychology is essentially a process for collecting, quantifying, and reporting co-worker observations about an individual (i.e., a ratee) that facilitates/enables three specific data-driven/based outcomes namely: (a) the collection of rater perceptions of the degree to which specific behaviors are exhibited; (b) the analysis of meaningful comparisons of rater perceptions across multiple ratees, between specific groups of raters for an individual ratee, and for ratee changes over time; and (c) the creation of sustainable individual, group, and/or organisational changes in behaviors valued by the organisation [4].

Literature Review

360 Degree feedback - Argumentatively, 360 - degree has always existed in some form or the other in organisations, it has only recently been labelled as a concrete theoretical concept and gained momentum across organisations across the world. Some of the alternative forms of the 360 - degree feedback process is the 270-degree feedback, named so, due to the omission of one feedback source, such as customer ratings, or the180 degree feedback which includes only peer feedback [17]. Few organisations use an updated version of the 360 - degree feedback process which is termed "540 degrees", because external customers and suppliers also form a source of rating [9]. But in certain cases, the term 360 - degree feedback is also used when the rating includes customers and suppliers as a source of rating.

For a successful implementation of 360 - degree feedback organisations must have a clear understanding of what they want to achieve through feedback [13]. The most prevalent uses of 360 - degree feedback are that of (1) *Career Development, (2) Culture Change, wherein organisation*s use this process to accelerate shift to teamwork, promote employee empowerment and make gradual shifts in the workplace culture [16], (3) *Performance Evaluation, (4) Evaluating Potential, (5) Enhancing team effectiveness:* Organisations are tending to develop customized 360 - degree feedback models which focus on effective teamwork [13]. The very nature of multi-source feedback is adapted towards improving team work and communication. The exercise is a nudge in the right direction to understand stakeholder behaviours for teamwork.

The effectiveness of the feedback implementation can be justified when there is actionable plans or proof of behavioural change across the people and the organisation at

large. Sustained behavioural change in an organisation can be measured by four critical design factors, (1) relevant content, (2) credible data, (3) accountability, and (4) census (organisation wide) participation [3].

Systems view of 360 - degree feedback suggests a new definition for the validity of this instrument. The validity of this instrument lies on the 'Acceptance' by the feedback recipients. The ratee and the feedback recipient should be agreeable to accept that the feedback is accurate and worthy of consideration towards guiding future behaviour [3].

Accountability increases when managers are involved in the implementation of multisource feedback process including rater selection, result discussion and prioritizing development and overall process standardisation. Sharing of results also becomes critical for achieving the benefits of 360 - degree feedback process. Real and perceived data credibility come from a number of sources, including: (1) Sample size of number of raters (2) selecting raters who have easy access to make ample observations of the ratee, (3) feedback recipient making an informed choice of the raters with manager's approval, (4) professionally constructed, valid and reliable instrument with distinct behavioural items, (5) unambiguous instrument without reverse wording or randomization, (6) distinct rating scale designed to reduce rating errors (e.g., leniency and halo), and (7) rater training [3].

Culture - As per Schein [2], culture is represented at 3 levels viz. behaviours and artifacts, beliefs and values, underlying assumptions. These have been ranked as per how easily it is visible in human behaviour and can be observed. Human Behaviour is quite easily visible while underlying assumptions of people need to be inferred. To be able to understand what the beliefs, values or assumptions actually mean to the participants, they need to be surfaced. Laurent argues that, corporate culture may be able to change the first two levels but may hardly have effect on the underlying assumptions as it stems from national culture. [21]. Cultures across different countries can be either be simple or complex. Gamble and Ginsberg [7] have distinguished simple and complex culture based on the number of formal roles that culture allows its members to perform. In simple culture the number of formal roles is fewer for example leader, priest, merchant, labour. In complex culture, the number of formal roles can possibly be infinite. In simpler culture, there is little deviation of manager's behaviour to different situation for instance, mostly managers are expected to have a directive and authoritarian style of leadership. But in complex society, managers' behaviour is likely to be situational [23]. In this case managers and employees are most likely to be able to deal with uncertainty including developing future ready work force without any opportunity at hand. [1].

