E-ISSN: 2676-1750 Journal of Studies in Language, Culture, and Society (JSLCS).
Received: 04-11-2018 Published: 31-12-2018 (01) 01, 2018. (PP 155-168)

Nor El Houda Khiari[1]
Faculty of Arts and Languages, University of Bejaia, Algeria

UNDERTAKING EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE SKILLS TRAINING TO OVERCOM SPEAKING ANXIETY AMONG NON-NATIVE PRE-SERVICE EFL TEACHERS

The Case of Third Year EFL Pre-Service Teachers at Oum El Bouaghi University, Algeria

Abstract

With the growing number of the learners who suffer from Foreign Language Speaking Anxiety (FLSA), it is becoming increasingly difficult to ignore its harmful outcomes on their performance and success, especially during their first contact with the pupils, as they will be teaching in the near future. The present study sheds light on Emotional Intelligence skills training as an effective strategy to help learners lessen their speaking anxiety and eventually to prepare them for their professional career. A quasi-experiment is used with two groups of third year EFL students. The Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) and the Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i) were used to collect data about the participants' FLSA and EI levels. The data analysis has yielded that the assumption that there is a negative correlation between EI and FLSA was statistically validated by the Pearson Correlation Test, concluding that, the more emotionally intelligent the individual is the less anxious s/he will be. In addition, the lack of amelioration in the results of the control group and the noteworthy improvement in the experimental group's results led us to conclude that the training was an effective strategy in minimizing the FLSA level and therefore, we confirmed our hypothesis.

Keywords: Emotional Intelligence, Emotional Intelligence skills training, EQ-I, FLCAS, Foreign Language Speaking Anxiety, Pre-Service EFL Teachers.

1. Introduction

The nature of teaching makes it one of the most stressful careers, and the case of non-native pre-service EFL teachers can be even more serious. Before they begin to teach English, those pre-service teachers were once EFL learners. With the increasing demand for English as a lingua franca of education, business, science, and technology, many universities and language schools emphasize the oral skill and make of it a must. Normally, third year pre-service EFL teachers who have been studying English for many years should have at least an average or above average proficiency of English which allows them to speak fluently without being anxious or feeling unable to communicate. Unfortunately, many students with high capacities are hidden because they suffer from Speaking Anxiety (SA). These learners, who are willing to be EFL teachers in the near future, find the oral courses much demanding. They feel unable to communicate, they fear making mistakes, and they fear negative evaluation or being called on. These factors and others cause various degrees of anxiety that EFL learners as well as pre-service and novice teachers do not know how to cope with.

[1] **Email**: norelhoudakhiari@gmail.com

2. Review of Literature

'Speech fright', 'stage fright' and 'public speech anxiety' are all names that refer to anxiety occurring when giving a speech in public. MacIntyre and Gardner (1994) described FLSA as the worry experienced when a specific situation requires a not fully proficient speaker to use a second or a foreign language. Tsipalakides (as cited in Siyli & Kafes, 2015, p. 26) also defined FLSA as a "mental blockage during speaking activities, forgetting previously learned materials and passivity in the class". The negative effect of anxiety on the learner's cognitive processing system, especially the retrieval processes duri cv ng an oral performance, was summarized by MacIntyre (1995) who argued that the reason behind the poor performance of EFL learners is the competition between the task-relevant information for space in the learner's processing system with the task-irrelevant information. For example, when presenting a lecture in class, novice teachers focus on (i) giving information with accurate grammar and pronunciation and at the same time (ii) evaluating the reactions of the pupils and worrying about unexpected situations to the extent that task-irrelevant information (such as negative self-evaluation and self-deprecating thoughts) increases and task-related information is restricted and therefore the performance suffers and will be impaired.

Many teachers look for effective ways to improve EFL learners' oral performance and increase their willingness to communicate. In relating EI to FLSA, public speaking is not about just giving information, rather, it is about engaging with an audience by emotions and emotional impact, even when delivering facts. Beginners as well as advanced learners suffer from FLSA; anxiety and fear are both emotions. Bar-On (2004) described EI as an "array of non-cognitive capabilities, competencies, and non-cognitive skills that influence one's ability to succeed in coping with situational demands and pressures" (p.111). In other words, EI concerns the ability to reason and think correctly about feelings and emotions and to use emotions and emotional knowledge contained in them to foster thinking and reasoning for the general purpose of enhancing different life domains. EI has different competencies, and each of them can not only influence public speaking success but also can help overcoming or at least minimizing SA through learning how to manage those emotions in an intelligent way. That is why EI is very important for shy, violent, anxious, lazy and negative people (Roohani, 2009).

