<A Review Paper>

Remaining issues in metacognitive instruction for second or foreign language listening development

Ogyoung Lee*

I. NEED FOR CRITICAL REEXAMINATION

A review on recent research on second or foreign listening instruction suggested a need for an analysis of the effectiveness of metacognitive instruction for developing L2 listening comprehension. Current approaches for effective L2 listening were toward real-life authentic ample-input listening with more of top-down approaches and process instruction. Most of the studies, if not all, supported for real-life listening with authentic materials (Buck, 2002; Goh, 2008; Richards, 2005; Vandergrift, 2007; Veenman et al., 2006). The importance of greater exposure to comprehensible spoken input has been widely asserted (Field, 2008; Krashen, 2008; Beasley & Chuang, 2008; Derwing, Munro & Thomson, 2008; Rost, 2007). Top-down approaches have drawn more recent favors than bottom-up approaches (Goh, 2008; Rost, 2002; Vandergrift, 2004). Process listening was favored to product listening (Vandergrift, 2004; Field, 2003; Buck, 1995; Krashen, 2008). Interest was also indicated in raising student awareness of the listening process (Vandergrift, 1999; Mendelsohn, as cited in Vandergrift, 2004). Among the approaches to L2 listening, metacognitive instruction for L2 listening was noted to be a most recent

* Graduate school, Department of English Education, Seoul National University

trend (Annevirta et al., 2007; Beasley et al., 2008; Chen, 2007; Derwing, 2008; Field, 2008; Goh, 2008; Graham et al., 2008; Lee & Oxford, 2008; Vandergrift, 2007; Veenman et al., 2006; Zohar & Peled, 2008). In a state-of-the-art review article on recent developments in second and foreign language listening comprehension by Vandergrift (2007), the suggested instructional model for L2 listening was metacognitive instruction. The favored process instruction also underlies metacognitive teaching (Vandergrift, 2004:11).

In the midst of these increasing interests, prior to application to Korean context, this paper examined research findings so far and some remaining questions on metacognitive instruction for second or foreign language listening comprehension. For this purpose, after briefly summarizing supported findings, it discussed problems and remaining issues for metacognitive instruction for L2 listening. The examination especially covered the findings on definition, effect, and methods, and skeptics on definition, methodology, effectiveness, and conditions of instruction. This review is expected to help understand the gaps in the literature and to suggest implications for future research on metacognitive listening instruction and its application in Korean English classrooms.

II. FINDINGS SO FAR

2.1 Metacognitive Strategy

2.1.1 Definition

Metacognitive knowledge, first coined by Flavell (1976; 1979, cited in Goh, 2008), refers to the individual's awareness of knowledge about and regulation of one's cognitive activities in learning processes (Flavell, 1979, cited in Veenman, 2006; Brown, 1978, cited in Veenman, 2006). The knowledge is about what, how, and

why they think about the learning task or situation (Goh, 2008: 192). Seven metacognitive processes were summarized by Vandergrift (2004) according to the stages of listening instruction: 1) planning and directed attention, 2) monitoring, 3) monitoring, planning and selective attention, 4) monitoring and problem-solving, 5) monitoring and evaluation, 6) selective attention and monitoring, and 7) evaluation. It was discussed that the described metacognitive processes could be focus of listening instruction to raise learners' awareness of their learning processes and to develop how to appropriately use the relevant strategies during listening. Vandergrift (2004) mentioned that teaching these metacognitive strategies might help learners comprehend the spoken input by being more aware of what and how they can use for better comprehension.

2.1.2 Effect on Language Learning and Listening Comprehension

The positive impact of instruction was suggested both on language learning and on listening comprehension. First, lots of studies indicated that development in strategic knowledge led to improvement in language performance (Annevirta et al., 2007; Vauras et al., 1999; Wenden, 1998). Annevirta et al (2007) and Vauras et al. (1999) drew their conclusion from the high correlation between improvement in meta-knowledge and better language performance. Enhanced metacognitive knowledge was suggested to be a good predictor of learning (Wang, Haertel, & Walberg, 1990), indicator of better text comprehension (Borkowski & Kurtz, 1987; Pressley, 2002; Annevirta et al., 2007), a compensation for one's cognitive and intellectual limitations (Veenman et al, 2006:6), and an effective tool for successful listening (Zhang & Goh, 2006).