Kogut and Singh [12] have defined national culture distance as the degree to which the cultural norms differ in different countries. Having standardized HRM (in this case 360 - degree feedback) may reduce competitive advantage by trying to ignore cultural differences instead of trying to have an inclusive approach. India and Germany being emerging and developed economies respectively as explained by Fletcher that there are cultural differences in terms of time, space, familiarity and friendship, consumption patterns, business customs and adoption of innovation between them when emerging markets or developing economies are compared to the developed ones [6].

Cultural Dimensions - As per Hofstede [10], the following five dimensions can be used to describe national culture:

a. **Power Distance**- Acceptance of individuals towards unequal distribution of power in institutions or country.

b. **Individualism & Collectivism** - Individualism refers to preference towards loosely-knit social orientations where individuals concern themselves with themselves and a select few, whereas Collectivism is the opposite where individual expresses loyalty towards family, organisation, country and that determines their attitudes.

c. **Masculinity & Feminity** - Masculinity refers to inclination towards assertiveness, achievement, ambition and challenges leading to material success as compared to Feminity which refers to preference for relationships, workplace security or quality of life.

d. **Uncertainty Avoidance** - Extent of feeling of unrest due to uncertainty or ambiguity

e. **Long term orientation**- Alignment of individuals with long-term objectives rather than short-term objectives of organisation or country.

Challenges of standardizing 360 - degree feedback in cultural Context

When we try to standardize a tool such as 360 - degree feedback in different cultures, there will always be challenges which would deter its implementation and acceptance. The question always remains that whether the process should be created and administered in regional language or not as Germans are more comfortable in their own local dialect whereas Indians see English as a parameter for learnedness. With more and more teams working in the virtual world, distance adds to the complexity of administering the process. There is also an issue of 'acceptance' in different parts of the world [18]. As per Rowson [18], there could be difference in acceptance by participants in Asia and Europe. Asians could accept it simply out of politeness or acceptance of authority or simply buy into the relevancy of the competency model. There is challenge with familiarity with the purpose of the tool across cultures. One of the most important cultural dimensions is power distance. In culture where there is low power distance, the rate of acceptance of feedback is quite high and finding the truth is central irrespective of the consequences. In high power distance culture, there is fear of adhering to social hierarchy which leads to lower acceptance of the feedback process and keeping information confidential is critical. Collectivist Culture like Chinese, French tend to rate themselves lower as modesty is emphasized [18]. Collectivist culture's participants tend to provide more favourable ratings (leniency effect) and also provide ratings that do not differentiate the personality of ratee (halo effect). [15]. As per Waldman & Bowen [27], challenges to 360 - degree feedback process is by their typology of customer-supplier relationship in 360 - degree feedback (customers refer to the raters and the suppliers are the rates)

Methodology

The objective of the research is to find out the effectiveness of the standardisation of 360 - degree feedback across German and Indian cultures and how cultural or individual factors play a role in the standardisation of the 360 - degree feedback. Basis studied literature, the theory building approach, is followed by inductive reasoning. The research paradigm follows interpretative approach and believes that it will tend to change depending upon the prevailing social and human interaction. The focus of the research was qualitative as it tries to find out the managerial perceptions of 360 - degree feedback on self- awareness, cultural factors that play a role in 360 - degree feedback and organisational effectiveness created by 360 - degree feedback which can be better answered through interviews.

The research strategy includes interviews to be conducted with a) the managers who will serve as the feedback recipient for this research, b) raters who are feedback givers for this research and c) third party vendors who have actually implemented 360 - degree feedback in India or Germany. As has been earlier mentioned, interviews would serve well as a research instrument as the research intends to measure the managerial opinion and perceptions and the cultural factors that influence their perceptions. Since the research is more explanatory in nature, it is recommended to use semi-structured interviews.

Since the study is intended to be interpretative, we use interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA) to probe into how participants perceive their personal, professional and social worlds. The double hermeneutic theoretical underpinning of IPA will aid the study further in capturing the interpretation of the 'lived experience' of the participant. In turn, helping the researcher to interpret their interpretations of the experiences. The meaning of events, experiences and states all hold different for each individual participant and that is the beauty of a study [24]. IPA studies are ideally conducted as semi structured interviews of a relatively small sample size. This type of study is peculiar because it involves a two-stage interpretation process where the participants are trying to make sense of their social sphere, while the researcher is also trying to make sense of the participants. The researcher engages with the participant in free-flowing conversations which are only initially led as per the interview schedule and carried on as per the response of the participants with occasional probing from the researcher based on areas of their interest. Eight participants were chosen for this study. Amongst them, six were Indians nationals working in India and two were German nationals working in Germany. The participants were chosen such that they were experiential experts of 360 - degree feedback and were conducted via Skype or phone calls of average 45-50-minute duration. The transcripts were generated for each interview and IPA was the chosen method of analysis with focus on meanings derived rather than frequency of occurrences.

