


**Shahid Rafiq<sup>1</sup>, Madiha Khadim<sup>2</sup> & Ayesha Afzal<sup>3</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Manager Outcome Based Education, University of Central Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan

<sup>2</sup>Lecturer, Department of Education, GC Women University, Faisalabad, Pakistan

<sup>3</sup>Assistant Professor, University of Management and Technology, Lahore, Pakistan

KEYWORDS	ABSTRACT
<p><b>360-Degree Leadership, Performance Appraisal, University Level</b></p>	<p>This research focuses on examining effects associated with implementing a comprehensive leadership performance evaluation system in a university environment. The main objective is to examine the relationships between utilizing 360-degree appraisal approach to assess leadership performance and its impact on faculty members and students in the university. These impacts encompass various aspects, such as improvements of leadership skills, shaping of organizational culture, and enhancement of employee satisfaction and overall performance. Through extensive survey conducted among university's teaching staff, valuable insights were gathered about potential advantages &amp; challenges of introducing 360-degree leadership performance evaluation system within the university's unique context. The study primarily employed quantitative methods to gather and analyze the data, involving 522 teaching staff participants from both public and private universities of Lahore. The results provide significant information in extracting the desired information, reaching the conclusion and offering recommendations to employees, stakeholders, institutions and the future researchers.</p>
<p><b>ARTICLE HISTORY</b></p> <p>Date of Submission: 08-07-2023 Date of Acceptance: 15-08-2023 Date of Publication: 19-08-2023</p>	
<p><b>Corresponding Author</b></p>	<p> 2023 Journal of Social Sciences Development</p>
<p><b>Email:</b></p>	<p><a href="mailto:shahid.rafiq@ucp.edu.pk">shahid.rafiq@ucp.edu.pk</a></p>
<p><b>DOI</b></p>	<p><a href="https://doi.org/10.53664/JSSD/02-02-2023-06-189-203">https://doi.org/10.53664/JSSD/02-02-2023-06-189-203</a></p>

## INTRODUCTION

In the dynamic landscape of higher education, universities consistently strive to enhance their leadership competencies and organizational effectiveness. A crucial aspect of this endeavor entails evaluating and enhancing leadership performance within university environment (Rafiq & Qaisar, 2021). Traditional assessment frameworks have conformed mainly to a hierarchical configuration, wherein appraisals predominantly originate from superiors or administrative entities (Ali, 2016). Nevertheless, a paradigmatic transformation has arisen with the advent of 360-degree leadership performance appraisal system (Cheng & Wu, 2020). 360-degree leadership performance review system embodies inclusive methodology for assessing leadership efficacy, incorporating feedback

from a broad spectrum of contributors (Al-Jedaia & Mehrez, 2020). These contributors encompass evaluations from supervisors, colleagues, subordinates & even self-assessments (Das & Panda, 2017). Underlying principle of this system is founded on recognition that comprehensive assessment offers more accurate and intricate depiction of individual leadership competencies and areas warranting further enhancement.

Despite its prevalent application in corporate realm, the incorporation of 360-degree appraisal system within unique milieu of universities introduces novel trajectory for scholarly investigation (Aarons & Ehrhart, 2022). This quantitative research investigation delves deeply into the consequences stemming from the integration of a 360-degree leadership performance appraisal system within the confines of a university environment (Das & Panda, 2017). The principal aim of this study is to empirically examine the interrelation between the implementation of 360-degree leadership performance appraisal methodologies and a range of outcomes at the university level. Empirical studies have also indicated the constructive correlation between 360-degree feedback implementation and the employee contentment and engagement (Mbokota, & Reid, 2022). These outcomes encompass the progression of leadership capabilities, the prevailing organizational ethos, employee satisfaction, and comprehensive performance evaluations (Cheng & Wu, 2020). By conducting an exhaustive survey that targets faculty members across a diverse array of universities, this study endeavors to illuminate potential benefits and challenges inherent in embracing a 360-degree leadership performance appraisal paradigm within the sphere of higher education (Boella & Goss-Turner, 2019).

The significance of this research lies in its potential to provide valuable insights to the university administrators, faculty development initiatives, and policymakers regarding the feasibility and consequences of adopting a 360-degree leadership performance appraisal system (Cheng & Wu, 2020). As universities endeavor to foster effective leadership & cultivate conducive organization environment, understanding implications of this innovative appraisal approach becomes of utmost importance (Kopsidas, 2021; Rafiq, Qaisar & Butt, 2022). By systematically exploring outcomes, this study contributes to broader conversation surrounding leadership assessment methodologies and their potential transformative role within dynamic landscape of higher education institutions (Kwon, & Kim, 2020). In the subsequent sections, we will delve into the theoretical foundations of the 360-degree leadership performance appraisal system, review relevant literature that informs its application within university contexts, outline the research methodology employed, present the findings and their implications, and conclude with a comprehensive discussion on the potential implications and the future directions for integrating the 360-degree appraisal system within the university environment.

