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**ABSTRACT**

The objectives of this research were to find out: (1) whether or not using humor as a teaching strategy is effective to improve students’ speaking achievements at SMA Negeri 1 Makale and (2) the students’ interest in using humor as a teaching strategy at SMA Negeri 1 Makale.

This research applied a quasi-experimental method which involved two groups. They were experimental and control groups. The population consisted of 246 students. This research used cluster random sampling. The researcher chose two classes of the third year students of SMA Negeri 1 Makale academic year 2015/2016 randomly, as the experimental group treated by using humor as a teaching strategy, while the control group was treated without humor. The research data were collected by asking students to retell a story. The speaking test was given in the form of retelling story by pre-test and post-test, then; it was analyzed by using SPSS 20.0 version to see the significant difference between the two groups.

The result of the data analysis showed that there was a significant difference between the score of the students who were taught by using humor and without humor. It was proved by the mean score of the experimental group which was higher than the control group in the post-test (93.39 > 89.54). The score of probability value (significant 2-tailed) in speaking ability was lower than the level of significance (0.043 < 0.05). In other words, H1 was accepted and H0 was rejected. The majority of the students (65 percents) responded “strongly agree” to the use of humor in the classroom. Their responses to the questionnaire statement indicated that they appreciated teachers using humor in the class and liked humor to be applied in the classroom. It can be concluded that the use of humor as a teaching strategy was effective to be implemented in speaking class.

**Key words**: Humor, teaching strategy, speaking, interest.

**INTRODUCTION**

Teachers must be creative and innovative because of the critical role play in creating an environment conducive to optimal student learning. Therefore, strategies take an important place during the teaching and learning process; each individual chooses the one that is the most suitable for him or her. Many English teachers have started to apply innovative teaching strategies inside and outside the classroom to advance their learners’ competency levels and to achieve the best learning outcomes. Humor is not new, but it is an innovative teaching strategy that can be used to improve different areas of education. Humor is a creative teaching technique that places demands on the skills and art of the educators (Martin, 2007).

There are lots of benefits that could be derived from the incorporation of humor in teaching English. Generally speaking, a sense of humor makes the classroom environment lively and reduces anxiety by creating a free and easy atmosphere. Krashen (1987) writes extremely on the negative effect of anxiety on the student’s ability to learn ESL (English as a Second Language). For a dreaded course like English especially in an ESL environment, humor can help to increase motivation, develop self-confidence and bridge gap between teachers and students. Through this, the students can maximize ESL lessons through easy understanding and long-term retention (Glenn, 2002). Further, Munoz (2005: 24) argues that ‘humor is closely related to memory as it is easier to recall an experience that occurred in a humorous context…’ as Tosta (2001: 27) regards being funny as humorous by asserting that the funny teacher is not a clown figure, he is a serious conscientious professional who believes in the meaningfulness and effectiveness of having fun while learning. He further makes a clear-cut distinction between a comedian/clown and a humorous teacher. The goal of a comedian even in a formed environment is distinct from that of a humorous teacher. A comedian/clown entertains and gets paid for it without a goal of imparting knowledge, but a humorous teacher is a professional who employs humor for the sole goal of making teaching and learning more interesting and effective. The major benefits of humor in the teaching of ESL can be summed up in Munoz (2005) submission thus:

There are many benefits to complementing humor in the classroom, it creates a cooperative atmosphere helping students to better relate to one another and it focuses them more effectively. It adds a cultural frame to language by presenting a tone, expression, and context to the materials, thus increasing cultural knowledge.

In the real condition, some English teachers of SMA Negeri 1 Makale sometimes teach in a very serious way. This way of teaching can increase students’ anxiety, decrease their self-esteem, and increase their heartbeats in a stressful situation. Many of the students feel anxious in a speaking class (Padmadewi, 1998), and some are likely to keep silent (Tutyandari, 2005). Based on her research, Padmadewi (1998) finds out that students attending a speaking class often feel anxious due to pressure from the speaking tasks which require them to present individually and spontaneously within the limited time. Tutyandari (2005) mentions that students keep silent because they lack of self-confidence, lack of prior knowledge about topics, and poor teacher-learner relationship.

