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Abstract

Leadership development has become a multi-billion dollar industry, but unfortunately, way too often leadership development initiatives fail, not delivering the intended outcome. Although organizational interventions are clearly needed, research indicates that stimulating participants to take development activities on their own is far more promising for successful leadership development. The purpose of this study was to investigate how feedback following a leadership development initiative, utilizing 360-degree feedback, influences participants. Starting with analyzing the divergence between self and other ratings in 360-degree feedback, a new model is developed to investigate the influence of participants perceived accuracy and usefulness of feedback on the likelihood for to engage in self-development activities.
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Introduction

The development of leadership capabilities is a prime task for organizations. Globalization, an increasingly diverse workforce, and the millennials with different views and expectations then prior generations entering organizations makes it necessary to develop more and better leaders. Surprisingly, in comparison to leadership theory, with over a century of research, the leadership development literature is rather short. Therefore, more factors influencing the success of leadership development initiatives must be found and their impact has to be evaluated. Considering the resources organizations put in the development of their leaders, and the fact that many leadership development programs fail, clearly indicate the need for further investigation in this research area. Although organizational interventions are important, research shows that stimulating participants to take individual actions for their development can be far more promising for successful leadership development. Since individuals differ in their views and attitudes it is important to have indicators that support organizations to understand whether organizational intervention is needed or not. This research helps to get further insight on how to increase the success of leadership development initiatives by analyzing how managers cope with feedback and whether differences between self- and other feedback lead to a different outcome regarding the likelihood that participants are taking actions to develop further competencies on their own. Many of the existing leadership development programs value and use 360-degree feedback as a cornerstone to their initiatives. This kind of feedback has shown promising results due to the possibility to give a leader feedback from different angles and show him the difference in his self- and others’ rating. Brett and Atwater (2001) state that “a better understanding of the emotional and cognitive reactions is needed” if participants should benefit from the feedback process and organizations want to retrieve their investment (p. 941). Leadership development is seen to be an initiation to leaders self-development, but organizational actions can facilitate or reduce the probability that participants engage in self-development activities (Boyce, Zaccaro, & Wisecarver, 2010). In other words, it is the interpersonal processes that are central to the leadership development over time (Day, Fleenor, Atwater, Sturm, & McKee, 2014). On an individual level, only limited research has been done to understand the characteristics that are associated with how individuals engage in self-development activities to develop their leadership skills (Boyce, Zaccaro, & Wisecarver, 2010). This paper aims to develop a model to analyze whether differences between self and other ratings in 360-degree feedback explain the likelihood that participants of leadership development programs are taking self-development activities. Further, it will be analyzed whether the perceived usefulness and accuracy of feedback has an effect on participants of leadership development programs to engage in development activities on their own.
Literature Review

Leadership development programs in organizations

Leadership development is a multi-billion-dollar industry and one of the most expensive activities in corporate training budgets. On a global scale it is estimated that companies spend annually more than USD 60 billion for leadership development initiatives, USD 14 billion alone in the US market (Gurdjian, Halbeisen, & Lane, 2014). Spending on leadership development has been increased significantly in recent years and is predicted to increase further. Considering the large investments of organizations and individuals in leadership development programs, it seems surprising that only limited research on the effectiveness of these programs exist (Ely et al., 2010). Today, there seems to be consensus on the fact that although some cognitive abilities and personality traits are innate and remain stable over time, there are many human capabilities that can be developed and trained to enable individuals to perform their tasks in a better way (Van Velsor, McCauley, & Ruderman, 2010). Burke and Day (1986) conducted a meta-analysis that is commonly regarded as the principal empirical support for the effectiveness of managerial training and leadership development programs. They found that managerial training was moderately effective and provided true mean effect sizes for each of the four criterion-measure categories used. Those where, subjective learning (.34), objective learning (.38), subjective behavior (.49), and objective results (.67). Approximately twenty years later, Collins & Holton (2004) conducted another meta-analysis, integrating eighty-three studies to determine the effectiveness of leadership development initiatives in their enhancement of performance, knowledge, and expertise at an individual, team and organizational level. They concluded that if sufficient front-end analysis is conducted to assure that the right development is offered to the right leaders, organizations should feel comfortable that their leadership development programs will produce significant results and participants can gain substantial improvements in both knowledge and skills.