### Research Problem

This research article addresses a significant gap in understanding the implications of implementing a 360-degree leadership performance appraisal system within the university context. Despite the increasing adoption of this appraisal method in various organizational settings, its application and impact in the unique environment of universities have not been thoroughly explored. The research problem at core of this study revolves around the need to comprehensively examine relationship

between utilizing 360-degree appraisal approach to assess leadership performance and its effects on both faculty members and students within university setting. Additionally, research problem aims to examine how outcomes resulting from integration of 360-degree leadership performance appraisal system influence a range of factors, including the enhancement of leadership abilities, the shaping of organizational culture, employee satisfaction levels, and overall performance within the university realm.

This research problem is rooted in understanding that traditional hierarchical appraisal methods might not capture intricate dynamics of leadership within academic environment. As universities seek to bolster leadership efficacy and improve organizational outcomes in the face of evolving educational landscapes, understanding the potential advantages and challenges associated with incorporation of 360-degree appraisal system become imperative. Through empirical exploration, this research endeavors to fill the gap in literature by offering insights into the nuanced impact of 360-degree leadership performance appraisal on many dimensions of university actions. Finally, research problem seeks to donate to evidence-based strategies for active leadership development, cultivation of organizational culture, and enhancement of overall performance within the unique context of universities.

### **Rationale of Study**

The rationale for conducting this study stems from growing need to boost leadership effectiveness and organizational performance within the dynamic landscape of higher education institutions. Traditional hierarchical appraisal systems often fall short in capturing complexities of leadership within the university context. As universities strive to foster environment for learning and growth, it becomes essential to explore innovative approaches that can elevate leadership capabilities and contribute to advancement of these institutions. The 360-degree leadership performance appraisal system presents promising avenue for addressing this need. Still, despite its widespread application in various sectors, its specific implications within universities remain underexplored. The rationale for this study is to bridge this knowledge gap by investigating the impact of implementing a 360-degree appraisal approach on the leadership performance and its outcomes within the university environment and setting.

By examining the relationship between the utilization of 360-degree appraisal methods and the resulting effects on faculty members and students, this study seeks to offer insights into how this appraisal approach can shape leadership abilities, organizational culture, employee satisfaction, and overall performance. The rationale is grounded in the belief that a comprehensive evaluation that includes feedback from multiple perspectives can provide a more accurate representation of leadership competencies and areas for improvement. This, in turn, can lead to targeted leadership development initiatives, fostering positive organizational climate, driving enhanced performance outcomes. Furthermore, as universities operate within a unique ecosystem characterized by diverse stakeholders and multifaceted relationships, understanding the challenges and benefits associated with 360-degree leadership performance appraisal is vital. Rationale for study covers to exploring potential hurdles faced by middle or 360-degree leaders, such as pressures from higher authorities and demands of subordinates or customers. By unraveling these complexities, this research aims to

inform evidence-based strategies that enable universities to leverage potential of this appraisal method effectively.

### Objective & Question

1. Examine the effect of 360-degree leadership performance appraisal on organizational outcomes at the university level.
2. What is influence of implementing a 360-degree leadership performance appraisal on various organizational outcomes within the university setting?

### LITERATURE REVIEW

The 360-degree leadership performance appraisal, also known as multi-rater feedback or 360-degree feedback, entails collecting input from diverse channels, including supervisors, colleagues, team members, and external partners, to offer a comprehensive appraisal of individual's leadership proficiencies (Lee, & Kim, 2022). This methodology strives to furnish a more all-encompassing and precise evaluation of leadership performance in contrast to conventional hierarchical assessments. Numerous research investigations have underscored role of 360-degree leadership performance appraisal in nurturing leadership development. By providing individuals with a comprehensive perspective of their strengths and areas necessitating improvement, this feedback-rich context can facilitate targeted enhancement of leadership skills. Consequently, this approach can contribute to cultivating more proficient leaders within university setting (Borge, Egeland, Aarons, Ehrhart, Sklar & Skar, 2022). Scholarly evidence suggests that adoption of 360-degree feedback practices can wield a positive influence on organizational culture. This is achieved through the promotion of transparency, fostering open lines of the communication, and fostering a culture centered around perpetual enhancement.

