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Abstract
What the teacher applies on teaching is the representation of teacher perceptions on how the teaching process should take place. However, what the students perceive and believe would also affect to how they study at classroom. This study aimed at finding the students’ and teachers’ perceptions on spoken CF and discovering the similarities and differences of perceptions between students and teachers on spoken CF. This study was a qualitative study. Observation, interview and questionnaire were the instruments used. The two teachers involved were observed in the classroom for three meetings and also interviewed. The questionnaire was distributed to two classes representing of each teacher’s class. Both teachers and students agreed if the spoken CF is required and delayed correction is more suitable time to do. Nevertheless, both teachers and students have different arguments about the frequency of spoken CF. The discrepancy perceptions are also discovered in the priority corrected errors and the strategy of spoken CF. In sum, teachers should take into account students’ perceptions as factors to enhance the learning activities. Besides, the amount of spoken CF should also consider students’ beliefs, learning objectives, and learning activities.
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INTRODUCTION
Issues concerning corrective feedback have been investigated from different viewpoints. Some studies focused on the effectiveness of certain types of CF (e.g., Sheen (2010) and Lyster and Saito (2010)) while others looked into the relationship between error types and CF types or between CF types and learners' responses (e.g., Kennedy (2010) and Lyster and Ranta (1997)). Those studies only focus on the effectiveness of corrective feedback and the corrective feedback in relation to students’ response. Despite the importance of corrective feedbacks and its role on the classroom, only limited studies that seek the students’ perceptions towards the corrective feedbacks given by the teachers, (Kagimoto & Rodgers, 2008). In fact, Schulz (2001, p. 245) states that students’ beliefs play an important role in motivation, selection of learning strategies, and learning in general. Therefore, the study focusing on students’ perceptions is necessary in order to find out what the students expects and what they receive from the teachers.

Not only studies on students’ perceptions and preferences on corrective feedback that play important role in their learning, but also studies on teachers’ perceptions in giving CF are warranted to explore. This is due to the fact that
although both theoretical and empirical research have showed the beneficial influence of corrective feedback on language learning, the teachers’ practice of corrective feedback in language classroom remains some problems. Chaudron (1977) and Long (1977) found that the teachers’ practice of spoken corrective feedbacks was neither consistent nor effective; therefore, it is was not effective. The other problem is that teachers usually applied corrective feedbacks in an unsystematic way and the feedbacks given was ambiguous, (Lyster & Mori, 2006). The last problem also found by Lyster and Ranta (1997) that claimed many teachers fear to correct students’ errors since it would interrupt the communication or there were some error criteria that should be addressed. These problems are considerably related to the teachers as the main provider in giving corrective feedback. Teachers have different perspective towards to the use of corrective feedback in the classroom. Some teachers think that providing feedback will not help students to improve their linguistic features while others believe that it is the best way for reducing students’ errors. Moreover, many other perceptions regarding to the corrective feedback may surely result different implementation of corrective feedback in the classroom, such as time of giving correction, the way to give correction, and error to be treated.

Therefore, in order to shed some lights on these issues, this study examines teachers’ and students’ perceptions on spoken corrective feedback. A number of studies have investigated the relevant studies. Schulz (2001) conducted a study to find out the perceptions between teachers and students with different cultures; Colombia and USA, on the role of grammar instruction and corrective feedback. Despite the different culture between two countries, this study found that teachers and students perceived corrective feedback as necessary in learning. However, the result showed that the teachers perceived less strong than the students. While the students considered the grammar instruction and corrective feedbacks as the best ways to accelerate their English proficiency, the teachers contrarily more agreed to apply the real-life communicative tasks as the way to improve students’ English skill. Next, a research conducted by Kagimoto and Rodgers (2008) was aimed at describing the students’ perceptions of corrective feedbacks in terms of the preferred and useful ones. The study found that the students considered metalinguistic feedbacks and explicit corrections as their two preferred and useful corrective feedbacks. This study revealed that the students perceive the explicit corrective feedbacks; telling the students about their errors, was preferable for the students. Conversely, Méndez and Cruz (2012) tried to find out teachers’ perceptions on spoken corrective feedback and their practice. The teachers favored the implicit corrective feedbacks; not telling the students about their errors. They believed if implicit corrective feedbacks, such as clarification request and recast, would be appropriate for the students.

