UCLA EIP S. CH   Evaluation of Instruction   20F: POL SCI 30 DIS 1D: P   No. of response   Enrollment   Response Rate	On Program Report OLITICS & STRATEGY Ises = 12 t = 20	
1. Background Information:		
fear in School.		۸ n=12
Freshma		-
Sophomor Junic		1
Senic		0
Graduat		0
Othe		0
<sup>1.2)</sup> UCLA GPA: Below 2.1		0 n=12
2.0 - 2.4		0
2.5 - 2.9		0
3.0 - 3.4	9	0
3.5		4
Not Establishe		8
<sup>1.3)</sup> Expected Grade:		
		9 n=12
	3	1
		0
	=	0
F		0
N		1
	?	1
<sup>1.4)</sup> What requirements does this course fulfill?		
Majo	r	10 n=12
Related Field		0
G.E		1
Non	•	1

2	. To What Extent Do You Feel That:											
2.1)	Teaching Assistant Knowledge – The T.A. was knowledgeable about the material.	Very Low or Never	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2 9	9 Very High or 4 Always 9	n=12 av.=8.67 md=9 dev.=0.65
2.2)	Teaching Assistant Concern – The T. A. was concerned about student learning.	Very Low or Never	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2 8	B Very High or Always	n=12 av.=8.5 md=9 dev.=0.8
2.3)	Organization – Section presentations were well prepared and organized.	Very Low or Never	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		1 Very High or Always	n=12 av.=8.92 md=9 dev.=0.29
2.4)	Scope – The teaching assistant expanded on course ideas.	Very Low or Never		0	0	0	0	0	0		9 Very High or Always 9	n=12 av.=8.75 md=9 dev.=0.45
2.5)	Interaction – Students felt welcome in seeking help in or outside of the class.	Very Low or Never	0	0	0	0	0	6	1 7		9 Very High or Always 9	n=12 av.=8.5 md=9 dev.=1
2.6)	Communication Skills – The teaching assistant had good communication skills.	Very Low or Never	0	0	0	0	0	0	3		9 Very High or Always 9	n=12 av.=8.5 md=9 dev.=0.9
 2.7)	Value – The overall value of the sections justified your time and effort.	Very Low or Never	0	0	0	0	0	1	3 ► 7		7 Very High or Always	n=12 av.=8.17 md=9 dev.=1.11
2.8)	Overall – What is your overall rating of the teaching assistant?	Very Low or Never	0	0	0	0	0	0	2		8 Very High or Always	n=12 av.=8.5 md=9 dev.=0.8
3	. Your View of Section Characteristics:											
3.1)	Difficulty (relative to other courses)	Low		2	F		8			2	High	n=12 av.=2 md=2 dev.=0.6
3.2)	Workload/pace was	Too Slow		1			9			1	Too Much	n=11 av.=2 md=2 dev.=0.45 ab.=1
3.3)	Integration of section with course was	Poor		0			4	<b>I</b>	+	8	Excellent	n=12 av.=2.67 md=3 dev.=0.49

<sup>3.4)</sup> Texts, required readings	Poor	0	4	3 ] 3	Excellent	n=7 av.=2.43 md=2 dev.=0.53 ab.=5
<sup>3.5)</sup> Homework assignments	Poor	0	5	5 	Excellent	n=10 av.=2.5 md=2.5 dev.=0.53 ab.=2
<sup>3.6)</sup> Graded materials, examinations	Poor	0	3 2	7	Excellent	n=10 av.=2.7 md=3 dev.=0.48 ab.=2
<sup>3.7)</sup> Lecture presentations	Poor	0	3 2	9	Excellent	n=12 av.=2.75 md=3 dev.=0.45
<sup>3.8)</sup> Class discussions	Poor	1	3 	7	Excellent	n=11 av.=2.55 md=3 dev.=0.69 ab.=1
4 Comments:						