Second, across the literature, it was widely suggested that knowledge and use of metacognitive strategies facilitates L2 listening comprehension (Annevirta et al., 2007; Beasley et al., 2008; Chen, 2007; Derwing, 2008; Field, 2008; Goh, 2000; 2002; 2008; Graham et al., 2008; Hasan, 2000; Liu & Goh, 2006; Macaro et al., 2007; Mareschal, 2002, cited in Vandergrift, 2003; Lee & Oxford, 2008; O'Malley & Chamot, 1990, cited in Vandergrift, 2003; Rubin, 1994; Vandergrift, 1999; 2002;

2003a; 2003b; 2004; 2007; Veenman et al., 2006; Zohar & Peled, 2008). Goh (2008) indicated the three benefits as 1) affectively more motivating and less anxious, 2) advantage in listening performance, and 3) more benefit to weak listeners. Goh (2008) noted that the knowledge influences the manner in which learners approach the task of listening and learning to listen. Learners who have appropriate task knowledge about listening may plan, monitor and evaluate what they do." Flavell (1979:908, cited in Goh, 2008) stated the effect as:

I believe that metacognitive knowledge can have a number of concrete and important effects on the cognitive enterprises of children and adults. It can lead you to select, evaluate, revise, and abandon cognitive tasks, goals, and strategies in light of their relationships with one another and with your own abilities and interests with respect to that enterprise. Similarly, it can lead to a wide variety of metacognitive experiences concerning self, tasks, goals, and strategies, and can also help you interpret the meaning and behavioral implications of these metacognitive experiences (Flavell, 1979: 908).

2.1.3 Identification Process

Learners' self-reports were analyzed to understand learners' metacognitive knowledge for language processes. The methods for collecting self-reports usually included five: retrospective interviews (O'Malley & Chamot, 1989), stimulated recall interviews (Robinsons, 1996, cited in Chamot, 2004), questionnaires (Goh, 2008; Lee & Oxford, 2008; Vandergrift, 2002; 2005), written diaries (Peterson, 2000, cited in Chamot, 2004), think-aloud protocols (Chamot, 2005). More examples with corresponding types are well summarized in Chamot (2004). Among others, Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL), developed by Oxford (1990), was observed most often. It was also agreed in Chamot (2004). As an instance, to test children's metacognitive knowledge, Annevirta et al. (2007) assessed three cognitive processes of remembering, understanding, and learning by means of questionnaires after verbally and pictorially presented tasks. A useful tool specially developed for

listening was introduced in Goh (2008), as an adapted form of Metacognitive Awareness Listening Questionnaire (MALQ), as in Table 1.

<Table 1> A Questionnaire for Metacognitive Knowledge of L2 Listening Process, Goh (2008)

Self-report items on metacognitive awareness about L2 listening (based on the original MALQ by Vandergrift *et al.* 2006; used with the publisher's kind permission)

1 Strongly agree	2 Agree	3 Partially agree	4 Partially disagree	5 Disagree	6 Strongly disagree	For each item, write the number that shows what you think
1. Before I start to listen, I have a plan in my head for how I am going to listen.						
2. I focus harder on the text when I have to understand it.						
3. I find that listening in English is more difficult than reading, Speaking or writing in English.						
4. I translate in my head as I listen.						
5. I use the words I understand to guess the meaning of words I don't understand.						
6. When my mind wanders, I recover my concentration right away.						
7. As I listen I compare what I understand with what I know about the topic.						
8. I feel that listening comprehension in English is a challenge for me.						
9. I use my experience and knowledge to help me understand.						
10. Before listening, I think of similar texts that I may have listened to.						
11. I translate key words as I listen.						
12. I try to get back on track when I lose concentration.						
13. As I listen I quickly adjust my interpretation if I realize that it is not correct.						
14. After listening, I think back to how I listened, and about what I might do differently next time.						
15. I don't feel nervous when I listen to English.						
16. When I have difficulty understanding what I hear, I give up and stop listening.						
17. I use the general idea of the text to help me guess the meaning of the words that I don't understand.						
18. I translate word by word as I listen.						
19. When I guess the meaning of a word, I think back to everything else that I have heard, to see if my guess makes sense.						
20. As I listen, I periodically ask myself if I am satisfied with my level of comprehension.						
21. I have a goal in mind as I listen.						