It was believed that an individual's level of intelligence is relatively fixed and difficult to change (Mayer & Salovey, 1993). Nonetheless, "Intelligence can be learned and improved throughout life" (Gardner, 1983, p. 41). Many researchers (e.g. Jacobs, 2001; Gardner, 1983; Cherniss & Goleman, 2001) believed that EI skills and competences can be taught, learned and developed regardless the age of the person; however, it is more difficult and is time consuming to train people on EI skills compared to cognitive skills. EI training is "the process of teaching and learning the skills, knowledge and dispositions that allow people to understand, process, manage and express the social-emotional aspects of their lives" (Saarni, 2007, p.17).

3. Methodology

3.1 Context

The present study aims at investigating the effect of EI skills training on overcoming or at least minimizing pre-service teachers' FLSA. It addresses the following ***questions***:

- Is there any relationship between the pre-service EFL teachers' EI level and their FLSA?
- To what extent does the EI skills training help pre-service EFL teachers to overcome their SA?

The study is based on one main ***hypothesis***: Undergoing Emotional Intelligence skills training would relatively reduce the pre-service EFL teachers' Speaking Anxiety.

3.2 Participants

The population of the present study is 139 male and female third year EFL learners in the English Department of Larbi Ben Mhidi University who have been studying English for about nine years, from middle school to present university form. This period of time is long enough to lessen their anxiety related to novelty and unfamiliarity with both the university environment and the foreign language and it implies that they have at least an average proficiency and knowledge of English which we assume allow them to participate in the experiment. Since the groups are already formed by the administration, two groups out of three are chosen randomly to be the sample of the study. The participants are 55 male and female students representing 39.57% of the whole population.

3.3 Procedures

The nature of this research, which is estimating the causal impact between the two research variables, made it necessary to conduct an experimental design. There is a random selection of the groups but not of the participants and this made our design a quasi-experimental one.

First, both groups received the pre-test which consists of two scales: the EQ-i and the FLCAS to measure their levels of EI and FLSA before receiving the treatment. Nine items in the FLCAS (i.e. items 2, 5, 8, 11, 14, 18, 22, 28 and 32) need reverse scoring because they are negatively worded so that a higher score would be an indicator of higher anxiety (Aida, 1994). After conducting the pre-test, participants in the experimental group took part in a discrete training designed to teach the EI skills and how to use them to reduce FLSA. The control group carried out their lectures as usual and they did not receive any treatment. After the training period, the FLCAS and the EQ-i were used once again in the post-test to see the progress of the participants and to test the effectiveness of the training.

Table 1

The Training Sessions Design

Sessions	Duration	Skills
1st Session	90 Min	An introductory session aims at helping the participants of the experimental group recognize the benefits of the training; motivate them to be self-directed to participate in it and to develop positive expectations about it
2nd Session		Identifying Emotions: Accurate perception of emotions: About the self About the others Accurately expressing emotions The techniques used in this session are: Facial expressions, body language, and voice tones Story - Emotion Checklist for videos
3rd Session		Using Emotions: To have better social relationships To enhance reasoning and decision making The self-help techniques used in this session are: Creative visualization - Positive Self-talk
4th Session		Understanding Emotions The self-help techniques used in this session are: - Reflecting on past experiences - Story
5th Session		Managing Emotions: Managing Feelings of the Self Managing Feelings of Others The self-help techniques used in this session are: Creative visualization Positive Self-talk Breathing Exercises
6th Session		In this concluding session we recapitulated and summed up what we had seen during the whole training period. The participants were motivated to make efforts and learn from their mistakes. They were also encouraged to apply what they had learned from the training in their real life and to be aware of the possible difficulties they may face; some situations would not go according to their plans.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Results

The collected data were analysed quantitatively using the Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS). It is worth noting that all tables of scores

have been arranged in appendices. It has been done so for a pure 'arrangement constraint'.

4.1.1 Pre-Test Results

The participants' FLCAS scores were calculated and arranged from the higher to the lower then categorized into five levels (Very low Anxiety, Low Anxiety, Moderate Anxiety, High Anxiety, Very high Anxiety). Then the descriptive statistics of the participants' FLSA level were calculated.

