



Giving Peer Feedback in Support of Clinical Nursing

Lihua shan, Lulu wan , Yingge Lai

2022 Laurea





Laurea University of Applied Sciences

Giving Peer Feedback in Support of Clinical Nursing

Lihua Shan, Lulu Wan, Yingge Lai
Degree Program of Nursing
Thesis
March, 2022

Lihua Shan, Lulu Wan, Yingge Lai

Giving Peer Feedback in Support of Clinical Nursing

Year	2022	Number of pages	31
------	------	-----------------	----

Abstract

Peer feedback is one of the basic sections of professional development (Creta & Gross 2020). Peer feedback as an evaluation tool which may be useful in Finland. In the process of implementation, some factors such as cultural differences and training program may need to be taken into consideration. Thereby to benefit the employee's satisfaction, their professional development and increase the qualitative of care for patients.

The purpose of this thesis is to describe what is peer feedback (peer assessment) in nursing teams and what is its influence in hospitals. The aim of this thesis is to help nurses understand and use peer feedback/assessment program, which will improve nurse's clinical competence and job satisfaction as well as improve patient outcomes. 16 articles were analyzed by qualitative research. Articles' results were organized in a table and analyzed again to get the overall results. Peer feedback plays a positive role in improving nurses' performance and improve the skills. However, effective peer feedback requires enough training, comfortable working environment, and mutual trust relationship as well as supportive leader or experts.

Keywords: peer feedback, nursing peer review, peer assessment, Magnet® Hospital status

Contents

1	Introduction.....	6
2	Theoretical Background.....	7
2.1	Peer feedback.....	7
2.2	Nursing Peer Review	7
2.3	Peer Assessment	8
2.4	Magnet® Hospitals.....	8
2.5	Peer feedback used in other areas	9
3	Purpose and aim	9
4	Methods	10
4.1	Literature review	10
4.1.1	Data collection	11
4.1.2	Inclusion and exclusion criteria.....	11
4.1.3	Data collection from databases:.....	12
4.2	Data analysis	12
4.3	Description of findings.....	13
5	Discussion	16
5.1	Reliability.....	16
5.2	Ethics Consideration	17
6	Conclusion	17
7	Recommendation	18
	Figures	错误!未定义书签。
	Tables	24
	Appendices	25

1 Introduction

Peer feedback is one of the basic sections of professional development (Creta & Gross 2020). It is important to use it in clinical nursing practice to improve professional ability and skill. Lerchenfeldt & Taylor (2020) stated that peer feedback often refers to peer assessment or peer evaluation (Lerchenfeldt & Taylor 2020). According to Foster's clarification, the peer feedback is a tool used by peers to evaluate each other's performances. The aim of using this tool is to improve the receiver's understanding regarding his or her strengths and gaps in a special practice or performance. After the peer feedback, the receivers will get additional insight regarding what he or she did and what was the impact (Foster 2015). As an evaluation tool, peer feedback is widely used in medical professional works and health professions education. There are many advantages of performing peer feedback. Peer feedback is implemented by people of equal levels. As demonstrated by studies on the introduction, more and more proofs have justified its efficiency in improving professional knowledges and improving patients' safety (Gielen et al. 2010, Leclair-Smith et al. 2016, Wichmann et al. 2018, Wu & Schunn 2020, cited in Zhang et al. 2022). According to Lerchenfeldt & Taylor (2020), Nofziger et al. in 2010 and Lerchenfeldt et al. in 2019 on the introduction of peer feedback can support students and staffs to develop professionalism, teamwork and communication skills (Nofziger et al. 2010 & Lerchenfeldt et al. 2019, cited in Lerchenfeldt & Taylor 2020). It helps students better understanding their own performance, improving their grades and developing their skills (Lerchenfeldt & Taylor 2020).

On the other hand, peer feedback is a tool to implement peer review, which is necessary to be used as one essential part to apply for Magnet® Hospital status. HUS Comprehensive Cancer Center, HUS Children and Adolescents, the HUS Heart and Lung Center and HUS Psychiatry are applying for the Magnet status (HUS 2019). Magnet model contains five components: transformational leadership, structural empowerment, exemplary professional practice, new knowledge, innovation, and improvements as well as empirical quality results (American Nurses Credentialing Center 2022). Global (2016) refers to a study by George & Haag-Heitman (2011) mentioned that peer review is an inevitable requirement to achieve the exemplary professional practice part (George & Haag-Heitman 2011, cited in Global 2016). To achieve the Magnet® Hospital status, it is necessary to apply peer feedback in the medical team. Although peer feedback is a popular term recently, and it is frequently used in many areas of working environment, there is rare information in Finland regarding what it really is and how it works in nursing teams. Therefore, peer feedback was chosen as the research object in this thesis.

The purpose of this thesis is to describe what is peer feedback (peer assessment) in nursing teams and what is its influence in hospitals. The aim of this thesis is to help nurses understand and use peer feedback/assessment program, which will improve nurse's clinical competence and job satisfaction as well as improve patient outcomes.