However, today’s world requires that the goal of teaching speaking should improve students’ communicative skills because, only in that way, students can express themselves and learn how to follow the social and cultural rules appropriate in each communicative circumstance. Speaking is a productive or active skill which is absolutely vital in the encouragement of communicative efficiency. Diyyab, *et al.* (2013: 2) states that teaching speaking skills have become increasingly important in English as a foreign language due to a large number of learners who want to use English spontaneously and freely for communicative purposes.

The need for speaking mastery in English has been increased due to the strengthening position of English as a language for international communication. It has become apparent that students of English as a foreign language have considered themselves good and successful learners if they can communicate fluently and effectively in English (Graves, 2008; Nazara, 2011). At present, the ability to speak English fluently has become a must, especially for EFL students. According to Derwing, *et al.* (2004: 661) fluency is considered an important characteristic of foreign language speech for a variety of reasons. EFL learners need to speak fluently ranging from a mere desire to feel confident when talking to others in English to an urgent need to pass a language test of spoken English.

To improve students’ speaking skills, the teacher must enable the students to overcome their psychological problems and must help them develop their self-confidence. These require careful planning, skillful motivation, varied techniques, patient instruction, relaxed atmosphere, visual stimuli, and good humor. The researcher interests in conducting a creative teaching strategy to improve students’ achievements in speaking based on the use of humor. The aims of this study are to explore the effectiveness of using humor as a teaching strategy in speaking class and the students’ interest in using humor as a teaching strategy at SMA Negeri 1 Makale.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

**Previous Related Research Findings**

Syafiq and Saleh (2012) conducted a research entitled “Humor English Teaching Material for Improving Students’ Speaking Skill with High and Low Learning Motivation”. The study aimed at investigating the effectiveness of humor as English teaching material to improve student’s speaking skill with high or low motivation and the effect of humor use gives to their teaching in English as a foreign language context. The achievement results illustrated that more students were in favor of humor as teaching material in the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classroom in improving their speaking skill than the conventional method. Most of the students pointed out that humor helped them in progressing their speaking skill thus it indicated that jokes helped them pay more attention during class time and increased their level of concentration and anxiety. In comparison, only few students believed that jokes did not have an effect on increasing speaking skill in the classroom.

Alkhatab (2012) with the title “Humor as a Teaching Strategy: The Effect on Students Educational Retention and Attention in a Nursing Baccalaureate Classroom”. The study explored the effect of using humor as a teaching strategy on the educational retention and attention of sophomore nursing students. The setting for this study was a nursing college at a Midwestern university. The participants were sophomore nursing students who were randomly assigned to a group of humorous and non-humorous lectures. The participants who experienced the humorous lectures were also asked to complete the Humor Questionnaire (HQ). Pre-quiz and post-quiz were conducted and they demonstrated a significant difference in the pre-quiz and post-quiz scores of the students in the humorous lecture. Also, there was a statically significant increase in the level of attention among students who participated in the humorous lectures. Sophomore nursing students appreciate educators who used humor and wished that there were more use of humor in their nursing classes. The results suggested that using humor in nursing classrooms increases nursing students’ information retention and increases their attention.

Olajoke (2013) conducted a study about the students’ perception on the use of humor in the teaching of English as a second language in Nigeria. This research was approached from the sub-linguistic field known as applied linguistics covered language teaching, speech therapy, evaluation, translation, interpretation, planning and other concepts in the human domain that centered on language. The study investigated the perceptions of the use of humor in the teaching of English as L2 on the students of a Tertiary Institution in Nigeria. The paper reflected the relationship between culture and humor as reported by students. It was therefore suggested that the use of humor in the teaching of English as the second language (ESL) should be done by teachers with care considering the fact that the linguistic environment is cross-cultural so that the purpose of effective teaching of ESL to learners will be achieved.

**Some Pertinent Ideas**

**Humor**

Humor, to a large extent, depends on the parties involved in a discourse, the ones lie on the participants to know whether something is humorous or not. Therefore, humor is anything perceived by parties as humorous in any communication act.

