



The Reading Matrix © 2011
Volume 11, Number 2, April 2011

Attitudes and Affect toward Peer Evaluation in EFL Reading Circles

Max Prayer

Tsukuba University

Greg Rouault

Konan University, Hirao School of Management

John Eidswick

Konan University

ABSTRACT

Teachers often use peer evaluation as a way to increase opportunities for constructive feedback. However, few studies have investigated student attitudes toward such evaluation. This study examined preferences among Japanese university students ($N = 86$) in an intensive English-language program (intermediate proficiency) toward peer evaluation for the components of ease, nervousness, embarrassment, and usefulness, when using a numerical scale only (NSO) and a numerical scale together with written comments (NWC). As subcategories, the gender and academic majors of the participants were explored. Descriptive statistics indicated that, although students generally experienced nervousness and embarrassment when engaging in evaluation with NWC and perceived that NSO was easier than NWC, most students felt that NWC was more useful than NSO. Additionally, two-way contingency table analyses showed significant effects for gender and academic major. Possible interpretations of the results are discussed, and suggestions are offered for future research and classroom use of peer evaluation.

INTRODUCTION

Teachers of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) often use collaborative activities to increase opportunities for student interaction. While collaborative groups might improve chances for intragroup communication, they also render more difficult the ability of teachers to provide feedback on students' performances. To address this problem, peer evaluation is sometimes incorporated into such group activities. A form of group activity being used increasingly in EFL classrooms is known as *Reading Circles*. Used originally in first-language (L1) educational settings to facilitate children's literacy skills, Reading Circles are formed by students taking on different but complementary roles to engage in discussion about written texts. In a typical Reading Circle, a *Discussion Leader* leads a group discussion by producing and asking other group members questions about the text; a *Word Wizard* presents new vocabulary from the text,

and an *Illustrator* draws pictures inspired by the text and describes the reasons for their inspiration. A *Character Sketcher* describes important characters in the text, and a *Connector* relates textual elements and themes to qualities in the real lives of the students. (For more on Reading Circle roles, see Furr, n.d.) Reading Circle discussions incorporate components of task-based learning and cooperative learning, such as group product, negotiated meaning, and learner interdependence, and as such are well suited for peer evaluation of performance.

Peer Evaluation

Topping (2009) defines peer evaluation as “an arrangement for learners to consider and specify the level, value, or quality of a product or performance by other equal-status learners” (pp. 20-21). Research into the effectiveness and mechanisms of peer evaluation, especially in L1 learning domains and in second language (L2) writing, has been gaining momentum in recent years. The claimed benefits of peer evaluation include support of learner autonomy by requiring students to take responsibility for monitoring and analyzing parts of their learning process and the performances of their peers (Cheng & Warren, 2005). Group dynamics in classroom management and time restrictions may limit opportunities for teachers to provide feedback or evaluation to multiple groups or individual learners. Peer evaluation can provide formative feedback that teachers cannot otherwise provide (Ballantyne, Hughes, & Mylonas, 2002). Research has shown that teachers and students can produce generally similar evaluations (Saito & Fujita, 2009); however, attaining valid similarities might, in part, require establishing rubrics and providing models and training for the students to conduct evaluations on such factors as objective scoring and constructive feedback (Ozogul & Sullivan, 2009).

Other potential benefits of peer evaluation include providing useful feedback through which students can better perform tasks and ensuring more diligent completion of tasks. Peer evaluation might also increase the likelihood of equal work among group partners and produce useful feedback by which students can identify areas for remedial action and improve their English skills. Benefits of peer evaluation are said to extend to both the evaluator and those being evaluated (Topping, 2009).

While the many apparent benefits of peer evaluation seem to be drawn largely from the provision and reception of direct feedback on performance, there is potential for discomfort on the part of students, related to their attitudes toward providing and receiving such feedback.