2 Theoretical Background

2.1 Peer feedback

According to Atay and Kurt (2007), the definition of peer feedback is “A communication process. In this process, learners participate in dialogues that are related to performance and standards” (Atay & Kurt 2007). The authors' another article claims that peer feedback provides opportunities for students to talk and listen, write, read in a meaningful way. It also reflects on the content, ideas, issues and concerns of an academic subject (Atay & Kurt 2006).

From the University of Oxford's teaching resources website, however, peer feedback has another definition: It's the process when students use relative assessment criteria or standards to provide feedback to another student regarding his/her work or performance. It enables students to better understand how to use the criteria and how to do better self-assessment at the same time. It can also expose them to different ways of accomplishing an assignment. (University of Oxford Center for Teaching and Learning 2022)

Based on the above descriptions, it is safe to draw the following conclusion: Peer feedback is provided by peers, not from the superior or other field personnel. Through the process, feedback receivers can develop some skills or at least receive some new information.

2.2 Nursing Peer Review

In 1988, the ANA stated peer review means practicing registered nurses access, monitor, and make judgments about the quality of nursing care provided by peers. The process is measured against professional standards of practice and the process is systematically (Tornwall 2018). The peer review receiver could be an individual nurse or a group of nurses, and the receiver's work is evaluated by individuals who have the same rank according to this field's standards (Globe 2016).

According to Mangold, Tyler, Velez and Clark (2018), American Nurses Association states that peer review is “a collegial, systematic, and periodic process by which registered nurses are held accountable for practice and which fosters the refinement of one's knowledge, skills, and decision-making at all levels and in all areas of practice”. (Mangold et. al 2018)

2.3 Peer Assessment

According to the definition given by Iowa State University's Learning and Teaching center, Peer assessment is a range of activities that students assess and give feedback to their peers regarding their work or performance. It is frequently used as a way for students to evaluate their peers' contributions to teamwork. (Iowa State University Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching 2022)

According to Boud, Cohen and Sampson (1999), peer assessment is the process that peers (can be colleagues, students, or teachers) evaluate and provide feedback to each other (Boud et al 1999). This explanation has similar meaning with peer feedback. Actually, in some articles, the author argues that the two terms mean the same process (Lerchenfeldt & Taylor 2020). In this thesis, these two words are considered as the same process.

Cornell University's Center for Teaching Innovation (CTI 2022) defines Peer Assessment as below: Peer assessment (or peer review) is a systematic learning process in which students could critique and give feedback to each other on their performance. It helps students to develop the skills of assessing and giving feedback to others. At the same time, they improve the ability of self-evaluation and improve their own work performance. (CTI 2022) Noticed that in this definition, peer assessment is equivalent with the term "peer review". However, in some other places, peer review has its own definition. Especially in the Magnet® status, they have clear differences. Peer review is a wider concept and process which includes peer feedback or peer assessment tool. In this thesis, as the topic is closely related to Magnet® status, peer assessment and peer review are considered as two different concepts.

2.4 Magnet® Hospitals

Magnet® Hospitals are the medical institutions which meet the Magnet® hospital criteria. Magnet® Hospitals are certified by the American Nurses' Credentialing Center (ANCC 2022). Magnet® recognition is not only implemented in U.S, but also a worldwide recognition. In 1983, the American Academy of Nursing (AAN) Task Force on Nursing Practice in Hospitals began the research to recognize the work environment which would attract and maintain high-quality nurses, thereby promoting high-quality care for patients and clients. There were 41 out of 163 organizations fulfilled the qualities and thus they got "magnet" as a designation (ANCC 2022). At the moment (1.2022), there are 579 hospitals achieved Magnet status (ANCC 2022). Magnet® status benefits both nurses, patients, and clients. In Magnet® Hospitals, nurses are empowered not only to take care of the patient but also inspired to make good changes and innovation. For nurses, those hospitals which achieved the Magnet® status provide a positive work environment: increase nurses satisfaction, decrease nurse burnout and nurse's turnover. Benefits to patients and clients: increase patients' and clients' safety;

promote quality of care by nurses; decreased mortality rates and patient fall rates, decreased nosocomial infections and hospital-acquired pressure ulcer rates (ANCC 2022).

Peer feedback used in other areas

2.5 Peer feedback used in other areas

Peer feedback is a relatively new concept in nursing area, but it has been used in other medical areas and education areas for decades. For example, in the research performed by Elshami and Abdalla with radiography students, they got the following conclusion: Peer assessment (peer feedback) is essential part in students' learning progress. It can significantly improve the student's performance and develop their evaluation skills. It can also develop students' critical think and problem-solving skills. (Elshami and Abdalla 2016)

In another research which took place in the University of Pittsburgh, the researcher Patchan reached the following conclusion: Peer feedback can help students have a better understanding with writing. Besides, both the high-level writers and low-level writers can benefit from the peer review process. (Patchan 2011)

There are plenty of other example regarding the applications of peer feedback. According to Lerchenfeldt, Mi and Eng (2019), in order to improve the professionalism behavior, peer feedback might be a reliable tool in cooperative studying environment (Lerchenfeldt et al 2019). Creta and Gross stated that nursing peer feedback could be done under some professional standards and guidelines which were published in American Nurses Association, Infusion Nursing Society and Oncology Nursing society (Creta and Gross 2020). Hulsman and Van Der Vloodt refer to a study by Donald Schön in 1983 on introduction of peer feedback, which has been become popular in recent years in the modern educational paradigm of reflective practice (Hulsman and Van Der Vloodt 2015).

