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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Cooperation might be defined as the act of operating in agreement and for the mutual benefit of the participants. Although the teacher is the originator of experiences and learning in experience units for pupils, it is still imperative in the spirit of mutual assistance and cooperation to create an atmosphere of maximum effectiveness.
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The classroom must be considered a special laboratory in which children learn to live with others cooperatively and harmoniously. It must be a place in which arbitrary decisions are not made, but in which control resides in the group and is exercised for the welfare of the majority. The general atmosphere of this laboratory is characterized by mutual understanding and mutual respect. Pupil should have freedom and greater freedom for pupil rights in a democratic atmosphere and expression by all members of the class. The teacher is included.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Cooperation might be defined as the act of operating in agreement and for the mutual benefit of the participants. Although the teacher has had a multitude of experiences and learnings in comparison with her pupils, it is still imperative that the spirit of mutual assistance and friendliness exist between the instructor and the instructed if the final product or sum of experiences are to be wholesome and afford maximum development. Baxter states:

The educational significance of the direct influence of the mature personality of the teacher upon the impressionable personalities of children is worthy of careful evaluation. Especially is this true today. While the teacher's personal example and social outlook have always been factors to be considered, the scope of the teacher's potential influence is greater under the complex living conditions of today than ever before. 1

This meant that those who did not know should acquire knowledge.

The classroom must be considered a special laboratory in which children learn to live with others cooperatively and harmoniously. It must be a place in which arbitrary decisions are not made, but one in which control evolves from within the group and is exercised for the welfare of the majority. The general atmosphere of this laboratory is characterized by mutual understanding and mutual respect of pupil for pupil, pupil for teacher, and teacher for pupil. There is a purpose-sharing attitude expressed by all members of the class, the taught included.

Since the teacher is the one adult member of the group, his every act has to coincide with the democratic way of thinking and acting which he would have pupils acquire. The teacher cannot give lip service to democracy but must exemplify democratic ideals if he is to inspire children to democratic living.  

Educators are attempting to instill their apprentices with the philosophy of the teacher being an understanding guide rather than being the pedestal teacher of the early twentieth century with her "inferiors" gathered about her. This effort in the field of human relationships is the result of the change in emphasis from the book-centered to the child-centered school begun by John Dewey. Kilpatrick sums up the new philosophy in reply to the question, "Would Dr. Kilpatrick explain what he means by the dethronement of subject-matter and the enthronement of personality development?" after his lecture "Democracy and The Individual":

What I mean is that beginning from the time of Aristotle there were organized bodies of knowledge, all that was thought and known up to that time. And later, at Alexandria especially, there were schools, built to hand down this knowledge as subject-matter, on the theory that what was required was that those who knew should teach those who didn't know. This meant, too, that those who did not know should accept on authority what was thus handed down. From there the practice was carried over to Rome, then was revived in the Renaissance and spread over Europe. In this way the common run of schools has been based on that theory. It is that theory which I wish to dethrone. The alternative is to take each child as a person, start where he is, and help him grow into the finest and richest personality that he can, and use subject-matter strictly as a means to this end. The ordinary schools run on the basis that this subject-matter has got to be learned; that is, that

1Ibid, p. 2.
knowledge subject-matter and not the child is the end, and if 
this child cannot learn the assigned subject-matter, 
we shall fail him; this assigned stuff has got to be 
learned, whatever happens to the child in the process. ¹

The child is no longer considered the empty well into 
which is poured the knowledge and experiences of his super-
iors; he is rather viewed as a person, inexperienced and 
unlearned, "yes," but with ideas, desires, and needs of his 
own. He is, with proper guidance and the wealth of fore-
sight of his associated, able to make decisions which are 
wise ones. By exercising his right of choice and intelli-
gence and by suffering or enjoying the results of his 
decisions, he has learned. On the other hand, the teacher 
is no longer to be a 

... channel through which mere information flows, 
but is responsible for planning experiences for chil-
dren which will be educative in many ways; in the 
seeking and finding of information; in sharing findings 
with others; in accepting the substantiated information 
presented by others; in working in the capacity of both 
leader and follower; in deciding worth-while group pro-
jects; and in finding ways and means of solving problems 
and of sharing both the work and the results of work 
with other children.²

Teaching, consequently, becomes largely a matter of 
training the inexperienced child in the way which society 
believes and knows through experiences and psychological know-

¹Committee on Individual Differences, National 
Council of Teachers of English, Pupils are People ed. 
Nellie Appy (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1941), 
p. 31 f.
4.

ledge will best suit him to live in the world of change and complexity. Unless the child has an atmosphere conducive to learning, unless he has only minor barriers between him and the teacher, and unless he has a genuine desire to learn, most of the teacher's efforts are in vain. The pupil's judgment of the worth of the personal relationship between him and his teacher and the effectiveness of the teaching is very important to all the people interested in his learning. All teaching is aimed at changed behavior and attitudes in the learner, but these changes may not be displayed for some time following the learning. It may be that the learner will be unaware of these changed attitudes and behaviors himself until he analyzes why he has acted as he has. His immediate response to the teacher will, however, gravely affect the degree of his efficiency in learning and his open-mindedness toward the exposure to experiences new to him.