Research on attitudes toward peer evaluation among L2 learners has been sparse. In a study on attitudes toward online peer evaluation among university students in Taiwan, Wen and Tsai (2006) found that participants, while generally holding positive attitudes toward peer evaluation, did not regard it as helpful to learning, and that males were more likely to have positive attitudes than females. In another study (Miller & Ng, 1994), students expressed discomfort with online peer evaluation, primarily over ‘loss of face.’ Cheng and Warren (1997), in a study of English students at a university in Hong Kong, found that while a majority of participants regarded peer evaluation favorably, a minority believed themselves or other students to be excessively biased, viewing their peers as unable to provide fair evaluations or to be unqualified to give evaluations in their L2. Cheng and Warren speculated that the students in their study did not respond with concern over loss of face because the evaluations were provided anonymously and were interspersed with those of the teachers, thus reducing chances of public humiliation and direct criticism.

There is a great potential for English students in Japan, where direct criticism is normally avoided, to experience anxiety or embarrassment over giving or receiving negative feedback. The purpose of this study was to explore student attitudes toward two forms of evaluation, one using only numerical evaluations (NSO), the other using numerical evaluations with written explanations (NWC). The following research questions were explored:

1. Do student attitudes toward peer evaluations differ between *providing* feedback by using NSO and using NWC for the components of ease, nervousness, embarrassment, or usefulness?
2. Do student attitudes toward peer evaluations differ between *receiving* feedback on NSO and on NWC for the components of ease, nervousness, embarrassment, or usefulness?
3. Do the proportions of males and females differ for peer evaluations (provided and received) on NSO and on NWC for the components of ease, nervousness, embarrassment, or usefulness?
4. Do the proportions of students differ by major for peer evaluations (provided and received) on NSO and on NWC for the components of ease, nervousness, embarrassment, or usefulness?
5. Do individual student profiles for the components of ease, nervousness, embarrassment, and usefulness differ when providing and receiving peer evaluation?

METHOD

Participants

This study was conducted using four intact classes of intermediate-level learners (TOEFL ITP 430-520) in a compulsory English course at Kwansei Gakuin University in Japan. The sample ($N = 86$) was made up of second-year students majoring in Business, Economics, Humanities, and Law in the second term of Intermediate English classes taught by the authors.

Materials

A 5-point scale (adapted from Drummond, 2008) was used by students to record peer evaluation of the Reading Circle role leaders on four criteria: (a) preparation, (b) leading a lively discussion, (c) leading an interesting discussion, and (d) increasing the understanding of the book (see Appendix A). The two approaches to peer evaluation in the study included using NSO and NWC, and a survey (asking students to report their attitudes toward peer evaluation using the two methods for feedback), and was designed in English (Appendix B) and translated into Japanese (Appendix C).

Procedure

The four classes that were used in this study were part of an integrated skills course that met three times per week for 90 minutes. To address the reading component of this course, a reading project was implemented and a set of six level-appropriate graded readers was selected. (For more on reading levels in the Intermediate classes see Rouault, 2009.) Four books published by Oxford (Level 2, 700 headwords) and two books published by Penguin (Level 2, 600 headwords, and Level 3, 1200 headwords) were assigned to each class. Over a 2-week period, groups of four to five students from the same class were randomly assigned the same book to be read outside of class. Students used a worksheet to prepare for their Reading Circle role and to guide them in leading a small group discussion that lasted approximately 10 minutes. At the completion of the Reading Circle, each student first completed a self-evaluation and then a peer evaluation of each member in their group. In the first three cycles of the reading project, students in all classes circled only the number on the rating scale and then passed them on to the person they evaluated. In the final three rounds, students in all classes conducted peer evaluations by using the number scale and also by writing comments before passing them to their classmates. At the end of the 12-week Reading Circle project, the students' attitudes toward peer evaluation using the two methods for feedback were collected.

RESULTS

Descriptive statistics were calculated to examine the attitudes toward giving peer evaluation, the results of which are shown in Table 1. For the component of ease, 72% of students found NSO easier, compared to 28% of students who found NWC easier when providing feedback. For the component of nervousness, 24% of the students expressed that they were more nervous giving evaluations with NSO, compared with 76% who said NWC made them more nervous. Similarly, for the component of embarrassment, 39% claimed that they were more embarrassed giving evaluations using NSO, compared to 61% who said NWC. Finally, for the component of usefulness, 6% of students reported that using NSO was more useful when providing feedback, compared with 94% who reported NWC was more useful.