3 Purpose and aim

The purpose of this thesis is to describe what is peer feedback (peer assessment) in nursing teams and what is its influence in hospitals.

The aim of this thesis is to collect data, which will help nurses understand and use peer feedback/assessment program, thus improve nurse's clinical competence and job satisfaction as well as improve patient outcomes. In the long run, with high nursing job satisfaction and improved patient outcomes, the hospital will have more possibility to get the Magnet® status. At this level, clarifying and implementing peer feedback can have dual benefits. Research questions are:

1. What is peer feedback in nursing?
2. How to apply it into nursing practice?
3. What is its impact on nursing practice?

4 Methods

4.1 Literature review

As nursing peer feedback is not used in Finland hospitals now, there is no existing data could be collected from hospitals, so the literature review is used as main research methods. According to Aveyard, literature review means analyzing the collected literature resources which related to the chosen topic and then develop new ideas form the systematic analysis results. (Aveyard 2010, chap.1).

According to Taylor, literature review is a systematic summary of previous knowledge or research on a specific topic. The materials being researched can be scholarly articles, professional discourses, books and other forms of resources related to a particular area (Taylor 2022).

McCombes (2022) also confirms that literature review means the survey of academic resources related to a special research question or special topic. The resources can be books, journal articles as well as theses. Literature review mainly involves the following process: finding relevant resources, analyzing the data and then explaining what has been found from the resources. Shona further explains that literature review not only means to summarize resources, but also to analyzes and synthesizes the data, and critical thinking is also needed to finally get a clear picture of the knowledge on this topic. (McCombes 2022)

McCombes pointed out there are several essential steps in the literature review process. Before researching the relative literature, there should be a specific question or topic. Then figure out the keywords list and search for relevant resources with the keywords. The search can be broadened or narrowed down with the conjunction words “AND, OR NOT”. A lot of materials may be found with the original searching, but after reading the abstract, only a part of useful publications will be chosen as research source. The last time-consuming step is to analyze and synthesize the data to get the conclusion. (McCombes 2022)

4.1.1 Data collection

EBSCO, PROQUEST, SCIENCE DIRECT (ELSEVIER) were used as our databases. The following terms were used in the articles “Peer feedback” OR “peer review” OR “peer assessment” AND “Magnet® Hospital status”. At the beginning, only few nursing relevant articles were searched. The main reason was there is a limited information regarding peer feedback implementation in nursing area. Then the search scope was enlarged to “peer feedback/assessment/review in all medical or education area” and sufficient literature was searched. The search was limited to full text articles which are in English or Chinese language, and which are published between 2012 to 2022. After the review of titles and abstracts, finally 16 articles were chosen as research material.

4.1.2 Inclusion and exclusion criteria

Inclusion	Exclusion
Peer feedback or peer assessment in healthcare and education field	other professionals
Year 2012-2022	Year before 2012
English and Chinese language	Other language
Full text available	Not full text available

Table 1: Inclusion and Exclusion criteria

4.1.3 Data collection from databases:

DATABASE	SEARCH	LIMITS	RESULTS	ACCEPTED WITH ABSTRACT	ACCEPTED
EBSCO	Professional competences or professional skill AND feedback evaluation or peer feedback AND peer review or peer support	10 years Full text Academic journal	26	3	1
PROQUEST	FEEDBACK EVALUATION/PEER FEEDBACK AND NURSING AND PEER REVIEW AND PEER ASSESSMENT	10 years Full text scholarly journals	126	20	9
SCIENCE DIECT(ELSEVIER)	FEEDBACK EVALUATION/PEER FEEDBACK AND NURSING SKILLS AND CLINICAL COMPETENCES/SKILLS/PROFESIONAL SKILLS AND PEER REVIEW AND PEER ASSESSMENT	10 years Full text research articles	432	25	5
GOOGLE SCHOLAR	Peer feedback/ learning/improvement	10 years Full text research articles	2	1	1

Table 2: Search Results

When researching these 16 articles, three initial research question were always emphasized: What is peer feedback in nursing? How to apply peer feedback into nursing practice? What is its impact on nursing practice? Reading notes around these three questions were written during the literature review process. Finally, the dominant views and results of these articles were analyzed. 16 articles were analyzed as an attachment.

4.2 Data analysis

Totally 16 academic articles are used. Most of the articles show a positive attitude regarding the effects of peer feedback. The advantage of peer feedback are as follows. Peer feedback can increase professionals' confidence and improve their ability. It can also develop people's responsibility and their collaboration attitude. In clinical nursing, it enhances professionalism through professional practice assessment. It was satisfactory by participants as well as the patient outcomes (Mangold et al. 2018). It is a primary element of professional improvement. Give useful peer feedback progresses their professional and complete competence growth (Creta and Gross 2020).

However, in a few articles, there are also concerns regarding the performance of peer feedback. For example, some participants may have skeptical attitudes with the effects of peer feedback. They don't trust their peers' or their own ability to provide accurate and effective feedback. Some participants are worried that giving non-anonymous feedback may break the relationship between team workers. Others may feel uncomfortable or embarrassing when they receive negative feedback from peers. Some participants claim that peer feedback is a time-consuming process, but no obvious effects can be achieved at the end of this process.

