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Abstract

This study aimed to explore the perceptions and experiences of peer evaluation (PE) in group work (GW) among nursing students at the Faculty of Nursing and Health Sciences, Bethlehem University, Palestine in spring 2016. While previous studies have examined the importance of PE in GW in a variety of disciplines in higher education, researchers have not paid much attention to PE in the assessment of nursing students in Palestine. A qualitative approach was used on a sample population of third- and fourth-year nursing students (n = 70) at Bethlehem University who had participated in PE in previous courses at least three times. Results revealed that participation in GW promoted the students’ leadership skills, team spirit, self-confidence, and respect for others, while significantly contributing to their professional growth. The results also highlighted challenges to GW such as distributing assignments to groups and providing clear specifications for the group leader’s role. Results also showed that the main challenges...
facing PE were the lack of objectivity, fairness, anonymity, and clear evaluation criteria, as well as the limited items in the evaluation forms. The study recommended the development of a faculty handbook containing guidelines for GW and PE, conducting training sessions for students, and encouraging all faculty members to use GW and PE routinely in their teaching practices.
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ساهم الباحثون في هذه الدراسة بشكل متساوي

الملخص

هدفت هذه الدراسة إلى استكشاف مفهوم وتجربة طلبة التمريض لتقييم الأقران في العمل الجماعي في كلية التمريض والعلوم الصحية، جامعة بيت لحم، فلسطين في ربيع ٢٠١٦. بينما تناولت الدراسات السابقة أهمية تقييم الأقران في العمل الجماعي في مجموعات متنوعة من التخصصات في التعليم العالي، لم يولي الباحثون اهتماماً كبيراً لتقييم الأقران في تقييم طلاب التمريض في فلسطين. استخدمت هذه الدراسة المنهج وتكوين مجتمع الدراسة من طلبة التمريض في السنة الثالثة والرابعة من كلا الجنسين (ن = ٢٠٠) في جامعة بيت لحم الذين شاركوا في العمل الجماعي وتقديم الأقران ثلاث مرات على الأقل. بنيت نتائج الدراسة أن المشاركة في العمل الجماعي عززت مهارات القيادة لدى الطلبة، وروح الفريق، والثقة بالنفس، واحترام الآخرين، مع المشاركة بشكل كبير في تطورهم المهني. وأظهرت تقييم الأقران على الطلبة إحساساً أكبر بالمسؤولية للمشاركة بنشاط في العمل الجماعي والعملية التعليمية، وتشجيع جمعية أعضاء هيئة التدريس على استخدام العمل الجماعي وتقييم الأقران بشكل مستمر في ممارساتهم التعليمية.
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1.1 Introduction

University students are required to carry out several types of assignments and tasks that are accomplished either individually, such as exams and tests, or in groups, such as presentations, case studies, role-plays, article analyses, and concept maps. Group work (GW) is a common method of learning and evaluation in higher education, including health programs. This approach supports the student-centered learning model that has been widely adopted in higher education, as it promotes motivation, communication, and cooperation among students and helps them develop their organizational, problem-solving, critical thinking, and leadership skills (Chang & Brickman, 2018; Kilickaya, 2017). Moreover, incorporating GW into the curriculum can promote student learning (Shaw, Mitchell, & Fabbro, 2015).

The researchers were introduced to peer evaluation in group work and its effectiveness through training programs. They used this tool to evaluate students and they desire in order to assess its effectiveness from the students’ perspective. The researchers are the only ones using this approach within the Faculty of Nursing and Health Science and its main objective is to try to generalize its use within the department. In addition, PE plays a key role in the empowerment of the students’ role in the learning and educational process at the university.

These skills are congruent with the characteristics of Bethlehem University graduates as outlined in the 2019 university catalog:

“Bethlehem University graduates are independent thinkers capable of leading significant lives, of making sound choices and decisions, capable of working in teams, and who can respond creatively to a variety of challenges in their environment.”

