**Abstract**

While higher education has a unique contribution to helping students achieve civility, uncivil behaviors is growing. The purpose of this study was to assess the perception of educators and nursing students about the importance and frequency of incivility of students. The sample consisted of 178 nursing students and 63 educators. The scale of nursing incivility in education was used. All analyses were carried out using SPSS, version 20 and descriptive and inferential statistics. From the perspectives of both groups, the maximum mean score belonged to the items, “threat with weapons ” (3.84 ± 0.58), “ property damage” (3.83 ± 0.59) and “ physical threats of harm to others” (3.83±0.59). The lowest mean score belonged to the items of “ re-examination, greater time, or score ” (1.99 ± 1.08), ” demanding a passing mark while being failed” (2.14 ± 1.06) . “The expression of indifference or indifference to the content of the lesson” has often been experienced by both groups. The results of numerous studies along with this study confirm the need for providing strategies to raise awareness among educatores and students of the issue of civility.
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**Introduction**

As a serious problem in nursing education (1), incivility occurs at all levels from classrooms to the clinical environment (2). According to Clark (2011), incivility is defined as any action or behavior that disturbs the occupational, social, personal or educational environment (3). According to Clark et al. (2015), in nursing education, both lecturers and students are repeatedly influenced by incivility (4). But such behaviors will be a major challenge for faculty members in academic settings (5). They increasingly face incivility among their students (2, 6) and believe that the incidence and severity of incivility has increased (7).

Such behaviors result in disturbance in the student-lecturer relations (8) and the learning environment, especially Team learning (2, 7, 9). They not only disturb the teaching and learning process, but also have negative effects on health and inter-personal interactions (4). The lecturer's fear of maintaining his or her personal safety, due to confronting uncivil students, leads to physical and mental tensions, as well as doubting their abilities as a lecturer (10) to the extent that in some sources, incivility has been mentioned as one of the most important predictors of job quitting (11).

In spite of the importance and the prevalence of incivility among students, few studies have been carried out on the lecturers’ experiences of incivility. In the study conducted by Sprunk (2014), the Participants' experiences indicated that lecturers face various kinds of unacceptable student behaviors and, in their opinion, facing such behaviors is time consuming and causes harm to their personal health. In addition, the above-mentioned authors refer to the connection between the ethical and civic behaviors of the achademic period with those of the professional period (8). Larson (2013) also believes that there is a connection between the incivility that appears in the academic environment and the occurrence of these behaviors in the healthcare environment (12), which is a point requiring contemplation by itself. According to Schaffer, the main goal of nursing education is to train students who will become empathetic nurses in the future. He believes that incivility, due to minor or major effects that it has on the student, prevents students from progressing and moving towards this goal (13, 14). Today's students are our future colleagues, and if these uncivil behaviors are not managed and organized, they will turn into uncivil future personnel (6, 15). Therefore, not only is incivility a direct threat to the patient’s safety, but also its continuation at work place results in quitting the job and thus is a threat to the patient’s well-being and leads to inadequate care (9, 16), a toxic workplace and clinical problems such as increasing the likelihood of medical errors, reducing the quality of care and patient dissatisfaction (2, 13, 12, 16).

Hence, identifying these behaviors and their optimal management is essential. If lecturers recognize the causes of incivility, they will be able to provide a healthy environment for improving their relations with students. On the other hand, teachers are ethically required to provide a secure learning environment and train students in professional civil ethics (4, 7). In addition, if the goal is to design strategies to reduce the occurrence of such behaviors and improve the level of retention in lecturers and learners, identifying the effective factors will be necessary (7, 12).

In Iran, a few studies have been conducted regarding incivility, which have mainly been conducted in a qualitative method (15). Thus, considering the limited national literature and the need to examine this subject and regarding the different perceptions and reactions of the lectures and students in dealing with incivility (6), the necessity of identifying the mentioned behaviors before the students’ entering the professional practice (3), this study aims to determine the nursing teachers and students’ perceptions of the importance and the frequency of uncivil behaviors of students in academic environments.