There is but one way to ascertain a teacher's effect upon pupils. That is discovered by watching pupils' behavior when in contact with the teacher. Intelligence, insight, social understanding, breadth of information, and studentlike attitude are all indications of potential teaching strength, but they do not give a complex index of a teacher's power. Even the candidate's personal appeal to adults cannot be taken as absolute assurance of success. The real test comes when the prospective teacher is placed in a situation involving direct contact with children. The way in which the children react to the teacher day after day, is the true measure of the teacher's effectiveness.¹

¹Baxter, op. cit., pp. 154 f.
The burden of the criticism is that the board's method of screening candidates for eligibility is unsatisfactory and that "despite the screening process of competitive examinations, men and women who are not suited for this demanding profession (of teaching) pass the tests and secure licenses. Once a teacher is granted a permanent license, he is virtually guaranteed lifetime employment". (The same can, of course, be said of all professional examinations, whether qualifying or competitive.)

This is a somewhat native concept of the issues involved in the process of selection and ignores the very large number of studies that have been devoted to the effort of discovering in advance who is likely to become a good teacher. All the studies have produced negative results except for a correlation as to be worthless for practical purposes.\(^1\)

The Commission on Teacher Education, American Council on Education, meeting in Washington, D.C., in 1944, states:

He (the teacher) it is who is in vital daily contact with the boys and girls in our schools. Upon his character, convictions, knowledge, skills and capacity to work well with others the effectiveness of the school must ultimately depend.\(^2\)

... good teaching requires a favorable relationship with children and an understanding of their natures and potentialities. Teaching is above all a human affair, a matter of personal intercourse. Teachers good for the schools our times require will respect the personalities of those with whom the teaching relationship is established. This undoubtedly calls for a positive feeling tone, a warm responsiveness and indeed a genuine affection for young people. It implies a trustfulness, a willingness to give one's self away. Friendliness should describe the attitude of the teacher as well as the atmosphere of the school, but the friendliness that is wise and objective, not sentimental and uncritical.

---

\(^1\)"Selection of Teachers," School and Society, LXXV (May 17, 1952), 315.

As friends, teachers will see children as fellow human beings, free and equal in the ultimate sense of those terms, to be worked with, not on or even for. They will have faith in the potentialities of these young people. They will aim to awaken self-awareness, deepen self-understanding, strengthen self-reliance. They will respect and encourage integrity. Of course, such teachers will freely contribute, out of their own knowledge and according to their own convictions, to the relationship that has been created. They will earnestly wish to bring their friends to share the knowledge they have found vital, the belief they have found sustaining, the appreciations that have brought joy to their living. But they must reject all unworthy means of attaining these ends and must sincerely respect divergent views honestly held and expressed. They must consider it a chief evidence of failure as good teachers to have manipulated children into professions of agreement that are not genuine.¹

Prescott says:

The personal relationships which a child experiences at school educate him just as genuinely and importantly as what he reads, sees, hears, or otherwise experiences.²

Torgersen believes:

The fundamental importance of teacher-pupil relationship is self-evident, because it is essential to the promotion of optimum conditions for learning. Certain attitudes, traits, and procedures are undoubtedly necessary to establish teacher behavior patterns that contribute to wholesome relationships in the classroom. A study of the integration of the teacher's attitudes, traits, and practices necessary to create and maintain such an environment is a challenging problem that may throw considerable light on the problem of measuring teaching success.³

¹Ibid, p. 165.
Many teachers and supervisors regard a teacher as being "excellent" because her children always behave well and respond courteously when called upon. These actions are sometimes genuine and sincere, but too many times they are the false faces of the emotionally maladjusted. How many of these false faces may be in a given classroom depend largely on the relationship between the teacher and the pupil, and Baxter in an experiment found that teachers tend to stimulate children to the same kind of behavior which they exhibit.

Since differences of opinion do exist between interested persons on the type of relationship existing between a given teacher and her students, the present study is an effort to determine the extent of the rank correlation between the teacher's evaluation of the rapport between herself and her pupils and the pupils' evaluations of the same relationship. The teacher's and pupils' supervisor was the third party chosen to evaluate the relationship, since he was most likely to be unbiased and unprejudiced toward both members.

A survey of the current literature on the evaluation of teacher-pupil relationships was largely unfruitful. Most of the studies that have been conducted have used high school or college students, while this study is concerned primarily with grade school and junior high pupils. Amatora conducted
a study in 1952, similar to the ones conducted by Kratz\(^1\) and Hawthorn\(^2\), using the ratings of one thousand elementary school children in grades six through eight in both public and private schools. The number of children in a classroom varied from twenty-two to fifty-six. She used her own "Diagnostic Teacher Rating Scale". The children rated their teachers in the following areas: (1) Liking for Teacher, (2) Ability to Explain, (3) Kindness, Friendliness and Understanding, (4) Fairness in Grading, (5) Discipline, (6) Amount of Work Required, and (7) Liking for Lessons. The conclusions from this study were:

While a study of the ratings given the above seven teachers by their respective pupils does not permit one to generalize regarding all pupils of the elementary school level, it does show quite conclusively that the children in the present study were discriminative in judging their teachers on the specific traits rated.

The findings herein presented in the two profile charts suggest further study of this important field of pupil-teacher relationships. If it be true that children in the elementary schools can discriminate vital differences in traits of their teacher, then this is a potent and easily secured means for the teacher to get a picture of himself as he is daily mirrored before his class. This self-knowledge will be useful to the teacher as a first step in self-improvement; from this, improvement in rapport between pupils and teacher seem inevitable.\(^3\)

---

\(^1\) H. E. Kratz, "Characteristics of the Best Teacher as Recognized by Children", Pedagogical Seminary, III (June 1896), 413-418.

\(^2\) A. Hawthorn, "My Best Teacher", American Childhood, XV (January, 1930), 5-6 and 60-61.

\(^3\) Mary Amatora, "Can Elementary School Children Discriminate Certain Traits in Their Teachers?" Child Development, XXIII (March, 1952), 79.
9.