“Bethlehem University graduates are self-motivated, lifelong learners who are empowered to enhance their own professional, entrepreneurial, and leadership skills.” (Bethlehem University Catalog, 2019, p.10)
Our classroom experience observation and evaluation, however, revealed an inconsistency among faculty in following a student-centered versus a teacher-centered approach. This inconsistency is due to differing faculty and university requirements and results in disparities where some students are actively involved in their learning while others only passively receive information. This leads to student confusion and increased workloads. The student-centered versus teacher-centered approach is also affected by trends in high school education. In the high school environment, students are passive learners and are mainly evaluated through exams. The high school curriculum is based exclusively on textbooks, and few schools have extracurricular activities to support the learning.

On the other hand, at Bethlehem University, follow-ups are not conducted to monitor graduates’ development and measure whether or not they have succeeded in acquiring the attributes described in the university catalog.

Lecturers at the Faculty of Nursing and Health Sciences aim to integrate the most recent evidence-based teaching and learning methodologies into our curriculum to enhance our students’ critical and analytical thinking and problem-solving skills. In doing this, we meet Bethlehem University’s mission that states, “The University emphasizes excellence in academic programs and the development of students as committed people prepared to assume leading positions in society” (Bethlehem University Catalog, 2019, p.10).

Peer evaluation (PE) is crucial to our faculty because it promotes students’ ability to assess their peers’ performance constructively and enhances the communication process during GW. Such skills are vital to students’ future nursing careers, where honesty and objectivity will be essential in evaluating the work of their peers. Our graduates—future nurses—are likely to assume leadership roles in their workplaces, and their duties will include conducting performance appraisals of their colleagues as well as monitoring and evaluating team productivity. Moreover, nursing practice occasionally involves responding to life-threatening patient circumstances that are brought about by negligence or malpractice on the part of a member of the health team. The nurse, who is assumed to be the patient’s advocate, is expected to promptly intervene to address these actions by investigating such incidents and freely expressing his or her views on the situation.

Students’ perception of GW varies across cultural groups since it is dependent on the values, goals, and interests of the respective culture (Milhouse, 1996).
Therefore, as teachers, we should promote a culture of accepting another person’s opinions while having the courage to express our point of view without feeling shy, fearful, or intimidated.

Kaufman, Felder, and Fuller (2000) identified five conditions that should be considered in the design of GW. These conditions include “positive interdependence, individual accountability, face-to-face interaction, appropriate use of collaborative skills, and regular self-assessment of team functioning” (p. 133). At all levels of education, teachers are traditionally responsible for the grading of their students’ work. However, with the movement toward a student-centered approach in higher education settings, students are increasingly given a more active role in the formative and summative assessment of their coursework.

Furthermore, according to Brutus, Donia, and Ronen (2013), repeated peer feedback trials helped students become more confident and specific in their performance evaluations; these are critical skills in a professional environment. PEs are also effective in reducing social loafing in GW (Tessier, 2012).

Peer- and self-assessments were found to be significant in engaging and empowering students and developing their self-regulation and communication skills (Harris & Brown, 2013; Orsmond, Merry, & Reiling, 2000), and makes them more responsible for their learning process (Seifert & Feliks, 2019). “Self and peer-assessment are becoming central aspects of student-centered assessment processes in higher education.” (Wanner & Palmer, 2018, p. 1032). Also, involving students in the assessment process contributes to their empowerment and provides them with skills necessary for their professional development and lifelong learning (Adachi, Tai & Dawson, 2018; Planas Lladó et al. 2014). The use of PE as a means to award points for individual student contributions in a particular GW activity has also increased (Shiu, Chan, Lam, Lee, & Kwong, 2012). In addition, students can develop different skills during PE in the learning process, such as understanding the importance of being considerate when evaluating their peers (Lindblom-Ylänne, Pihlajamäki, & Kotkas, 2006). Finally, peer assessment provides students with an opportunity to assess GW. Walker (2001) argued that peer assessment is essential in developing students’ sense of autonomy and responsibility and enhances their capacity to contribute to GW.
1.2 Literature Review