Table 1. Student Attitudes toward Providing Peer Feedback

Component	NSO (%)	NWC (%)
Ease	62 (72)	24 (28)
Nervousness	20 (24)	63 (76)
Embarrassment	32 (39)	50 (61)
Usefulness	5 (6)	77 (94)

In Table 2, descriptive statistics were used to explore attitudes toward receiving evaluation. For the component of ease, 14% of students found NSO easier, compared to 86% of students who found NWC easier when receiving feedback. For the component of nervousness, 32% of the students expressed that they were more nervous receiving evaluations with NSO, compared to 68% who said NWC made them more nervous. For the component of embarrassment, 51% of students claimed that they were more embarrassed receiving evaluations using NSO, compared to 49% who said NWC was more embarrassing. Finally, for the component of usefulness, 7% of students reported that using NSO was more useful when receiving evaluations, where as 93% said NWC was more useful.

Table 2. Student Attitudes toward Receiving Peer Feedback

Component	NSO (%)	NWC (%)
Ease	12 (14)	74 (86)
Nervousness	26 (32)	55 (68)
Embarrassment	40 (51)	39 (49)
Usefulness	6 (7)	77 (93)

To address the third research question (if males and females differ), a two-way contingency table analysis was conducted to evaluate whether attitudes toward peer evaluations differed by gender (male $n = 31$, female $n = 55$). Separate 2 x 2 tables were created in SPSS for the components of ease, nervousness, and embarrassment. There was a significant association between gender and type of evaluation for the component of ease $X^2(1, N = 86) = 9.18, p < .01$, and a Cramér's $V = .33$ suggested a moderate effect size. Standardized residuals were used to investigate the association further. Results showed that statistically significantly more males than expected found receiving peer evaluation by NSO to be easy ($z = 2.2, p < .05$). Using the Chi square, no significant associations were found for evaluation type by gender for the components of nervousness or embarrassment.

For the fourth research question, a two-way contingency table analysis was conducted to evaluate whether attitudes toward peer evaluations differed by major for the Business ($n = 20$), Economics ($n = 22$), Humanities ($n = 22$), and Law ($n = 22$) students. Contingency tables were created in SPSS for the components of ease, nervousness, and embarrassment. There was a significant association between major and type of evaluation for the component of ease $X^2(3, N = 86) = 11.81, p < .01$. A Cramér's $V = .37$ suggested a moderate effect size. Standardized residuals were used to investigate the pair-wise comparisons further. Results showed that statistically significantly fewer Humanities students than expected found giving peer evaluation by NWC to be easy ($z = -2.1, p < .05$). Using the Chi square, no significant associations were found for evaluation type by major for the components of nervousness or embarrassment. For the component of usefulness, the assumptions for the Chi-square test could not be met as certain cells had an expected count of less than five. Therefore, the procedure was not used for the variables of gender or major.

Regarding individual student profiles for the components of ease, nervousness, embarrassment, and usefulness, descriptive statistics were calculated to address research question 5 (see Table 3). For the component of ease, ten students stated that providing and receiving feedback was easier with NSO. Fifty-three students reported that they thought it was easier to provide feedback with NSO, but when receiving feedback it was easier to have NWC. Only two students found it easier to give feedback with NWC, but when receiving feedback, thought NSO was easier. Twenty-one students stated that providing and receiving feedback was easier with NWC.

For the component of nervousness, 10 students reported that providing and receiving feedback made them more nervous with NSO. Seven students claimed that they were more nervous to provide feedback with NSO, but when receiving feedback they were more nervous to have NWC. Fourteen students were more nervous to give feedback with NWC, but when receiving feedback, thought NSO made them more nervous. Forty-eight students stated that providing and receiving feedback made them more nervous with NWC.

Table 3. Profiles for Components of Ease, Nervousness, Embarrassment, and Usefulness

Component	A	B	C	D
Ease	10	53	2	21
Nervousness	10	7	14	48
Embarrassment	25	6	14	33
Usefulness	4	1	2	74

Note:

A = providing feedback with NSO and receiving feedback with NSO.