Those research on perceptions between teachers and students on corrective feedbacks showed that what the teachers believed was not always similar as the students expected. There were some discrepancies between teacher and student perceptions on corrective feedbacks. While those previous studies explored the
teachers’ and the students’ perception in terms of necessity and the preferred corrective feedbacks, this study adapting the study of Park (2010) is an attempt to investigate the teachers’ and students’ perceptions of spoken corrective feedback in terms of necessity of corrective, errors to be treated, time of correction, and the preferred corrective feedback in the EFL classroom setting. The category of spoken CF on this study followed as described by Lyster and Ranta (1997). Based on the investigation of feedback used by four teachers who were observed during the interaction with students, Lyster and Ranta (1997, p. 46) distinguish six different types of spoken feedback: (1) explicit correction; indicating the committed errors and telling the correct form, (2) recast; reformulating all or partial utterance without telling the error, (3) clarification request; using several questions for asking clarification, (4) metalinguistic feedback; giving comments, information, or questions related to the correct form without explicitly providing the correct form, (5) repetition; simply repeating the erroneous utterance, and (6) elicitation; pausing the erroneous utterance and allowing the learner to complete the utterance. In coding the errors, this study took Lyster (1998, p. 278) who divided the errors into 4 main error types: grammatical, pronunciation, lexical, and unsolicited uses of the first language (L1). This error classification is intended to figure out the teachers’ and students’ perceptions about the errors that should be prioritized in correction.

**METHODOLOGY**

This qualitative research was undertaken to figure out the teachers’ and students’ perceptions on spoken corrective feedback in terms of the necessity of spoken CF, errors to be corrected, time of correction, and the preferred spoken CF.

The research was conducted in senior high school 1 Garut. Two English teachers of second grade participated in the study whose teaching experience varied from 15 to 20 years. The two teachers declared to have magister degree. The number of participating students in the research is 73 second grade students. They were from two classes where the two involved teachers taught. The respondents had exposed on English more than 5 years. Majority of the students, that is 91.78%, had high interest on English whose English ability is varied. 33 students, 45.21%, revealed if they could speak English quite well and 3 students, 4.11% admitted that they could speak English fluently and the rest of students, 49.32%, revealed if they could not speak English very well.

To answer the research questions, the researcher selected three instruments, namely: observations, questionnaire, and interview. The first instrument is observation. It allows the researcher to observe the lessons of the two teachers. The observation was undertaken for six times, three meetings for each teacher. During the time of observing, the researcher also made some notes related to the investigated issues. This observation was possible to verify the views and opinions stated both in questionnaire and interview. The second instrument, questionnaires were distributed to the students. The choice of this instrument was intended to gather the necessary
data that would give researcher with the background information about the respondents and their perceptions on spoken CF. The open-ended questionnaire covered several issues; necessity of spoken CF, the corrected errors, time of correction, and the preferred spoken CF. The third instrument, semi-structured interview was administered to the two teachers involved in the research. The listed issues to gain perceptions were questioned to the teachers including necessity of spoken CF, the corrected errors, time of correction, and the preferred spoken CF.

FINDINGS

Students’ Perceptions on Spoken CF

Necessity of Spoken CF

Unquestionable, almost all of the student respondents, that is 98.63% agreed to be corrected when they made spoken errors. The most reason found, that is 72.60%, was that correction could improve their English spoken ability. In terms of frequency of spoken CF, there were varied answers among students. Almost the same percentage of the students agreed that their spoken errors should be “every time” and “often” corrected, 35.62% and 39.73% respectively. Meanwhile, 21.92% of students wanted their spoken errors “sometimes” to be corrected and only 1.37% or a student who thought he should “never” be corrected. Surprisingly, the highest response is that the students need their spoken errors “often” to be corrected, not “every time” corrected. The most reason of this choice is that if the teachers “often” corrected their spoken errors it would significantly increase or improve their ability.