Unfortunately, although the focus of research during the last century was lying on leadership theory, the development of these capabilities was getting far less attention. Leadership is an emerging interdisciplinary field, but there has been very little research on leadership development programs in general (Avolio, Avey, & Quisenberry, 2010). Day et al., (2014, p.64) state that “we need to focus on development as much as leadership to shed light on how this process unfolds”. This is particularly important since research findings suggest that not even can managerial leadership development have no effect, but the experience that participants have can become negative. It is therefore important to understand that simply identifying and placing individuals in these programs do not ensure that they will become more effective leaders when completing the training (Kirchner & Akdere, 2014). Arnulf, Glasø, Andreassen, & Martinsen (2016) investigated the perception of leadership development program participants toward the outcome of training initiatives with the outcome that more than half of participants were negatively biased toward the field and experience the activities as negative but harmless, and 44 percent as even negative. As the cause of negative
experiences was most frequently attributed to external consultants, operating in an environment characterized by a lack of evaluation. Further, it is argued that the most likely scenario for negative effects seems to occur in companies that invest quite a lot in the development activities themselves but not in their evaluation. In contrary companies, that either invest little and rely on internal resources or invest high sums of money for certain leadership development and therefore also monitor the effects closely achieve the most positive outcome. Arnulf et al. (2016) argue that leadership development activities are having negative effects if they directly reduce the person’s capacity to perform leadership roles or indirectly reduce organizational performance by wasting resources and undermining the belief in developmental efforts. Based on their research, Kirchner & Akdere (2014) argue that there is a significant probability, that if someone is participating in leadership development programs against their wishes, they will not fully engage in the themes being discussed. Since organizations typically promote these programs based on tenure and position, this oversight appears to be particularly significant; calling for a reconsideration of design and target population in leadership development programs. Lacerenza, Reyes, Marlow, Joseph, & Salas (2017) estimated the effectiveness of leadership training across four criteria (reactions, learning, transfer, and results) performing a meta-analysis to determine which elements are associated with the most effective leadership training interventions. Overall, their research suggested that leadership development interventions are indeed effective, showing the biggest effect for transfer (i.e. utilizing the abilities that were taught), followed by learning (i.e. acquiring knowledge), results (i.e. achieving organizational objectives including costs, company profits, turnover and absenteeism) and reaction (i.e. trainee attitudes toward training).

Feedback in leadership development programs and the influence of self- other rating differences on the reactions of participants