B = providing feedback with NSO and receiving feedback with NWC.

C = providing feedback with NWC and receiving feedback with NSO.

D = providing feedback with NWC and receiving feedback with NWC.

For the component of embarrassment, 25 students stated that providing and receiving feedback was embarrassing with NSO. Only six students reported that they thought it was more embarrassing to provide feedback with NSO, but when receiving feedback it was more embarrassing to have NWC. Fourteen students found it more embarrassing to give feedback with NWC, but when receiving feedback, thought NSO was more embarrassing. Thirty-three students stated that providing and receiving feedback was more embarrassing with NWC.

Finally, for the component of usefulness, four students stated that providing and receiving feedback was more useful with NSO. Only one student reported that they thought it was more useful to provide feedback with NSO, but when receiving feedback it was more useful to have NWC. Just two students found it more useful to give feedback with NWC, but when receiving feedback, thought NSO was more useful. Seventy-four students stated that providing and receiving feedback was more useful when employing NWC.

DISCUSSION

In general, a large majority of students seemed to anticipate experiencing discomfort, in the form of anxiety or embarrassment, in evaluating other students using NWC. Not surprisingly, this inclination was more pronounced with nervousness than with embarrassment, perhaps because an evaluator providing negative feedback might worry about the response of the receiver, whereas embarrassment would seem less likely an outcome of providing such feedback.

When it came to receiving feedback, more students expressed feeling anxious or nervous with NWC, perhaps afraid of negative comments. However, more than eight out of ten students reported that, in actuality, receiving evaluations with comments was the easier of the two forms. Apparently, anticipation of anxiety did not closely relate with the perception of ease or difficulty of NWCs (see also discussion below on gender). This division is supported also by the student profiles, in which 53 students said giving feedback was easier by NSO, but receiving feedback was easier by NWC. A possible explanation for this finding is that receiving an evaluation consisting merely of numbers is difficult because it lacks clarity. Students, regardless of how well or poorly they are evaluated, wanted to know the reasons for their score, and perceived evaluations with supporting written comments, therefore, as “easier.”

When it came to anticipating embarrassment and receiving evaluations, students were roughly evenly split between the evaluation forms, and it is difficult to interpret such an even split. However, several students who answered that NSO was more embarrassing when receiving

evaluations reported that “numbers alone are too ambiguous,” “without comments you don’t really know what you’ve done well,” and “without comments you don’t know the basis for their evaluation.” These comments perhaps suggest that students are more embarrassed when they don’t know the concrete reasons for a negative score. On the other hand, students who thought NWC was more embarrassing made comments such as “it’s tough to read negative comments when I know I’ve done a poor job,” “when the comments are detailed, it becomes clear what I’ve done wrong,” and “I become ultra-aware of what others thought of my work.” These comments seem to imply that some students are perhaps self-conscious of their work and care quite a bit about what others think of them.

In their reports of perceptions of usefulness, it is important to note that, regardless of perceived ease, anxiety, or embarrassment, students overwhelmingly endorsed NWC as being the more useful form of evaluation for improving English language skills. It appears that even the threat of loss-of-face and the potential difficulties of writing evaluations of peers did not undermine students’ overall sense that NWC was the form more likely to aid in their development, more likely to guide future improvement in performance, and to help them gain confidence in the areas that were done well. Indeed, some student comments support this: “Because of everyone’s opinions, we are able to understand our good and bad points,” “giving comments allows my partners to realize what they have done wrong and make adjustments,” and “it is better to receive comments so I can focus on what I need to improve.” However, for the development of a range of English skills (including reading, listening, writing, grammar, and correction of production errors), other comments suggest that students perceived both giving *and* receiving evaluations as a valuable process in itself. More specifically, students appeared to regard peer evaluation using NWC (more than simply circling numbers) as a kind of auxiliary task, one which possessed its own package of learning benefits: “Because I can write my own comments in English,” “thinking of comments in English raises our skills,” “I listened more carefully because I knew I would have to write comments,” “because it also improves my English reading skills,” and “good for my grammar.”