The literature abounds with different views on the importance of PE from the students’ perspective. Students’ perceptions of PE range from equitable, fair, and logical to a more traditional view that considers it relatively ineffective in addressing the free rider problem and lack of objectivity. Several studies have reported that peer assessment provides many benefits for both the assessor and the students who are receiving the assessment. Falchikov (1986) and Roscoe and Chi (2007) claimed that students who assess the work of their peers are engaging in a cognitively demanding activity that extends their understanding of the subject matter. Venables and Summit (2003) reported that students who receive peer review are intellectually stimulated by the process and enhance their knowledge of the topic studied.

At Bethlehem University’s Faculty of Nursing and Health Sciences, PE is utilized in some junior and senior courses. At the beginning of the course, lecturers explain the group assignment and define the groups according to their clinical placement, with an emphasis on the importance of collaboration within the group. Lecturers then introduce the PE form and inform students of how much PE will contribute to the total grade for the assignment. The PE process is believed to be an important educational task in which students are requested to comment on the quality of their classmates’ work and their commitment to achieving the GW benchmarks for assignments, meetings, communication, and the performance of certain tasks. At the end of the group assignment, students complete the PE form individually for themselves and their peers and return it to the lecturer. The PE form was designed after reviewing the literature, including the Johns Hopkins University PE form (Johns Hopkins University, 2006).

Although several studies have been conducted on students’ perceptions of peer assessment in a variety of disciplines, to the best of our knowledge, this will be the first study in the field of nursing education at Bethlehem University in Palestine.

The present study was conducted to explore nursing students’ perceptions of GW and PE. The study objectives were to

1) explore nursing students’ experiences with GW,
2) explore students’ experiences with PE,
3) identify benefits and challenges of PE in GW, and
4) explore students’ suggestions for improving the process of PE.
2. Methodology

The study used a mixed-method approach; nevertheless, for the purpose of this paper, only qualitative data will be presented. Focus group discussions were conducted to explore the nursing students’ views and suggestions on GW and the PE process. An interview guide was used in the focus groups. The guide included four questions about students’ experience with GW, their experience with PE, benefits and challenges of PE in GW, and suggestions for improving PEs (see –Table 1).

Focus groups are ideal for obtaining in-depth feedback regarding participants’ attitudes, opinions, perceptions, motivations, and behaviors (Liampittong, 2011). The focus group technique was used because (1) it facilitates obtaining feedback from a large number of subjects in a relatively short period of time, (2) it enhances the exchange of ideas and concerns among group members, and (3) in this particular case, data from the focus group discussions were used in designing a culturally sensitive questionnaire that was utilized in the quantitative part of the study (Freitas, Oliveira, Jenkins, & Popjoy, 1998).

The study population was third- and fourth-year nursing students (n = 70) at Bethlehem University who had participated in GW and PE at least three times. Our focus groups (28 students) were purposively created to include students from both years, an equitable mix of gender, and a fair representation of student academic performances according to the level of cumulative achievement (C to A).

2.1 Data collection

The data were collected during the 2015–2016 academic year. Four focus groups of seven students each were used. A facilitator and two researchers were assigned to each group to record and document the interviews and discussions. The facilitator in each group conducted the focus group discussion according to the interview guide. Each focus group session lasted approximately 90 minutes. An audio recording and written notes were used to record participants’ responses after securing their consent.
2.2 Ethical considerations

Ethical approval was obtained from the Bethlehem University Ethical Review Committee. A cover letter explaining the nature of the study was provided to the students before the start of data collection. The subjects were assured that their participation in the study was voluntary and that their non-participation would not affect them in any way. Participants were assured that any and all information gathered from them would be kept confidential and would be used solely for the purpose of the present study. Each student signed an informed consent form indicating his or her willingness to participate in the study.