Engaging the leaders across various tiers in reciprocal feedback exchanges can engender a more cooperative and all-encompassing work environment (Budworth, & Chummar, 2022). Empirical studies have indicated a constructive correlation between 360-degree feedback implementation and employee contentment and engagement (Mbokota, & Reid, 2022). When employees perceive that their viewpoints are acknowledged and their input holds the significance, this can engender heightened levels of the job satisfaction, motivation, and dedication to the university's overarching mission (Cashman, 2017). Existing scholarly literature indicates that introduction of 360-degree leadership performance appraisal holds potential to enhance both individual and organizational performance (Muna, 2022). This feedback-oriented approach aids individuals in identifying areas for personal development and aligning their endeavors with the overarching goalmouths of the organization, thereby fostering improvements in overall performance outcomes (Cheng, & Wu, 2020). While the potential benefits are discernible, the literature also acknowledges the existence of challenges connected to the implementation of 360-degree leadership performance appraisal (Shrestha, 2022).

Matters like potential bias among raters, nuanced interpretation of data, and concerns surrounding confidentiality necessitate vigilant management to ensure efficacy of appraisal process (Pulakos, Hanson, & Arad, 2019). Certain studies emphasize the significance of taking into account cultural

and contextual factors when integrating 360-degree feedback within diverse university settings (Church et al., 2018). Distinct cultural norms and institutional contexts may influence the efficacy of the appraisal process and the understanding of feedback (Sharma, 2021; Rafiq, Afzal, & Kamran, 2022). Contemporary literature underscores the importance for universities to establish feedback mechanisms and iterative loops for continual enhancement based on insights derived from 360-degree leadership performance appraisal. This cyclic process can donate essentially to sustained development of leadership skills and the progressive advancement of the organization as a whole (Das & Panda, 2017). Available body of literature concerning 360-degree leadership performance appraisal underscores its substantial likely for generating favorable effects on leadership growth, organizational culture, employee contentment, and performance results within university milieu (DeNisi & Kluger, 2000).

### Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework for this research article is grounded in several interconnected theories that provide comprehensive lens for understanding impact of 360-degree leadership performance appraisal on organizational outcomes within university context. However, successful application of this approach demands meticulous attention to challenges and seamless incorporation of feedback into ongoing initiatives (Satiani et al., 2022). The scholars persistently explore strategies to harness this methodology adeptly, aiming to elevate leadership proficiencies and make substantive helps to overarching achievements of universities (Docheff, & Gerdes, 2015). The primary theories that inform this study include:

1. **Social Exchange Theory:** At the core of theoretical framework is the Social Exchange Theory, which posits that relationships are governed by a system of social exchanges where individuals seek to maximize rewards and minimize costs. Thus, in the context of leadership performance appraisal, the theory suggests that individuals engaged in this process anticipate receiving the valuable feedback and the developmental opportunities in return for their efforts. This theory underscores how the 360-degree appraisal system functions as a reciprocal exchange, where leaders receive comprehensive evaluations in exchange for their commitment to improvement (Blau, 1964).
2. **Transformational Leadership Theory:** Transformational leadership theory highlights influence of leaders in inspiring and motivating followers to achieve beyond their expected performance. In context of 360-degree leadership performance appraisal, this theory explains how inclusive feedback offered over multiple perspectives can empower leaders to exhibit transformational leadership behaviors. By addressing strengths and weaknesses, leaders adapt their approach to foster a positive organizational culture and enhance employee satisfaction and performance (Bass & Riggio, 2006).
3. **Organizational Culture Theory:** Organizational culture theory emphasizes how shared values, norms, and beliefs shape an organization's behavior and outcomes. In the context of 360-degree appraisal, this theory helps us understand how the feedback process can contribute to shaping a culture of open communication, continuous improvement, and collaboration. The feedback-

rich environment created by appraisal system fosters a culture where individuals actively seek feedback and engage in reciprocal exchanges, thereby influencing overall organization culture (Schein, 1990).