2.1.4 Types of Strategy

The common classification was done one of the following three: person knowledge, task knowledge, and strategic knowledge (Flavell, 1989, cited in Wenden, 1998).

That is, metacognitive knowledge has usually been classified according to whether the focus is on learner, learning task, or the process of learning (Wenden, 1998). Griffiths (2003) well organized strategies according to the frequency, learner's proficiency, sex, age, nationality. The strategies for self-regulation in listening were categorized (Brown, 1978, cited in Goh, 2008:197)as follows: 1) planning: determining comprehension or learning objectives and deciding the means by which the objectives can be achieved; 2) monitoring: checking the progress of unfolding comprehension or overall listening development plans; 3) evaluating: determining the success of one's efforts at processing spoken input or the outcome of a plan for improving one's listening abilities. More description for the same steps of listening was also found in Vandergrift (2002) as in Table 2.

<Table 2> Metacognitive Listening Comprehension Strategies, (Vandergrift, 2002)

Metacognitive Listening Comprehension Strategies	
1. *Planning*: Developing an awareness of what needs to be done to accomplish a listening task, developing an appropriate action plan and/or appropriate contingency plans to overcome difficulties that may interfere with successful completion of the task.	
Advance organization:	Clarifying the objectives of an anticipated listening task and/or proposing strategies for handling it.
Directed attention:	Deciding in advance to *attend in general* to the listening task and to ignore irrelevant distractors; maintaining attention while listening.
Selective attention:	Deciding to *attend to specific aspects* of language input or situational details that assist in understanding and/or task completion.
Self-management:	Understanding the conditions that help one successfully accomplish listening tasks and arranging for the presence of those conditions.
2. *Monitoring*: Checking, verifying, or correcting one's comprehension or performance in the course of a listening task.	
Comprehension monitoring:	Checking, verifying, or correcting one's understanding at the local level.
Auditory monitoring:	Using one's 'ear' for the language (how something sounds) to make decisions.
Double-check monitoring:	Checking, verifying or correcting one's understanding across the task or during the second time through the oral text.
3. *Evaluation*: Checking the outcomes of one's listening comprehension against an internal measure of completeness and accuracy.	
Performance evaluation:	Judging one's overall execution of the task.
Strategy evaluation:	Judging one's strategy use.
4. *Problem identification*: Explicitly identifying the central point needing resolution in a task or identifying an aspect of the task that hinders its successful completion.	
Source: Vandergrift (1997, based on O'Malley & Chamot 1990)	

2.1.5 Effects of Learner Characteristics and of Context

First, metacognitive strategy and use were different according to different learner characteristics. Patterns of language strategy use were well discussed in Griffiths (2003) in relation with learner's proficiency, gender, age, nationality. Griffiths (2003) suggested that different strategies were used for different proficiency and nationality while no statistically significant difference was found according to gender and age. For example, proficiency effect was noted on the effectiveness of metacognitive knowledge (Chen, 2007). Effective use of metacognitive knowledge and high-level self-regulation was found to distinguish high-proficiency learners from poor learners (Annevierta et al, 2007; Pressley et al, 1989; Wong & Wong, 1986). Goh (2002) found that higher proficiency Chinese ESL listeners used more number of effective strategies than less proficient listeners who used similar strategies. In addition, the strategy was more effective for weak first language readers (Pressley & Gaskins, 2006), for weak second language listeners (Goh & Yusnita, 2006; Pressley, 2000). Moreover, as for the age effect, no critical age was supported while generally more meta-knowledge was suggested of older learners. Annevirta et al., (2007) summarized that older students had more strategic knowledge than younger ones, citing Miller (1994), Pressley & Afflerbach (1995), Vauras et al. (1994). On the other hand, Whitebread (1999) indicated that metacognitive skills can be obtained early by the school age.

Second, as for the social context effect, it was found that learners of different cultural setting preferred different strategies (Griffiths, 2003; Lee & Oxford, 2008; Sun, 2006; Chamot, 2005). Different goals of learning were also indicated to affect the strategy use. This was well reviewed in Chamot (2004).