Analysis & Discussion

Based on the emergent themes from the interview transcripts, the master list of super and sub-ordinate themes was charted out. This gave a vivid idea about 360 – degree feedback system and how it is perceived from two different cultures as felt and lived by people within their individual organisations.

Theme 1 - Advantages and Disadvantages of Standardisation of 360 - degree feedback:

a. Standardized questionnaire where each manager is rated on the same parameters

The uses of standardized questionnaire imply that the same questionnaire is used for all of the 360 - degree feedback processes and participants irrespective of their roles or responsibilities in the organisation. Customization can mean designing specific and unique questionnaires as per the roles and responsibilities of the feedback participant or designing a specific questionnaire as per the rater groups. Majority of our respondents reported to the use of standardized questionnaires. Standardisation, they felt, ensures there is no bias in the process.

b. Questionnaire based on competencies essential for the organisation task related, behavioural skills, company values, leadership competencies

The intent of 360 - degree varies across organisations but the standardized 360 - degree feedback questionnaire is based on the competencies that can be grouped along four categories- organisation task related, behavioural skills, company values, leadership competencies. When the 360 - degree feedback is specifically used for performance management in an organisation, the parameters take the shape of task-related goals in a 360 - degree feedback questionnaire. Company values were also used as parameters to see how much is the feedback recipient aligned to company values in his view and that of others Standardized questionnaires are based on standard behavioural competencies that remain standard across business units.

Standardisation helps to inculcate certain culture throughout the organisation through behavioural skills and company values

Corporate culture is the outcome of the company values held by an organisation. 360 - degree feedback helps to develop values that are dear to the organisation through individual behavioural traits and company values. A surprising result was to find out that none of the German research participants felt that 360 - degree feedback can be used to establish the corporate culture and company values did not find a place in the standardized 360 - degree feedback questionnaire.

Standardized questionnaire leads to different interpretations by people from different cultures

Standardisation poses problems in terms of interpretation. Different cultural experience causes the same question or feedback by respondent to be interpreted separate by different cultures and it is not wholly attributed to languages. Interpretation of the feedback may have ambiguity in terms of languages and expressions. Thus, language becomes a tricky component while framing standardized questionnaire.

Theme 2 - Effectiveness of 360 - degree feedback:

a. Feedback recipient prefers qualitative interviews over quantitative ratings along with comments

While the standard way of implementing a 360 - degree feedback is through a standard questionnaire with ratings and comments on ratings, feedback recipient preferred qualitative feedback through interviews but more often than not the raters are not very active when it comes to giving comments on their ratings and leave the section empty. The intent of the comment section in 360 - degree feedback questionnaire is to aid the development of the feedback recipient but it has not been proved fruitful in the Indian context. On comparing these observations to the German interview participants, the Germans also prefer qualitative interviews but with different reasoning that qualitative interviews help in better understanding of the feedback.

b.   Anonymity leads to genuine feedback
All the research participants from India and Germany were unanimous in their opinion that anonymity is essential to conduct 360 - degree feedback despite some setbacks. If the process is not anonymous, it would result in superficial feedback that does not help the feedback recipient much. In a hierarchical organisation, anonymous feedback works the best because sub-ordinates are not comfortable sharing their views with the manager. There is some apprehensiveness in the minds of sub-ordinates and anonymity is a must to ensure that genuine feedback is given. Even in a direct culture like that of Germany, anonymity finds importance because the managers as a feedback recipient considers himself a powerful person and the knowledge of source of feedback might have potentially dangerous consequences.

c.   Selection of raters based on who have worked with the feedback recipient and who know him well
Who selects the raters and on what criteria is an important area of concern for an effective 360 - degree feedback process. In most of the cases, it is the manager or the feedback recipient himself or the HR that does the selection of raters. The German feedback recipient could select raters from the peer group but the rest of the selection was made by the HR. Whenever a self-selection of raters was done by the feedback recipient in the German context, it was cross-checked by the immediate manager to prevent flawed feedback. The raters are selected on the basis of who has worked with the feedback recipient and who know the feedback recipient well and those who won't rate extremely positively or extremely negatively.