Time of Spoken CF

As illustrated in table 1, over half of the students, 54.79% (40 students), preferred to be corrected after they finish speaking. On the contrary, 32 students (43.84%) preferred to be corrected immediately or as soon as the errors are made even though it hinders the flow of conversation. And the least answer, there was only one student, 1.37%, who wanted to be corrected in the end of the lesson. Twenty one students believed that through delayed correction or the corrective feedback given after they finished speaking, it would not disturb concentration or interrupt them and they would not get offended or make them down. This finding indicates that the students comfortably preferred to be corrected as they finish speaking and interrupting them also will make them unhappy and will discourage them to learn. Nevertheless, whether the error is immediately given after the error is produced or the correction is given after they finish speaking, twenty students revealed that this timing of correction was essential in order that they could locate their errors and could be corrected directly by the teachers.

Errors to be Corrected

According to the Table 2, pronunciation places the students’ most preferred errors that should be corrected in the first place as 43%, followed by grammatical, 35.51%, lexical 13.08%, and unsolicited use of L1 as 8.41%. This finding indicates that the
students consider that their pronunciation error is the error that should have a great proportion corrective feedback rather than any other errors. This also confirms that pronunciation is the most important and concerned English aspect that must have more attention from the teachers. The most reason found among students who selected pronunciation was that the nature of English in which different pronunciation could be different meaning. In the second top reason, the students admitted if pronunciation was important and they would know the correct pronunciation through corrective feedback and consequently it would make them people understand their speaking.

**The Preferred Spoken Corrective Feedback**

In table 4.16 shows the total students’ responses on the preferred spoken corrective feedback for each error. Overall, the explicit correction undoubtedly becomes the students’ preferred corrective feedback at most. The students perceived the explicit correction as the most effective way to correct their errors. Metalinguistic feedback places the second highest number of the students’ preferred spoken corrective feedbacks among four errors. The two highest number of these two methods of correcting shows that they students favored to be indicated their committed errors or corrected explicitly but in different manners.

The students’ most preferred spoken corrective feedbacks, explicit correction, allows the students know not only the indication of committed errors but also the correction of the errors. The second one, metalinguistic feedbacks, the students recognize that they made errors because the teacher signal it by giving the metalinguistic questions and detailed explanation related to the errors the students made.

**Teachers’ Perceptions on Spoken CF**

**Necessity of Spoken CF**

To find out teachers’ perceptions on spoken CF, two instruments were applied namely observation and interview. Table 3 shows the teachers’ corrections for three meetings respectively. The result of observations was then compared and asked in interview sections. Therefore, it could verify the views and perceptions of the teachers towards the topic discussed. Both teachers corrected errors in different numbers. While the first teacher corrected few errors, the second teacher did the students’ committed errors more than the first teacher did. From the result of interview, the two teachers involved in this study indicated that the correction was certainly needed. However, they agreed if the correction should not be frequently applied. The correction was truly required when the students produced the fatal errors that could change the meaning of the sentence or the language function of the word.

This findings shows that the correction is thought as indispensable part of teaching since it can help the students to be accurate in speaking English. Nonetheless, the implementation of correction should not be done too much, only for
certain serious errors. Another interesting finding is that the second teacher thought that teachers should not always be the only provider correction. The students could be an effective provider correction giver but restricted for minor errors. Therefore, the students are not only the receiver but also the provider to the other students who produced errors.