4. **Feedback Theory:** Feedback theory elucidates role of feedback in shaping individual behaviors and performance. 360-degree appraisal system operates on basis of continuous feedback from various sources. This theory informs help of how feedback from supervisors, subordinates, and self-assessment collectively impacts leadership development. It highlights the importance of timely, specific, and actionable feedback in guiding leaders towards growth and improvement (Kluger & DeNisi, 1996).
5. **Leadership Development Theory:** This theory posits that leadership is dynamic process that can be developed through intentional experiences, education and feedback. Within context of 360-degree appraisal system, this theory emphasizes how diverse perspectives and insights offered by evaluation process contribute to leadership growth. The theory underscores that leadership development is not confined to formal hierarchies but extends to all levels within organization (Avolio & Hannah, 2008).

In integrating these theoretical perspectives, research seeks to provide a nuanced understanding of the intricate mechanisms through which 360-degree leadership performance appraisal influences organizational outcomes in the university environment. These theories collectively illuminate how reciprocal exchanges, transformational leadership behaviors, organizational culture, feedback dynamics, and leadership development intersect to shape the impact of the 360-degree appraisal system. Theoretical lenses provide the foundation for investigating the multifaceted relationships and implications that underlie the successful integration of this appraisal approach in higher education institutions.

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

### Paradigm of Study

This research follows a positivist paradigm, aiming to empirically examine impact of implementing 360-degree leadership performance appraisal system on organization outcomes within university settings. Positivism aligns with quantitative nature of study, facilitating measurement and analysis of variables to draw conclusions (Bryman, 2015).

### Research Design

The study adopts a cross-sectional research design, collecting data at the single point in time to explore relationships between variables. This design is suitable for investigating influence of 360-degree leadership performance appraisal on the various organizational outcomes within universities (Creswell & Creswell, 2017).

### Research Method

A quantitative survey approach is employed, involving collection and analysis of numerical data to identify patterns & relationships. This approach facilitates statistical analysis to draw objective conclusions from the data (Creswell & Poth, 2017).

### Population & Sampling

Population under study consists of university faculty members across various public and private universities of Lahore. Both head and faculty members are included in participant pool to capture perspectives from different hierarchical levels. Research focuses on public and private universities to ensure diversity in the institutional context. Utilizing a stratified random sampling technique, participants are branded based on university departments. This technique helps ensure depiction from various academic disciplines. Stratification allows for accurate analysis within each stratum (Creswell & Poth, 2017).

### Data Collection

A meticulously structured survey instrument is employed for data collection. The survey covers participants' experiences with 360-degree leadership performance appraisal, include perceptions of the leadership skill progress, organizational culture, employee satisfaction levels, and resulting performance outcomes. Likert-scale items are used to measure participants' responses, providing quantitative data for the analysis. The demographic information is also collected to understand the participants' characteristics.

### Data Analysis

Quantitative data collected through the survey are subjected to statistical analysis. Descriptive statistics, such as means and frequencies, are used to summarize participants' responses to different survey items. Inferential statistics, including correlation analysis, regression analysis, are employed to examine relations amid variables & to check impact of 360-degree appraisal on organizational outcomes (Bryman, 2015; Creswell & Creswell, 2017).

### Ethical Considerations

Ethical considerations include obtaining informed consent from participants, ensuring privacy of responses, and addressing potential biases. The study adheres to ethical guidelines outlined by the university's Institutional Review Board (IRB) to safeguard the participants' rights and well-being (Creswell & Creswell, 2017).

Table 1 Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	No. of Items
.823	36
.812	18

The survey was distributed electronically, allowing participants to complete it within a defined timeframe. Data collection process extended over duration of eight weeks, culminating in a sizable and well-represented sample. Ensuing quantitative data analysis executed employing statistical software SPSS-21. This encompassed utilization of descriptive statistics and correlation analyses, facilitating investigation of connections between 360-degree leadership performance appraisal and pivotal outcome variables.

## RESULTS OF STUDY

Table 2 Tests of Normality

	Kolmogorov-Smirnova			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	Df	Sig.
Instrument I	.113	522	.002	.905	522	.000
Instrument II	.048	522	.003	.984	522	.000

The table presents the outcomes of Tests of Normality, indicating that Sig. values for Questionnaires I and II are 0.002 and 0.003 respectively. Results suggest that distributions of questionnaire values adhere to a normal pattern.

**Descriptive Statistics**

The descriptive statistics within the paper offer a comprehensive outline of the organizational dyads. The presented table illustrates the attributes of the university respondents categorized by gender and sector.