3. Data analysis

The transcripts from the focus group discussions were assembled and carefully reviewed until the investigators were familiar with them. Responses were analyzed using content analysis to identify categories. Content analysis is an appropriate approach for analyzing qualitative research in which there is a subjective interpretation of the content of the text data derived from the systematic classification process of coding and identifying themes or patterns (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005, p. 1278).

4. Results

Theme 1: Experience in Group Work

Several positive experiences and challenges with GW were revealed during focus group discussions. Positive experiences include the enhancement of teamwork capabilities, and the challenges involve obstacles to creating a team and negative attitudes toward GW.

Enhancement of teamwork capabilities

The focus groups discussed the benefits gained from GW, such as listening to each other’s ideas, exchanging and defending ideas, respecting the opinions of other students, encouraging and supporting the ideas and efforts of others, offering assistance to others, and playing different roles in the group. A fourth-year student said, “Working in a group enabled us to know each other better, to know how to work together, and provide support to team members. We also learned to play different roles and deal with people with diverse characteristics.” A third-year student added, “GW enhances relationships, promotes ideas, and stimulates creativity among us.”
Therefore, *group work* provides a positive aspect to the students’ learning process through active learning, such as *encouraging social interactions* and collaboration communication, sharing and aggregating useful ideas, dividing the workload among all group members, getting tutoring and learning support from others, and learning to communicate within a diverse group. GW further allows for the articulation, clarification and exchange of ideas and knowledge (Baker & Clark, 2010; Ferrante et al., 2006). There are both personal and academic benefits to group work (Lavy, 2017).

**Obstacles to group work**

Participants indicated that team member roles and tasks were ambiguous. Other challenges facing GW are related to group members’ loss of motivation and energy, which usually leads to a delay in completing the group’s tasks. Consequently, the group has to work under pressure, often as the semester draws to a close. In these situations, the atmosphere in the group declines and the group often becomes dominated by a few, typically self-motivated, members. In addition, some members claim to have done all or most of the work when they did not. A fourth-year student explained, “*Group members work hard at the beginning, but they soon lose momentum and then try to work hard as the deadline draws closer in order to achieve the group goal.*” Further difficulties mentioned were choosing a group leader, a lack of clarity in the tasks, a lack of social interaction, and a decreased incentive to work displayed by some group members. In addition, the path to achieving the outcomes was unclear, and the more dominant group members overshadowed the weaker and shier participants.

**Negative attitudes toward group work**

Some participants complained about members who were not sufficiently committed to GW. Certain members depended on their teammates to accomplish their assigned tasks. In contrast, others preferred to work independently or did not believe in collective work at all (i.e., those who tended to have more individualistic personalities). For example, a third-year student said, “*In groups, there are the so-called free riders who often receive an evaluation, though not according to the work they actually did.*” Moreover, some members took advantage of the GW approach and claimed credit for work they did not do. According to a fourth-year, “*One of my colleagues bragged to the instructors about doing all the work, and he had not done any work.*” Furthermore, the participants revealed that GW should be adopted for first-year level courses; and students should be trained through workshops or simulation.
sessions on how to work in groups. In addition, there should be a clear specification of the goals of GW, what is expected of the students, a clear definition of the members’ roles, to allow the group to select the assignment if possible, and for members to be assigned to groups randomly. A fourth-year student said, “If we started group work in first year, it would have facilitated our understanding to the goals and description, and would have helped in consecutive group work.” Furthermore, the students’ characteristics and or abilities must be considered when forming the groups, abilities of group members should be considered when assigning tasks to them and to be fair, equal in distributing workload, considering the time and effort needed to accomplish a particular task though (Beccaria, Kek, Huijser, Rose, & Kimmins, 2014).

**Theme 2: Experience with Peer Evaluation**

The students had mixed feelings about PE. The main themes that emerged from the focus group discussions were feelings of unfairness, a lack of integrity in evaluating their peers, and feelings of being held responsible and challenged.