**Methods**

In this cross-sectional study, 63 lecturers were selected through whole enumeration from 4 nursing faculties of Lorestan University of Medical Sciences. Students (178 ones) were selected using stratified sampling, proportional to size of strata. The students were stratified based on the year of entrance to the university. The entering students of each year were considered as a category and the intra- category included the two sub-categories of men and women. Eventually, a systematic sampling was done in sub-category based on the student number. The original sample size was estimated based on the following formula:

Considering Z = 1.96, S = 24 and d = 5, the sample size was estimated to be about 89 people, which was decided to be twice that number, regarding the design effect, which means 178 people. The entrance criteria for the students included the willingness to enter the study, a second-year students and higher, and being neither a transferred student nor a guest. The inclusion criteria for the lecturers included the willingness to enter the study and the minimum teaching experience of one year in the academic environment (classroom or clinical setting). After providing the participants with clear explanations on the purpose of the study, the scale was completed by them through self-report. This scale consists of 2 parts. The first part includes demographic information, and the second part includes a 24-item list of uncivil behaviors in nursing students. The participants are asked to rate the level of incivility based on a 4-point Likert scale (from 1 = not uncivil to 4 = very uncivil) and to evaluate the frequency of these behaviors in the last year based on a 4-point Likert scale (1 = never to 4 = often). Finally, the mean and the frequency are calculated separately for each item (4, 19). After presenting the list in the form of several open-ended questions, the participants define how much incivility has been identified by them as a problem in the training programs. Then they are asked to choose three strategies, among 10, as the most important strategies for promoting civilization (4).

Due to the tool’s not being local, it was translated through forward and back translation, after sending a written request to the scale designer and getting permission. In order to evaluate the validity, the scale was provided to 11 experts (5 nursing faculty members, 3 sociologists and 3 psychologists). The content validity index for the items was higher than 0.78 and content validity index for the scale was 0.91. For measuring the reliability through test-retest method, the scale was provided to 30 nursing students and lecturers, and it was filled out with an interval of 72 hours. The intra-class correlation coefficient was 0.94 and the internal consistency of the scale was evaluated using Cronbach's Alpha method, which was confirmed with the Cronbach's alpha of 0.94.

For data analysis, SPSS software version 20 and descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation, frequency and percent), and inferential statistics (Chi-square test and variance analysis) were used and the results were reported at a significant level of 5%. The present study was brought up in the ethics committee of Lorestan University of Medical Sciences and was confirmed under the ethical confirmation number of Lums.RES.1395.197.

**Results**

The majority of the students aged 19-23, were singel, boys, and weren’t dormitory residents. The majority of the teachers were married, women, and in their forties or older. The other demographic characteristics are given in Table 1. The mean score of nursing students and lecturers’ perceptions of the students’ incivility level is presented in Table 2. From the perspectives of both groups, the maximum mean score belonged to the items 24, "threat with weapons" (3.84 ± 0.58); 22, "property damage" (3.83 ± 0.59) and 21, “physical threats of harm to others” (3.83±0.59), which indicated the high importance of these items. In contrast, the lowest mean score belonged to the items of "demanding a chance to take an exam again, being given more time or extra marks on the exam "(1.99 ± 1.08), "demanding a passing mark while being failed” (2.14 ± 1.06) and "being ill prepared for the class or other planned activities” (2.35 ± 0.93).