In the process of leadership development, 360-degree feedback has become almost ubiquitous in organizations of every type and is an important step to facilitate development (Day et al., 2014). As one possible source of feedback, 360-degree ratings allow the participant to formulate comparisons among various rating sources, and provides the participant with a more holistic depiction of his or her areas for improvement because the results are not based on a single-source and therefore may be perceived as more reliable (Lacerenza et al., 2017). Abraham (2004), found that if positive feedback is delivered in an informative manner, emotional honesty, self-confidence, and emotional resilience can promote superior performance. Today a consensus between practitioners and organizational consultants exists that solely self-ratings are not sufficient for a valid evaluation of leadership capabilities and therefore recommend the use of 360-degree feedbacks as a system to enhance self-knowledge and improve managerial behavior (Yammarino & Atwater, 1997a; Sala, 2001; Wolff, 2005). Yammarino and Atwater (1997) argue that the relative agreement or disagreement between self- and others rating has a potentially high impact for human resource management. It is through the use of these multi-rater instruments and the discrepancies between self- and others-rating that one can get more insights into leaders interpersonal world (Brutus et al., 1999). Furthermore, the literature shows that self-
perception can contribute to individual and organizational outcomes. Through the use of ratings generated by multi-rater instruments, the degree of agreement between self-perceptions and the perceptions of others can be employed to test this argument (Fleenor et al., 2010). Yammarino & Atwater (1997a), argue that the two main reasons of different outcome of self- and other rating are that there is a general lack of feedback especially for individuals in higher ranks and that they rely on their own perception of themselves, and second that individuals might have a perception disorder or general difficulties to evaluate and compare themselves to others. A field that has been overlooked is whether leaders who are receiving feedback from peers, subordinates or their managers, that deviates from their self-rating, are more likely to see a need to take actions in their development compared to leaders were self- and other-ratings are very much alike. Brett & Atwater (2001) conducted research on how discrepancies in self-other feedbacks were related to reactions and receptivity to development as well as recipients’ perceptions of usefulness and accuracy of the feedback. They found that less favorable ratings were related to beliefs that feedback was less accurate which led also to negative reactions. And because over-estimators (leaders rating themselves higher than others) believe that their level of performance is already high, they may ignore developmental feedback and fail to improve their performance (Fleenor et al., 2010). It is the influence of leaders’ reactions to 360-degree feedback, that is determining whether they take actions to improve their performance or not, determining and showing their willingness to learn. For actual learning to occur, an individual must be motivated to learn and trainee reactions may serve as an indicator of motivation. Participants reactions reflect the attitudinal component of the effectiveness of leadership development programs and consist of trainee attitudes toward the training. It is argued that given the popularity and importance of trainee reactions, it is critical to evaluate whether leadership training elicits positive changes in employee reactions (Lacerenza et al., 2017). Also other scholars state that the reaction on others’ feedback is influencing actions, but that this is a research field that has been neglected and deserves more research attention (Facteau et al., 1998). Brett and Atwater (2001) argue that if organizations want to retrieve their investment in leadership development programs “a better understanding of the emotional and cognitive reactions is needed” (p. 941). Therefore, organizations are confronted with the question, whether they have to take into account the fact that different outcomes of self- and others-rating affect the way their employees will react on their received feedback and additional intervention and support from the organization will be needed.
Atwater and Yammarino (1992) introduced the idea to use rating agreement categories to analyze self and others’ agreement data. This approach requires computing difference scores between self- and others' ratings and calculating the mean and standard deviation of the difference scores. Individuals are classified into groups based on the extent of their self-others’ difference (i.e. the standard deviation from the mean self–others difference). Initially recommending three rating agreement categories Yammarino and Atwater (1997) extended their model to four categories. Figure 1. shows the proposed categorization into (a) Over Estimator (where the self-rating is higher as the others-rating), (b) In-Agreement/Good (with a high self- and others-rating) (c) In-Agreement/Poor (a low self- and others-rating) and (d) Under Estimators (the self-rating is smaller than the others-rating).

Since it is not very resourceful to treat every individual the same, it is important for organizations to know what differences in self-others ratings exist between the participants of leadership development programs. Studies support the fact that it is the kind of feedback that seems to influence how individuals receiving feedback will react to the information provided (Facteau, 1998; Brett & Atwater, 2001). In one study, Facteau et al. (1998) investigated factors that influence the perception of leaders when receiving 360-degree (i.e. multilevel) feedback. They found that managers’ acceptance of subordinate feedback increased with increased favorableness of the feedback. Managers also tended to value the feedback as more useful, the higher their overall score according to their subordinates’ ratings was.
Methods

The increasing use of 360-degree feedback in organizations led to the question, what influence rating differences in a leader evaluation (self- versus other-rating) have on the perceived accuracy and usefulness as well as on the likelihood that recipients of feedback take development activities on their own. Becoming a learning organization depends in large parts on initiatives of single individuals within the company. This study is adding knowledge to the questions whether differences in feedback (positive, neutral or negative) between managers self-rating and the rating of others are influencing the chance that they will take development activities. It has been decided that quantitative, non-experimental, correlational design will be applied to answer the research question. This has been argued to be the best approach for the investigated problem because it enables the researcher to describe and measure the association or relationship between two or more variables or sets of scores using correlational statistics (Creswell, 2014).