Concerning the EQ-i results, the participants' raw scores were calculated then transformed into standard scores which were in turn categorized into five levels (Very much below average, Below average, Average, Above average, Very much above average). Finally, the descriptive statistics of the participants' EI level were calculated.

The results of both groups on the pre-test are summarized in table 2.

Table 2

The Experimental Group and the Control Group Results on the Pre-Test

			Experimental Group	Control Group	The difference*
FLSA	Desc. Stat**	Minimum	96	92	-4
		Maximum	137	148	11
		Mean	113.04	115.52	2.48
		Standard Deviation	10.525	15.024	4.499
	SA range	Very high SA	3.6%	11.1%	7.5%
		High SA	50%	37%	-13%
		Moderate SA	46.4%	51.9%	5.5%
		Low SA	0%	0%	0%
		Very low SA	0%	0%	0%
EI	Desc. Stat**	Minimum	73	75	2
		Maximum	127	133	6
		Mean	100	100	0
		Standard Deviation	15.036	15.013	-0.023
	EI range	Very much below average	0%	0%	0%
		Below average	25%	25.9%	0.9%

		Average	57.1%	59.3%	2.2%
		Above average	17.9%	11.1%	-6.8%
		Very much above average	0%	3.7%	3.7%

*The difference= Control Group Scores – Experimental Group Scores

**Desc. Stat: Descriptive Statistics

4.1.1.1 The Independent Samples T-Test

The t value was calculated using SPSS then compared to the correspondent t in the table of the critical values of t distribution (known as 'Table D') which equals 2.000. Since the latter is greater than the calculated t ($t_{FLSA} = -0.712$; $t_{raw\ scores} = 1.376$; $t_{standard\ scores} = 0.000$), then we can say that there is no significant difference between the experimental and the control groups' levels of SA and EI.

4.1.1.2 The Pearson Correlation Test

Since we are investigating the relationship between two variables, the most appropriate test is the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient.

$r = -0.807 < -0.6$
$P = 0.000 < 0.05$
} We conclude that: There is a significant strong negative relationship between FLSA and EI, $r = -0.807$, $P < 0.001$

4.1.2 The post-test results

The participants in both groups were asked to answer the two scales (the FLCAS and the EQ-i) once again to see their progress. The same procedure followed in analyzing the pre-test results was followed with the post-test.

The results of both groups on the post-test are summarized in table 3.

Table 3

The Experimental Group and the Control Group Results on the Post-Test

			Experimental Group	Control Group	The Difference*
FLSA	Desc. Stat**	Minimum	63	73	10
		Maximum	118	149	31
		Mean	91.32	111.26	19.94
		Standard Deviation	14.124	18.386	4.262
	SA range	Very high SA	0%	11.1%	11.1%
		High SA	14.3%	40.7%	26.4%
		Moderate SA	42.9%	37%	-5.9%
		Low SA	42.9%	11.1%	-31.8%
		Very low SA	0%	0%	0%

EI	Desc. Stat**	Minimum	72	84	12
		Maximum	125	136	11
		Mean	99.96	99.96	0
		Standard Deviation	15.012	15.019	0.007
	SA range	Very much below average	0%	0%	0%
		Below average	35.7	33.3%	-2.4%
		Average	39.3%	44.4%	5.1%
		Above average	25%	14.8%	-10.2%
		Very much above average	0%	7.4%	7.4%

*The difference= Control Group Scores – Experimental Group Scores

**Desc. Stat: Descriptive Statistics

We noticed that there is a difference between the two groups, but we need to determine if the difference is statistically significant or not. By conducting the ***Independent Samples T-test*** and comparing the calculated t (t_{FLSA} = -4.498; $t_{raw\ scores}$ = 5.270) with the correspondent t in the 'Table D' which equals 2.000 we deduce that the experimental and the control groups' SA and EI levels are significantly different:

1. The participants' FLSA level on the experimental group post-test is statistically significantly lower than the participants' FLSA level on the control group post-test.
2. The participants' EI raw scores on the experimental group post-test are statistically significantly higher than the participants' EI raw scores on the control group post-test.

➔ So, we conclude that the significant difference between the experimental and the control groups after the treatment period is due to our EI skills training and not by a chance.

4.1.2.1 The Paired Samples T-Test

This test is used with both groups in order to determine if the difference between their results on the pre and the post-tests is statistically significant or not.