The results of the frequency of the students' incivility from the perspective of the participants are presented in Table 3. According to the table, 34.8% of the students had often reported "expressing the lack of interest, boredom or indifference toward the content of the lesson or the subject of the discussion"; 34.3%, "Cheating on exams and quizzes" and 32%, "using computers, mobile phones, or any other media ". In contrast, 87.1% of the students hadn’t experienced "threat with weapons "; 65.2%, "property damage"; 64%, "physical threats of harm to others" and 58.4% hadn’t experienced "sending improper or offensive emails to others". In the case of teachers, the results also showed that during the previous year, 33.3% of them had often experienced "expressing the lack of interest, boredom, or indifference toward the content of the lesson"; 19%, "being ill prepared for the class"; 17.5%, "demanding a passing mark while being failed" and 15.9%, "using computers, mobile phones or any other media tool”. By contrast, 90.5% had never experienced “threat with weapons "; 79.4%, "physical threats of harm to others”; 1.65%, "property damage" and 9/61%, "offensive behavior" .

Findings on the correlation between the demographic characteristics and the mean score of the students and the teachers' perceptions of incivility showed that the mean score of the students' perceptions indicates a significant difference based on the faculty where they study (0.022). The students of Khoramabad and Boroujerd nursing faculties reported a higher level of incivility, but there was no significant correlation regarding other characteristics (P> 0.05). In non-native teachers’ opinion, the importance of uncivil behaviors was reported to be at a higher level (0.001). There was a significant difference among the frequency of the students' incivility based on their year of entrance at university (0.004), their average score (0.056) and their faculty, but no significant correlation was found regarding other characteristics (P> 0.05). The importance of uncivil behaviors was reported to be higher from the perspective of the students of Khoramabad’s nursing faculty who had entered university in 2013 and whose average score was 18 or over. In addition, the frequency of incivility showed a significant difference based on the employment status (0.005) and age group (0.017). The teachers over 40 years of age and employed by the government reported a higher frequency of incivility. Both groups reported incivility as a serious problem in nursing education. From the students' perspective, the probability of the occurrence of incivility was higher among students than lecturers while the lecturers reported it to be equal in both groups. From the lecturers’ perspective, three strategies to promote civility in nursing education were respectively “increasing awareness of civility” (2.4 ± 1.24), “being a role model in terms of professional behavior and civility” (2.52±1.44) and “training in effective communications and discussions on conflicts” (3.34 ± 0.90). From the perspective of the students, the most important strategies included “increasing awareness of civility” (2.7 ± 1.24), “being a role model in terms of professional behavior” (3.08 ± 1.32) and “defining behavioral codes” (3.42 ± 1.18).

**Discussion**

This study aimed to determine the importance and the frequency of uncivil behaviors from the perspectives of nursing teachers and students. Offensive behavior, physical threats of harm to others, property damage, and physical violence possess the highest mean scores. This finding indicates the importance of these behaviors from the participants’ perspective, which is consistent with the results of the study by De Gagne et al. (2015) regarding the importance of the items of "the threat of physical harm to others" and " threat with weapons ". In this study, both groups brought up the items indicating violence as behaviors including high levels of incivility. In this study, too, physical violence was considered as threatening and uncivil. Nevertheless, fortunately, their frequency was reported to be low and occasionally, had not even been experienced because a behavior’s being threatening does not necessarily mean that it is committed by the person (20). Similarly, Rad et al. (2015) reported in their study that physical threats and harm indicate the highest level of incivility (21).

In contrast, “being ill prepared for the class”, “the lack of intimacy toward others”, “demanding a chance to take an exam again, being given more time or extra marks on the exam” possessed the lowest mean score from both perspectives, which could be due to the lack of awareness of these issues and ignoring them, on the part of the students and even the teachers. Among the uncivil behaviors that many students often reported were “the lack of interest in the content of the lesson”, “cheating”, “using computers or mobile phones”, and “doing irrelevant activities”. Moreover, behaviors such as demanding a chance to take an exam again, being given more time, extra marks or the passing mark on the exam could not be ignored. From the perspective of the teachers, the occurrence of uncivil behaviors such as expressing the lack of interest in the content of the course was considerable, and behaviors such as using computers or mobile phones, doing irrelevant activities, being ill prepared for the class, demanding extra time or marks and demanding the passing mark were reported less often in comparison to the students’ feedback. In addition, the frequency of the items of “offensive behavior”, “physical threats of harm to others”, “property damage” and “threat with weapons” were negligible and near zero from the viewpoints of both the students and the teachers, and neither of them had experienced such behaviors.