Even though there are different worries with the implementation of peer feedback, most of the researchers believe that the results can be more positive if enough training and practice are provided before peer feedback. As people may feel confused with some concepts and have a lack of comprehensive understanding with peer feedback process, it is common that they are not able to receive desired feedback in the beginning. That is the reason why some researchers claim that enough training and preparation is necessary before doing peer feedback. Others believe that a good team atmosphere and mutual trust interpersonal relationship is necessary. Besides, a supportive leader or faculty will also be helpful to achieve desirable peer feedback results.

4.3 Description of findings

Lerchenfeldt and Taylor (2020) claims peer feedback has a positive outcome to support student learning in a nonpunitive atmosphere and allow students to promote their skills. However, give students clear instruction before giving peer feedback would make feedback results more effective. Students may not be able to give the accurate peer feedback without proper training. According to their research, they also mentioned, immature students may get a hurtful or inappropriate feeling by their understanding. For medical students, peer feedback is not used in evaluate everything, it should be evaluated in teamwork, work habits, professional and interpersonal performance. (Lerchenfeldt & Taylor 2020)

Evans (2015) states that some students reflected, trust in self and in peers is very important to give and receive good feedback. Meanwhile, for those students who are confident in their own ability, they think peer feedback is unnecessary. (Evans 2015)

According to research (Larson et al. 2016), the data of peer review have been shown to be biased, untrustworthy in radiologist. They believed, it based on trust and kindly skills professionals who will follow the professional principles. Also, depended on their scoring-based peer review programs, they found two negative occurrences. The first one is so called "going through the motions". It increased the physicians' burnout. The second one is so called "the vicious cycle of peer review", it results the disbelieve and resentment in the team.

Compare with peer feedback, they recommended the peer learning would be more effective to reduce the diagnostic error. (Larson et al. 2016)

According to Lerchenfeldt et al. (2019), there were some benefits by giving and receiving students peer feedback. Those positive outcomes were found by assessment and development of professionalism and team dynamic. They also recommended students develop peer feedback skills earlier. Some students would be confused about how to give and receive correct peer feedback. Therefore, proper training is very important to promote their skills. (Lerchenfeldt et al. 2019)

Dooley and Bamford (2018) mentioned although some students considered that peer feedback is not given by the expert of the professional field, they still concluded that early and repeated peer feedback can provide a chance, which helps to develop the self-regulation skill in the teamwork, also reflect and interpret on the feedback. (Dooley & Bamford 2018)

Maas et al. (2018) claimed that peer assessment is as effective as self-assessment. It can help improve physiotherapist's clinical performance. It is recommended to implement peer assessment in a national level. (Maas et al. 2018)

Hulsman and Van Der Vloodt (2015) claimed that peer feedback is effective in the training of medical communication skills (Hulsman & Van Der Vloodt 2015). According to Hulsman and Van Der Vloodt (2015), Wright et al. noted that peer feedback is so important that all British physicians need to perform peer feedback, which is mandatory to retain their practicing licenses. (Hulsman & Van Der Vloodt 2015)

According to Elshami and Abdalla (2015), peer assessment could significantly improve radiography students' performance, develop the learning and evaluation skills as well as critical thinking and problem-solving ability (Elshami & Abdalla 2015).

Patchan's research in 2011 proved that peer feedback can help students improving the writing ability (Patchan 2011).

Tornwal (2018) claims that peer assessment in clinical settings can broaden students' thinking and increase self-evaluation ability. However, if there is a lack of knowledge and preparation regarding peer feedback skills, they may not be able to provide effective or accurate feedback. Besides, Tornwal believes peer feedback should not be anonymous, which may result in irresponsible or harsh feedback. Because there is a lack of credibility with anonymous feedback. (Tornwal 2018)

Creta and Gross (2020) also support the point that peer feedback is an essential component in professional development. It can improve colleagues' skills and overall competence. (Creta & Gross 2020)

Mangold et al. (2018) states that in nursing practice peer-review competency assessment affect patient outcomes positively and improve nursing knowledge, skills, and enhance professional relationship. Peer review should be implemented in a comfortable environment with nurse educator support. Peer review is not punitive and anonymous. However, there are some barriers affect the effectiveness of peer review results, such as unclear peer review structure, lack of confidence about their professionalism ability and language barrier as well as culture differences. (Mangold et al. 2018)

Stenberg et al (2021) concluded that peer assessment in healthcare education can strengthen students' learning but before giving peer feedback the training regarding how to do peer feedback should be done. During formative peer assessment, students express positive and negative feedback have different effects to their personal relationship. However, teacher has emphasized that students should have awareness and be self-responsible about the feedback. Peer feedback also help students to plan learning and develop the professionalism behavior. (Stenberg et al 2021)

Engelmann (2014) mentions that peer assessment has been used by medical and health professionals to share knowledge and learn from each other as well as enhance their professionalism. However, in athletic training areas, it is helpful to research peer assessment as an evaluation tool for students to prepare for health professional. Jeanine M. refers to a study by Finn & Garner,2011; Hulsman et al.,2013 stated that peer assessment should be used between peers with similar work experience, knowledge, and skills. Peer assessment is also called by other names, such as peer feedback or peer revision. (Engelmann 2014)