In the area of gender, it would seem that on a single attitude factor—ease—more males than expected identified receiving evaluations with NSO as easy. The descriptives for this item indicate a large majority of students endorsing the opposite view (that receiving evaluations with NWC was the easier of the two forms). The few comments from these male participants might shed some light on their attitudes: “Don’t really understand what is written anyway,” “easier to understand,” and “simpler.” For a minority of students, perhaps more likely comprised of male students, the potential threat of written evaluations in an L2 being incomprehensible might therefore threaten a loss-of-face.

In the area of academic major, a lower number of Humanities students than expected indicated that writing evaluations using NWC was easy. A possible explanation for these findings, supported by anecdotal comments from the other majors, suggests that largely the Business, Economics, and Law students who found NWC to be easy did so with the interpretation that it was easier to produce a meaningful, clear explanation in their evaluation. Of the KGU Humanities students, made up of those studying literature, linguistics, and foreign languages, and reputed to be generally more motivated to study English, only one interpreted the question of ease in providing evaluations this way. Comments from the other 21 actually matched the more intuitively obvious and identified NWC as being more difficult and taking more time to complete as a task.

These findings are important in their implications for the teaching practice of instructors

interested in using peer evaluations in their classrooms, especially as a means of improving English skills. It seems that peer evaluations wherein students provide comments are regarded, both in their production and reception, as more useful for English skill development. However, such usefulness with some students might come at a cost of embarrassment or anxiety, or difficulties related to English reading and writing proficiency. In a classroom culture that fosters cooperative learning, however, it is reasonable, pedagogically, to see evaluation as part of learning by reflecting on models and standards of performance. From this process, learners identify ways to improve on personal performance in the future, even if the feedback is student to student. A way to reduce the risk of embarrassment or anxiety might be to provide peer evaluation training, through role play and other forms of practice, prior to using them for actual evaluative purposes.

LIMITATIONS

Although pre-teaching of how to do evaluations might have yielded better quality feedback to the learners, the essence of this study was to draw a baseline for student attitudes toward peer evaluation. As a result, no particular feedback guidelines were given, and particular language for evaluations was not specifically taught. Although the quality of discussion leadership was generally observed to be at an acceptable standard or higher, without the instruction, students may have felt less comfortable in giving negative feedback. Since Ozogul and Sullivan (2009) found that “when students receive appropriate training and practice in conducting formative evaluation, they perform at a similar level under self-evaluation and peer evaluation as under teacher evaluation” (p. 407), attitudes to peer evaluation, following some training, would be an area to explore in further research and would offer comparison with this baseline study.

Another potential problem, as yet unaddressed in the literature, involves the difficulty of writing evaluations in one’s second language. If it is too difficult to produce the language necessary for conveying opinions, students might feel disenchanting with the evaluation process. These same feelings can also likely be extended to reading and understanding the metalanguage for evaluations and the specific comments given in the L2 from the peer’s point of view. Future research, including interviews with the students in addition to their survey responses, would allow these subjective points to be explored further.

Ozogul and Sullivan (2009) also found that student attitudes toward teacher-based evaluations were more positive on the basis of knowledge and credibility. Cultural expectations held by students regarding the appropriateness or inappropriateness of evaluations not produced by teachers should not be overlooked. In addition, future studies with a more balanced gender distribution might do well to control for small-group gender composition, and measure attitudes toward giving and receiving peer evaluations among same-and different-gender group members.

The survey scale intentionally offered only two options for preference of evaluation type, not a third choice of “no difference.” Some comments would, however, justify the neutral stance of no difference taken by some of the learners: “I wasn’t embarrassed by either evaluation method,” “I wasn’t at all nervous,” and “numbers only or numbers and comments, I feel the same.”

In addition, indifference or possible non-compliance or resistance may have been represented by missing data or no comments written on the survey. As the missing data was

largely confined to male students in the one class of Economics majors it could possibly have been skewed somewhat by individual personalities.