2.2 Metacognitive Instruction for Listening Comprehension

2.2.1 Need for Instruction

It was reported that teaching metacognitive knowledge was required for strategy

development. Above all, it was found that without training a learner's strategy use was consistent over 6-month period (Graham, Santos, & Vanderplank, 2008). Thus, the benefit might be bigger for poor strategy users because the acquisition of helpful strategies might help facilitate the listening process (Vandergrift, 2007). In addition, classroom instruction was attested to enhance metacognitive knowledge (Mareschal, 2007; Vandergrift, 2004; Liu & Goh, 2006, cited in Goh, 2008).

The purpose of such training was said to train learners in applying strategies in order to handle the demands of listening (Mendelsohn, 1998). According to Goh (2008), instructions on metacognitive skills might help learners to be motivated to find ways of addressing them. Goh (2008) added that metacognitive instruction for L2 listening development elicits and enhances learners' knowledge about learning to listen, as well as helps learners use effective strategies for managing their comprehension and overall listening development (Goh, 2008:192).

2.2.2 Methods of Instruction

Various instructional methods were suggested: teacher-modeling (Neil, 2002, Goh, 2008; Chamot, 1995; Field, 1998), activities (Goh, 2008; Buck, 1995), explicit explanation (Veenman et al, 2006), among others.

First, an implicit type of teaching seemed teacher modeling. Unlike other teaching methods, this did not seem to employ explicit explanation. Teacher simply modeled by showing learners the mental activities that they engage in to construct their understanding of listening tests (Goh, 2008). Chamot (1995) described this as teacher thinking-aloud about planning, monitoring and evaluating strategies. It can be said to demonstrate cognitive strategies of verifying informed guesses (Field, 1998). For example, a teacher can be a model by demonstrating how strategies can be used. Neil (2002) discussed five types of metacognition and how teachers can model them. The five metacognition steps were:1) preparing and planning for learning, 2) selecting and using learning strategies, 3) monitoring strategy use, 4) orchestrating various strategies, and 5) evaluating strategy use and learning. This kind of approach, if applied implicitly, might draw different benefits for learners.

Positive effects of implicit teaching was discussed in Long (2007) and DeKeyser (2003).

Second, activities were described (Buck, 1995; Goh, 2008). Teachers can use pre-communication activities as a way of raising learners' awareness about listening processes (Buck, 1995). Goh (2008:201) presented learning activities according to instructional tasks, as in Table 3.

<Table 3> Metacognitive Activities for Second Language Listening Development (Goh, 2008)

Metacognitive Instructional Task	Learning activities
Integrated experiential listening tasks	Metacognitive listening sequence
	Self-directed listening
	Listening buddies
	Peer-designed listening programs
	Post-listening perception activities
Guided reflections on listening	Listening diaries
	Anxiety and motivation charts
	Process-based discussions
	Self-report checklist

Third, more benefit through explicit intervention and scaffolded learning in the classroom (Veenman et al, 2006).

Two different ways to teach metacognition were suggested by Veenman et al. (2006) that reflect the problems of students' metacognition use. Metacognitive instruction need to be provided to those do not use adequate strategies due to lack of available metacognitive knowledge ('availability deficiency' students). Cued metacognitive activities might be helpful during tasks if the learners have difficulty using the strategies they already know because of task difficulty, test anxiety, lack

of motivation, or inability to see the appropriateness of metacognition in a certain situation (Veenman et al, 2006).

Moreover, the three key elements to successful metacognition instruction were suggested by Veenman (2006: 9):

1) embedding metacognitive instruction in the content matter to ensure connectivity;
2) informing learners about the usefulness of metacognitive activities to make them exert the initial extra effort;
3) prolonged training to guarantee the smooth and maintained application of metacognitive activity.

As for the focus of instruction in metacognitive strategy teaching, more focus might need to be on incorrect answers and the process that resulted in those wrong answers in listening comprehension. Field (2003) noted that, by understanding the process how learners arrive at incorrect answers, L2 teachers might be able to help learners develop strategies to comprehend the spoken L2 inputs. Vandergrift (2004) mentioned the information from wrong answers could be useful to help less proficient learners try out more efficient strategies (Vandergrift, 2004:10).