Research Design and empirical model

The proposed model for this research has been subsumed in Figure 1. The foundation for this study consisted of a leadership development program aiming to increase participants emotional intelligence. For the self- and others-rating of emotional intelligence the emotional and social competence inventory – ESCI has been applied (HayGroup, 2011). After the initial rating, feedback has been provided to each individual explaining the differences between their self-rating and the rating of others. Later, a follow-up questionnaire has been designed and distributed to the participants. Managers’ perception of feedback to be accurate and useful and the likelihood for development action are defined as the dependent variables and the differences in ratings between self- and others are defined as the independent variables.

Figure 1: Illustration of the “Feedback and Reaction” model

Source: Created by the author
To investigate, what the individuals approach to the feedback is, a questionnaire has been developed. This questionnaire has been sent to participants a week after they received feedback about their self and other ratings of following a leadership development initiative. Fleenor et al. (2010) recommends to use simple indices such as comparisons of self-ratings to the mean ratings across rater groups, when giving 360-degree feedback to leaders and that in these situations, an overall index of rating agreement would be a useful indicator of whether an individual has a general tendency, for example, to under- or overestimate his or her performance. It has been shown, that while there is an overlap between the acceptance and the perceived usefulness of others-feedback, these variables are not completely redundant and therefore must be treated as separate dependent measures (Facteau et al., 1998).

According to Fowler (1995), who defined characteristics for questions in questionnaires, it is important that all participants understand what the questions mean, that the questions are consistently administered and communicated to the respondents and that it is consistently communicated to all respondents what kind of answer is wanted. Further, it is necessary to make sure that all respondents had access to the information needed to answer the question and finally, respondents need to be willing to provide the answer demanded in the question.

The developed questionnaire measures four components, (1) accuracy; (2) usefulness; (3) reaction to the feedback provided to the managers and (4) the likelihood to take development activities because of the feedback.

Accuracy measures the level to which managers feel that the received feedback truly reflects their competencies. The aim is to evaluate if recipients of feedback see the feedback as too positive or to negative. Facteau et al. (1998) for example used the term acceptance instead of accuracy to measure the “extent to which leaders believed that the feedback they received was an accurate representation of their performance” (p. 437). One example for a question measuring this part is: “I think that the feedback of my raters is very accurate regarding my competencies”.

Usefulness as the second component of the model is examining the level to which the managers see the feedback to be useful for their development. Questions like “Due to the feedback I found areas that I can improve on” have been defined to measure this area.

The third area, likelihood to take personal development activities, is measuring the probability that managers that found development possibilities are taking actions to improve. This section is being evaluated with questions like “Due to the feedback, I think that I will work on areas where I can improve”.

The questionnaire uses a 5-point Likert scale that ranges from 1 (very inaccurate) to 5 (very accurate) for the components “accuracy”, “usefulness” and “likelihood to take personal development activities”. How the managers react after receiving feedback is evaluated through the selection of a predefined mood. Positive (inspired, encouraged, informed, aware, pleased, motivated, enlightened), and negative (angry, judged, confused, examined, criticized, discouraged) emotions have been previously defined by Brett and Atwater (2001) and were applied in the questionnaire. Scherer (2005) argued that individuals who have to describe their
own feelings often have problems to come up with appropriate labels and that difficulties can arise because of different vocabulary. He further states that participants might want to answer with a term or category that is not provided and therefore should take the next best alternative or a residual category like “other” and therefore the accuracy of the data suffers (pp. 712). This is considered and therefore the developed questionnaire will distinguish between positive and negative feelings but will also provide an open category for the participants where they can add describe other feelings. These feelings are then allocated to the rather positive or rather negative category. To ensure the understandability and to test the formulations, the questionnaire has been pre-tested. It has been given to managers in the human resource department and the questions have been discussed afterwards. This led to certain changes in the formulation although the general understandability and unambiguity was confirmed.