Remmers\textsuperscript{1} and Flinn\textsuperscript{2} conducted investigations to determine if the judgments of pupils regarding their teachers were reliable and valid. Both investigators concluded that pupil ratings of teachers are reliable and valid.

Tiedemann conducted a study in 1942 to determine the likes and dislikes of four hundred fifty junior high students and whether or not they changed as the students grew older. He found:

\ldots the autocratic, domineering teacher is most disliked by junior high school pupils, followed in order by (2) the teacher who ridicules, used sarcasm, nags; (3) the teacher who threatens, frightens, and punishes to secure discipline; (4) the teacher who fails to provide for individual differences of pupils; (5) the teacher who has disagreeable personal peculiarities; and (6) the teacher who shows partiality to pupils.

The domineering teacher is liked least by ninth grade pupils, while eighth graders and seventh graders are slightly less disturbed by this type of teacher. The seventh graders apparently have the greatest dislike for a teacher who punishes, frightens, or threatens them to secure discipline, while the eighth graders are most hostile toward a teacher who ridicules, nags them or is sarcastic.

On the whole, pupils are most disturbed by aggressive or overt behavior, such as domination, ridicule, and punishment, and less disturbed by the more passive or subtle forms of teacher behavior, such as failure to provide for individual differences, personal peculiarities, and partiality.

\textsuperscript{1}H. H. Remmers, "Reliability and Halo Effect of High School and College Students' Judgment of Their Teachers", \textit{Journal of Applied Psychology}, XVIII (October, 1934), 629-630.


Amatora conducted a study of the evaluations of the personalities of one hundred teachers; each teacher was evaluated by four of her colleagues. Two patterns were used in this study: Pattern I consisted of rating on (1) Nervousness versus Calmness, (2) Tactfulness and Diplomacy, (3) Easily Angered versus Self-Control, and (4) Meeting New Social Situations. The results were (1) that the fifth and sixth grade teachers were ranked highest on all four scales, (2) the eighth grade teachers were ranked lowest, and (3) the fourth and seventh grade teachers were ranked in the intermediate position.

On Pattern II each teacher was rated on (1) Energetic and "Peppy", (2) Popular, (3) Interesting and Entertaining, (4) Awkward versus Graceful in Movement, and (5) Having a Pleasing Voice. She describes the results of this pattern as follows:

It will be noted that on these five characteristics of personality that the fourth and sixth grade teachers are judged below the fifth and seventh grade teachers on each scale. The teachers of the eighth grade, though showing a considerable drop in means, have a wider spread among the five scales.

Why such specific, clear-cut, grade-level patterns should emerge in the analysis of the data for these five scales is a question that would bear further investigation. However, it would seem that there are definite similarities among the five traits. Those teachers who as a group are the most energetic and "peppy", those who are most interesting and entertaining, those who show more grace in movement, are the same ones who possess a more melodious and pleasant
voice and who enjoy greater popularity among their pupils.\footnote{Mary Amatora, "Grade Level Similarities and Differences in Teacher Personality," \textit{School and Society}, LXXIX (January 23, 1954), 27.}

Although all of these studies have dealt with teacher-pupil relationships, the present study is different in that it compares the evaluations of three of the parties interested in a good teacher-pupil relationship—the pupil, the teacher and the supervisor.

The purpose of this study was to (1) determine the correlation between the teacher's and the pupils' evaluations of the teacher-pupil relationship with the supervisor's evaluation as criterion, (2) determine if children's judgments differ in correlation with the supervisor's rankings by the grade level of the pupils, (3) determine if students and teachers of small schools more nearly agree in evaluation of the relationship with the supervisor than those of larger schools, and (4) through the use of questionnaires to awaken in the teachers a need for evaluation as a teaching improvement device, to make the supervisor more aware of the need for a method of validating his appraisals of teacher-pupil relationships, and to bring to the fore the recognition that the child is capable of judging the value of the relationship between himself and his teacher and that his evaluation is reliable, valid, and most valuable to both administrator and teacher.

CHAPTER II

PROCEDURE

Preliminary card questionnaires and letters were sent out to ninety-six elementary schools with varying size enrollments and located in all parts of Iowa. These questionnaires solicited the cooperation of the schools' fifth, sixth, and seventh graders, their teachers, and their teachers' supervisors in filling out three questionnaires. Of these cards requesting cooperation, only ten were returned marked "I will not cooperate" and fifty-five were not returned at all.

As soon as the number of schools that would cooperate was known, the questionnaires and letters of explanation were sent out. Extra care was taken to insure that each person's evaluation would not be seen by any other person evaluating the same relationship. The supervisor evaluated the relationship first and mailed in his reply in a first class envelope. The teacher completed her check sheet and returned it in her own envelope. Last of all, the children evaluated their own activities in separate form. Six schools with ten or less pupils were eliminated as "small" and

1 Appendix A.
2 Appendixes B, C, D.
3 Appendix E.
checked their evaluation sheets under the supervision of an administrator and with the teacher absent. The envelopes containing the students' evaluations were sealed in their presence and whenever practical were mailed immediately.

Twenty-seven schools returned all three sets of evaluations in complete form. Of course, as is often true where many people are involved in following the same written directions, some did not respond according to directions; some teachers evaluated their supervisor instead of themselves and their pupils; and some pupils obviously did not understand how to check their sheets. Special precautions were taken to make the directions clear, but apparently some people did not know the purpose of the study or did not read the directions carefully enough. Only one rural group of teachers refused to conduct the survey after answering the preliminary question in the positive; they gave no reason for their refusal. Several supervisors commented favorably on the questionnaire while only one believed it to be too much in the negative vein. A total of five hundred twenty-nine pupils (two hundred fifty-six seventh graders, one hundred thirty-six sixth graders, and one hundred thirty-five fifth graders), twenty-seven teachers, and thirteen supervisors participated in the study. The twenty-seven schools which returned questionnaires in complete form were classified according to the enrollment in each grade. Six schools with ten or less pupils in a grade were classified as "small" and
were all rural schools. Ten of the schools had an enrollment in grades between ten and twenty and were rated as medium-sized schools. The third group of eleven was largely junior high and grade schools which were a part of a large city system, such as Ottumwa. The study, therefore, included schools of nearly all sizes found in Iowa.