**Feelings of unfairness**

The evaluation process was sometimes unfair, as students were not completely objective in their feedback. A fourth-year student said, “I was afraid to be unfair while evaluating others, so I raised my group members’ marks.” Others had a different concern—that group members lacked objectivity because of their personal relationships. A statement by a fourth-year student supports this: “Personal relationships influence objectivity.”

This brings the attention to the fact that students in group work might get a low grade even though their contribution was higher than others. Moreover, peer evaluations do not reflect the students’ contributions as they are afraid of each other. In our education, the students do not objectively evaluate their peers due to interpersonal and sociocultural norms and are not used to taking part in evaluation processes. The individual places a great deal of importance on their relationships with friends, which might affect their objectivity with regards to daily decisions.

**Lack of integrity in evaluating peers**

Some participants stated that they considered the well-being of their group members when evaluating peers. As a third-year student explained, “Giving high grades will help increase the final course grade for each group member.” Another fourth-year student said, “Usually, we give high grades to each other
so the whole group can achieve a high score.”

Traditionally, in high school, students are not partners in their learning: the teacher is the focus, and students are passive learners. Nor are students involved in the evaluation process. Therefore, the university setting is most students’ first experience with a student-centered approach that includes GW and PE. Participants felt that assessing their peers was challenging because they had to appraise individuals based on their contributions and development while ignoring social and personal relationships. At times, however, personal relationships outweighed the other evaluation criteria. According to a fourth-year student, “We take into consideration how much the student has developed, but we are afraid of creating personal problems if we assign low grades.” Other participants have little confidence in their judgment. For example, a third-year student said, “Group members are afraid to be unfair and some lack confidence in their own judgment, so they give higher grades to each other.”

The analysis of the focus group data reveals that students’ perceptions and experiences of PE may be affected by three factors: (1) previous experience with PE, (2) the relationship among group members, and (3) past experience with GW.

**Theme 3: Benefits of Peer Evaluation in Group Work**

The majority of participants had a positive perception of PE; most viewed it as very useful, and participants all made similar comments regarding their experience. The following themes emerged from the group discussions: PE developed participants’ self-confidence and sense of responsibility, boosted students’ motivation, and enhanced student integrity.

**Development of self-confidence and responsibility**

PE gives students a feeling of responsibility and inclusion in the teaching process. A fourth-year student stated, “It means a lot to me to be actively involved in the teaching and assessment process, as it shows my capabilities.” Another fourth-year student said, “I recognize that participating in PE enhanced our self-confidence, and that enabled us to evaluate ourselves and others.” Furthermore, some participants noted that PE improves students’ self-confidence and their sense of responsibility and accountability. This is evident from these quotes by the students: a fourth-year student said, “It teaches us to be more responsible, which is better than just getting the grade,” while another fourth-year student stated, “It encourages weak students to become more responsible.”

So, providing students with opportunities to participate more actively in
assessments empower them to be self-regulated learners (Orsmond et al., 2000, Rust et al., 2003) and to enhance their skills for professional development and lifelong learning (Planas Lladó et al., 2014).

**Boosting student motivation**

Students indicated that PE motivated them to improve their individual work within the group in order to receive a positive evaluation from their peers, as seen in the following quotes. A third-year student stated, “I worked hard because I knew that there was an evaluation and was not sure how I would be evaluated by others...PE motivates students to do better work.” While a third-year student said, “Using PE helps us to be more committed to doing our duties to get the mark we deserve. It is a good way to keep students working.” Also, a fourth-year student said, “I am motivated to say what I should say and get feedback from the teacher to improve myself.”

**Building student integrity**

In their responses, students emphasized that taking part in several PEs helped them to be more objective, fair, honest, sincere, and credible in their assessment. This is illustrated in the following student statements. A third-year student said, “Peer evaluation promotes certain values among the students, such as integrity, objectivity, credibility, fairness, respect for others, and learning from others. It also improves student behavior in the future.” Another third-year student stated, “PE enables students to give grades according to the work done by the student. In the future, I will know how to evaluate others objectively regardless of our friendship and be more responsible, serious and mature.”