Table 3 Sector and Gender-Wise Distribution of Dyads (N=522)

#	Demographics	Total	Mean	SD
1	Public	321	1.38	0.567
2	Private	201		
3	Male	324	1.29	0.498
4	Female	198		

Table 4 Descriptive Statistics of Demographic Variables of Study

	N	Mean		Std. Deviation
	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic
Gender	522	1.39	.020	.488
Sector	522	1.44	.021	.497
Age	522	2.70	.050	1.197
Experience	522	2.20	.032	.780
Education	522	1.08	.012	.285
Position	522	1.49	.023	.540

Descriptive statistics were utilized to ascertain MCT, encompassing the mean, range, SD, variance, minimum, and maximum, along with kurtosis and skewness indicators. These descriptive statistics played a pivotal role in analyzing all demographic variables under investigation within study. The provided table showcases the highest, lowest, average, and standard deviation values for these demographic variables.

Table 5 Descriptive Statistics of Essential Variables of Study

	N	Mean		Std. Deviation
	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic
Student Outcomes	522	65.27	.152	3.659
Teacher Outcomes	522	39.29	.115	2.751
Overall Outcomes	522	70.49	.190	4.558

All variables examined in this study were formulated based on concept of 360-degree leadership, with aim of explore its impact on organizational outcomes at university level. Descriptive statistics



were employed to ascertain minimum, maximum, mean, and standard deviation of questionnaire responses within the two groups.”

**Inferential Statistics**

The comparison of mean scores for two distinct groups was carried out using an Independent Sample T-test. Within this study, male and female scores, as well as public and private sectors, constituted the two groups for which the T-test was employed. The outcome of T-test is outlined in the provided table. The outcomes of the T-test reveal that a Sig value surpassing 0.05 signifies the presumption of equivalent variance between the public and private sectors. Thus, this holds true for both Questionnaires I and II, where the Sig values exceed the threshold of 0.05. Furthermore, a two-tailed Sig value below 0.05 signifies the absence of noteworthy distinction in mean scores between the two groups.”

Table 6 Independent Samples Test

	LT for EV		t-test for Equality of Means				
	F	Sig.	T	Df	SIG.	Mean Difference	SE Difference
Q1	1.109	.293	-1.145	574	.253	-1.278	1.116
			-1.127	506.693	.260	-1.278	1.134
Q2	.193	.661	.778	574	.437	.44691	.57439
			.773	529.383	.440	.44691	.57836”

The T-test analysis demonstrates that a significance (Sig) value surpassing 0.05 indicates the assumption of equal variance between the public and private sectors. Upon comparing male and female respondents, the T-test was employed, revealing that in both Questionnaires I and II, the Sig values exceed the predefined p-value of 0.05. Furthermore, when the two-tailed Sig value falls below 0.05, it suggests the lack of a noteworthy disparity in mean scores between the two gender groups.”

Table 7 Gender-Based Group Statistics

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	SE Mean
Q1 Total	Male	321	379.03	13.231	.714
	Female	202	379.51	13.277	.882
Q2 Total	Male	311	174.92	6.6312	.353
	Female	221	175.23	7.1765	.478”

T-tests were utilized for variables featuring two distinct dependent levels within this study. Sector variable comprises two levels, namely, public and private, while the gender variable consists of two levels, male and female. T-tests were conducted for both of these variables. Presented table shows disparities in mean scores amid genders.

Table 8 Gender T-test

	LT for EV		t-test for Equality of Means				
	F	Sig.	T	Df	SIG	Mean Difference	SE Difference
Q1 Total	.154	.695	-.418	520	.676	-.475	1.13
			-.419	481.421	.676	-.475	1.13
Q2 Total	.462	.497	-.534	520	.593	-.312	.584
			-.525	450.025	.600	-.312	.595”

The T-test results indicate that when significance (Sig) value exceeds 0.05, it implies assumption of equal variance among the respondents in this study, including both males and females. For both Questionnaires I and II, the Sig values are greater than the set p-value of 0.05. A two-tailed Sig value exceeding 0.05 suggests a significant difference in the mean scores between the male and female groups.

A One-way between-groups ANOVA is employed when there is one independent variable with three/more levels of dependent variables. ANOVA table provides both amid groups and within-groups sums of the squares, along with degrees of freedom (DF). ANOVA elucidates within-group differences, and if the Significance (Sig) Value is equal to or lower than 0.05, a significant difference among mean scores of dependent variables across three groups is observed. Mean scores for each group are outlined in descriptive table.”