Although rated as the most useful for developing English discussion skills, only NWC offered the choice of written comments; no chance for face-to-face comments was given. Although, considering many students' interpretation of peer evaluation as a further chance to use and develop their English, oral feedback might be considered far more useful for discussion skills. Including spoken comments as one of the types of evaluation would provide another area for a follow-up study.

CONCLUSION

This study was conducted to explore the attitudes of EFL learners toward giving and receiving two forms of peer evaluation, one using NSO and the other using a numerical scale with written comments. Attitudes were examined in terms of anticipated ease, nervousness, embarrassment, and usefulness. Findings indicated that although students generally anticipated discomfort and difficulty in both giving and receiving peer evaluation, especially using comments, more than 90% endorsed using a numerical scale with comments as being more useful for improving English discussion skills. Teachers using peer evaluation might wish to choose forms of evaluation that provide students opportunities to express specific reasons for their opinions. However, efforts should be made to reduce the potential for embarrassment and anxiety, and ensure that students are not unfairly challenged because of low English proficiency. These efforts could include evaluation training, as well as establishing a way to provide evaluations anonymously. The results of this study suggest that L2 peer evaluation is an underexplored research strand that could add valuable knowledge for classroom practice.

The authors are co-researchers who worked together in the Intensive English Program of Kwansei Gakuin University (Japan) from 2008 to 2010.

***Max Prayer** is an Assistant Professor at Tsukuba University and a TESOL doctoral candidate at Temple University, Japan. His research interests lie in language teacher self-efficacy, and peer assessment.*

Email: maxprayer@mac.com

***Greg Rouault** is a lecturer in the Hirao School of Management at Konan University, Japan. His research interests include multiple intelligences, brain-based learning, and experiential learning in English for Specific Purposes.*

Email: rouault.greg@gmail.com

***John Eidswick** is an English instructor at Konan University. He is a doctoral candidate (TESOL) at Temple University, Japan. His research focuses on the influence of interest on second-language reading comprehension.*

Email: johneidswick@hotmail.com

REFERENCES

- Ballantyne, R., Hughes, K., & Mylonas, A. (2002). Developing procedures for implementing peer assessment in large classes using an action research process. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 27, 427-441.
- Cheng, W., & Warren, M. (2005). Peer assessment of language proficiency. *Language Testing*, 22, 93-121.
- Drummond, H. (2008). Literature circles for the Japanese university EFL classroom. *Kwansei Gakuin University Language Center Annual Research Report*, 11, 21-32.
- Furr, M. (n.d.). Using the literature circle role sheets with EFL students. In *Welcome to EFL Literature Circles*. Retrieved January 8, 2011 from <http://www.eflliteraturecircles.com/howandwhy5>
- Miller, L., & Ng, R. (1994). Peer assessment of oral language proficiency. *Perspectives (City University of Hong Kong)*, 6, 41-56 (5th category down). Retrieved January 8, 2011 from <http://sunzi1.lib.hku.hk/hkjo/article.jsp?book=10&issue=100010>
- Ozogul, G., & Sullivan, H. (2009). Student performance and attitudes under formative evaluation by teacher, self, and peer evaluators. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 57, 393-410.
- Rouault, G. (2009). Introduction of graded reading into an integrated skills course. *Kwansei Gakuin University Language Center Annual Research Report*, 12, 53-89.
- Saito, H., & Fujita, T. (2009). Peer-assessing peers' contribution to EFL group presentations. *RELC Journal*, 40, 149-171.
- Topping, K. J. (2009). Peer assessment. *Theory into Practice*, 48, 20-27.
- Wen, M. L., & Tsai, C. (2006). University students' perceptions of and attitudes toward (online) peer assessment. *Higher Education*, 51, 27-44.