**Theme 4: Challenges to Peer Evaluation**

During the focus group discussions, students expressed shared concerns about the challenges they faced during the PE process. They recognized that the main challenges to PE are the fear of losing friends, the lack of awareness of and experience with PE, a lack of understanding of the importance of PE, the inappropriate timing of the evaluation, and the lack of privacy due to completing PE form in class.

**Fear of losing friends:**

One of the concerns raised during focus group discussions was the fear of compromising personal relationships with classmates. This is supported by the following feedback. A third-year student said, “PE affects our personal relation-
ships; we give high marks even when the student has not worked at all, as we do not want to lose our friends.”

**Lack of awareness and objectivity in peer evaluation**
Many students acknowledged that they were not fully aware of the importance of PE. A fourth-year student said, “We thought that PE...only mattered for the grade, so we just gave high marks to everyone.” In addition, a majority of students believed that they were not objective in their evaluations, and they did not take the process seriously. They also felt that they failed to maintain their integrity throughout. A third-year student said, “We did not take it seriously. It was a quick, non-objective evaluation, and our concern was to give high marks to all regardless of their contribution.” This lack of objectivity can most likely be attributed to limited experience and training in the PE process. As a third-year student said, “I was not objective in evaluating peers and gave them high grades...because I lacked... experience...but as my experience grew, I became more objective.”

**Lack of privacy**
Students were asked to complete the PE form in class, leading to concerns about a lack of privacy. A third-year student said, “When we did the PE, it was in the same classroom, and we did not have privacy...We shared the evaluations with each other, and we gave everyone high marks.”

**Inappropriate timing of the evaluation:**
Some students thought the timing of the PE was not appropriate, as it was done after exams were completed. A fourth-year student said, “Since the evaluation was done after the exam, it affected me negatively... I did not have enough time, so I evaluated all my group members in a non-objective way.”

**Theme 5 Proposed suggestions for Improving PE**
After discussing the main benefits and challenges encountered during PE, students were asked to share proposals for future improvements. The themes that emerged were approaches to PE, the role of the team leader, and grade allocation.

**Approaches to peer evaluation**
PE is a new tool that allows students to assess their GW; they are still learning how to best integrate it into their learning. Students identified three areas that could be targeted for improvement: an early introduction
of PE, an initial explanation of GW and PE, and modification of the PE form.

**Early introduction of peer evaluation**

The majority of students believed that GW and PE should begin in the first year of study. A fourth-year student said, “It is better to use PE in GW for assignments for students from first year.” In this case, we at the faculty of nursing, will adopt this practice and have student be involved in GW and PE.

**Initial explanation of group work and peer evaluation**

Many students agreed on the importance of teachers explaining the value and significance of GW and PE at the beginning of the course. This could be done during the introduction of the syllabus through a discussion of the assessment criteria. A fourth-year student suggested, “The teacher should give out the PE form...at the beginning of the GW task and explain its importance and how the process is carried out.” Another fourth-year student stated, “PE should be an anonymous process, and the evaluator’s name should be anonymous as well. We did not want to hurt others, so we gave good grades...to both those who worked and those who did not to avoid being unfair.”

**Modification of the peer evaluation form**

Many students discussed the need to modify the present PE form to allow more space for feedback. They also suggested a more specific grading scale with a clearer rubric, which could be adjusted according to the assignment. One student shared that “it is important to modify the scale and assign points for each evaluation statement and add a column for comments.” A third-year student said, “The form needs some modification, such as adding items related to time commitment and submission of the assigned task to the team on time.”