According to Burgess et al. (2021), peer review is used in team-based learning which strengthen students' professional communication skills by giving and receiving feedback. In order to get an effective results of peer review exercise, it is necessary to provide detailed training and orientation to students before peer review. Using peer feedback process can improve the results. (Burgess et al. 2021)

Zhang et al. (2021) claimed that peer video feedback is more useful than expert video feedback in the formative learning because of its effectiveness. It also has the benefits of being more individualized and timelier than expert feedback. Peer feedback helps in developing the participants' knowledge and skills. It also helps in improving patient safety. There are different kinds of feedback, video peer feedback is one of it. (Zhang et al. 2021)

5 Discussion

5.1 Reliability

Firstly, an obstacle in doing the literature review was that the definition of keywords is vague and there is no unified standard. In different articles, authors have different definitions of peer feedback. This becomes a hindrance in the literature searching stage. Therefore, longer time was consumed than expected. Taking peer feedback and peer assessment, for example. In some articles, the author argues they have the same meaning (Lerchenfeldt & Taylor 2020). In some other articles, the author believe they are different concepts (Foster 2015). This problem results in some confusion for a long time. At last, peer feedback and peer assessment were considered as same practice in this thesis because according to the existing articles, researchers are doing the same process, no matter what term they are using. For example, when different authors refer to the term of peer assessment or peer feedback, students who are involved in are following similar routine: all the studies include feedback providers and feedback receivers. The process of giving peer feedback/assessment is in an equal, friendly, and transparent way, and the goal is to improve the feedback recipients' skills or ability. From this point of view, it would not be a problem to mix these two concepts.

Secondly, the lack of experience with academic writing is a factor needs to be considered. Three students were involved in writing this thesis, and each has individual understanding with the topic and research methods. The good point is that support and discussion is always available whenever needed, but confusion may also occur in this process. For example, in the beginning, assignment was separated to search for the related articles from different databases. Because of different understanding and views with related topic, articles number may vary from person to person. Consequently, individual specificity may affect the accuracy of the overall thesis.

Another unavoidable concern is cultural differences. As peer feedback is seldom used in Finland even in Europe, all the research articles were collected from other countries, especially from America. It has to be admitted that even though some approach is successful in other parts of the world, it does not necessary means it will go well in Finland. It sounds like a little bit sensitive topic, but different hospitals may have various working environment and peer communication habits. Americans may be relatively more outgoing and not hesitate to speak out their own opinion and give their peers some suggestions in a team. In Finland, it seems less common to provide feedback especially the negative feedback to coworkers. No data has been found to prove that cultural differences affect the effectiveness of feedback, but this is an issue worth further exploration. The reliability of data may be somehow affected by cultural differences, however, almost all the present available data confirm that peer feedback plays a positive role in a team.

Lastly, the lack of existing data may also affect the reliability of literature review results. As widely recognized, applying for the Magnet® Hospital status is a long and hard process. Taking the year 2011 for example, among all the hospitals who had submitted the application, only 6.61% finally got the Magnet Recognition status (Andre 2014). In Europe, however, only one hospital has passed the application so far, and it is the Universitair Ziekenhuis Antwerpen (UZA) in Belgium (HUS 2019). Therefore, there are lack of enough theoretical and practical data in Finland and Europe. Even in the worldwide level, not many hospitals are using the peer feedback in the nursing team. Consequently, it was quite difficulty to find relative academic articles in this area. At the beginning of literature review phrase, as our searching scope was limited to “nursing peer feedback/assessment”, plenty of time was spent but rare useful materials were available. Then the searching scope was enlarged to other areas such as other medical area or education area. In this way, enough research materials were achieved, but it resulted in a problem. Several included articles are not talking about peer feedback in nursing team but are focused on the other topics. However, after the literature review, general conclusion is drawn that the peer feedback's implementation process is quite similar in different fields. It was proved to be effective in other subjects, it should also have a similar effect in nursing practice. At least the nursing peer feedback implication deserves to have a try, and to get some further research results in the future.

5.2 Ethics Consideration

It is crucial to adherence to the ethical consideration through the research process. The guideline of The Finnish Advisory Board of Research Integrity (TENK) has been followed while the data has been being studied. According to the TENK, “The research follows the principles that are endorsed by the research community, that is, integrity, meticulousness, and accuracy in conducting research, and in recording, presenting, and evaluating the research results” (TENK 2012). The Guidelines of Referencing of Laurea University of Applied Sciences have been followed as well. All the data analysis and discussion were maintained in a high level of objectivity. The authors of the references were respected. “Research misconduct: fabrication, falsification, plagiarism and misappropriation” were avoided (TENK 2012). All the research data have been confirmed repeatedly from database to ensure their reliability. It is considered to be very important to tell the truth.

6 Conclusion

According to the analyzed data, peer feedback is helpful to improve professionals' ability or skills. However, in order to receive positive results, enough attention should be paid in the following aspects.

Firstly, peer feedback participants need receive enough training before the process. Through the training process, participants can achieve more confidence with themselves and their peers. Only when they are familiar with the concepts and clear with what will happen in each phase, the process can go smoothly. In order to avoid possible confusion, it is recommended to use some standard guidelines or criteria to do the assessment.