- <sup>4.1)</sup> Please identify what you perceive to be the real strengths and weaknesses of this teaching assistant and course.
- I always looked forward to discussion and felt that Soonhong really enhanced my understanding of the material. He was always really understanding and cares about his students.
- My TA has been great he is always willing to help. H knows the course materials and always provided handouts to reinforce what we have learned during the lecture. Weaknesses maybe to provide more examples and examples similar to the hoework.
- Our TA was amazing. He was very patient and went into great detail for this course. It was challenging and he acknowledged it, so he gave us many tips and expanded on course material a lot. He is very smart and couldn't have asked for a better TA discussion.
- Soonhong was a great TA who was always very helpful. Each discussion he would talk about difficult problems so that we could better understand the course. He was excellent in answering all questions, and always responded quickly to emails outside of class. I can't think of any weaknesses for him, because overall he was wonderful to have as a TA.
- Soonhong was extremely well prepared and organized for our sections. He always expanded on what we learned in lecture in new ways so that we would definitely be able to do the homework. He prepared his own problems, examples and outlines that were very helpful. He was also very kind and approachable, and tried very hard to make section a friendly place. He put a lot of effort into making sure we learned everything we needed to.
- Strengths: The TA expanded on topics discussed in class and explained the concepts more in depth or prepared us with new content for the next week. Weaknesses: The discussion section didn't really feel like an actual discussion; it felt more like an extension of the class, which wasn't too great in regards of communication and actual discussion.
- The T.A was highly personable and made every effort possible to help students achieve academic success within the course.
- They were very organized, the notes helped out a lot and I felt it helped prepare for the class. The main weakness was they wrote a number but said something else they caught it very quickly but if that happens just state what the correct method is again. If possible it would help to record the lecture so we can go back and see it in case we missed something. Other than that it was a very helpful addition and

they were very polite! Was very happy to have them as my TA and would gladly take another class with them.

Very knowledgable about the subject and helpful.

n=12

n=12

n=12

n=12

n=12

n=12

n=12

n=12

av.=8.67

av.=8.50

av.=8.92

av.=8.75

av.=8.50

av.=8.50

av.=8.17

av.=8.50

Very High or

Always

Always

Always

Always Very High or

Always

Always Very High or

Always

Always

## Profile

Subunit:

POL SCI

Name of the instructor: Name of the course: (Name of the survey) S. CHO 20F: POL SCI 30 DIS 1D: POLITICS & STRATEGY

Very Low or

Very Low or Never

Never

Never

Never

Never

Never

Never

Never

Values used in the profile line: Mean

#### 2. To What Extent Do You Feel That:

- <sup>2.1)</sup> Teaching Assistant Knowledge The T.A. was knowledgeable about the material.
- <sup>2.2)</sup> Teaching Assistant Concern The T.A. was concerned about student learning.
- 2.3) Organization Section presentations were well prepared and organized.
- $^{2.4)} \ \ \, Scope The teaching assistant expanded on course ideas.$
- <sup>2.5)</sup> Interaction Students felt welcome in seeking help in or outside of the class.
- <sup>2.6)</sup> Communication Skills The teaching assistant had good communication skills.
- 2.7) Value The overall value of the sections justified your time and effort.
- <sup>2.8)</sup> Overall What is your overall rating of the teaching assistant?

3. Your View of Section Characteristics:

3.1)	Difficulty (relative to other courses)	Low		High	n=12	av.=2.00
3.2)	Workload/pace was	Too Slow		Too Much	n=11	av.=2.00
3.3)	Integration of section with course was	Poor		Excellent	n=12	av.=2.67
3.4)	Texts, required readings	Poor	<del>(</del>	Excellent	n=7	av.=2.43
3.5)	Homework assignments	Poor		Excellent	n=10	av.=2.50
3.6)	Graded materials, examinations	Poor		Excellent	n=10	av.=2.70
3.7)	Lecture presentations	Poor		Excellent	n=12	av.=2.75
3.8)	Class discussions	Poor	<i>i</i>	Excellent	n=11	av.=2.55

UCLA EIP S. CH   Evaluation of Instruction   20F: POL SCI 30 DIS 1E: POL   No. of response   Enrollment   Response Rate	on Program Report DLITICS & STRATEGY ses = 14 : = 20	
1. Background Information:		
		n=14
Freshman		11-14
Sophomore		
Junior Senior		
Graduate		
Other		
<sup>1.2)</sup> UCLA GPA:		
Below 2.0	0	n=14
2.0 - 2.49		
2.5 - 2.99		
3.0 - 3.49		
3.5+		
Not Established	5	
<sup>1.3)</sup> Expected Grade:		
A		n=13
В		
с		
D		
F		
NP		
?		
ť		
<sup>1.4)</sup> What requirements does this course fulfill?		
Major	12	n=12
Related Field	0	
G.E.	0	
None	0	