Table 9 ANOVA

	360-Degree Leadership	Mean Square	F	Sig
“Experience	B/w group	316.254	1.797	.111
	Within group	175.948		
Education	B/w group	1201.037	6.919	.001
	Within group	36.92		
Position	B/w group	688.159	3.929	.020
	Within group	175.385		
Age	B/w group	9856.630	5.571	0.00
	Within group	171.708”		

**Correlation Analysis**

Correlation analysis is employed to reveal connections between multiple variables. In the scope of this study, an investigation was conducted into the relationship between 360-degree leadership performance appraisal and five distinct organizational outcome factors using bivariate correlation. Chosen method for exploration was Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficient, recognized as the most appropriate measure for evaluating variables. The objective encompassed the handling of missing data, the assessment of data’s adherence to a normal distribution, and the verification of the data’s linearity. Outcome of scrutiny unveiled a moderate correlation amid 360-degree leadership questionnaire and organizational outcomes. Significantly, a statistically meaningful yet moderate correlation of 0.488 came to 4, stressing role of 360-degree leadership in influencing configuration of organizational outcomes.”

Table 10 Correlations

Q1 Total	“Pearson Correlation	1	.488**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	522	522
Q2 Total	Pearson Correlation	.488**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	522	522
“***. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).”			

A discernible and positive correlation was observed between 360-degree leadership performance appraisal and organizational outcomes. The findings underscore the influential role of 360-degree leadership in shaping organization's outcomes. Exploration of relationship between 360-degree leadership performance appraisal and measured organizational outcomes involved the application of the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. Preliminary analyses were led to validate fulfillment of assumptions related to normality, linearity, homoscedasticity. Modest yet affirmative correlation was evident amid two variables, denoted by  $r = 0.488^{**}$ , within a sample size of  $N = 522$  and a significance level of  $P < .005$ .

### DISCUSSION

The study's findings establish a positive correlation between 360-degree leadership performance appraisal and organizational outcomes. A recent study further substantiates the positive impact of 360-degree leadership performance appraisal on organizational outcomes. Notably, the presence of a 360-degree leader within an organization facilitates collaborative efforts with middle-level leaders (Garman, Tyler, & Darnall, 2004). The findings illuminate the intricate nature of leading in all directions, underscoring need for diverse skill set for effective leadership. Several participants emphasized significance of intuitive sensibilities when navigating various organizational domains. However, the study also identifies challenges faced by middle or 360-degree leaders, including pressures from higher authorities and demands from subordinates or customers (Garg, 2018). In this connection, such circumstances create a complex environment for middle-level leaders. These findings align with the conclusions drawn in Maxwell's study (Hosain, 2016). The research indicates that not all individuals possess the aptitude to lead effectively within an organizational context for diverse outcomes.

Specific skills are indispensable for navigating leadership roles proficiently. Moreover, the study underscores pivotal role of middle-level leaders in shaping organizational structure. The identified correlation coefficient ( $r = .488$ ) signifies the statistically significant albeit moderate correlation between variables. Historically, advocates of 360-degree systems emphasized their developmental nature, primarily designed for fostering advancement (Fleenor, Taylor, & Chappelow, 2020). Some organizations continue to employ these systems exclusively for developmental purposes, aiding in implementing organizational changes (Kanaslan & Iyem, 2016). However, the study suggests that organizations should recognize multifaceted requirements of their employees and acknowledge pivotal role of feedback in enhancing performance. Empirical studies have indicated a constructive correlation between 360-degree feedback implementation and the employee contentment and engagement (Mbokota, & Reid, 2022). The consensus among participating the faculty members, functioning as the middle-level leaders, suggests that the individuals can assess and enhance their leadership capabilities regardless of their hierarchical diverse required position (Karkouljian, Srouf & Messarra, 2019).

This implies that leadership development can emanate from many organizational tiers, underlining the necessity for diverse leadership competencies (Khan, Ramzan, & Ghaffar, 2017). Experienced leaders often possess an inherent understanding of how to navigate and establish connections across different organizational levels. Investigation centers on a university context, where departmental

head assumes the role of 360-degree leader. The study findings underscore the positive association between the implementation of 360-degree leadership performance appraisal in universities and favorable organizational outcome (Fleenor, 2019). In this connection, when employees perceive that their viewpoints are acknowledged as well as their input holds the significance, this can engender heightened levels of the job satisfaction, motivation, and dedication to the university's overarching mission (Cashman, 2017). In this linking, offering a comprehensive and impartial evaluation of the leadership performance can contribute to enhancing leadership effectiveness, fostering a positive organizational climate, strengthening alliances, along with positively impacting other pertinent and desired outcomes.