Theme 3 - Cultural or Individual factors affecting 360 - degree feedback:

a.   Direct negative feedback is not appreciated in Indian culture, tries to validate it
Most of the Indian research participants felt that they would not prefer to give/receive negative feedback directly. Direct negative feedback can also create a lot of demotivation among Indian feedback recipients. Negative feedback should be enclosed with positive feedback to make the 360 - degree feedback exercise impactful.

b.   Direct reportees are not open with their managers in Indian culture
The whole concept of 360 - degree feedback being routed by a third party or an HR works well in the Indian context as the sub-ordinates are not open with their managers. The sub-ordinates agree to their managers on everything without questioning the authority. Building relationship with sub-ordinates and gaining trust of sub-ordinates is extremely important in receiving genuine feedback and it is tough to implement.

c.   Indians believe in external/societal factors for their development while Germans are not much affected by this.
As per the Indian research participants, they are heavily dependent on the organisational factors for their development. If the feedback recipient does not receive external support for his development, there is a quick tendency to leave the organisation. In contrast to this, Germans are not affected by conflicting scenarios where they exhibit an internal locus of control saying that they have to own their own personal development.

d.   Age and hierarchy affect how feedback is given/received in Indian society
Age demands respect in India and people are not so critical of people who are senior by age. An important thing to note is that the German research participant felt that 360 - degree feedback should be introduced in a less hierarchical organisations and flat teams where people value open feedback.

Theme 4 - Intent of 360 - degree feedback:

a.   360 - degree feedback is either used for learning and development or performance management
The success of 360 - degree feedback depends on the intent with which 360 - degree feedback has been introduced in the organisation. In a few organisations, 360 - degree feedback is being used as a replacement for the bell curve systems for the performance management systems. Another important implication of 360 - degree feedback is for training and development purposes. Its usage has been seen in some Indian subsidiaries and Indian organisations for development, wherein a negative feedback is always suffixed by a development plan. The Germans use this tool for development of skills and to measure the leadership capability through a framework.

b.   Acceptance rate among participants is more when 360 - degree feedback is used for development purpose as compared to performance management
The 360 - degree feedback implementation experts experienced hesitation among the participants when it is rolled out in any organisation because the first thing that strikes about 360 - degree feedback is performance appraisal. The German research participant is also not comfortable with the use of 360 - degree feedback as performance measurement tool as performance is a bigger issue in an organisation and requires dialogue to find what's wrong and how to fix it. Although the 360 - degree feedback tool is much popular tool for performance management than development tool, the acceptance rate for the popular tool is quite low among the participants of 360 - degree feedback exercise.

c.   360 - degree is weakly correlated to the business strategy if used as a development tool
Like most of the development interventions, it is tough to justify the tangible benefits achieved out of a 360 - degree feedback tool. Therefore, the managers feel that 360 -

degree feedback is weakly linked to the business strategy. Also, 360 - degree feedback is more aligned to an individual and less towards company values and strategy. There were few participants who felt that 360 - degree feedback is aligned to the strategy when 360 - degree feedback is used for the measurement of performance because the individual goals and business goals are then aligned. Germans on the other hand explained the usage of 360 - degree feedback as a leadership development tool and to measure where leadership stands. It is possible that in spite of the best leaders, business results can be bad and thus the link between the two is very weak.

Theme 5 - Managerial self-awareness created by 360 - degree feedback:

a. Self-ratings are important for the feedback recipient to know how far he stands from others' viewpoint

360- degree feedback helps to identify the gap areas which could help identify the developmental needs. Self-ratings enable this process by letting the feedback recipient know where does he stand we compares himself to that of other's viewpoint. Self- ratings also help a feedback recipient know how fit is he for a purpose in the eyes of others.

b. Indians tend to rate themselves more positively than they actually feel about themselves

This is a general tendency observed by the research participants amongst their fellow peers who belong to India. The inefficiency of self-ratings can be attributed to the fact that everyone tends to rate themselves higher than actual. This can be because of the fact that when 360 - degree feedback is used for performance measurement, discrepancy between self and others' ratings are not taken positively. On the contrary, Germans prefer a level-headed rating and rate themselves the way they actually are.

c. 360 - degree feedback is ineffective in the Indian context due to lower acceptance rate by the participants

Acceptance rate should be pretty high to plough the real advantages of 360 - degree feedback. As explained earlier, most of the Indians do not take 360 - degree feedback seriously because it has been ineffective in the past years. Its usage as a performance measurement tool is popular but less effective. Acceptance rate also depends on the genuine feedback and amount of information shared. The implementation experts do not prefer 360 - degree feedback as the rolling out takes a lot of time.