1. Population, Sample and Data collection process

After selecting and approaching an organization with multiple sites dispersed in various countries, the human resource department of that company was sending out an email to 95 managers that were all registered in the companies’ internal leadership development program. There the intended study and the concept of the leadership development initiative and the 360-degree feedback was explained. To be able to participate, managers had to be in their current position for a minimum of one year and had to have a responsibility for at least three subordinates. Managers that agreed to participate in the leadership development initiative were asked to self-rate their competencies and to name a minimum of two peers and two subordinates to provide feedback to them. In total, the managers nominated 204 raters. The questionnaire was completed by 28 managers (87.5%) and 154 raters (75.5%). All managers that had valid self- and others rating in received a personalized feedback regarding their competencies with a clear differentiation between self- and other rating. Two weeks after the feedback a link to a follow up questionnaire was send to those managers via e-mail. A total of 26 managers (93%) responded with valid data providing data about their perception of the feedback and the likelihood that they will take personal development activities. These managers were grouped according to the level of agreement between their self- and other rating and their reaction as well as the likelihood to take individual development activities was analyzed.

2. Statistical procedures for the “Feedback and Reaction model” data analysis

Following the self and other ratings of managers, utilizing the ESCI questionnaire (HayGroup, 2011), an individual feedback for each of the 28 participating managers with valid self and other-rating data has been created and provided to them. A questionnaire regarding the reaction to the feedback has been send a week after feedback regarding managers self- and other rating has been provided to the managers. In total 26 managers (92.9%) completed the questionnaire. Managers were grouped in “overraters”, “underraters” and “in-agreement” regarding their self- and other rating. Since the data for the competences of emotional
intelligence where showing a normal distribution, the paired sample t-test has been applied to answer the question whether there are differences between self- and others ratings of managers’ competencies. Following, Spearman’s rho was computed to find whether the parameters of perceived accuracy, usefulness and likelihood to take development activities, correlate. Then it was tested, utilizing the Kruskal-Wallis Test, whether the difference between self- and other rating, explain also differences in the perceived accuracy of feedback, its usefulness and the likelihood that managers take future development activities on their own.

Results and Discussion

Testing the Feedback/Reaction model

To investigate whether differences between the self-rating of managers and the rating they received from others exist, the mean average others-rating from peers and subordinates was compared to the self-ratings utilizing the paired sample t-test for parametric independent variables. As stated by Church (1997) “research has demonstrated that averaged ratings are more reliable and therefore better indicators of the behavior being rated than any single assessment” (p. 285). As proposed by Atwater and Yammarino (1992) that introduced the idea to use rating agreement categories to analyze self and others’ agreement data, difference scores between self- and others’ ratings have been computed and the mean and standard deviation of the difference scores have been calculated. Individuals were then classified into groups of “over-raters” in-agreement” and “underraters” based on the extent of their self-others’ difference (i.e. the standard deviation from the mean self–others difference). Following the recommendations of Shanock, Baran, Gentry, Pattison, & Heggestad, (2010) descriptive information about the occurrence of congruence and incongruence between self and others’ ratings have been calculated to achieve a clearer initial understanding of the data. This has been done by standardizing the score for self and other ratings. Leaders with a standardized score on the self-rating half a standard deviation above others’ score was categorized as an over-estimator, whereas any leader with a standardized score for self-rating, half a standard deviation below others’ score were categorized as an under-estimator. Leaders within these limits were categorized as in-agreement with others. As illustrated in Table 1, all three of the categories were well represented in the sample, which, according to Shanock et al. (2010), constituted a good basis for the subsequent self-other analyses.

Table 1: Classification of groups according to rating differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Self-Rating</th>
<th>Mean Other Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-Agreement</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overrater</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underrater</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Source: Created by the author, using own empirical data
In Table 2 the descriptive statistics for the perceived accuracy and usefulness as well as for the likelihood of managers to take individual development activities are shown. In the underlying questionnaire a 5 level Likert scale (ranging from 1-5) has been employed. The minimum and maximum values for accuracy range between 3 and 5, for usefulness and likelihood to take development activities between 2 and 5. Due to the data, it can be stated that the participants perceived the development program particularly useful with a mean value of 4.04. Although the mean values are lower for accuracy and likelihood for development, the mean values are still above average.