2.	To What Extent Do You Feel That:										
2.1)	Teaching Assistant Knowledge – The T.A. was knowledgeable about the material.	Very Low or Never	0 0	2 3	0	0	0	0	4 10 4 9	Very High or Always	n=14 av.=8.71 md=9 dev.=0.47
2.2)	Teaching Assistant Concern – The T. A. was concerned about student learning.	Very Low or Never	0 0	0 0	0	0	2	2		Very High or Always	n=14 av.=8.21 md=9 dev.=1.19
2.3)	Organization – Section presentations were well prepared and organized.	Very Low or Never	0 0	0 0	0	0	0	2		Very High or Always	n=14 av.=8.57 md=9 dev.=0.76
2.4)	Scope – The teaching assistant expanded on course ideas.	Very Low or Never	0 0	1	0	2	0	1		Very High or Always	n=14 av.=7.79 md=9 dev.=2.01
2.5)	Interaction – Students felt welcome in seeking help in or outside of the class.	Very Low or Never	0 0	0 0	0	5	2	0	3 8 8 9	Very High or Always	n=14 av.=8.07 md=9 dev.=1.38
2.6)	Communication Skills – The teaching assistant had good communication skills.	Very Low or Never	0 0	0 0	1	0	1   <b>ட</b> 6	4	4 4	Very High or Always	n=14 av.=7.57 md=8 dev.=1.4
2.7)	Value – The overall value of the sections justified your time and effort.	Very Low or Never	0 0	0 0	0	0	0	2	5 7 	Very High or Always	n=14 av.=8.36 md=8.5 dev.=0.74
2.8)	Overall – What is your overall rating of the teaching assistant?	Very Low or Never	0 0	0 0	0	0	0	2		Very High or Always	n=14 av.=8.43 md=9 dev.=0.76
3.	Your View of Section Characteristics:										
3.1)	Difficulty (relative to other courses)	Low	1 [ 1			11 2		-	2	High	n=14 av.=2.07 md=2 dev.=0.47
3.2)	Workload/pace was	Too Slow	C [ 1			13 2	<u> </u>		1	Too Much	n=14 av.=2.07 md=2 dev.=0.27
3.3)	Integration of section with course was	Poor	1 [ 1			3		+	10 3	Excellent	n=14 av.=2.64 md=3 dev.=0.63

\_

<sup>3.4)</sup> Texts, required readings	Poor	0	4 2	5 3	Excellent	n=9 av.=2.56 md=3 dev.=0.53 ab.=5
<sup>3.5)</sup> Homework assignments	Poor	0	6 2	7 1 3	Excellent	n=13 av.=2.54 md=3 dev.=0.52 ab.=1
<sup>3.6)</sup> Graded materials, examinations	Poor	0	2 2 2 2		Excellent	n=13 av.=2.85 md=3 dev.=0.38 ab.=1
<sup>3.7)</sup> Lecture presentations	Poor	0	3 ⊢ 2		Excellent	n=13 av.=2.77 md=3 dev.=0.44 ab.=1
<sup>3.8)</sup> Class discussions	Poor	0	7 1 2	6 3	Excellent	n=13 av.=2.46 md=2 dev.=0.52 ab.=1
4. Comments:						

- <sup>4.1)</sup> Please identify what you perceive to be the real strengths and weaknesses of this teaching assistant and course.
- Soonhong was very nice, caring and always available to help any student. It truly was a pleasure of having him as a TA. He went over class material and even Homwork. I appreciate his hard work, dedication and grit.
- AMAZING TA. Super knowledgeable and not only expanded on the course material but also went ahead to preview the material for the next week which as extremely helpful. Probably the best TA I had and I wish all my TAs were more like him. Excellent TA and excellent class!
- Although sometimes difficult to understand and writing was sometimes unclear, Mr.Cho was a great TA that made sure his section was up to speed.
- Good TA, always knew the course material and how to help.
- Great TA. Very helpful and understanding when coming to him with hard problems. Knows what he's talking about and gives examples to help students learn. Recommend!
- I really loved this section and thought the TA really did an exceptional job. He took the time to go through more advanced material with us and even previewed lecture material a few times, which really helped when completing the course's homework assignments. He also went above and beyond to prepare extra study and review materials for us to give us options for extra practice. Soonhong really made this class enjoyable and made the material very digestible for us.
- My TA was really flexible given the circumstances. He really understood how to help us, and even if I ever had a questions and was too shy to ask in discussion, he responded to all my emails very promptly. That was highly appreciated, especially considering how often I work/how often my internet fails me. He has made catching up and understanding the material a dream. His kindness and knowledge of the material are incredible. I would definitely recommend him as TA
- My TA was very good at explaining the material we learned in class. I liked that he used homework questions to explain how to do it. He was very nice and understanding. I learned so much from his discussions!
- One strength is the knowledge of the material, Soonhong was very knowledgable and could answer any question that I asked. Another is his temperament, game theory can be extremely difficult to