Along with the above analysis, the primary data collected from the interviews and their subsequent transcripts were also analysed in the light of the various dimensions of culture as envisioned through their respective frameworks by Hofstede, Schwartz and Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner.

Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions and 360 Degree feedback System – Indian and German Perspective.

a. Power Distance

Most respondents have experience low power distance in organisations be it in India or Germany. As quoted by a respondent, "I go and talk to my employees" (Interview 5,1), it shows how employees perceive there is equal distribution of power in organisations.

But on certain instance employees in India feel there is high power distance in Indian cultures as highlighted by "the power distance is a lot in India, for everything we depend on our management" (Interview 2,2). But in contrast the German counterparts unanimously perceive their culture as one with low power distance as put forward by "the bosses that they have a regular meeting with the board members and then they give feedback to all the different managers in that area" (Interview 3,8).

b. Individualism

The respondents have experience high degree of autonomy and freedom and participation in decision making in their organisations but social interactions are low and people only tend to concern themselves with their own work. Putting oneself before others is a manifestation of individualism as mentioned "everyone will rate himself/herself in a very good manner" (Interview 1, 23). The positives of individualism are that "Every single employee can think that that he has the potential to a bigger role" (Interview 5, 20) and you realize "I am the one that needs to take action on my own personal development" (Interview 8, 33).

c. Masculinity

The respondents from Indian and German culture have divergent views from masculinity perspective. Indians do not want to disclose their feedback in front of their peers and subordinates as if their male pride or ego would get hurt (Interview 1). The Germans are open and direct in terms of receiving feedback in public. If we look at it from achievement perspective of masculinity both Germans and Indians want to develop themselves and do better from the feedback they receive from their managers.

d. Uncertainty Avoidance

Culturally, the ability to deal with ambiguity and uncertainty is clearly higher in German organisations than Indian organisations. The respondents from German culture have majorly shown openness to receive accurate feedback from subordinates or managers so that they can work upon their weaknesses and develop themselves rather not form a negative bias towards them as mentioned. "Can I have some more information? So that I can know more about it? Always, how can I address the issue that they rate?*"* (Interview 8, 22) and the feedback recipient discusses with raters a development plan after feedback report. When it comes to Indian context, there are divergent views upon anonymity of source of feedback and how open they are towards feedback which depends on the culture of organisation (startup or hierarchical) and mostly respondents have said that the employees are wary of their managers while giving feedback and as well would want to avoid it being discussed in front of colleagues.

e. Long-term Orientation

The Indian culture predominantly views order of events with short term objectives as something that must be maintained sequentially. This is evident from the response of interviewee 2 "if someone is not doing well in one particular area, organisations are making sure that you go and take a particular training for that particular skill and capability" (Interview 2, 9) wherein they talk about the organisation just focusses on employee development as the need of the hour

without any long-term view of capability development. On the contrast German cultures tend to have more long-term orientation where they realize the need for treating the past present and future as interlocked time periods, this is brought out by their concern for using 360 as developmental tools as stated by, "And this 360 assessment or feedback gives you a very good view, Am I managing all my stakeholders? It is not only I lead my team; I work with my boss." (Interview 8, 7).

Concluding Summary

The research has tried to have an exploratory approach to the way 360 - degree feedback is incorporated in two different cultures, i.e. India and Germany. It looks at how cultural dimensions from the cultural frameworks of Hofstede would to an extent help shed light on the research questions. With respect to standardisation of 360 - degree feedback in different cultures is concerned, one big advantage is that it helps in inculcating a standard corporate culture in two different national culture. It is effective in performance management in matrix organisation structures especially across different cultural context. The implementation of 360 - degree feedback in different cultures have certain barriers. These barriers are mainly because of cultural factors like power distance as defined in Hofstede's framework, individualism or collectivism, the concept of self in Indian culture as compared to community in German Culture. These dimensions quite clearly impact the effectiveness of the tool, which is determined by its acceptance rate and its implication on the business strategy. An individual factor which plays a crucial role in 360 - degree feedback is age of participants which is not seen in case of Germans. Since, all the cultural factors vary in Indian and German society. Hence, the 360 - degree feedback implementation experts should consider these different cultural aspects while standardizing this multi-rater tool in two different cultures, India and Germany.