The scope of the study, geographically, would have been much more adequate had all the schools contacted responded favorably or completely. The northeastern and central western quarters of the state were not contacted or questioned. It is believed, however, that the results would have been similar if a sampling of the entire state had been permitted by time and finances, since no noticeable differences in evaluations were evident from different localities.

The questionnaires used in this survey were compiled by Tiedeman after extended research in the field of pupil likes and dislikes of various teacher traits.

On the pupil questionnaire "How I Feel About What My Teacher Does"\(^1\), the student was given a choice of five answers. If the trait was not applicable to his teacher, he was to make no response. The choices for applicable traits were: (1) She (he) does this too often, (2) She (he) does this sometimes but it doesn't bother me, (3) I think she (he) should do this much

\(^1\) Appendix B.
oftener, (4) I think she (he) is perfectly right in doing this, and (5) I think it is wrong for her (him) to do this.

Because of the wording of choice number two and the fact that it did not bother the pupil, this section was not included in the pupil's evaluation of the relationship. "I think she (he) should do this much oftener" (choice number three) was also deleted because it was felt that the teacher did not possess this trait in sufficient degree to make a difference. Most of the pupils who checked this blank, who were comparatively few, also checked "She is perfectly right in doing this", which was counted. Actually, therefore, the pupil had only three choices if his teacher possessed the trait described.

Since all of the traits were worded from the negative view and since the teachers were rated by the average number of points given them by their respective students, the responses were weighted. Three points were given to every check under choices number one and number five (both negative feelings about a trait) and one point to every check under choice number four, a positive reaction to a trait. It was felt that this weighting would make up for the reluctance of children to check negative responses against traits found in their teacher.

The questionnaires used by the teacher and the super-
visor were identical; therefore, the total score was computed the same for both. The checks of each teacher and her supervisor were then transferred to the Teacher-Pupil Relationship Rating Scale. Each check was put under one of the following appropriate headings:

I. Autocratic
II. Ridicule
III. Threatens
IV. Individual Differences
V. Personal Peculiarity
VI. Partiality

Under each of these headings, nine questions commented favorably on the teacher and nine unfavorably. Of course, the person checking the questionnaire had no way of telling, outside his own intelligence and investigative powers, which questions fell under which headings.

The favorable responses were totaled. From these were subtracted the unfavorable responses, giving a score on the evaluation of the teacher's part in the relationship. The same was true of the questionnaire "How the Pupils Respond" used by the teacher and supervisor to evaluate
the children's part in the association. The checks on this questionnaire were transferred to a tally sheet\(^1\) in order to compute a score. These two scores were added together to get the total picture of the relationship as evaluated by the teacher and supervisor.

The criterion for determining the coefficient of correlation in all instances was the supervisor's evaluation of the teacher-pupil relationship. He was believed to be the most unbiased of the three judges of the relationship since his position calls for equal concern for the teacher and the pupil. The ranks assigned the relationship by the teacher were then compared with the ranks assigned by the supervisor using the formula

\[ \rho = 1 - \frac{6 \left( \frac{\bar{D}^2}{N} \right)}{N(N^2-1)} \]

The pupils' scores for each teacher were added and an average score was computed to be used in determining the deviation of the pupils' rank from the supervisor's rank. The rest of the calculations were identical with those of the teacher.

1. Sixth Grade (Thirteen Teachers)  Positive Correlation .139 (\(r = 0.140\)) with Supervisor

2. Fifth Grade (Twelve Teachers)  Positive Correlation .285 (\(r = 0.311\)) with Supervisor

The teachers' evaluations of the pupils' response to the teachers' behavior correlated positively as follows.

\(^1\) Appendix G.
CHAPTER III

DATA

Using total score ranking of the teacher-pupil relationship, the coefficient of correlation between the teachers' evaluations and the supervisors' evaluations was \( +.247 (r = .258) \), while the pupils' evaluations correlated \( +.679 (r = .697) \) with the supervisors' ranking.

The teachers' evaluations of their part in the teacher-pupil relationship was computed on a grade level basis, using the number of teachers in each grade and ranking them by grades. Of course, some teachers taught more than one grade and were, as a result, included in the ranking of both grades. The results were:

1. Seventh Grade
   (Fourteen Teachers)
   Positive Correlation
   \( .532 (r = .549) \) with Supervisor

2. Sixth Grade
   (Thirteen Teachers)
   Positive Correlation
   \( .136 (r = .140) \) with Supervisor

3. Fifth Grade
   (Twelve Teachers)
   Positive Correlation
   \( .292 (r = .311) \) with Supervisor

The teachers' evaluations of the pupils' response to the teachers' behavior correlated positively as follows...
with the supervisors' judgments:

1. Seventh Grade
   Correlated +.320
   \( (r = +.334) \) with
   Supervisors

2. Sixth Grade
   Teachers
   Correlated +.194
   \( (r = +.203) \) with
   Supervisors

3. Fifth Grade
   Teachers
   Correlated +.374
   \( (r = +.387) \) with
   Supervisors

The coefficients of correlation between the teachers' total score evaluations and the supervisors' total score evaluations and between the pupils' total score evaluations and the supervisors' total score evaluations are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Correlation between Teachers' Evaluations and Supervisors' Evaluations</th>
<th>Correlation between Pupils' Evaluations and Supervisors' Evaluations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seventh</td>
<td>+.557 ( (r = +.583) )</td>
<td>+.758 ( (r = +.770) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>+.084 ( (r = +.094) )</td>
<td>+.654 ( (r = +.669) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>+.350 ( (r = +.365) )</td>
<td>+.769 ( (r = +.802) )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From these figures it may be concluded that, when comparing evaluations of teacher-pupil relationships by rank based on the supervisors' ranking, the children are much better judges of the actual relationship than are the teachers. It should also be noted that the seventh grade teachers are the better judges of their part in the relationship, with fifth grade teachers second, and sixth grade teachers last. But in judging the pupils' reactions the fifth
grade teachers excel the seventh grade teachers by a slight margin, and both groups agree more closely with the supervisors than the sixth grade teachers in this study.

Each item on the teachers' evaluation was grouped under the six titles listed below. The rank correlation between the teachers' evaluation and the supervisors' evaluation, using twenty-seven teachers as a basis for ranking, were:

I. Autocratic Tendencies \( r = +.303 \)
II. Use of Ridicule \( r = +.317 \)
III. Threatens \( r = +.485 \)
IV. Individual Differences \( r = +.109 \)
V. Personal Peculiarities \( r = +.018 \)
VI. Partiality \( r = -.049 \)

The questions on the pupils' poll sheet were grouped in a similar manner. These responses correlated by rank with those of the supervisor, using the number of teachers in each grade as a basis of rank, as shown on the following graph.

From the following graph it is interesting to note the grouping of the pupils' rank correlations around those of the teachers in the first three categories, but marked deviations in the last three categories. The teachers' rankings exhibit a remarkably low positive correlation throughout all six categories.

The teachers and the fifth and sixth graders tend
Correlation of Evaluation of Selected Iowa Elementary Teachers and Pupils by Grades with the Evaluation of the Supervisors on Different Categories of the Teacher-Pupil Relationship.
group together on "Autocratic" and "Threatens" categories, but the sixth grade shows a much higher correlation on judging the "Use of Ridicule". There is nearly unanimous agreement in the three grades as to whether or not "Individual Differences" are taken care of adequately.

The greatest difference in the pupils' evaluations is between the fifth and sixth graders on "Personal Peculiarity". The closest agreement of pupil evaluations is in the fifth and sixth graders' evaluations of "Partiality".

It would appear from the above graph that teachers are not as aware of those items pertaining to their part in the relationships as are their supervisors or their pupils.

Apparently fifth and sixth grade pupils are more dependent on the teacher and have not yet reached the stage of seeking to establish independence. "Autocratic" leadership is, therefore, more welcomed and not so disagreeable to them as to the seventh graders.

The sixth graders are more sensitive to "Ridicule" and are better judges of this trait in their teachers than are the teachers themselves or the other two grades studied. The seventh graders again show their desire for independence in being better judges of the use of "Threats" than either of the other two pupil groups.

From the high correlation between the supervisors' rankings on "Individual Differences" and those of all three grades, it is evident that all pupils are aware of whether
the teachers are doing their job adequately toward them as individuals. Fifth and sixth grade pupils are better judges than seventh graders of "Partiality" shown by the teacher.

The relationships were ranked according to total scores and by the size of the schools as described previously. The number of schools in each size group was used as a basis for ranking; the results follow:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of School</th>
<th>Correlation between Teachers' Evaluations and Supervisors' Evaluations</th>
<th>Correlation between Pupils' Evaluations and Supervisors' Evaluations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Small</td>
<td>+.200 (r = +.209)</td>
<td>+.629 (r = +.642)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Medium</td>
<td>+.030 (r = +.031)</td>
<td>+.491 (r = +.503)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Large</td>
<td>+.371 (r = +.385)</td>
<td>+.600 (r = +.613)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When ranked with all the relationships, instead of just the size school group, by total scores, the picture changed somewhat, with the evaluations of the teachers and pupils in the medium-sized schools having a high correlation than the evaluations of the teachers and pupils of large schools. The opposite was true when only the teachers' evaluations of relationships in large schools were ranked with evaluations of other teachers from large schools. The results of ranking as an entire group are:
Correlation between Teachers' Evaluations and Supervisors' Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Schools</th>
<th>Correlation between Pupils' Evaluations and Supervisors' Evaluations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Small</td>
<td>+.823 (r = +.833)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Medium</td>
<td>+.733 (r = +.747)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Large</td>
<td>+.694 (r = +.708)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is concluded that teachers are less subject in evaluating themselves and their peers than the students, relationships that they are the fearful of authority to be able to have a free evaluation, or that they are just too concerned for their own personal ego and security to evaluate their own behavior without inhibitions. Something causes them to be less accurate in evaluation than their pupils when they should be more accurate. Sixth grade teachers in this study proved to be the poorest judges of the effects of their behavior on pupils.

Teachers are better judges of their students' behavior than of their own more passive behavior. The students are better judges of the more passive behavior of their teachers than they are of the teachers' overt behavior. It may be that the less obvious, more hidden, teachers' behaviors bother the pupils more than the overt ones.

The results of this study show that the sixth grade school teachers are less subject to influence with their supervisors' evaluations than with relationships with.
CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS

From the data presented in this study it is concluded that teachers are too modest in evaluating themselves and their part in the teacher-pupil relationships; that they are too fearful of authority to be able to make a free evaluation; or that they are just too fearful for their own personal ego and security to evaluate their own behavior without inhibitions. Something causes them to be less accurate in evaluation than their pupils when they should be more accurate. Sixth grade teachers in this study proved to be the poorest judges of the effects of their behavior on pupils.