comprehend and it would take me a long time to figure out how to do these problems. Soonhong helped and never lost his patience throughout and always kept a calm demeanor. He has a great personality for teaching and very hard to find flaws.

- Soonhong was a great T.A. He was very helpful and provided good feedback. He was easy to access through email with any questions. The only area that I saw a weakness was sometimes his internet connection seemed to be unstable so it was difficult to hear him during section.
- Soonhong was great with making sure that everyone understood the material and did not move on unless he knew that we all had a good grasp on the concepts. However, sometimes, it was a bit difficult to understand, but that may have been just because the material itself was hard. Overall, great and kind TA. Thank you Soonhong :)
- Strengths: Loved that we could go over certain homework problems that would otherwise be challenging and have it explained well and clearly for us. Doing extra problems in section that built off of the lecture and helped clear things up in terms of how to do them and also the written notes that explain how to do it was a big help as well. Also, Soonhong was great at making time for students to meet with him in office hours and the Google Sheets made sure that he could meet with as many people as possible. Very helpful with clarifying issues of the X-Problems and made sure every student would do as best as they could in the class.
- You can tell he really cares for his students and he wants us to succeed! He was very helpful by going over tough questions on the homework. He definitely knows the material well.
- overall a solid TA! I think the professor was more helpful though!

## Profile

Subunit:

POL SCI

Name of the instructor: Name of the course: (Name of the survey) S. CHO 20F: POL SCI 30 DIS 1E: POLITICS & STRATEGY

Values used in the profile line: Mean

#### 2. To What Extent Do You Feel That:

- <sup>2.1)</sup> Teaching Assistant Knowledge The T.A. was knowledgeable about the material.
- <sup>2.2)</sup> Teaching Assistant Concern The T.A. was concerned about student learning.
- <sup>2.3)</sup> Organization Section presentations were well prepared and organized.
- $^{2.4)}\ \ \, Scope$  The teaching assistant expanded on course ideas.
- $^{2.5)}\,$  Interaction Students felt welcome in seeking help in or outside of the class.
- 2.6) Communication Skills The teaching assistant had good communication skills.
- 2.7) Value The overall value of the sections justified your time and effort.
- <sup>2.8)</sup> Overall What is your overall rating of the teaching assistant?

3. Your View of Section Characteristics:

3.1)	Difficulty (relative to other courses)	Low		High	n=14	av.=2.07
3.2)	Workload/pace was	Too Slow		Too Much	n=14	av.=2.07
3.3)	Integration of section with course was	Poor _		Excellent	n=14	av.=2.64
3.4)	Texts, required readings	Poor _	<b>/ /</b>	Excellent	n=9	av.=2.56
3.5)	Homework assignments	Poor _	<b>i</b>	Excellent	n=13	av.=2.54
3.6)	Graded materials, examinations	Poor _		Excellent	n=13	av.=2.85
3.7)	Lecture presentations	Poor _		Excellent	n=13	av.=2.77
3.8)	Class discussions	Poor		Excellent	n=13	av.=2.46

Very Low or	Very High or	
Never	Always	n=14 av.=8.71
Very Low or Never	Very High or Always	n=14 av.=8.21
Very Low or Never	Very High or Always	n=14 av.=8.57
Very Low or Never	Very High or Always	n=14 av.=7.79
Very Low or Never	Very High or Always	n=14 av.=8.07
Very Low or Never	Very High or Always	n=14 av.=7.57
Very Low or Never	Very High or Always	n=14 av.=8.36
Very Low or Never	Very High or Always	n=14 av.=8.43