Table 4

SPSS Results of the Paired Samples T-Test of the Experimental Group

	Paired Differences					t	f	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	D	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
FLSA Pre-Test – FLSA Post-Test	21.714	9.3	3.653	14.220	29.209	5.945	7	.000
Raw Scores Pre-Test – Raw Scores Post-Test	-46.321	3.6	8.241	-63.231	-29.412	-5.621	7	.000
Standard Scores Pre-Test – Standard Scores Post-Test	.036	8.8	3.553	-7.254-	7.326	.010	7	.992

As shown in table 4, the P-values of the FLSA and raw scores are less than 0.001 whereas the P-value of the standard scores is approximately equal to 0.5. So, we conclude:

1. The participants' FLSA level on the experimental group post-test is statistically significantly lower than their FLSA level on the pre-test, t(27)= 5.945, P=0.000<0.05 (one-tail)
2. The participants' EI raw scores on the experimental group post-test are statistically significantly higher than their EI raw scores on the pre-test, t(27)= -5.621, P=0.000<0.05 (one-tail)
3. The participants' EI standard scores on the experimental group pre and post-tests are statistically significantly identical, t(27)= 0.010, P= 0.496 >0.05 (one-tail)

Table 5

SPSS Results of the Paired Samples T-Test of the Control Group

	Paired Differences					t	f	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	SD	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
FLSA Pre-Test – FLSA Post-Test	4.259	14.02	2.698	-1.287	9.806	1.578	6	.127
Raw Scores Pre-Test – Raw Scores Post-Test	-7.185	19.52	3.756	-14.906	.536	-1.913	6	.067
Standard Scores Pre-Test – Standard Scores Post-Test	.037	10.24	1.970	-4.013	4.087	.019	6	.985

As indicated in table 5, P (FLSA) = 0.063 > 0.05 (one-tail). It may be observed that the participants' FLSA levels on the control group's pre and post-tests are not statistically significantly different, t(26)= 1.578, P=0.063 > 0.05

As indicated in the same table, P (EI raw scores) = 0.033 < 0.05 (one-tail). It may be deduced that the participants' EI raw scores on the control group pre and post-tests are statistically different, t(26)= 1.578, P=0.063 > 0.05. However, the fact that they are different does not imply that there is a significant difference between them because the critical value (t= -1.913) is 30 times bigger than 0.05. This proves that the difference between the control group EI raw scores on the pre and post-tests are very insignificant.

Moreover, as table 5 shows, P (EI standard scores) = 0.492>0.05 (one-tail) which indicates that the control group pre and post-tests standard scores are statistically significantly identical.

4.2 Discussion

- ***Is there any relationship between EI and learners' FLSA?***

The assumption that there is a negative correlation between EI and FLSA was statistically significantly validated by the Pearson Test using the pre-test results of both experimental and control groups. The Pearson's ***r*** of the experimental group equals -0.807 which is very close to -1, signifying that there is a strong negative relationship between the students' EI and FLSA scores. Similarly, it has been found that the control group Pearson's ***r*** equals -0.721 which is close to -1, signifying a strong negative correlation between the two research variables. It is therefore deduced that the more emotionally intelligent the participant is the less anxious will be.

- ***To what extent does the EI skills training help EFL students to overcome their speaking anxiety?***

Our quasi-experiment's results, which were validated with the Paired Samples T-Test and the Independent Sample T-Test, confirmed the research hypothesis, showing an acceptable improvement of the participants' scores after receiving the treatment (EI skills training). What was remarkable after the training is that almost all the participants in the experimental group (89.29%) had lower levels of FLSA, except two participants (N°15 and N°24) who remained at the same level (7.14%) and one student (N°20) who had a higher level of FLSA (3.57%). The two students who remained at their SA level, had higher EI raw scores, but when we compared these raw scores to the whole experimental group's mean we found that they had lower EI standard scores. Also, 24 students (85.71%) had higher EI raw scores after the treatment. The other 4 students (6, 17, 20 and 28) had a lower EI raw scores and lower EI standard scores (14.29%). The participant 6 difference score is only -1, so it is highly not significant. Concerning the participant 20 who had higher FLSA and lower EI, maybe, because she was absent 2 times from the training. In addition if we consider the activity they were asked to perform in the oral module we find it "Telling Stories" which may be another possibility for raising their SA. In order to find out the reason behind the decline of the participants 17 and 28, an informal interview was conducted with them. Unfortunately, it did not help us with any worthy explanation.