Teachers are better judges of their own overt behavior than of their own more passive behavior. The students are better judges of the more passive behavior of their teachers than they are of the teachers' overt behavior. It may be that the less obvious, more insidious teachers' behaviors bother the pupils more than the overt behavior.

The results of this study show that the rural small school teachers and pupils agree more closely with their supervisors' evaluations of teacher-pupil relationships than ranking of the relationship and the supervisors' ranking.
do their city or urban counterparts with their supervisors. Perhaps this is further evidence of the ability of the teachers who have all grades in the same room to get along with people better than the specialized, or departmentalized, teacher of the bigger systems. It may also be indicative of the close cooperation and personal understanding between the rural supervisor and his teachers.

A great need exists for closer cooperation and planning between the teachers and their supervisors. The same is true of teachers and pupils. Although twenty-seven teachers and their supervisors participated in this study the correlation between teachers' evaluations of the teacher-pupil relationship and the supervisors' evaluations was only +.247, while the evaluations of the 529 students correlated with the supervisors' evaluations +.679, which is quite a difference. This only makes the problem of self-evaluations by teachers more imperative and critical. Of course, it should not be overlooked that an equal share of the responsibility for the differences in correlations might be accredited to the supervisors but with the relatively high correlation between their rankings and those of the pupils one can only conclude that the majority of the burden rests with the teachers.

In only four of the twenty-seven teachers' evaluations was there a marked difference between the teachers' ranking of the relationship and the supervisors' ranking.
These were all cases in which the supervisors rated the relationship especially low. Teachers should lend a more attentive ear to the opinions of her charges; they have earned a little more respect by their judgments than probably has been afforded them in the past.

One important part of the relationship only was covered in this study existing between teacher and pupil in the classroom; that of the personal relationship. The teacher's influence "after and before school hours" is also worthy of consideration. Her attitudes and philosophy of life and how they sway their pupils would be another interesting field of study. A more detailed study analyzing the response by pupils in behavior and attitudes to specific teacher traits would be profitable to both the teacher and the supervisor.
Card Questionnaire:

Dear Mr. __________:

I am conducting a study of teacher-pupil relationships in selected Iowa elementary schools. The results will include responses of teachers, pupils, and supervisors (or administrators) on a brief questionnaire relating to teacher's classroom practices and procedures and pupils reactions to these procedures.

I need your help in completing this study. Would you be kind enough to cooperate by permitting this questionnaire to be filled out by your fifth, sixth, and seventh grade teachers, pupils, and by yourself and/or supervisor. If you would be willing to cooperate in this study, will you please fill out the attached return postal card and mail it.

Sincerely,

I will cooperate ______ I won't cooperate ______

Name of School: ____________________________________________

Person Responsible for Evaluating Teachers: ______________________

Title: ______________________________________________________

Total No. of 5th, 6th, 7th Grade Teachers: ____________

Total No. of 5th, 6th, 7th Grade Students: ________________
APPENDIX B

How I Feel About What My Teacher Does

On this form you will be given a chance to tell how you feel about some things which your teacher does at different times.

In the column headed "What My Teacher Does" are listed some things your teacher may do at certain times. You are to tell as well as you can how you feel about each one of these things that your teacher does by putting a check (✓) mark in the proper column or columns under the heading "How I Feel About What My Teacher Does". Perhaps your teacher doesn't do all the things listed here. If that is the case you will not have any feeling about some of them so you will not check these items. You are, however, expected to have some feeling about each of the things that your teacher does and to check one or more of the columns to describe that feeling.

Remember to think about one teacher all the time and be honest in telling how you feel. No one who knows you will see your paper. Do not sign your name.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher's No. or Name</th>
<th>Pupil's Grade</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Pupil's Age</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOW I FEEL ABOUT WHAT MY TEACHER DOES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>She (he) does this too often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think she (he) is perfectly right in doing this.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. "Punishes" me about my behavior.
2. Compares in front of the class the way I behave with how others behave.
3. Becomes Cross when I ask questions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHAT MY TEACHER DOES</th>
<th>She (he) does this too often</th>
<th>She (he) does this sometimes but it doesn't bother me.</th>
<th>I think she (he) should do this much oftener.</th>
<th>I think it is perfectly right in doing this.</th>
<th>I think it is wrong for her (him) to do this.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Is cross or angry when I try to exchange ideas with her (or him) in class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Is impatient or angry when I give suggestions in class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Scolds me if I don't do well, even if I tried my best.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Threatens to punish me but never does.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Threatens to fail me if I don't behave.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Gives me harder assignments in order to make me behave.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Lowers my grade if I don't behave right.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Talks about the bad in me rather than the good.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Gives me a lot of homework if I am naughty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Acts like a &quot;bigshot&quot; in class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Talks about how much she (or he) knows.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHAT MY TEACHER DOES</td>
<td>(She (he) does this too often)</td>
<td>She (he) does this sometimes but it doesn't bother me.</td>
<td>I think she (he) should do this much oftener.</td>
<td>I think she (he) is perfectly right in doing this.</td>
<td>I think it is wrong for her (him) to do this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Acts like a boss in class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Believes that her (or his) ideas are better or more important than pupil's ideas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Makes me work out my lessons exactly as she (or he) would work them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Says that she (or he) has not made a mistake even when pupils know she (or he) has made one.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Says she (or he) is too busy to give me special help with my work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Allows other pupils to get away with things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Gives better grades to some pupils than to others, even if both do equally well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Lets other pupils do things I am not allowed to do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Shows more interest in her (or his) own work than in my hobbies or what I like to do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOW I FEEL ABOUT WHAT MY TEACHER DOES</td>
<td>She (he) does this too often</td>
<td>She (he) does this sometimes but it doesn't bother me.</td>
<td>I think she (he) should do this much oftener.</td>
<td>I think it is perfectly right in doing this.</td>
<td>I think it is wrong for her (him) to do this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHAT MY TEACHER DOES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Acts more interested in other pupils than in me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Stops explaining whenever she (or he) feels like it without asking us whether we understand.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Does lots of things in class that I can't see any reason for doing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Makes the class uninteresting to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Does not explain the assignments clearly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Gives me things to do that are &quot;too hard&quot; for me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Has me do things without my knowing why I do them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TEACHER-PUPIL RELATIONSHIP RATING SCALE