UCLA EIP S. CHO   Evaluation of Instruction Program Report   20F: POL SCI 30 DIS 1F: POLITICS & STRATEGY   No. of responses = 15   Enrollment = 20   Response Rate = 75%									
1. Background Information:									
<sup>1.1)</sup> Year in School:				- 44					
	Freshman		4	n=14					
	Sophomore		5						
	Junior Senior		4						
	Graduate		0						
	Other		0						
<sup>1.2)</sup> UCLA GPA:									
OCEA OF A.	Below 2.0		0	n=15					
	2.0 - 2.49		0						
	2.5 - 2.99		0						
	3.0 - 3.49		3						
	3.5+		5						
	Not Established		7						
<sup>1.3)</sup> Expected Grade:									
	A		11	n=15					
	В		2						
	С		1						
	D		0						
	F		0						
	Р		0						
	NP		0						
	?		1						
<sup>1.4)</sup> What requirements does th	nis course fulfill?								
	Major		14	n=15					
	Related Field		0						
	G.E.		1						
	None		0						

2	. To What Extent Do You Feel That:											
2.1)	Teaching Assistant Knowledge – The T.A. was knowledgeable about the material.	Very Low or 0 Never		0	0	0	0 F	2	0	12 9	Very High or Always	n=15 av.=8.27 md=9 dev.=1.87
2.2)	Teaching Assistant Concern – The T. A. was concerned about student learning.	Very Low or 1 Never	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	9		n=15 av.=8 md=9 dev.=2.07
2.3)	Organization – Section presentations were well prepared and organized.	Very Low or 1 Never	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	Very High or -Always	n=15 av.=7.93 md=9 dev.=2.05
2.4)	Scope – The teaching assistant expanded on course ideas.	Very Low or 0 Never	1	0	0	1	0	1	4	8	Very High or _Always	n=15 av.=7.87 md=9 dev.=1.96
2.5)	Interaction – Students felt welcome in seeking help in or outside of the class.	Very Low or 1 Never	0	0	0	1       5	0	4	0	9	Very High or -Always	n=15 av.=7.67 md=9 dev.=2.23
2.6)	Communication Skills – The teaching assistant had good communication skills.	Very Low or 1 Never	0	0	0	0		4	0	9	Very High or -Always	n=15 av.=7.73 md=9 dev.=2.15
2.7)	Value – The overall value of the sections justified your time and effort.	Very Low or 0 Never	0	0	1	0	0	2 	3	8	Very High or Always	n=14 av.=8.14 md=9 dev.=1.41 ab.=1
2.8)	Overall – What is your overall rating of the teaching assistant?	Very Low or 0 Never	1	0	0	0	1   <b>⊢</b> 6	0	4	9	Very High or -Always	n=15 av.=8.07 md=9 dev.=1.87
3	. Your View of Section Characteristics:											
3.1)	Difficulty (relative to other courses)	Low	1			12	<b>—</b> 1		1		High	n=14 av.=2 md=2 dev.=0.39 ab.=1
3.2)	Workload/pace was	Too Slow	0		H	13	<u> </u>		1		Too Much	n=14 av.=2.07 md=2 dev.=0.27 ab.=1
3.3)	Integration of section with course was	Poor	1			4		ł	10	-1	Excellent	n=15 av.=2.6 md=3 dev.=0.63

<sup>3.4)</sup> Texts, required readings	Poor	0 3 	4	Excellent	n=7 av.=2.57 md=3 dev.=0.53 ab.=8
<sup>3.5)</sup> Homework assignments	Poor			Excellent	n=14 av.=2.64 md=3 dev.=0.63 ab.=1
<sup>3.6)</sup> Graded materials, examinations	Poor	1 5 	9	Excellent	n=15 av.=2.53 md=3 dev.=0.64
<sup>3.7)</sup> Lecture presentations	Poor	0 4 <u> </u>		Excellent	n=14 av.=2.71 md=3 dev.=0.47 ab.=1
<sup>3.8)</sup> Class discussions	Poor	0 4 1 2	9	Excellent	n=13 av.=2.69 md=3 dev.=0.48 ab.=2
4. Comments:					