In the study by Luparell et al. (2006), offensive behaviors from the teacher’ perspective included items such as delay in entering the classroom, mobile phone use, cheating on exams, disturbing the class atmosphere and questioning the lecturer's knowledge. However, the incidence of behaviors such as cheating on the exam was reported to be among the most frequent behaviors on the part of students, which was consistent with the students' viewpoints in this study (22). In Clark et al. (2007), the most important offensive behaviors from the lecturers’ perspective included rude gestures, being ill prepared for the class, distracting discussions, using mobile phones and cheating on the exam (10), which was consistent with our results. Different frequency distributions of uncivil behaviors from the perspectives of the lecturers and the students may be due to the fact that because of the existing generational gap, the lecturers regard behaviors such as expressing indifference or the lack of interest in the content of the lesson as insulting their professional ability, and somehow, this behavior can discourage the lecturer. It also reflects the lack of interest among students, which doubles the teacher's tiredness and suffering.

In addition, the frequencies of offensive behavior, physical threats of harm to others, property damage and threat with weapons were negligible and near zero from the perspectives of both the students and the teachers, and none had been experienced during the previous year. Similarly, in the study of Vardanjani et al (2016), the frequency of these behaviors has been reported to be negligible and near zero (23).

According to the findings, the mean score of students' perception was significantly different from faculty to faculty. The students of Khorramabad and Boroujerd’s nursing faculties had reported higher levels of incivility more than other faculties. Moreover, the mean score of the perception of uncivil behaviors was reported to be higher in non-native lecturers, the reason behind which can be traced back in cultural differences. In addition, regarding the year of entrance to the university, the highest amount of incivility was reported by the students entering the university in 2013 and the lowest one was reported by the students entering the university in 2015, which itself confirms that these results are likely to directly correlate with the students’ age. The frequency of uncivil behaviors has been reported to be lower by the elder students while the younger ones seem to be more sensitive. In addition, the frequency of such behaviors has been higher in Khorramabad’s nursing faculty, and the lowest, in Aligudarz’s faculty. In Khorramabad, the reason behind this can be found in the large number of students and the vastness of the educational space. Aligudarz’s nursing school has a relatively small educational environment despite being old and fewer students are studying there, thus, the low frequency of uncivil behaviors and their management seems logical regarding the existing conditions.

From the perspective of the teachers, the frequency of uncivil behaviors was significantly different depending on the employment status and age group. Most reports on the high frequency of these behaviors were made by the official and contractual staff. It seems that the occurrence of such behaviors has been of more importance from the perspective of the official and contractual staff due to a stronger employment commitment and having a better job prospect. Regarding the age variable, it seems that due to less age differences and having a closer relationship with students, as well as less work experience, a lower incivility frequency has been reported by younger lecturers.

Both groups reported incivility as a serious problem in nursing education. Regarding the occurrence of incivility in the two groups, it seems that the lecturers have a more moderate attitude in comparison with the students and they generally ignored many of the students’ uncivil behaviors or considered them to be due to their age and their rawness. In the study of Vardanjani et al. (2016), according to 58% of students, the degree of uncivil behavior was moderate and 48% of them believed that uncivil behaviors had been seen equally among both the lecturers and the students. From the perspective of the lecturers, too, the occurrence of such behaviors in educational environments was moderate and it was reported to be a bit higher among the students (23). Contrary to the present study, in the study of Joibari et al. (2010), too, the frequency and the severity of offensive behaviors have not been reported to be significant. The reason behind this difference may be the time of doing the research, the previous decade, and the upward trend of uncivil behaviors in the recent years (24), as pointed out in the study of Ibrahim et al. (2016) (25).