**Time of Spoken CF**

The observed lessons for six meetings in total are also intended to find out the teachers’ preferred time for correcting the students’ errors whether it is after the errors are made even it interrupts the students (immediate), after the students finish speaking (delayed), or the correction is given in the end of lesson. As shown on the table, the two teachers used the corrective feedback mostly after the students finished speaking. This could be indicated that correcting the students after the errors made was not the main choice for them. They more preferred to correct later in order that the students completed their speaking first and then the teacher did some corrections. Nonetheless, there are different arguments to decide the proper time for correction. While the first teacher regarded the students’ psychology as her attention, the second teacher only mentioned that situation and condition influenced him to prefer time for correction.

**Errors to be corrected**

As seen on Table 5, the observed lesson for six meetings shows the most corrected errors by each teacher. According to the number of corrected errors from two teachers during six meetings, they corrected mostly on grammatical errors. Conversely, the pronunciation was the second number of corrected error. It indicates that pronunciation and grammar are two focused errors for corrective feedback. The learning objectives, the material presented to the students, and the available time for learning are three things that affect the teachers’ choice for correcting certain errors. Given that grammatical as the most corrected errors, the two teachers agreed if error in grammar is serious error that can affect the meaning of sentence. While in pronunciation errors, both teachers also approved if the pronunciation was not necessary to be corrected too often. The available supporting media could enable the students to correct their pronunciation error by themselves. Besides, as long as the listener can understand us, the minor pronunciation error should not be corrected because we can know the meaning of what we say.

**The Preferred Spoken CF**

The recast was mostly the teachers preferred to deal with all four errors. Among six corrective feedback used by the teachers, recast, repeating the erroneous utterance with the correct form, placed the first spoken CF method used by the teachers followed by explicit correction. The rest of spoken CF; metalinguistic feedback, repetition, elicitation, and clarification request were the least used by the teachers. The choice of recast was influenced by the teachers’ anxiety to judge the students’
incorrect utterances. Besides, teachers were afraid if the students would have no
courage to speak up anymore.

Different Perceptions between Teachers and Students

With regard to necessity of corrective feedback, both teachers and students
indisputably had the same agreement about the role of spoken corrective feedback.
They thought spoken CF was beneficial for improving students’ ability, avoiding the
same errors in the future and locating the errors directly. However, they had slightly
distinctive perceptions in terms of frequency of spoken CF. While the students
perceived spoken CF to be done often, the teachers merely thought if spoken CF was
necessary only when students made serious errors; therefore, it should not be done
every time. The psychological aspects became the teachers’ consideration when
giving corrective feedback. They believed that doing too much correction might make
students felt not confident when speaking but if the students’ expectation of
corrective feedback was high and not fulfilled, it would similarly discourage us to
speak.

With respect to time of spoken CF, both students and teachers had overall the
same perception that letting the students finish speaking first and then do corrections
was the appropriate time for correction. Nevertheless, the number of students who
preferred to be corrected immediately after the errors were made was also high.
Therefore, the preferred time correction would be individual choice. Due to some
students also chose to be corrected after the errors were made, the teachers should
also be able to offer the variation of treatments by knowing their individual students’
beliefs to apply corrective feedback in the suitable and affective time.

In terms of errors to be corrected, the students and teachers had different
perceptions. Most of the students perceived pronunciation to be mainly corrected
because of the nature of English pronunciation. In other hand, the teachers recognized
grammar as the most essential errors to be corrected as seen from the observation.
Making grammatical errors was regarded as the serious errors that required
correction.

With regard to the preferred corrective feedbacks, students and teachers had
contradictory perceptions. The students mostly more chose explicit correction,
followed by metalinguistic feedback, and recast. They considered explicit correction
as effective correction because it located their error and were directly corrected. In
other hand, of the six corrective feedbacks, recast was the most frequent corrective
feedback used to deal with students’ errors. They favored recasts as the most effective
way to correct due to it could correct students’ errors without judging the students
that they made errors.