- <sup>4.1)</sup> Please identify what you perceive to be the real strengths and weaknesses of this teaching assistant and course.
- Although I did not show my face every discussion, Soonhong always made me feel welcome and never hesitated to help. He is also very smart and I would recommend him for years to come. there is no doubt that he will succeed.
- I like how Soonhong Cho would teach us lessons on current class material and then add on what we would learn in the upcoming lecture. His explanations of problems also made sense.
- Really good at drawing out the concepts and explaining them
- Soonhong did a phenomenal job explaining what was going on in the class lectures, and even created extra worksheets we could do, where he also walked us through a few examples, to help us solidify our knowledge of the coursework. He was very responsive to emails, and was extremely helpful. He did an outstanding job in my opinion and made a great learning environment for everyone in the class. Sections were extremely comfortable and made the class enjoyable.
- Soonhong is a great TA. He was very helpful with expanding on course topics and always made himself available for questions both in his office hour and outside.
- Soonhong was a great TA. He was very concerned with student learning and always replied promptly to my emails. He was very understanding and helped facilitate learning by going over difficult homework problems in our class discussions. Overall, I thought he was a very helpful TA.
- TA was great! helped with the course and very understanding for accommodations.
- The T.A.'s explanation of class related work was detailed and very useful. If I were to take this class again, I would want him to be my T.A. again.
- The TA's relates course material poorly. The TA makes it harder to understand the material. The TA sometimes shows a lack of knowledge on the subject by at times explaining material incorrectly.
- This TA was very insightful and helpful. He taught the class in a very organized way and allowed us to reach out to him whenever we needed any help. A strength his TA had was that he was good at challenging us and allowing us to see how far we could go. He never explicitly gave us any answers but just guided us towards a path where we could find the answer. However a weakness he had was that

he would sometimes expect us to know a lot of information. This would cause me to get lost because the information he skipped out on was information I wasn't aware of.

- Very helpful and did a great job connecting class material and even expanding on it. I felt very comfortable coming with any questions or concerns about things I did not understand.
- Very knowledgable of the course material... very dedicated to making sure all understand it.
- strengths: easily available outside of the course and good at re-explaining the difficult concepts covered in class

# Profile

Subunit:

POL SCI

Name of the instructor: Name of the course: (Name of the survey) S. CHO 20F: POL SCI 30 DIS 1F: POLITICS & STRATEGY

Values used in the profile line: Mean

### 2. To What Extent Do You Feel That:

- <sup>2.1)</sup> Teaching Assistant Knowledge The T.A. was knowledgeable about the material.
- <sup>2.2)</sup> Teaching Assistant Concern The T.A. was concerned about student learning.
- <sup>2.3)</sup> Organization Section presentations were well prepared and organized.
- $^{2.4)} \ \ \, Scope The teaching assistant expanded on course ideas.$
- $^{2.5)}\,$  Interaction Students felt welcome in seeking help in or outside of the class.
- 2.6) Communication Skills The teaching assistant had good communication skills.
- 2.7) Value The overall value of the sections justified your time and effort.
- <sup>2.8)</sup> Overall What is your overall rating of the teaching assistant?

3. Your View of Section Characteristics:

3.1)	Difficulty (relative to other courses)	Low	 	High	n=14	av.=2.00
3.2)	Workload/pace was	Too Slow	Í.	Too Much	n=14	av.=2.07
3.3)	Integration of section with course was	Poor		Excellent	n=15	av.=2.60
3.4)	Texts, required readings	Poor		Excellent	n=7	av.=2.57
3.5)	Homework assignments	Poor	<del>}</del>	Excellent	n=14	av.=2.64
3.6)	Graded materials, examinations	Poor	<del>`</del>	Excellent	n=15	av.=2.53
3.7)	Lecture presentations	Poor		Excellent	n=14	av.=2.71
3.8)	Class discussions	Poor	<u>i</u>	Excellent	n=13	av.=2.69

Very Low or Never	Very High or Always	n=15 av.=8.27
Very Low or Never	Very High or Always	n=15 av.=8.00
Very Low or Never	Very High or Always	n=15 av.=7.93
Very Low or Never	Very High or Always	n=15 av.=7.87
Very Low or Never	Very High or Always	n=15 av.=7.67
Very Low or Never	Very High or Always	n=15 av.=7.73
Very Low or Never	Very High or Always	n=14 av.=8.14
Very Low or Never	Very High or Always	n=15 av.=8.07