Secondly, a comfortable environment and mutual trusted team member relationship is necessary. Peers need to have confidence that the aim of giving/receiving is not to punish any mistakes, but to improve all the participants' knowledge and skills. The whole process needs to be carried out in an equal, friendly, and transparent environment. All the feedback is supposed to be provided timely and cooperatively.

Last but not the least, supportive leader or experts are also valuable factors in the process of achieving effective peer feedback. Although it's proved in some articles that peer feedback is as effective (or even more effective) as expert or supervisor feedback, the expert's opinion is still valuable under some special conditions. Whenever there are deviations in the peer feedback process, experts can give timely correction, which will help the process to keep in the right trail.

According to the data analyzed and past experiences, peer feedback has been proved as a useful tool to improve the participants' skills. In nursing area, it can be used in support of clinical nursing to improve nurses' knowledge and giving feedback about colleague performance, especially in the Magnet® Hospitals. Besides, a successful career in clinical nursing demands committing lifelong studying (Creta & Gross 2020). Peer feedback as a relatively new but popular tool in nursing areas, which has been frequently used in Magnet® Hospitals, deserves to be implemented in Finnish hospitals as well. Although there may be different problems existing in the process of implementation, peer feedback is still a tool worth further exploration to benefit the employee's satisfaction and to provide more qualitative care for patients.

7 Recommendation

Peer feedback has been used as a tool to evaluate and stimulate nurses deliver safe, ethical and evidence-based care in Magnet Recognition Program® (2020). According to the literature and analysis, most of data shows that peer feedback brings positive outcomes in both healthcare education and healthcare professions, so it deserves to try to apply it in the clinical nursing environment. Peer feedback worth more study in nursing area in the future.

Under the current situation that peer feedback has not been widely implemented in Finland and there may be a lack of standard feedback models in Finland hospitals, it is worth referring to the model in other hospitals, especially those Magnet hospitals that are already proficient in using this tool. However, Finnish hospitals may need to develop their own peer feedback templates according to local culture and different departments' condition.

References

Printed

Atay, D. & Kurt, G. 2006. Prospective teachers and L2 writing anxiety. *Asian EFL Journal*, 8 (4), 100-118.

Atay, D. & Kurt, G. 2007. "The Effects of Peer Feedback on the Writing Anxiety of Prospective Turkish Teachers of EFL". *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education*, 3 (1), 12-23.

Aveyard, H. 2010. *Doing a literature review in health and social care a practical guide*. E-book. 4th edition. London: Open University Press.

Boud, D., Cohen, R. & Sampson, J. 1999. Peer learning and assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 1999,24(4),413-426.

Creta, A, M. & Gross, A, H. 2020. Components of an Effective Professional Development Strategy: The Professional Practice Model, Peer Feedback, Mentorship, Sponsorship, and Succession Planning.

Dooley, L, M. & Bamford, N, J. 2018. Peer Feedback on Collaborative Learning Activities in Veterinary Education. *Veterinary Sciences*, 5 (4), 90.

Engelmann, J, M. 2014. Accuracy and reliability of peer assessment of clinical skills and professional behaviors among undergraduate athletic training students. Northcentral University.

Evans, C. 2015. Students' Perspectives on the Role of Peer Feedback in Supporting Learning. *Journal of Cognitive Education and Psychology*, 14 (1), 110-125.

Globe, P, H. 2016. The impact of nurses' professionalism from an innovative peer review committee. University of North Carolina at Charlotte.

Lerchenfeldt, S. & Tracey, AH, Taylor. 2020. Best Practices in Peer Assessment: Training Tomorrow's Physicians to Obtain and Provide Quality Feedback. *Advances in Medical Education and Practice*, 11, 571-578.

Mangold, K., Tyler, B., Velez, L. & Clark, C. 2018. Peer-Review Competency Assessment Engages Staff and Influences Patient Outcomes. *The Journal of Continuing Education in Nursing*, 49(3).

Patchan, M, M. 2011. Peer review of writing: Learning from revision using peer feedback and reviewing peers' texts. University of Pittsburgh.

Electronic

ANCC. 2022. About Magnet. Accessed 9 January 2022.

<https://www.nursingworld.org/organizational-programs/magnet/about-magnet/>

ANCC. 2022. Find a Magnet Organization. Accessed 9 January 2022.

<https://www.nursingworld.org/organizational-programs/magnet/find-a-magnet-organization>

ANCC. 2022. Magnet Model- Creating a Magnet Culture. Accessed 9 January 2022.

<https://www.nursingworld.org/organizational-programs/magnet/magnet-model/>

ANCC. 2022. Why Become Magnet. Accessed 3 January 2022.

<https://www.nursingworld.org/organizational-programs/magnet/about-magnet/why-become-magnet/>

Andre, C. 2014. Magnet Hospitals: What's the big deal? Accessed 18 April 2022.

<https://prezi.com/pnnsbu2v5a1a/magnet-hospitals-whats-the-big-deal/>

Burgess, A., Roberts, C., Lane, A, S., Haq, I., Clark, T., Kalman, E., Pappalardo, N & Bleasel, J. 2021. Peer review in team-based learning: Influencing feedback literacy. *BMC Medical Education*. 21, 1-11. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12909-021-02821-6>.