Humor has three formats: wit, mirth, and smiling. According to Bradshaw and Lowenstein (2011: 98), wit is the cognitive process that elicits humor; mirth is the emotional reaction to humor, joy, and pleasure; laughter or smiling is a physical expression of humor. People use intentional humor, or conversational humor, to create an amusing environment of interaction. Conversational humor can be classified into anecdotes (relating an amusing story about oneself or someone else); wordplay (creating puns, witty responses, or wisecracks that play on the meaning of words); and irony (a statement in which the literal meaning is different from the intended meaning) (Martin, 2007: 12). Unintentional or accidental humor is humor that results in a surprise. It can be physical or linguistic; for example, spilling orange juice on one’s pants or finding misspellings in the headline of a professor’s handout (Martin, 2007).

Another classification of humor is appropriate (positive) and inappropriate (negative or offensive) types of humor (Hsieh et al., 2005). Inappropriate humor is explained as one’s presenting oneself as superior to another person or group, which can be hurtful and offensive (Hsieh et al., 2005), for example, using humor in the class negatively to offend the students because of their work or behavior. Appropriate humor is categorized into four types: “topic related humor, humor unrelated to a topic, self-disparaging humor, and unplanned humor” (Englert, 2010: 48). These four types are considered effective teaching tools for teachers. Furthermore, appropriate humor can have different forms with any teaching strategy, for example, quotations, cartoons, multiple-choice items, top 10 lists, anecdotes, skits and dramatizations, ad-libs that are not actually ad-libs, and storytelling (Ulloth, 2003: 126).

Martineau (1972) discusses three functions of humor: consensus, conflict, and control. The term consensus refers to the reduction of social distance. The function of such humor is to initiate and solidify the development of the social relationship. Conflict humor introduces or fosters conflict in a group. Ridicule is a form of humor that can effectively introduce conflict. The term control refers to the control of others.

Using humor in the classroom can be very challenging. The only main reason for using humor in the classroom is to improve students’ learning. The creative development and expression of humor in the classroom deal with ‘how’ to teach, not ‘what’ to teach. If the use of humor as a teaching strategy is effective, it will increase the amount of "what" is taught which is actually learned by students.

The following are recommendations for competent use of humor in the classroom (Wanzer, et. al., 2006): (1) humor related to material (tactic not specific), (2) humor related to course material using different types of media or external props to enhance learning, (3) jokes related to course material, (4) humorous examples to illustrate course concepts, (5) humorous stories to illustrate course concepts or reinforce learning, (6) critical/cynical about course material in an effort to be humorous, (7) humor attempts related to course material and targeting stereotypical college behaviors, (8) humor attempts related to the material and, at the same time directed towards students, (9) humor attempts related to class materials that involve some type of animated performance, (10) humor attempts related to course materials that involve student role play or activities, and (11) humor attempts related to course materials that involve creative language or wordplay.

Wandersee (1982) has also addressed the concept of humor as a teaching strategy. He states the problem is to discover the types of humor which are most productive and then to apply them in the proper way to teaching in the classroom.

**Teaching Speaking Skill**

Kusrini (2012) defines speaking as the process of oral communication involving the interaction both speaker and listener in sharing information. Speaking is considered as the most complex skills to be learnt. Ideally, in learning speaking, the students should be good at some language components like grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation. It is because the mastery of those three language components will influence the mastery of speaking itself.

To motivate students in EFL contexts, teachers should include many activities and strategies that attract students’ attention and make them interested in the lesson. As Peck (1978), cited in Celce-Murcia (2001), states, “Activities need to be child-centered and communication should be authentic. The strategies that the teacher uses can be fun and enjoyable, and at the same time achieve academic goals. Humor has the ability to relax people, reduce tension, and thereby create a conducive atmosphere for learning and communication. Humor strengthens the relationship between student and teacher, reduces stress, makes a speaking class more interesting and, if relevant to the subject, may even enhance recall of the material.

**Interest**

According to Eggen and Kauchak (1997:342), interest usually refers to an activity that a person prefers to engage in, would not avoid and would choose in preference to many others activities. In relation to the teaching and learning process, it can be concluded that interest is the students’ desire to learn or to know about something as the teacher’s strategy in teaching.