**Role of team leader**

The majority of students believed that team leaders should receive guidance from teachers, allowing the leaders to more effectively fulfill their role. A fourth-year student said, “The leader should set and follow a clear plan, prepare for the meetings, and take attendance and meeting minutes.” A fourth-year student observed, “Leader evaluation of progress is necessary and may be done in the middle of and throughout group work.”
Grade allocation

Students highlighted the importance of transparency in PE in improving their performance and leadership skills and empowering them to show their personality during the evaluation process. A fourth-year student said, “If objectivity is our goal, the student should know how he was evaluated by others.” In addition, a third-year student said, “Each group member should know how the other members evaluated him/her for the sake of improvement,” and a fourth-year student stated, “Students should have privacy to complete the PE form and then meet to share their evaluation.”

Furthermore, ideas about grade allocation were varied, with some students desiring a significant percentage of the grade being derived from PE, for a breakdown that a third-year student said, “40% from PE, 20% from teacher evaluations, and 40% from presentations.” Other participants wanted an objective PE to account for an even higher percentage of the grade, where a third-year student said, “80% for PE and 20% for teacher evaluations.”
5. Discussion

This study explored nursing students’ perceptions of GW and PE at the Faculty of Nursing and Health Sciences at Bethlehem University. The findings support the use of PE in GW, as it develops students’ evaluation skills, deepens their role in the group, and enhances their sense of responsibility. This, in turn, builds students’ self-confidence and professionalism, enhances students’ level of involvement in their education—making them active participants—and promotes teamwork and leadership skills. Despite these benefits, PE is likely to suffer from a lack of objectivity stemming from limited student experience with evaluations or the pressure of friendships or other biases.

Barak and Rafaeli (2004) stated that PE in GW is another level of engagement for students involved in GW, and it reflects a particular level of responsibility.

Conclusion and Recommendations

There is no doubt that students’ engagement in PE as early as the first year will enhance the effect of GW in deepening the group members’ professionalism, self-trust and confidence, their communication and management skills, abilities and creativity, to resolve problems through negotiation and dialogue, to discover personal potential, respect for others, and responsibility toward studying.

In order for PE in GW to fulfill its objectives, training sessions should be held to teach students the importance of the evaluation and its components. Students should begin to engage with PE from the first year of study, with clear criteria for completing the PE form. Teachers and group leaders should conduct regular follow-up on both GW and PE.

GW and PE should be formally adopted by the Faculty of Nursing as a pedagogical strategy and should be integrated into the program and course syllabus with guidelines for implementation in the faculty and student handbooks. Student training in the practice of GW and PE should accompany this beginning in the first year of study.

This study has some limitations. It was conducted on a small group of participants at one institution and therefore cannot be generalized. Further research should be done to include a larger sample size across a greater number of institutions using different methodologies.
Students recommended that the use of GW and PE begin in the first year of study so they can become familiar with the teamwork process and strategies for effective collaboration. Students indicated that proper training and relevant experience are necessary for them to be able to objectively evaluate their peers and not base their assessment on social or personal relationships. As a fourth-year student stated, “Experience and training in the evaluation process should be undertaken as early as the first year. Utilizing smaller tasks will help distinguish the creative students from those who are...less interested.” It is clear that many factors affect evaluations, including the experiences of group members, their personalities, their dedication to their role, the relationship among group members.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Sub-Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Experience with Group Work</td>
<td>⇒ Enhancement of Teamwork Capabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ Obstacles to group work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ Negative Attitudes Toward Group Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Experience with Peer Evaluation</td>
<td>⇒ Feelings of Unfairness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ Lack of Integrity in Evaluating Peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ Boosting Student Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ Building Student Integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Challenges to Peer Evaluation</td>
<td>⇒ Fear of Losing Friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ Lack of Awareness and objectivity in PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ Lack of Privacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ Inappropriate Timing of the Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Proposed Suggestions for Improvement of PE</td>
<td>⇒ Approaches to Peer Evaluation (Early Introduction of PE, Initial Explanation of GW and PE, Modification of the Form)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ Role of Team Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ Grade Allocation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>