This is a series of traits, characteristics, and practices common to teachers and pupils. Check the numbers of the traits, characteristics, and practices which you consider most descriptive of Teacher No. _____ and her pupils. This evaluation was made by _____ the teacher _____ the supervisor.

1. Is tolerant and considerate.
2. Maintains reserved, formal atmosphere.
3. Finds fault with pupils' activity.
4. Constructively criticizes pupils' physical and social activities when necessary.
5. Is kind and friendly.
6. Refuses to accept an apology for a mistake, preferring to carry a grudge as a weapon to make pupil behave.
7. Genuinely interested in welfare of every pupil.
8. Judges pupils as adults.
9. Interest in pupils depends on teacher's mood.
11. Grades all pupils on basis of actual achievement--not on basis of personal likes or dislikes.
12. Is prejudiced against boys, or girls.
13. Encourages pupil participation or activity.
14. Tolerates no joking or laughing in classroom.
15. Likes to make people squirm; is inconsiderate of pupils' feelings.
16. Privately points out pupil behavior difficulties and suggests ways of improvement.
17. Maintains such friendly and cooperative relationships with pupils that disciplinary problems do not develop.
18. Is harsh and unfriendly.
19. Shows sympathetic understanding of pupil needs.
20. Is interested primarily in subject matter.
21. Dislikes being bothered by pupils' problems.
22. Is encouraging, resourceful, patient, and courteous.
23. Regards all pupils as being equally deserving of advice, guidance and recognition.
24. "Sticks up" for smaller children even when they are to blame for misdeeds.
25. Guides pupils' activities without domination.
26. Intolerant and inconsiderate.
27. Permits pupils to ridicule and laugh at each other.
28. Makes pupils feel that they have an important contribution to make when speaking to the class.
29. Speaks to the class in a pleasant, but authoritative, tone of voice.
30. Makes use of corporal punishment.
31. Provides for success among all pupils.
32. More concerned with school routine and administration than with student welfare.
33. Does not compliment or encourage pupils.
34. Inspires confidence in pupils.
35. Treats every pupil as though he were worth knowing and had a definite contribution to make to the group.
36. Is inconsistent and unreliable in handling pupils.
37. Encourages pupils to formulate own plans and procedures with a minimum of direction.
38. Is indecisive and dogmatic with classroom objectives.
39. Ridicules pupils.
40. Considers pupils’ present emotional status when making suggestions, requests, or criticisms.
41. Establishes and maintains feeling of belongingness on part of all pupils.
42. Sends pupils to the office for discipline.
43. Encourages originality in pupils.
44. Does not consider pupil needs.
45. Remains aloof, impartial, impatient.
46. Is understanding and sympathetic toward pupils and their problems.
47. Treats boys and girls equally—no favoritism toward either group.
48. "Picks on" certain pupils.
49. Permits free purposeful discussion among pupils in class.
50. Demands strict conformity to established procedures and practices.
51. Is sarcastic.
52. Prevents pupils from ridiculing or laughing at each others mistakes.
53. Quick to accept an apology for a mistake rather than punish a child for it.
54. Threatens pupils in order to maintain discipline.
55. Provides adequate motivation based on interests, needs, background of pupils.
56. Is not interested in pupils' welfare.
57. Has no sense of humor; never friendly or cheerful.
58. Has respect of all pupils.
59. Does not accuse an innocent person of wrongdoing to protect someone else she "likes better".
60. Has "pets"; is partial.
61. Acts in capacity of adviser, counsellor, and companion rather than dictator or director.
62. Discourages overt pupil activity.
63. Nags and preaches.
64. Emphasizes the good points in pupils' activities or work.
65. Considers grades and marks merely as incidentals in the training and guidance of pupils.
66. Tears up pupils' papers for making mistakes.
67. Is more interested in guiding and advising pupils than in indiscriminately doling out knowledge to all.
68. Has very little concern for pupils' interests, needs, and capacities.
69. Fails to develop confidence in weaker pupils.
70. Remains calm and composed under all circumstances.
71. Assigns desirable duties or responsibilities to all pupils on the basis of merit or capability.
72. Marks certain pupils lower than they deserve.
73. Welcomes suggestions, criticisms, and original ideas from pupils, and utilizes them if possible.
74. Allows pupils to participate only frequently.
75. Criticizes children openly.
76. In private conference points out errors to slow or dull pupils, and suggests possible improvements.
77. Recognizes pupils' resistance to authority as an impersonal attitude of early adolescence.
78. Keeps pupils after school to do additional school work for punishment.
79. Adjusts work to interests, needs, and capacities of pupils.
80. Makes dull pupils compete with bright pupils, and expects some standard of achievement from both groups.
81. Is unkind and unsympathetic.
82. Takes initiative in developing wholesome, positive relationships with boys and girls.
83. Expects every pupil to do the best work of which he is capable.
84. Accuses some pupils of something they didn't do, in order to protect some pupil, or pupils, whom she likes.
85. Has excellent comradeship with pupils.
86. Dictates procedures and decisions.
87. Calls attention of class to differences between dull and bright pupils.
88. Maintains an "at ease" attitude on part of self and pupils.
89. Maintains adequate and efficient working and studying conditions in classroom without resorting to force.
90. Screams at pupils to scare them into submission.
91. Provides remedial work for weaker pupils.
92. Discourages pupils' originality.
93. Is tense, impatient, discourteous.
94. Welcomes pupils' problems.
95. Judges all pupils or situations impartially on basis of facts, not emotions.
96. Is unfair.
97. Provides suitable activities as outlets for adolescent urge for association with peers.
98. Dominates pupils.
99. Makes a pupil stand in front of the class and makes a spectacle of him.
100. Tactfully, not sarcastically, calls pupils' attention to errors in written or spoken classwork.