**METHOD**

**Design and Samples**

This research applied quasi-experimental design, with nonequivalent control group design. It is employed when it is not possible to randomly assign individual participants to groups (Gay, *et al*. 2006: 258). The sample was the twelfth-grade natural science 2, consisted of 35 students, became the control class and the twelfth-grade natural science 1, consisted of 36 students, as the experimental class. They were the twelfth-grade students of SMA Negeri 1 Makale, Tana Toraja. Both groups were given the same pre-test and post-test. The experimental group was treated with humorous teaching strategy, while the control group was treated with the conventional teaching strategy. Both the teaching processes run for six meetings in which each meeting lasted for ninety minutes at the same time frame.

**Instruments and Procedures**

There were two types of collecting data, namely, speaking test and questionnaire. The data was collected by administering pre-test, post-test, and questionnaire. Pre-test and post-test were applied to both experimental and control groups, while Humor Questionnaire was just applied to experimental group. The researcher conducted the treatment by using humor as a teaching strategy to the students of experimental group and the other teacher conducted the treatment by using conventional teaching strategy to the students of control group.

The treatment was conducted for six meetings in both experimental and control groups. There were three humorous stories for the experimental group and three non-humorous stories for control group presented in six meetings. Each story was presented in two meetings. On the first meeting of each, the students were grouped into groups of four. They were given twenty minutes to read the story, and then they retold it to his or her friends in turn in their groups. On the second meeting of each, every student was given a chance to reread the humorous story for five minutes and then retell it to the class. After all the students retold the stories, the students and the researcher gave comments on the students’ performance, and the students were asked some questions related to the story to check their comprehension.

The procedure of analyzing data was done as follows:

1. Tabulating the score of students’ speaking test of both experimental and control group in from of speaking accuracy, fluency, and comprehensibility.
2. Calculating the mean score and standard deviation of students’ speaking test of both experimental and control group by using SPSS 20.0.
3. Calculating the value of t-test to see the significant differences between experimental and control group by using SPSS 20.0.
4. Analyzing the data from the Humor Questionnaire to find out the students’ interest toward using humor as a teaching strategy in speaking class based on Likert Scale.

**RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

**The Students’ Speaking Achievement**

There is an improvement of students’ speaking achievement after the treatment of both experiment and control groups. To have a clear overview about it, some tables and figures will be shown below.

Table 1. Frequency and Percentage of Students’ Pre-test of Experimental and Control Group

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Classification | Range of Score | Experimental Group | Control Group |
| F | % | F | % |
| Excellent | 96 – 100 | 7 | 19.44 | 5 | 14.29 |
| Very Good | 86 – 95 | 11 | 30.56 | 10 | 28.57 |
| Good | 76 – 85 | 12 | 33.33 | 12 | 34.29 |
| Fairly Good | 66 – 75 | 3 | 8.33 | 7 | 20 |
| Fair | 56 – 65 | 3 | 8.33 | 1 | 2.86 |
| Poor | 36 – 55 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Very Poor | 0 - 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 36 | 100 | 35 | 100 |

Table 1 reveals that before giving the treatment, most of the students’s pre-test result for both experimental and control group were in good classification.

Table 2. Frequency and Percentage of Students’ Post-test of Experimental Group and Control Group

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Classification | Range of Score | Experimental Group | Control Group |
| F | % | F | % |
| Excellent | 96 – 100 | 13 | 36.11 | 10 | 28.57 |
| Very Good | 86 – 95 | 19 | 52.78 | 11 | 31.43 |
| Good | 76 – 85 | 3 | 8.33 | 12 | 34.29 |
| Fairly Good | 66 – 75 | 1 | 2.78 | 2 | 5.71 |
| Fair | 56 – 65 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Poor | 36 – 55 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Very Poor | 0 - 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 36 | 100 | 35 | 100 |

Table 2 illustrates that after the treatment, most of the students in experimental group were categorized in very good and excellent classification. Meanwhile, most of the students in control group were in good and very good classification.