References

[1] Adsit, D. L. (1997). Cross-cultural differences in upward ratings in a multinational company. The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 385-401.

[2] Ashford, S. (1989). Feedback seeking in individual adaptation: a resource perspective. Academy of Management, 465-487.

[3] Bracken, D., & Rose, D. (2011). When Does 360-Degree Feedback Create Behavior Change? And How Would We Know It When It Does? Journal of Business and Psychology, 26(2), pp.183-192.

[4] Bracken, D., Rose, D., & Church, A. (2016). The Evolution and Devolution of 360° Feedback. Industrial and Organisational Psychology, 9(04), pp.761-794.

[5] Fleenor, J. W. (2010). Self-other rating agreement in leadership: A review. The Leadership Quarterly, 1005-1034.

[6] Fletcher, R. (2004). Foreign investment in developing countries. Palgrave Macmillan.

[7] Gamble, T. J., & Ginsberg, P. E. (1981). Differentiation, Cognition, and Social Evolution. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 12(4), 445–459.

[8] Gillespie, T. (2005). Internationalizing 360-Degree Feedback: Are Subordinate Ratings Comparable? Journal of Business and Psychology, 19(3), pp.361-382.

[9] Handy, L., Devine, M., & Heath, L. (1996). 360 - degree Feedback: Unguided Missile or Powerful Weapon? Berkhamsted: Ashridge Management Research Group.

[10] Hofstede, G. (1980). Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-related Values. Sage.

[11] Huggett, M. (1998). 360-degree feedback - great expectations? Industrial and Commercial Training, 28-130.

[12] Kogut, B., & Singh, H. (1988). The effect of national culture on the choice of entry mode. Journal of International Business Studies, Vol. 9 No. 3, pp. 411-32.

[13] Lepsinger, R., & Lucia, A. (1997). Creating champions for 360 feedback. In R. Lepsinger, & A. Lucia, The Art and Science of 360 - degree feedback (pp. Vol. 52 No. 2, 49-53.

[14] McCarthy, A. M., & Garavan, T. N. (2001). 360 - degree feedback processes: performance improvement and employee career development. Journal of European Industrial Training 25/1, 5-32.

[15] Ng, K.-Y., Koh, C., Ang, S., Kennedy, J. C., & Chan, K.-Y. (2011). Rating leniency and halo in multisource feedback ratings: Testing cultural assumptions of power distance and individualism-collectivism. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1033-1044.

[16] O'Reilly, B. (1994, October). 360 - degree feedback can change your life. Fortune, pp. 7-93.

[17] Peters, H. (1996). Peer coaching for executives. In Training and Development. 50(3), 39-42.

[18] Rowson, A. (1998). Using 360 - degree Feedback Instruments up, down and around the world: Implications for global implementation and use of Multi-Rater Feedback. International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 45-48.

[19] Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2009). Research Methods for Business Students (5 ed.). London.

[20] Schein, E. H. (1992). How can organizations learn faster?: the problem of entering the Green Room.

[21] Schneider, S. C. (1988). National vs. corporate culture: Implications for human resource management. Human resource management, 27(2), 231-246.

[22] Schwartz, S. (1994). Beyond individualism/collectivism: new cultural dimensions of values. Individualism and Collectivism: Theory, Method, and Applications, 85-119.

[23] Shaw, J. (1990). A Cognitive Categorization Model for the Study of Intercultural Management. The Academy of Management Review, 626.

[24] Smith, J., & Osborn, M. (2007). Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis. Qualitative Psychology, 53-80.

[25] Susan C. SCHNEIDER. (1988). National vs. Corporate Culture :Implications for Human Resource Management. Human Resource Management, pp.231-246.

[26] Trompenaars, F., & Hampden-Turner, C. (1997). Riding the Waves of Culture: Understanding. Nicholas Brealey Publishing Limited.

[27] Waldman, D., & Bowen, D. (1998). The acceptability of 360 - degree appraisals: A customer-supplier relationship perspective. Human Resource Management, 117-129.

[28] Yeganeh, H. (2011). A generic conceptualization of the cultural distance index Application to Schwartz's and Hofstede's frameworks. Journal of Strategy and Management, 325-346.