### **CONCLUSION**

The field of prospective research and its practical applications offer an exciting avenue for delving deeper into the intricate mechanisms that underlie impact of 360-degree leadership performance appraisal. By doing so, we can gain valuable insights into driving forces behind the effectiveness of this appraisal method. This enhanced understanding, in turn, has the potential to shape evidence-based strategies that resonate with both educational practitioners and policymakers alike. In this context, cultivation of culture that thrives on constructive feedback within the university setting emerges as the pivotal factor that is responsible for various desired consequences. A culture that fosters open and meaningful feedback exchanges can significantly amplify the positive outcomes of 360-degree leadership performance appraisals. To achieve this, it becomes superior to establish an environment that not only recognizes importance of the feedback but actively encourages its contribution to growth.

Moreover, recognizing and incentivizing endeavors aimed at improving leadership performance through the integration of feedback can serve as a powerful catalyst in this process. In essence, each individual within the university ecosystem functions as a 360-degree middle leader, navigating various roles such as the superior, subordinate, or customer. By valuing feedback and channeling efforts towards incorporating it into the personal growth trajectories, individuals can collectively contribute to a more enriched organizational environment. As the realm of research progresses, a pivotal task for upcoming researchers involves delineating precisely how the implementation of the 360-degree performance review process can intricately enhance the overall functioning of an organization. In this connection, this entails exploring the nuanced ways in which diverse feedback channels influence the leadership efficacy, organizational culture, and performance outcomes. By doing so, we can unearth the subtleties that shape the transformational potential of this appraisal practices and methods.

### **Recommendations**

1. It is advisable that leaders across various organizational echelons, encircling both upper and middle management, contemplate integration of performance appraisal techniques to assess performance of employees or subordinates. Such integration could yield valuable insights for augmenting organizational effectiveness.
2. Subsequent research undertakings could delve into exploration of 360-degree leadership appraisal employing a mixed-methods and phenomenological approach. In this lining, such

an inquiry could furnish a more comprehensive grasp of the intricate dynamics inherent in leadership assessment.

3. Given their pivotal role, there exists a necessity to conduct a comprehensive exploration of challenges encountered by middle-level leaders who constitute backbone of organizations. Investigating multifaceted errands of multitasking and problem-solving they shoulder could yield valuable insights.

## REFERENCES

- Aarons, G. A., & Ehrhart, M. G. (2022). Leading implementation by focusing on the strategic implementation leadership. In *Implementation Science* (pp. 178-180). *Routledge*.
- Ali, Y. (2016). A Study on Modern Methodologies in Performance Appraisals. *International Journal of Advanced Trends in Engineering and Technology*, 2456-4664.
- Al-Jedaia, Y., & Mehrez, A. (2020). The effect of performance appraisal on job performance in the governmental sector: The mediating role of motivation. *Management Science Letters*, 10(9), 2077- 2088.
- Avolio, B. J., & Hannah, S. T. (2008). Developmental readiness: Accelerating leader development. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 60(4), 331-347.
- Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). Transformational leadership (2nd ed.). Psychology Press.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). Exchange and power in social life. Transaction Publishers.
- Boella, J., & Goss-Turner, S. (2019). Performance management and appraisal. In *Human Resource Management in the Hospitality Industry* (pp. 163-182). *Routledge*.
- Borge, R. H., Egeland, K. M., Aarons, A., Ehrhart, M. G., Sklar, M., & Skar, S. (2022). "Change Doesn't Happen by Itself": Thematic Analysis of 1st-Level Leaders' Experiences Participating in the Leadership and Organizational Change for Implementation Strategy. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, 49(5), 785-797.
- Bryman, A. (2015). *Social Research Methods*. Oxford University Press.
- Budworth, M. H., & Chummar, S. (2022). Feedback for performance development: A review of current trends. *International Handbook of Evidence-Based Coaching*, 337-347.
- Cashman, K. (2017). Leadership from the inside out *Becoming a leader for life*: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Cheng, T. F., & Wu, H. C. (2020). A follow-up study on vocational high school principals' opinions about 360-degree evaluation feedback and their leadership effectiveness and behavior change. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 21(1), 65-81.
- Church, A. H., Dawson, M., Barden, L., Fleck, C. R., & Tuller, M. (2018). Enhancing 360-degree feedback for individual assessment and organization development: Methods and lessons from the field. In *Research in the organizational change and development* (26: 47-97). Emerald Publishing Limited.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. *SAGE Publications*.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2017). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches*. *SAGE Publications*.