<https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/peer-review-team-based-learning-influencing/docview/2562532133/se-2>.

Cornel University. 2022. Peer Assessment. Accessed 18 April 2022.

<https://teaching.cornell.edu/spring-teaching-resources/assessment-evaluation/peer-assessment>

Creta, A, M. & Gross, A, H. 2020. Components of an Effective Professional Development Strategy: The Professional Practice Model, Peer Feedback, Mentorship, Sponsorship, and Succession Planning. *Seminars in Oncology Nursing*, 36(3). DOI 10.1016/j.soncn.2020.151024.

<https://search-ebscobost-com.nelli.laurea.fi/login.aspx?direct=true&db=c8h&AN=143780661&site=ehost-live>.

Elshami, W. & Abdalla, M. E. 2017. Diagnostic radiography students' perceptions of formative peer assessment within a radiographic technique module. *Radiography*, 23(1), 9-13. DOI 10.1016/j.radi.2016.06.001.

<https://search-ebscobost-com.nelli.laurea.fi/login.aspx?direct=true&db=c8h&AN=120543196&site=ehost-live>.

Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity. 2012. Responsible conduct of research and procedures for handling allegations of misconduct in Finland. Accessed on 13 March 2022.

https://tenk.fi/sites/tenk.fi/files/HTK_ohje_2012.pdf

- Foster, R, R.2015. Peer review tip: distinguishing the difference between peer review, peer evaluation, and peer feedback. American Nurses Association. Accessed 5 January 2022. <https://www.nursingworld.org/organizational-programs/ana-consultation-services/tips-articles-and-videos/distinguishing-the-difference-between-peer-review-peer-evaluation-and-peer-feedback/>
- Hulsman, R, L.& Van Der Vloodt, J. 2015. Self-evaluation and peer-feedback of medical students' communication skills using a web-based video annotation system. Exploring content and specificity. *Patient Education & Counseling*,98(3),356-363. DOI 10.1016/j.pec.2014.11.007. <https://search-ebSCOhost-com.nelli.laurea.fi/login.aspx?direct=true&db=c8h&AN=109697000&site=ehost-live>.
- HUS.2019. Magnet Hospital. Accessed 18 April 2022. <https://husinvuosi2019.fi/en/patient-care/quality-and-patient-safety/magnet-hospital/>
- Iowa State University. 2022. Peer Assessment. Accessed 18 April 2022. <https://www.celt.iastate.edu/teaching/assessment-and-evaluation/peer-assessment/>
- Larson, B, D., Donnelly, F, L., Podberesky, J, D., Merrow, C, A., Sharpe, E, R. & Kruskal, B, J. 2016. Peer Feedback, Learning and Improvement: Answering the Call of the Institute of Medicine Report on Diagnostic Error. *Radiology* 2017 283:1, 231-241 <https://pubs.rsna.org/doi/10.1148/radiol.2016161254>
- Lerchenfeldt, S., Mi, M. & Eng, M. 2019. The utilization of peer feedback during collaborative learning in undergraduate medical education: a systematic review. Accessed 18 April 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-019-1755-z>
- Lal, M, M. 2020. Peer Feedback: a tool for growth. *The journal of nursing administration*, 50(1), 3-4. doi: 10.1097/NNA.0000000000000829 https://journals.lww.com/jonajournal/Abstract/2020/01000/Peer_Feedback__A_Tool_for_Growth.2.aspx#:~:text=Peer%20feedback%20in%20particular%20is,support%20a%20culture%20of%20safety.&text=Peers%20experience%20the%20same%20work,ability%20to%20give%20honest%20feedback.
- Maas, M, J, M., Driehuis, F., Meerhoff, A, G., Heerkens, F, Y., Van der Vleuten, C, P, M., Nijhuis-van der Sanden, M, W, G.& Van der Wees, P, J. 2018. Impact of Self- and Peer Assessment on the Clinical Performance of Physiotherapists in Primary Care: A Cohort Study. *Physiotherapy Canada*,70(4),393-401. DOI 10.3138/ptc.2017-40.pc. <https://search-ebSCOhost-com.nelli.laurea.fi/login.aspx?direct=true&db=c8h&AN=133301623&site=ehost-live>.
- McCombes S. 2022. What Is a Literature Review. Accessed 10 February 2022. <https://www.scribbr.com/dissertation/literature-review/>

Stenberg, M., Mangrio, E., Bengtsson, M., Carlson, E. Formative peer assessment in higher healthcare education programmes: A scoping review. 2021 11(2). doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2020-045345>. <https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/formative-peer-assessment-higher-healthcare/docview/2487672522/se-2>.

Taylor, D. 2022. The Literature Review: A Few Tips on Conducting It. University of Toronto Health Sciences Writing Centre. Accessed 1 February 2022. <https://advice.writing.utoronto.ca/types-of-writing/literature-review/>

Tornwall, J. 2018. Peer assessment practices in nurse education: An integrative review. *Nurse Education Today*, 71, 266-275. DOI 10.1016/j.nedt.2018.09.017. <https://search.ebscohost-com.nelli.laurea.fi/login.aspxdirect=true&db=c8h&AN=133151463&site=ehost-live>.