All in all, the lack of amelioration in the results of the control group and the noteworthy improvement in the experimental group results (which was confirmed to be due to our treatment and not by a chance) lead us to conclude that EI skills training was an effective strategy in minimizing the FLSA level and therefore, we confirm our research hypothesis.

5. Conclusion

There was an encouragement from the previous studies to create and incorporate EI training into the EFL classes' programmes. This study focused on EI skills and competencies to overcome or at least minimize FLSA. The present piece of work investigated the possible effect of EI skills training on lowering Non-Native Pre-Service Teachers' FLSA following a quasi-experimental design.

There was a random selection of the control and experimental groups but not of the participants themselves who were already randomly put together by the administration. The FLSA level of our population was found to be high and their EI level was moderate. The results of the study revealed that instructing students the EI skills was statistically significant and successful in reducing their anxiety in speaking classes. Therefore, our research hypothesis is confirmed validating our assumption that there is a negative correlation between the two variables. In the light of the present study's findings, more importance should be given to Emotional Intelligence as an effective strategy to minimize Foreign Language Speaking Anxiety and its negative outcomes in the EFL classrooms.

References

Aida, Y. (1994). Examination of Horowitz, Horowitz, and Cope's construct of foreign language anxiety: The case of students of Japanese. *The Modern Language Journal, 78*, 155-168. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.1994.tb02026

BarOn, R. (2004). The Bar-On emotional quotient inventory (EQ-i): Rationale, description, and summary of psychometric properties. In Glenn Geher (Ed.), *Measuring emotional intelligence: Common ground and controversy* (pp, 111-142). Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science Publishers.

Cherniss, C., & Goleman, D. (2001). Training for emotional intelligence: A model. In C. Cherniss & D. Goleman (Eds.), *The emotionally intelligent workplace: How to select for, measure, and improve emotional intelligence in individuals, groups, and organizations* (pp, 209-233). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. New York: Basic Books.

Jacobs, R. L. (2001). Using human resource functions to enhance emotional intelligence. In C. Cherniss & D. Goleman (Eds.), *The emotionally intelligent workplace: How to select for, measure, and improve emotional intelligence in individuals, groups, and organizations* (pp, 159-181). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

MacIntyre, P. (1995). How does anxiety affect second language learning? A reply to Sparks and Ganschow. *The Modern Language Journal, 79*(1), 113-154. Retrieved September 9, 2015, from http://www.jstor.org/stable/329395

MacIntyre, P.,& Gardner, R. (1994). The effects of induced anxiety on cognitive processing in computerised vocabulary learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 16*, 41-67.

Mayer, J., & Salovey, P. (1993). The intelligence of emotional intelligence. *Intelligence, 17*, 433-442.

Roohani, A. (2009). The study of emotional intelligence and literature in education: Gender and major of study. *The Journal of Asia TEFL, 6*, 39-66.

Saarni, C. (2007). The development of emotional competence: Pathways for helping children to become emotionally intelligent. In R. Bar-On, J. G. Maree & M. J. Elias (Eds.), *Educating people to be emotionally intelligent* (pp. 15-36). USA: Praeger.

Siyli, N., & Kafes, H. (2015). Overrunning speaking anxiety through audio journals. *International Journal of Language Studies, 9*(1), 23-40.

Appendices

Appendix A: The Experimental Group Pre-Test Results

Participants	FLSA	FLSA Range	Participants	Raw Scores	EI	EI Range
1	137	very high SA	1	176	73	below average
2	131	high SA	2	190	80	below average
3	130	high SA	3	211	90	average
4	127	high SA	4	183	76	below average
5	124	high SA	5	186	78	below average
6	121	high SA	6	209	89	below average
7	121	high SA	7	218	94	average
8	120	high SA	8	208	89	below average
9	118	high SA	9	224	97	average
10	117	high SA	10	222	96	average
11	116	high SA	11	234	102	average
12	115	high SA	12	211	90	average
13	113	high SA	13	202	86	below average
14	112	high SA	14	250	110	average
15	112	high SA	15	245	107	average
16	109	moderate SA	16	284	127	above average
17	108	moderate SA	17	248	109	average
18	107	moderate SA	18	232	101	average
19	106	moderate SA	19	230	100	average
20	106	moderate SA	20	249	109	average
21	105	moderate SA	21	277	123	above average
22	105	moderate SA	22	233	101	average
23	104	moderate SA	23	233	101	average
24	104	moderate SA	24	278	124	above average
25	102	moderate SA	25	235	102	average
26	102	moderate SA	26	231	100	average
27	97	moderate SA	27	279	124	above average
28	96	moderate SA	28	275	122	above average