Regarding the major strategies of promoting civility, the lecturers and the students had a mutual perception of offering common solutions. Both groups emphasized the need to raise awareness of uncivil behaviors. High education requires increased focus on teaching civil ethics and informing students. If the necessary training in this field is provided for lecturers and students in the academic environment, their perception of civility will be enhanced and, as a result, the possibility of the occurrence of uncivil behaviors will decrease (24). Role modeling is also a method based on patterning and the presentation of objective and practical examples. Regarding their experiences and their social integrity, lecturers are at a higher level comparing to students. Therefore, they are considered as objective models for students (26). The third strategy offered by lecturers was training in effective communication. Effective communication is considered as a vital element in the civility of the medical education and treatment system. Therefore, it is necessary to include the techniques of effective communication and enhancing interpersonal skills as much as possible as credits in curriculum.

From the perspective of students, defining the codes of conduct can identify norms and abnormalities and place them within the framework of ethics. Generally, holding meetings to discuss challenging behaviors and their causes, as well as the establishment of a specific framework and discovering the procedures to make the necessary changes are among the useful strategies to prevent and deal with challenging behaviors (28). In the study by Morrissette et al. (2001), in order to reduce students' challenging behaviors by lecturers, some strategies have been listed including developing interpersonal skills, adjusting course expectations, getting appropriate feedback to students on teaching methods, creating a collaborative learning environment and experiencing interactive class management, respectful response to contradictions and handling complaints instantly(29). Clark et al. (2011), too, have highlighted the importance of making students and lecturers familiar with the topic of incivility (30). Rad et al (2016) have emphasized the need for holding training workshops, too (31).

**Conclusions**

In summary, the results of numerous studies along with this study confirm the need for providing strategies to raise awareness among educatores and students of the issue of civility. Therefore, incivility in the academic environment has been reported as a serious problem in nursing education, in which students have a noticeable role. Thus, identifying and rooting the causes for the occurrence of such behaviors are essential and require training in civil behaviors and ethical principles through holding training workshops.
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|  |
| --- |
| **Table** 1. Nursing Students and educators' demographic variables |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Students** | | | | **Educators** | | | |
| **Variables** | **Category** | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Variables** | **Category** | **Frequency** | **Percent** |
| **Age** | 29/9 | 9 | 14/3 |
| **Age** | 19-23 | 163 | 81/6 | 30-39/9 | 18 | 28/6 |
| 23< | 15 | 18/4 | 40 | 36 | 57/1 |
| **Gender** | Male | 96 | 53/9 | **Gender** | Male | 15 | 23/8 |
| Female | 82 | 46/1 | Female | 48 | 76/02 |
| **Marital status** | Single | 162 | 91 | **Marital status** | Single | 22 | 34/9 |
| Married | 16 | 9 | Married | 41 | 65/1 |
| **University entering year** | 2013 | 29 | 16/3 | **Education** | Bachelor | 21 | 33/3 |
| 2014 | 45 | 25/3 | Master's degree | 10 | 15/9 |
| 2015 | 66 | 37/1 | PhD | 32 | 50/8 |
| 2016 | 38 | 21/3 | **work experience(Year)** | <5 | 16 | 25/4 |
| **Semester** | 3-4 | 76 | 42/7 | 5-14 | 27 | 42/9 |
| 5-6 | 56 | 31/5 | >15 | 20 | 31/7 |
| 7-8 | 46 | 25/8 | **Academic Rank** | Faculty /Non-Faculty | 47 | 74/6 |
| **Average of passed courses** | > 16 | 37 | 20/8 | Assistant Professor/Associate Professor /Professor | 16 | 25/4 |
| 16-17.99 | 107 | 60/1 | **Place of Residence** | Native | 59 | 93/7 |
| 18≥ | 34 | 19/1 | Non-native | 4 | 6/3 |
| **Residence status** | Dormitory | 78 | 43/8 | **Employment conditions** | Formal | 25 | 39/7 |
| Non-dormitory | 100 | 56/2 | contractual | 20 | 31/7 |
| **Faculty** | Khorramabad | 81 | 45/5 | others | 18 | 28/6 |
| Aligoudarz | 27 | 15/2 | **Faculty** | Khorramabad | 51 | 81/1 |
| Poldokhtar | 36 | 20/2 | Aligoudarz | 4 | 6/3 |
| Boroujerd | 34 | 19/1 | Poldokhtar | 4 | 6/3 |
|  | | | | Boroujerd | 4 | 6/3 |