APPENDIX A
Reading Circles: Group Evaluation

Name: _____ Role: _____

Did I....

prepare well?	lead a lively discussion?	lead an interesting discussion?	increase my understanding of the book?
Yes 2.5	Yes 2.5	Yes 2.5	Yes 2.5
Yes, quite well 2	Yes, quite well 2	Yes, quite well 2	Yes, quite well 2
Somewhat	Somewhat	Somewhat	Somewhat
Not really 1.5	Not really 1.5	Not really 1.5	Not really 1.5
Not at all 1	Not at all 1	Not at all 1	Not at all 1
0	0	0	0

Name: _____ Role: _____

Did he or she....

prepare well?	lead a lively discussion?	lead an interesting discussion?	increase my understanding of the book?
Yes 2.5	Yes 2.5	Yes 2.5	Yes 2.5
Yes, quite well 2	Yes, quite well 2	Yes, quite well 2	Yes, quite well 2
Somewhat	Somewhat	Somewhat	Somewhat
Not really 1.5	Not really 1.5	Not really 1.5	Not really 1.5
Not at all 1	Not at all 1	Not at all 1	Not at all 1
0	0	0	0

APPENDIX B
Attitudes toward Peer Evaluation (English)

For each sentence, please circle one (with numbers/with numbers and comments), and support your choice with reasons why.

1. As the rater/evaluator,

- a) Evaluating other classmates in Reading Circles (with numbers/with numbers and comments) was easier to do because:
- b) Evaluating other classmates in Reading Circles (with numbers/with numbers and comments) made me more nervous because:
- c) Evaluating other classmates in Reading Circles (with numbers/with numbers and comments) was more embarrassing because:
- d) Evaluating other classmates in Reading Circles (with numbers/with numbers and comments) was more useful for studying English discussion skills because:

2. As the person being rated/evaluated,

- a) Evaluations from other classmates in Reading Circles (with numbers/with numbers and comments) were easier to understand because:
- b) Evaluations from other classmates in Reading Circles (with numbers/with numbers and comments) were more enjoyable because:
- c) Evaluations from other classmates in Reading Circles (with numbers/with numbers and comments) were more embarrassing because:
- d) Evaluations from other classmates in Reading Circles (with numbers/with numbers and comments) were more useful for studying English discussion skills because:

APPENDIX C
Attitudes toward Peer Evaluation (Japanese)

以下のそれぞれの文について、(i) または (ii) のどちらか、あなたの気持ち（感覚）に近い方を選んで○で囲み、その理由を書いてください。

1. 採点・評価する立場では：

- a) リーディング・サークルでクラスメートの評価をしたとき、私は
[(i) 評価を数字だけで表す (ii) 評価を数字とコメントの両方で表す] 方がより簡単に評価できると感じた。理由：
- b) リーディング・サークルでクラスメートの評価をしたとき、私は
[(i) 評価を数字だけで表す (ii) 評価を数字とコメントの両方で表す] 方がより緊張する（気を使う）と感じた。理由：
- c) リーディング・サークルでクラスメートの評価をしたとき、私は
[(i) 評価を数字だけで表した (ii) 評価を数字とコメントの両方で表した] ときに、より強い気まずさ（当惑・困る気持ち）を感じた。理由：
- d) リーディング・サークルでクラスメートの評価をしたとき、私は
[(i) 評価を数字だけで表す (ii) 評価を数字とコメントの両方で表す] 方が、英語でディスカッションをするスキルを学ぶのにより役立つと感じた。理由：

2. 採点・評価される立場では：

- a) リーディング・サークルでクラスメートからの評価を受けたとき、私は
[(i) 評価を数字だけで表す (ii) 評価を数字とコメントの両方で表す] 方が、より理解しやすいと感じた。理由：
- b) リーディング・サークルでクラスメートからの評価を受けたとき、私は
[(i) 評価を数字だけで表す (ii) 評価を数字とコメントの両方で表す] 方がより緊張する（気を使う）と感じた。理由：
- c) リーディング・サークルでクラスメートからの評価を受けたとき、私は
[(i) 評価を数字だけで表す (ii) 評価を数字とコメントの両方で表す] ときに、より強い気まずさ（当惑・困る気持ち）を感じた。理由：
- d) リーディング・サークルでクラスメートからの評価を受けたとき、私は
[(i) 評価を数字だけで表す (ii) 評価を数字とコメントの両方で表す] 方が、英語でディスカッションをするスキルを学ぶのにより役立つと感じた。理由：