University of Oxford Center for Teaching and Learning 2022. Peer feedback. Accessed 18.4.2022. <https://wwwctl.ox.ac.uk/peer-feedback>

Zhang, H., Liao, W, X, A., Goh, H, L, S., Yoong, Q, S., Lim, X, M, A. & Wang, W, R. 2022. Effectiveness and quality of peer video feedback in health professions education: A systematic review. *Nurse Education Today*. DOI 10.1016/j.nedt.2021.105203. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0260691721004603>

Tables

Table 1: Inclusion and Exclusion criteria 11

Table 2: Search Results 12

Appendices

Appendix 1: Findings 26

Appendix 1: Findings

Title	Author /Year	Participants	Results
Best Practice in Peer Assessment: Training Tomorrow's Physicians to Obtain and Provide Quality Feedback	Lerchenfeldt & Taylor 2020	Medical students at OUWB (Oakland University William Beaumont School of Medicine)	peer feedback has a positive outcome to support student learning in a nonpunitive atmosphere and allow students to promote their skills.
Students' Perspectives on the Role of Peer Feedback in Supporting Learning	Evans 2015	Two groups of students in two universities in UK	Trust in self and in peers is very important to give and receive good feedback for some students. However, for those students who are confident in their own ability, they think peer feedback is unnecessary.
Peer Feedback, Learning, and Improvement: Answering the call of the Institute of Medicine Report on Diagnostic Error	Larson et al. 2016	Radiologist	Compare with peer feedback, they recommended the peer learning would be more effective to reduce the diagnostic error.
The utilization of peer feedback during collaborative learning in undergraduate medical education: a systematic review	Lerchenfeldt et al. 2019	Undergraduate students	Peer feedback in a learning environment may be useful to students' development. However, students need to be trained systematically to learn and improve peer feedback skills.
Peer Feedback on Collaborative Learning Activities in Veterinary Education	Dooley & Bamford 2018	Veterinary students	Early and repeated involve the peer feedback can provide a chance, which support to develop the self-regulation skill in the teamwork, also reflect and interpret on the feedback.
Components of an Effective Professional Development Strategy: The Professional Practice Model, Peer Feedback, Mentorship, Sponsorship, and Succession Planning	Creta & Gross 2020	Oncology nurses	Constructive feedback to peers helps increasing skill development and overall competence. Peer feedback is also essential to improve the quality of patient care.
Peer assessment practices in nurse	Tornwall 2018	Diagnostic radiography students	Peer assessment in clinical settings can broaden students' thinking and increase self-evaluation ability.

Title	Author /Year	Participants	Results
education: An integrative review			However, if there is a lack of knowledge and preparation regarding peer feedback skills, they may not be able to provide effective or accurate feedback. Besides, peer feedback should not be anonymous.
Peer review of writing: Learning from revision using peer feedback and reviewing peers' texts	Patchan 2011	Psychological science students	Peer feedback can help students improve the writing ability. Peer feedback provides the opportunities of learning from receiving feedback and providing feedback.
Diagnostic radiography students' perceptions of formative peer assessment within a radiographic technique module	Elshami & Abdalla 2015	Radiography students	Peer assessment could significantly improve radiography students' performance, develop the learning and evaluation skills as well as critical thinking and problem-solving ability.
Self-evaluation and peer-feedback of medical students' communication skills using a web-based video annotation system. Exploring content and specificity	Hulsman & Van Der Vloodt 2015	Medical students	Peer feedback is effective in the training of medical communication skills. All British physicians need to mandatory perform peer feedback because it is an important tool.
Impact of Self- and Peer Assessment on the Clinical Performance of Physiotherapists in Primary Care: A Cohort Study	Maas et al. 2018	Physiotherapists in the Netherlands	Peer assessment is as effective as self-assessment. It can help improve physiotherapist's clinical performance. It is recommended to implement peer assessment in a national level.
Peer-Review Competency Assessment Engages Staff and Influences Patient Outcomes	Mangold et al. 2018	Clinical RN	Under comfortable and supportive environment, peer- review assessment can improve nursing ability and patient outcomes.
Formative peer assessment in higher healthcare education programmes: a scoping review	Stenberg, Mangrio, Bengtsson & Carlson 2021	Medical students	Peer assessment will enhance student's learning after giving a constructive peer feedback training.
Accuracy and Reliability of Peer Assessment of Clinical Skills and Professional Behaviors Among Undergraduate	Engelmann 2014	Athletic training students	Peer assessment has been used in health and medical areas to enhance their professionalism. However, peer feedback should be done with same work experience or education.

Title	Author /Year	Participants	Results
Athletic Training Students			
Peer review in team-based learning: influencing feedback literacy	Burgess, Robert S, Lane, Haq, Clark, Kalman, Pappalardo & Bleasel 2021	Year 2 Students	Peer feedback can improve the student's professionalism skills, but a well orientation should be processed before doing feedback each other.
Effectiveness and quality of peer video feedback in health professions education: A systematic review	Zhang et al. 2021	Healthcare students	Peer video feedback can strength participants knowledge and skills. Peer video feedback is more effective than expert feedback.