Table 3. The Students’ Speaking Achievement of Experimental and Control Group.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Pre-test | Post-test |
| Experimental | Control | Experimental | Control |
| Subject | 36 | 35 | 36 | 35 |
| Mean Score | 84.97 | 85.03 | 93.39 | 89.54 |
| Std. Dev. | 12.141 | 10.185 | 7.283 | 8.392 |

Table 3 shows that the total number for each group in the experimental group is 36 and the control group is 35 students. The mean score and standard deviation show the difference in pre-test and post-test to both groups. The mean score pre-test of experimental and control group is statistically similar before giving the treatment. After giving the treatment, the post-test score of both groups; experimental and control group show a different mean score. The mean score above will be strengthened by comparing the mean score difference in both groups, experimental and control group.

Table 4. The Mean Difference of Speaking Achievement of Experimental and Control Group.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | N | Pre-test | Post-test | Mean Difference |
| Experimental | 36 | 84.97 | 93.39 | 8.42 |
| Control | 35 | 85.03 | 89.54 | 4.51 |

Table 4 indicates that the improvement gained by the students in the experimental group through the implementation of humor as a teaching strategy was very high comparing with control group.

Table 5. The Probability Value of T-test of the Experimental and Control Group Achievement.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Experimental Group & Control group |  df t |  2 Tailed Value | (α) |  Remarks |
| Pre-test | 69 -0.021 | 0.983 |  0.05 | No Significantly Different |
| Experimental Group & Control Group | 69 t |  2 Tailed Value | (α) | Remarks |
| Post-test | 2.064 | 0.043 | 0.05 | Significantly Different |

Based on the result of data analysis shows in table 5 on the probability value on pre-test (0.983) is higher than the level of significance at t-table (0.05), so, Ho is accepted and H1 is rejected. In the other words, there is no significant difference on the pre-test of students’ speaking of both groups, experimental, and control group. On the other hand, on the probability value on post-test (0.043) is lower than the level of significance at t-table (0.05), so, H0 is rejected and H1 is accepted. That means, there is a significant difference on the post-test of students’ speaking between experimental and control group. In the other words, using humor as a teaching strategy improves students’ speaking achievements.

**Students’ Interest**

The majority of the participants responded “strongly agree” to the use of humor in the classroom. A total percentage of students responded “strongly agree” was 65 %, “agree” was 27.50%, “neutral” was 5.93%, “disagree” was 1.48%, and “strongly disagree” was 0.09% to the thirty Humor Questionnaire statements.

Figure 1. Histogram of Humor Questionnaire Used with Experimental Group

In accordance with the finding (Figure 1), shows that humor is appropriate to be applied in the classroom, which, the students appreciated teachers using humor in the class and liked humor to be applied in the classroom, especially in speaking class.

**CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION**

Humor as a teaching strategy in speaking class has a significant effect on students’ speaking of the twelfth-grade students of SMA Negeri 1 Makale. It can be seen from the post-test mean score of the students which was 93.39 for the experimental group, while the post-test mean score of the control group was 89.54, and the final score of probability value (significant 2 tailed) in speaking was lower than alpha (0.043< 0.05). In other words, H0 was rejected and H1 was accepted. It means that there was a significant difference on the post-test of students’ speaking test between experimental and control group. It can be concluded that using humor as a teaching strategy affects students’ speaking achievements at SMA Negeri 1 Makale.

The twelfth-grade students of SMA Negeri 1 Makale were interested in the use of humor as a teaching strategy. It can be proved from the majority of them responded positively to the use of humor in the classroom.

Based on the conclusions above, the researcher puts forwards some suggestions and recommendations. The teachers are suggested to apply humor as a teaching strategy as one of an alternative strategy to be successfully improving the students’ speaking ability. Using humor connected to the material not only enhances the learning environment but also increases the effectiveness of what is being learned. Students appreciate their teachers who use humor to share and facilitate their teaching material; the use of humor served as a pleasurable teaching strategy in the classroom. Since this research is just limited to the use of humor as a teaching strategy in speaking class in the form of written sources, it is recommended for future research to use humorous videos to enhance students learning.
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**APPENDIX**