- Das, U.K., & Panda, J. (2017). The Impact of 360 Degree Feedback on Employee Role in Leadership Development. *Asian Journal of Management*, 8(4), 962-966.
- DeNisi, A. S., & Kluger, A. N. (2000). Feedback effectiveness: Can 360-degree appraisals be improved? *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 14(1), 129-139.
- Docheff, D. M., & Gerdes, D. (2015). *The HEART of Coaching. Strategies*, 28(2), 28-32.
- Felfe, J., & Elprana, G. (2022). Leadership theories as a knowledge base in coaching. In *International Handbook of Evidence-Based Coaching: Theory, Research, and Practice* (pp. 531-541). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Fleenor, J. W. (2019). Delivering 360-degree feedback. In *Feedback at Work* (pp. 227-247). Springer.
- Fleenor, J. W., Taylor, S., & Chappelow, C. (2020). *Leveraging the impact of 360-degree feedback*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Incorporated.
- Garg, S. (2018). An empirical study on the relevance of 360-degree performance evaluation practice with special reference to the delhi-NCR private banking sector. 12(2), 30-38.
- Garman, N., Tyler, J. L., & Darnall, J. S. (2004). Development and validation of a 360-degree feedback instrument for healthcare administrators. *Journal of Healthcare Management*, 49(5), 307.
- Hosain, S. (2016). 360 Degree Feedback as a Technique of Performance Appraisal: Does it Work? *Asian Business Review*, 6(1), 84-92.
- Kanaslan, E. K., & Iyem, C. (2016). Is 360-degree feedback appraisal an effective way of performance evaluation? *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 6(5), 172-182.
- Karkouljian, S., Srouf, J., & Messarra, L. C. (2019). The moderating role of 360-degree appraisal between engagement and innovative behaviors. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 12(1), 13-19.
- Khan, A. M., Ramzan, A., & Ghaffar, R. (2017). Testing Maxwell's Leadership Level Assessment Questionnaire Appraising Executive's Leadership Level in Educational Context. *Journal of Educational Research*, 21(2), 82-94.
- Kluger, A. N., & DeNisi, A. (1996). The effects of feedback interventions on performance: A historical review, a meta-analysis, and a preliminary feedback intervention theory. *Psychological Bulletin*, 119(2), 254-284.
- Kopsidas, O. (2021). A 360-degree feedback model is a tool for total quality management. *Economics*, 9(1), 1-11.
- Kwon, K., & Kim, T. (2020). An integrative literature review of employee engagement and innovative behavior: Revisiting JD-R model. *Human Resource Management Review*, 30(2), 100704.
- Lee, U. K., & Kim, H. (2022). UTAUT in Metaverse: An "Ifland" Case. *Journal of Theoretical and Applied Electronic Commerce Research*, 17(2), 613-635.
- Mbokota, G., & Reid, A. (2022). The role of group coaching in developing leadership effectiveness in a business school leadership development program. *South African Journal of Business Management*, 53(1), 10.
- Muna, A. N. (2022). Examining Importance of Leadership Skills in Today's Life. *International Journal of Social Service and Research (IJSSR)*, 2(10), 977-982.

- Pulakos, D., Mueller-Hanson, R., & Arad, S. (2019). Evolution of performance management: Searching for value. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 6, 249-271.
- Rafiq, S., & Qaisar, S. (2021). Teachers' perception about process of teacher evaluation: A case study of a private university of Lahore. *Gomal University Journal of Research*, 37(3), 350-362.
- Rafiq, S., Afzal, A., & Kamran, F. (2022). Exploring the Problems in Teacher Evaluation Process and Its Perceived Impact on Teacher Performance. *Gomal University Journal of Research*, 38(4), 482-500.
- Rafiq, S., Qaisar, S., & Butt, I. H. (2022). Analysis of tools used for teacher evaluation process at university level: A document analysis approach. *Gomal University Journal of Research*, 38(2), 214-224.
- Satiani, B., Dawson, K., Mehta, S., & Gerhardt, A. (2022). Lessons Learned After Implementing an Academic Faculty Leadership Program Over Seven Years. *Physician Leadership Journal*, 9(2).
- Schein, E. H. (1990). Organizational culture. *American Psychologist*, 45(2), 109-119.
- Pallant, J. (2005). *SPSS survival guide*. Crow's Nest, N.S.W.: Allen & Unwin.
- Sharma, P. (2021). *Soft Skills 3rd Edition: Personality Development for Life Success* (English Edition). BPB publications.
- Shrestha, G. (2022). Performance management system in education institutions uses Management by Objectives (MBO) and 360° appraisal method. *Shanti Journal*, 1(1), 134-147.