**Table** 2. Mean score of the educators and nursing students’ perception students' incivility

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Students | Educators | Items | |
| Mean ± SD | **Mean ± SD** |
| 2.46± 0.93 | 2.48± 1.07 | Expressing disinterest, tiredness, or indifference toward the course content or the subject matter | 1 |
| 3.51±0.77 | 3.37±0.92 | Impolite gestures or nonverbal behaviors towards others (e.g. eye rolling, pointing to somebody by fingers, etc.) | 2 |
| 3.12±0.95 | 3.21±0.98 | Inefficient or ineffective teaching methods (changing the time of assignments or exams) | 3 |
| 2.51±0.94 | 2.73±1.03 | Refusing or being reluctant to answer direct questions | 4 |
| 2.74±0.89 | 3.14±0.93 | Using a computer, cell phone, or any other media in faculty meetings, councils, or doing irrelevant activities | 5 |
| 2.75±0.93 | 2.98±0.88 | Delay in entering the class or other planned activities | 6 |
| 2.67±0.91 | 3.03±0.88 | Early leaving classes or other planned activities | 7 |
| 2.35±0.93 | 2.65±0.97 | Not being prepared for the class or other planned activities | 8 |
| 2.57±0.92 | 2.94±0.98 | Cancelling the class or other planned activities without prior announcement | 9 |
| 2.42±1.02 | 2.33±0.91 | Insincerity and coldness towards others (indifference and not accepting students’ opinions) | 10 |
| 2.65±1.07 | 2.83±0.94 | Punishing the whole class because of one student’s inappropriate behavior | 11 |
| 2.95±0.87 | 2.94±0.89 | Permitting students’ marginal talks which disturb the class | 12 |
| 3.17±1.09 | 3.63±0.65 | Unfair grading | 13 |
| 3.62±0.81 | 3.78±0.58 | Spoiling or being impolite to others | 14 |
| 1.99±1.08 | 2.19±1.07 | Refusing to talk about re-examinations, test deadlines, or revising grades | 15 |
| 2.83±0.97 | 3.0±0.93 | Ignoring, indifference or encouraging disturbing student behaviors | 16 |
| 2.14±1.06 | 2.63±1.15 | Showing superiority, abusing position personal rank against others (such as threatening students not to pass the exam without any reason) | 17 |
| 2.67±1.03 | 2.49±1.12 | Inaccessibility outside of the class (not answering contacts or not attending workplace during work hours) | 18 |
| 3.63±0.79 | 3.68±0.64 | Sending inappropriate or impolite emails to others | 19 |
| 3.43±0.84 | 3.41±0.71 | Mentioning discriminative ideas (racial, ethnic, gender, etc.) | 20 |
| 3.75±0.70 | 3.86±0.50 | Disrespecting (scorning or swearing) others | 21 |
| 3.83±0.59 | 3.87±0.58 | Threatening others physically (implied or real) | 22 |
| 3.83±0.59 | 3.87±0.49 | Damaging properties | 23 |
| 3.84±0.58 | 3.9±0.53 | Making threatening statements about weapons | 24 |