Appendix B: The Control Group Pre-Test Results

Participants	FLSA	FLSA Range	Raw Scores	EI	EI Range
1	148	very high SA	201	80	below average
2	144	very high SA	196	75	below average
3	138	very high SA	212	91	average
4	131	high SA	201	80	below average
5	130	high SA	213	92	average
6	130	high SA	220	99	average

7	129	high SA	229	107	average
8	126	high SA	204	83	below average
9	125	high SA	217	96	average
10	120	high SA	215	94	average
11	118	high SA	223	101	average
12	118	high SA	226	104	average
13	112	high SA	211	90	below average
14	110	moderate SA	222	100	average
15	109	moderate SA	210	89	below average
16	109	moderate SA	215	94	average
17	109	moderate SA	207	86	below average
18	108	moderate SA	219	98	average
19	108	moderate SA	228	106	average
20	106	moderate SA	230	108	average
21	103	moderate SA	252	130	above average
22	101	moderate SA	221	99	average
23	100	moderate SA	229	107	average
24	99	moderate SA	245	123	above average
25	99	moderate SA	231	109	average
26	97	moderate SA	256	133	very much above average
27	92	moderate SA	248	126	above average

Appendix C: The Experimental Group Post-Test Results

Participants	FLSA	FLSA Range	Participants	Raw Scores	EI	EI Range
1	111	high SA	1	205	72	below average
2	79	low SA	2	308	112	above average
3	68	low SA	3	342	125	above average
4	107	moderate SA	4	220	78	below average
5	84	low SA	5	241	86	below average
6	118	high SA	6	208	73	below average
7	63	low SA	7	313	114	above average
8	74	low SA	8	302	110	average
9	80	low SA	9	302	110	average
10	77	low SA	10	297	108	average
11	84	low SA	11	298	108	average
12	81	low SA	12	307	112	above average
13	80	low SA	13	295	107	average
14	84	low SA	14	317	116	above average
15	112	high SA	15	287	104	average

16	91	moderate SA	16	312	114	above average
17	99	moderate SA	17	233	83	below average
18	91	moderate SA	18	294	107	average
19	94	moderate SA	19	302	110	average
20	118	high SA	20	228	81	below average
21	89	low SA	21	298	108	average
22	100	moderate SA	22	242	86	below average
23	92	moderate SA	23	239	85	below average
24	104	moderate SA	24	288	104	average
25	98	moderate SA	25	238	85	below average
26	96	moderate SA	26	293	106	average
27	91	moderate SA	27	306	111	above average
28	92	moderate SA	28	235	84	below average

Appendix D: The Control Group Post-Test Results

Participants	FLSA	FLSA Range	Participants	Raw Scores	EI	EI Range
1	144	very high SA	1	213	92	average
2	149	very high SA	2	198	84	below average
3	128	high SA	3	216	93	average
4	142	very high SA	4	219	95	average
5	100	moderate SA	5	209	90	below average
6	128	high SA	6	241	106	average
7	73	low SA	7	260	116	above average
8	129	high SA	8	208	89	below average
9	122	high SA	9	223	97	average
10	124	high SA	10	257	115	above average
11	115	high SA	11	225	98	average
12	120	high SA	12	224	98	average
13	84	low SA	13	210	90	average
14	96	moderate SA	14	222	96	average
15	112	high SA	15	209	90	below average
16	117	high SA	16	229	100	average
17	111	high SA	17	199	84	below average
18	104	moderate SA	18	220	95	average
19	114	high SA	19	221	96	average
20	105	moderate SA	20	229	100	average
21	100	moderate SA	21	263	118	above average
22	105	moderate SA	22	200	85	below average
23	97	moderate SA	23	205	88	below average

24	91	moderate SA	24	285	130	above average
25	101	moderate SA	25	201	85	below average
26	103	moderate SA	26	297	136	very much above average
27	90	low SA	27	292	133	very much above average