

# Analysing case



**ASSIGN  
BUSTER**

Introduction Feedback has over the years been widely used by organizations to stimulate behavior change, enhance performance, and gain greater self-awareness among the employees. It has been argued that feedback is important for motivation, development, career planning, and performance management. One major challenge for organizations, and managers, has been how to handle employees who seem not to benefit from feedback. The prior belief has been that the more frequently one receives feedback, the more likely for her to change. In this paper we find out that feedback interventions do not always lead to performance improvements (Silverman, Pogson, and Cober 136). However, there are individual and organizational level factors that if taken into account would increase the likelihood for an employee to change in response to feedback. Individual precursors (IPs) There are five individual-level precursors that, when present, increase the likelihood that an employee will change in response to feedback. The five IPs are: 1) Awareness; 2) Sense of Necessity; 3) Confronting Change; 4) Willingness for feedback; and 5) Development Orientation. The central IP is awareness. Awareness is what makes an individual acknowledge that a problem exists and that it calls for change. Sense of necessity is the recognition that a change in behavior is important and that it has to be followed through. Confronting change is an extension to awareness but with a greater understanding of the steps needed to change. Willingness for feedback indicates emotional readiness for feedback and openness to frank opinions from others. Development orientation involves believing in seeking development through trying new things and seeking learning opportunities (Silverman, Pogson, and Cober 141). Works cited Silverman, Stanley B, Corrie E Pogson, and Alana B Cober. " When Employees at Work Don't Get It: <https://assignbuster.com/analysing-case/>

A Model for Enhancing Individual Employee Change in Response to Performance Feedback." Academy of Management Executive 19. 2 (2005): 135 - 147. Print.