DISCUSSIONS
Despite the different claims of the corrective feedbacks’ roles in language learning, this study supports from both the students and teachers that providing spoken CF is required in learning process. The result of this study also confirms the theory as proposed by Swain (2000) and Schmidt (1990); (2010). According to Swain’s Output Hypothesis, the function of CF is to develop the students’ knowledge or ability in the language. While in Schmidt’s Noticing Hypothesis, the CF could make the students notice the gap between the correct and incorrect form. As the result, the language learning would be easily understood by the students and would enhance the learning process. In spite of the same perceptions about the necessity of spoken CF, students perceived more favorable on spoken CF than the teachers. Schulz (1996) explained if this strong perceptions towards corrective feedback was the result of their personal experiences that believed if the learning could be enhanced by rule awareness and corrective feedbacks. Furthermore, according to his study, Schulz (1996) proposed some affecting factors related to the role of CF such as aspect of language, learning characteristics, and instructional circumstances. He, then, suggested the teachers to take into account the students’ belief to what the learning should take place. In other hand, when applying spoken CF, teachers used it by considering some reasons. These reasons were in fact similarly found as prior researches; (1) teachers’ belief on how the language learning should work (Mori, 2002), (2) teachers’ perceptions of certain learners and their errors, (Yoshida, 2008); (Schulz, 1996), (3) Instructional objectives (Mori, 2002); (Schulz, 1996).

The interesting fact among the perceptions of the teachers was that the place of corrective feedbacks only associated with the accuracy only. From both the corrected errors, the highest corrected error was grammatical, followed by pronunciation. The grammatical was mainly corrected when the objective of learning was grammar. Nevertheless, when it came to the discussion sections, such as the teacher asked several questions that lead to the topic, the teachers ignored the errors. In fact, Ellis (2013) suggested that corrective feedbacks could be used both fluency and accuracy work. When the focus is for communication, we can use the delayed correction. As long as the corrective feedback used is brief and unobtrusive, it can work for fluency. Besides, the teacher can also note the students’ errors while they are speaking and make correction when the activity is over.

In term of time for spoken CF, although both teachers and students generally perceived similarly if the delayed correction worked appropriately, the finding showed that the preferred time for providing corrections among the students was not revealing. The close percentage clearly indicated that in terms of time for correction the students had no dominant preference. Similarly, despite the frequent use of delayed corrections among the teachers, their perceptions about the best time for giving corrective feedbacks were also different. While the first teacher avoid giving the correction as soon as the students made errors, the second teacher used both more
frequently. The findings that showed the close percentage of delayed and immediate correction among the students and the different views among teachers about timing correction confirmed Hendrickson’s study (1978) as cited by (Park, 2010) that there was no general best time when to correct errors. Furthermore, Mendez & Cruz (2012) claimed that the teachers’ learning focus will be determined which time of corrective feedbacks works best and effectively. If the focus is on accuracy, the correction would be more suitable to do immediately; on the other hand, if fluency, the delayed correction would be more proper to do. During the observation, the use of immediate correction was applied more on pronouncing accuracy. When the students mispronounced the word, the second teacher almost corrected the pronunciation error immediately.

With respect to the prioritized corrected errors, the students’ most favorable on pronunciation error was in contradictory as in Schulz (1996) proposed. He found that the students had more favorable on grammar rather than other errors. This indicates that the choice of the students was much influenced by the most errors that they most did in learning English and also the different nature of pronouncing between their first language and English. Nevertheless, looking at the most teachers’ corrected errors, following as found in Lyster (1998); Yoshida (2008); Mendez & Cruz (2012), grammatical error was the main focus. This discrepancy occurs because of the different perceptions. While the teacher believed making error in grammar was fatal that could change the meaning of the sentence, the students instead preferred pronunciation simply because it was the most errors they did.