**Table** 3. Frequency distribution of nursing incivility from the students and educators' perspective

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Students | | | | Educators | | | | Items |
| Frequency (Percentage) | | | | Frequency (Percentage ) | | | |
| Often | Sometimes | Rarely | Never | Often | Sometimes | Rarely | Never |
| 62(8/34) | 78(8/43) | 29(3/16) | 9(1/5) | 21(3/33) | 25(7/39) | 15(8/23) | 2(2/3) | 1 |
| 15(4/8) | 52(2/29) | 76(7/24) | 35(7/19) | 3(8/4) | 24(1/38) | 29 (46) | 7(1/11) | 2 |
| 36(2/20) | 79(4/44) | 50(1/28) | 13(3/7) | 7(1/11) | 31(2/49) | 17(27) | 8(7/12) | 3 |
| 24(5/13) | 64(36) | 69(8/38) | 21(8/11) | 5(9/7) | 20(7/31) | 31(2/49) | 7(1/11) | 4 |
| 57(32) | 68(2/38) | 40(5/22) | 13(3/7) | 10(9/15) | 33(4/52) | 19(2/30) | 1(6/1) | 5 |
| 18(1/10) | 79(4/44) | 57(32) | 23(9/12) | 9(3/14) | 35(6/55) | 13(6/20) | 6(5/9) | 6 |
| 15(4/8) | 64(36) | 72(4/40) | 27(2/15) | 8(7/12) | 30(6/47) | 18(6/28) | 7(1/11) | 7 |
| 33(5/18) | 69(8/38) | 62(8/34) | 14(9/7) | 12(19) | 24(1/38) | 20(7/31) | 6(5/9) | 8 |
| 14(9/7) | 63(4/35) | 79(4/44) | 22(4/12) | 5(9/7) | 23(5/36) | 22(9/34) | 13(6/20) | 9 |
| 23(9/12) | 53(8/29) | 82(1/46) | 20(2/11) | 2(2/3) | 27(9/42) | 26(3/41) | 8(7/12) | 10 |
| 19(7/10) | 47(4/26) | 82(1/46) | 30(9/16) | 0 | 17(27) | 28(4/44) | 18(6/28) | 11 |
| 27(2/15) | 72(4/40) | 62(8/34) | 17(6/9) | 2(2/3) | 18(6/28) | 31(2/49) | 12(19) | 12 |
| 61(3/34) | 56(5/31) | 40(5/22) | 21(8/11) | 8(7/12) | 19(2/30) | 27(9/42) | 9(3/14) | 13 |
| 18(1/10) | 43(2/24) | 64(36) | 53(8/29) | 2(2/3) | 21(3/33) | 24(1/38) | 16(4/25) | 14 |
| 35(7/19) | 65(5/36) | 59(1/33) | 19(7/10) | 9(3/14) | 23(5/36) | 23(5/36) | 8(7/12) | 15 |
| 25(14) | 60(7/33) | 69(8/38) | 24(5/13) | 6(5/9) | 20(7/31) | 24(1/38) | 13(6/20) | 16 |
| 35(7/19) | 54(3/30) | 59(1/33) | 30(9/16) | 11(5/17) | 25(7/39) | 18(6/28) | 9(3/14) | 17 |
| 14(9/7) | 43(2/24) | 79(4/44) | 42(6/23) | 5(9/7) | 8(7/12) | 18(6/28) | 32(8/50) | 18 |
| 13(3/7) | 20(2/11) | 41(23) | 104(4/58) | 3(8/4) | 2(2/3) | 15(8/23) | 43(3/68) | 19 |
| 18(1/10) | 35(7/19) | 62(8/34) | 63(4/35) | 1(6/1) | 11(5/17) | 24(1/38) | 27(9/42) | 20 |
| 9(1/5) | 24(5/13) | 56(5/31) | 89(50) | 0 | 6(5/9) | 18(6/28) | 39(9/61) | 21 |
| 4(2/2) | 13(3/7) | 47(4/26) | 114(64) | 0 | 3(8/4) | 10(9/15) | 50(4/79) | 22 |
| 5(8/2) | 19(7/10) | 38(3/21) | 116(2/65) | 1(6/1) | 10(9/15) | 11(5/17) | 41(1/65) | 23 |
| 5(8/2) | 4(2/2) | 14(9/7) | 155(1/87) | 0 | 1(6/1) | 5(9/7) | 57(5/90) | 24 |
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