**Humor Questionnaire Used With Experimental Group**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No. | Humor Questionnaire Item | StronglyAgree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | StronglyDisagree |
| %(n) | %(n) | %(n) | %(n) | %(n) |
| 1. | Students appreciate teachers use of humor in the class | 66.7 (24) | 33.3 (12) |  |  |  |
| 2. | Students feel more comfortable with the teachers who use humor in the class | 77.8 (28) | 22.2 (8) |  |  |  |
| 3. | Humor can create a closer relationship between the teacher and students | 61.1 (22) | 38.9 (14) |  |  |  |
| 4. | Humor can get and hold students’ attention during teaching and learning process | 72.2 (26) | 25 (9) | 2.8 (1) |  |  |
| 5. | Humor can increase students’ interest in the subject or topic | 75 (27) | 25 (9) |  |  |  |
| 6. | Humor can facilitate students’ creativity and critical thinking | 38.9 (14) | 47.2 (17) | 13.9 (5) |  |  |
| 7. | Humor can facilitate the understanding of students about difficult concepts. | 50 (18) | 38.9 (14) | 11.1 (4) |  |  |
| 8. | Humor can provide students a mental break to make sense of learning | 86.1 (31) | 11.1 (4) | 2.8 (1) |  |  |
| 9. | Humor can increase retention of what is learned | 61.1 (22) | 33.3 (12) | 5.6 (2) |  |  |
| 10. | Humor can give the students another reason to attend class | 58.3 (21) | 33.3 (12) | 5.6 (2) | 2.8 (1) |  |
| 11. | Humor can provide valuable feedback from students to teacher | 50 (18) | 30.6 (11) | 19.4 (7) |  |  |
| 12. | Humor can promote positive classroom atmosphere | 38.9 (14) | 38.9 (14) | 19.4 (7) | 2.8 (1) |  |
| 13. | Humor can allow shy or timid students to participate actively in learning | 55.6 (20) | 33.3 (12) | 8.3 (3) | 2.8 (1) |  |
| 14. | Humor can make students to take pleasure in the company of each other | 86.1 (31) | 11.1 (4) | 2.8 (1) |  |  |
| 15. | Humor can contribute to class unity and learning | 55.6 (20) | 36.1 (13) | 5.6 (2) | 2.8 (1) |  |
| 16. | Humor can reduce the authoritarian position of the teacher | 52.8 (19) | 22.2 (8) | 25 (9) |  |  |
| 17. | Humor can reduce students’ anxieties of dread subjects | 75 (27) | 22.2 (8) |  | 2.8 (1) |  |
| 18. | Humor can lift the spirit of students and help them to see the topic / subject / teacher in a more positive light | 66.7 (24) | 30.6 (11) | 2.8 (1) |  |  |
| 19. | Humor can relief stress, tension and boredom for students | 91.7 (33) | 8.3 (3) |  |  |  |
| 20. | Humor can relax students and they could become good listeners | 75 (27) | 25 (9) |  |  |  |
| 21. | Humor can energize and exercise the body for healthy living | 36.1 (13) | 50 (18) | 11.1 (4) | 2.8 (1) |  |
| 22. | Humor can contract the muscles and increase blood flow | 47.2 (17) | 50 (18) | 2.8 (1) |  |  |
| 23. | Humor can give pleasant glow on the faces | 69.4 (25) | 22.2 (8) | 5.6 (2) | 2.8 (1) |  |
| 24. | Humor should be appropriate and timely | 72.2 (26) | 27.8 (10) |  |  |  |
| 25. | Humor should not be run any student down | 75 (27) | 25 (9) |  |  |  |
| 26. | Humor should not be on disability | 88.9 (32) | 8.3 (3) | 2.8 (1) |  |  |
| 27. | Humor should not be delivered through insult or sarcasm | 91.7 (33) | 8.3 (3) |  |  |  |
| 28. | Humor should be thoughtful and made an integral part of the class | 77.8 (28) | 22.2 (8) |  |  |  |
| 29. | Humor should make students to be comfortable and safe | 83.3 (30) | 16.7 (6) |  |  |  |
| 30. | Teacher uses jokes about himself/herself always rather than his/her students. | 13.9 (5) | 27.8 (10) | 30.6 (11) | 25 (9) | 2.8 (1) |