The discrepancy between the actual use of teachers’ spoken corrective feedbacks and students’ preferred on it was also found. Ellis, Loewen, and Erlam (2006) defines the corrective feedbacks in terms of implicit and explicit. Implicit corrective feedback does not provide the indication to the students about their errors; on contrary, explicit corrective feedback allows the students to realize the errors because the teacher tells them. Recast, clarification request, elicitation, repetition are implicit corrective feedbacks. Explicit correction and metalinguistic feedback belong to explicit correction. As similarly found on previous study for example Lyster & Ranta (1997), Yoshida (2008), of six spoken corrective feedbacks, recast was the most frequently used by the teachers, followed by explicit correction, and metalinguistic feedback. Elicitation, clarification request, and repetition were three least spoken corrective feedback used. Recast was mainly used when it came to pronunciation and grammatical errors respectively. The result of observation and interview revealed that the teacher preferred using recast, repeating the students’ committed errors with the correct ones, to deal with errors. Therefore, it can conclude that teacher perceived to use implicit correction, giving no overt indication of the committed errors to the students.
Yoshida (2008) pointed out some main reasons the teachers preferred to use recast because of the limited time and also to avoid social embarrassment the learners if the correction is explicit. The teachers having the allotted time with the arranged plans should fulfill the learning objectives with certain learning activities. Because the recast took little time and had no distraction to the flow of communication, the teachers chose it. Furthermore, the teachers felt it was less intimidating corrective feedbacks. The recast may work because it did not affect the flow of communication or intimidate the students. Nevertheless, another problem of applying the recast is that the students would not realize the correction given or notice that the teacher corrected their errors. Consequently, the response on recast was limited.

On the other hand, the students preferred to be corrected explicitly. The students’ more favorable on explicit corrective feedbacks than implicit corrective feedbacks on this study supported the findings on previous research as in Schulz (2001) which pointed out that students prefer more explicit forms of correction while teachers generally prefer more implicit types. Ellis et al. (2006) also revealed that explicit corrective feedback is more effective than implicit one. When the students are provided explicit corrective feedbacks, they are likely able to more comprehend the corrective feedbacks given. The students’ favored the explicit corrective feedbacks for example explicit correction and metalinguistic feedbacks were due to they were easily understood and to make them aware of the committed errors. Kagimoto and Rodgers (2008) emphasized more that explicit corrective feedbacks was not only the students’ most preference for correction but also the useful corrective feedbacks.

CONCLUSION
It is admitted that giving the correction is a complex process which needs certain consideration. The learning objectives, the available time, the material give are examples of some factors to take into account. This study shows that despite the different perceptions on what errors that should always be corrected and the preferred spoken corrective feedbacks, the teachers also should consider what the students perceive about corrective feedbacks, especially how the students want to be treated to enhance learning process. The implicit corrective feedbacks (recast) is required to be applied but the explicit corrective feedbacks (explicit correction and metalinguistic feedbacks) are necessary to be applied more on learning with the consideration of the students’ language proficiency, feeling and emotion, and needs.

REFERENCES


Méndez, Edith Hernández, & Cruz, María del Rosario Reyes. (2012). Teachers’ Perceptions About Oral Corrective Feedback and Their Practice in EFL Classrooms. *Universidad Nacional de Colombia, 14*(2), 63-75.


Park, Hyang-Sook. (2010). *Teachers’ and learners’ preferences for error correction*. (Master), California State University.


### Table 1

**Student Responses on Time of Corrective Feedback**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of Corrective Feedback</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After the error is made although it interrupts me</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After I finish speaking</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the end of the lesson</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2

**Student Responses on Errors to be Corrected**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Errors to be Corrected</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammatical</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsolicited use of L1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chart 1

**The Students' Preferred Corrective Feedback**

![Chart of preferred corrective feedback types](image)

### Table 3

**Number of Correction used Teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>1st Teacher</th>
<th>2nd Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Meeting</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Meeting</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Meeting</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4
Time of Corrective Feedbacks used for Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>1st Teacher</th>
<th>2nd Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immediate</td>
<td>Delayed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Meeting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Meeting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Meeting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5
The Teachers’ Corrected Errors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Errors to be Corrected</th>
<th>1st Teacher</th>
<th>2nd Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammatical</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>72.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsolicited use of L1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 2