101. Believes the administrative office is not for disciplinary problems.

102. Gives zero or other low grades as punishment.

103. Considers differences in intelligence and background when evaluating pupils' achievement.

104. Does not attempt to motivate pupils; complains of disinterest and laziness among pupils.

105. Fails to command respect of pupils; lacks poise, is ill at ease, and fears pupils.

106. Has real interest in, and liking for, boys and girls.

107. Feels that continuous praise of selected pupils is unfair.

108. Ignores needs, requests, or desires of certain pupils.
HOW THE PUPILS RESPOND

1. Some pupils are frequently inattentive.
2. Occasional breaches of discipline.
3. Continual prodding is necessary.
4. Disciplinary problems are frequent.
5. Pupils have formal attitude in work.
6. Pupils respond wholeheartedly, eagerly, and enthusiastically.
7. Respect for teacher as a specialist.
8. Pupils are physically and mentally alert.
9. Class is conscious of favoritism.
10. Pupils are selfish and undemocratic.
11. Most pupils are lazy and inattentive.
12. Pupils ignore teacher's demands.
13. Many pupils are listless and unresponsive.
14. Pupils are frequently sullen and rebellious.
15. Pupils are afraid of the teacher.
16. Pupils are eager to contribute and accept evaluation.
17. Weaker pupils feel inferior.
18. Teacher is respected as a leader and companion.
19. Pupils are self-conscious.
20. Only a few pupils volunteer their ideas.
21. Pupils are motivated largely by grades.
22. Pupils are rude to teacher.
23. Pupils like library books but not text-books.
24. Capable pupils monopolize discussion.
25. Widespread day-dreaming in class.
26. All pupils are confident and participate freely.
27. Pupils are unduly dependent on teacher for guidance and direction.
28. Pupils are unafraid to express ideas and opinions.
29. Attempts to hide embarrassment.
30. Pupils are afraid to try.
31. Interest in discussion is short-lived.
32. Frequent misbehavior.
33. Pupils respond spasmodically.
34. General whispering, talking, and confusion in classroom.
35. General "Don't care" attitude.
36. Pupils are eager to learn.
37. Pupils express little or no originality in written or oral work.
38. Widespread pupil participation.
39. Frequent pupil defense reactions.
40. Pupil activity without purpose or aim.
Finally, the children should continue their evaluations while the teacher is absent from the room (if possible) and prefer-
under the guidance of their immediate supervisors. The evaluations should be similar to the one just completed. A spontancous answer to the question will be obtained from the children if they are interested in the questions made of their

This study should be completed at the end of the present

Educators have long been concerned with teacher-pupil

Supervisors, on the other hand, are concerned with the same problem especially when it is time to evaluate the
teacher. Most supervisors do not have the time to make a thorough investigation or study of how pupils respond to their teachers.

I am making a study to determine to what extent the supervisor's, the teacher's, and the pupils' evaluations of
teacher-pupil relationships in the classroom agree. The schools in which this study is being conducted represent the typical Iowa elementary school in size, location, and organization. I appreciate your consent to cooperate with me on this subject.

The questionnaires are being mailed to you today under separate cover. Would you (or the teacher's immediate super-
visor) please check the items applicable to your fifth, sixth, and seventh grade teachers (including special subject teachers) on the sheet marked "Supervisor" and seal them in the clasp en-
velope enclosed with the questionnaires before distributing the evaluation sheets to the teacher or the pupils. This will pre-
vent anyone from seeing your evaluation and thereby influencing his own.

The teacher should make her evaluation on the same type check-list used by the supervisor, and should seal it in the stamped envelope marked for her. She should be assured that her evaluation will be held in the strictest confidence. To further insure anonymity, each teacher should be given a number and this number (instead of her name) should be placed on each of the three evaluations.

Prairie City, Iowa
December, 1963
Finally, the children should make their evaluations while the teacher is absent from the room (if possible) and preferably under the guidance of the supervisor. The children's evaluations should be sealed in the clasp envelopes in their presence and mailed as soon as possible after completion. A more spontaneous answer to the questions will be obtained from the children if they are informed of the use being made of their response.

This study should be completed before the end of the present school term. I shall be glad to mail you a copy of the results if you will put a check indicating that desire in the space provided on the questionnaire.

Thank you so much for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

P. S. Please don't throw this letter in "FILE 13" or tuck it away in your "Future Reference" folder. I would appreciate your placing it with items for "Immediate Attention."
# APPENDIX G

## HOW PUPILS RESPOND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I No Interest</th>
<th>II Dominate</th>
<th>III Submit</th>
<th>IV Secure</th>
<th>V Insecure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Underlining of question number indicates desirable items.*

---
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