

Coming from someone that has not had the best experiences in group settings because of conflicts between group members and unsatisfactory group work, I'd say Peer-Review could be a great tool, but only if people use it maturely and respectfully. Many argue that Peer-Review makes their companies more dynamic while others argue that it causes tension and uncomfortable environments. Since there are many types of personalities and agendas in the workplace, my stance is against Peer-Review. Constructive criticism could be a great tool in the workplace administered by the right people at the right time, but I believe Peer-Review would do more bad than good because people could use it as a tool to cause issues or attack a coworker because of personal feelings.

Peer-Review can be helpful but can also be used as a destructive tool when employees have conflicts with their peers. If someone does not like someone's point of view or their work ethic, Peer-Review could allow an employee to take advantage of the system and over exaggerate a problem or attack a coworker just to benefit their personal opinions and feelings. Peer-Review has created a toxic work environment because of tensions created and some people have even resigned from their positions. I feel as if Peer-Review does more bad than good and I believe higher authorities in the workplace should be the ones giving constructive criticism, not fellow employees.

I believe that this policy could cause someone to be uncomfortable in their workplace which is not a career I would want to stay in if I was in that position. If it were up to me, I believe every business should let higher positions in the organization give constructive criticism and not allow Peer-Review. Peer-Review should not be considered as totally factual and further investigation should be performed before any decisions are made on an employee.