| Source: Created by the author, using own empirical data |

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for accuracy and usefulness of feedback and the likelihood to take development activities

| Source: Created by the author, using own empirical data |

Table 3. shows the Min, Max, Mean, Standard deviation and Variance of data for the self-other rating differences. The minimum and maximum are ranging from -.83 to .59 indicating the minimum and maximum values of the difference between self and other ratings. Negative values in this sample are occurring when the self-rating of managers is lower than the others rating (underraters). The standard deviation is .30 and it is used to help to distinguish the groups of managers being underraters, overraters or in agreement with their raters.

| Source: Created by the author, using own empirical data |

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics for self- and other rating differences

Influence of rating group difference on the perceived accuracy and usefulness of feedback and the likelihood to take development activities

This part of the study aims to give insight on how individuals react on feedback and whether differences in rating outcome between the self and other rating can influence the participants’ initiatives for their own development.

In Table 4 the mean ranks for the groups of overraters, underraters and in-agreement participants for accuracy, usefulness and the likelihood for development activities are displayed. Further the Kruskal Wallis Test is shown. Reviewing the results, it can be stated that with a significance level of .954 for accuracy, .109 for usefulness and .219 for the likelihood to take development activities the three groups of self-other rating comparison (Overrater, Underrater, InAgreement) do not differ significantly.
Table 4: Influence of self- and other rating differences on perceived accuracy, usefulness, and likelihood for development activities using the Kuskal Wallis Test

| Source: Created by the author, using own empirical data |

Effect of perceived accuracy and usefulness in feedback on the likelihood to take personal development activities

After showing the descriptive statistics for the data of perceived accuracy, usefulness of feedback and the likelihood to take development activities, the three values were correlated to answer the research question. In table 4 the three variables have been correlated using Spearman’s rho. It can be noted that participants perceived feedback accuracy also correlated with the perceived usefulness of this feedback (p=.05). Furthermore, it is possible to see that perceived usefulness is statistical significant correlated with individuals’ likelihood to take development activities in the future on their own.
The results of this research show that the feedback process in leadership development activities is crucial. The feedback/reaction model did confirm the difference between managers self and others rating in a leadership development initiatives utilizing a 360-degree feedback, but could not find evidence that those differences (i.e. being an overrater, underrater, or being in agreement) influences the likelihood for participants to take development activities on their own. The statement, that the perceived accuracy and usefulness of feedback also leads to an increased likelihood to take personal development activities was partly supported. On the one side, perceived accuracy of the feedback did not correlate with the likelihood to take development activities, on the other side, it was found that the more useful participants perceived the feedback to be, the more likely they were to engage in further personal development activities. Research has shown that organizational interventions in leadership development are less successful than stimulating individuals to take their development into their own hands. Nevertheless, still many corporations do not encourage employees to increase their leadership capabilities. Data gathered in this study indicates that it is important for individuals to view the leadership development initiative that was introduced by their company to be useful to further engage in their own development activities.

### Table 4: Correlation between perceived accuracy, usefulness and likelihood to take development activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
<th>Usefulness</th>
<th>Likelyhood for development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spearman’s rho</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.422*</td>
<td>.224*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.572*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.422*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.547**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.224*</td>
<td>.547**</td>
<td>1.080*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source: Created by the author, using own empirical data
Based on the literature review and the quantitative research conducted, the following suggestions are given:

- Investing in leadership development programs can pay off. This research suggests that it is important to know how useful participants of these programs see the initiative to be in order to also take development activities once the corporate intervention is over. Only this will secure a sustainable and continuous improvement of the management and leadership force.

- Despite the big effort in leadership development, only mediocre results are reported. Often this is the case because participants are left alone with their feedback results. It is therefore suggested that a specific strategy following a 360-degree feedback needs to take into consideration that some participants need more encouragement than others to further develop their skills and that organizations need to have a holistic view on leadership development programs.

- As research was showing, the perceived usefulness of feedback is correlating with the likelihood to take personal development activities. Initiators of leadership development programs have to make sure that they explain how participants can benefit from the training, possibly also providing examples from workplace situations where participants can understand the value of the planned leadership development initiative.
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