III. SKEPTICS

While positive influence was widely suggested of the metacognitive knowledge and instructions, there still remain questions on the conclusions. The problems were mainly concerned with inconsistent definitions, methodological subjectivity and doubtful process of interpretation, less-fully investigated effectiveness of instruction, and underspecified conditions for instruction.

3.1 Inconsistent Definitions

Confusion remained of the exact meaning of the terms. The definitions were confusing because different researches define metacognitive knowledge or training in varying ways. While most interchangeably used the three terms of metacognitive knowledge, metacognitive strategy, and metacognition (Chen, 2007; Chamot, 2005; Goh, 2008; Vandergrift, 2007; Neil, 2002), some separated metacognitive knowledge and metacognitive strategy and put them under the concept of metacognition (Wenden, 1998). Citing Brown et al. (1983), Wenden (1998) stated that metacognitive knowledge and strategy should not be considered interchangeably but dealt with distinct ones. Wenden (1998: 519) regarded metacognitive knowledge as "information learners acquire about their learning" but metacognitive strategy as "general skills through which learners manage, direct, regulate, guide their learning, i.e., planning, monitoring and evaluating." Wenden (1998) described that metacognitive knowledge consists of learner beliefs, learners' psychology of learning, and learner presentations, with additional relevant characteristics. On the other hand, terminological problem was also reported that some were rather general while some were too specific (Veenman et al, 2006:4). Moreover, it was confusable with other relevant concepts. For instance, it was mentioned that self-regulation was subordinate of metacognition (Brown & DeLoache, 1978; Kluwe, 1987) while it was other times superordinate (Winne, 1996; Zimmerman, 1995). Wenden (1998:519) explained that self-regulation is the term used in cognitive psychology in replacement for the use of metacognitive strategies in learning, for self direction in adult education and in the literature on learner autonomy in SLA. Sometimes metacognitive knowledge was ambiguously defined like knowledge about themselves as listener s and their listening process (Goh, 1997; Graham, 2006; Sinanu, Palupi, Anggeraeni & Hastuti, 2007; Goh & Yusnita, 2006; Vandergrift, 2002).

Regarding the development of strategy use, there were opposing findings whether learners' strategic use change naturally without instruction. It was discussed in Veenman et al. (2006:4) that habit of strategy use did not tend to change naturally

without instruction. By contrast, Annevirta et al. (2007) observed that students' strategy knowledge developed naturally over time from pre-school to the second-year of elementary school.

3.2 Methodological Doubts

Considering the data collection methods and process of interpretation, varying conclusions seemed possible about the kinds of metacognitive strategy and the effect of instruction.

3.2.1 Data Collection

First, concerning the identification of strategy use, the adopted method of self-report could have been subjective. As admitted in Chamot (2004:15), the participants might have incorrectly retrieved their thinking process or simply answered what they assumed to be right or desirable.

3.2.2 Interpretation

Second, the interpretation process seemed problematic when the studies supported for the effect of improved metacognitive knowledge on better language performance. Firstly, although Annevirta et al. (2007) argued that the metacognitive knowledge and listening comprehension skills are strongly related, their interpretation process was doubtful. They claimed as if separate development of knowledge and performance were actually cause-and-result relation. In the data from 181 children, who were tested three times from preschool to the third grade in one-year intervals, Annevirta et al. (2007) claimed of the positive correlation between knowledge and comprehension because better scores were indicated in all the meta-knowledge and listening and reading skills. If just two simultaneous indication of separate development meant cause-and-effect relationship, many of the unrelated factors could be wrongly interpreted as related.

3.3 Inconclusive Effectiveness of Metacognitive Instruction

3.3.1 Little Empirical Studies on Effectiveness

Much of the claims did not accompany experimentally supported evidences. Unexpected from the large quantity of studies concerning metacognition, most claims for the effectiveness were done with argumentations. Empirical evidences were not surprisingly small to support the impact of metacognitive instruction. The supports for the positive effect might have to be firmly assessed by means of actual application and tangible results by the learners. Field (2008) also noted that "there has been disappointingly little academic research into the effectiveness of these new approaches." Vandergrift (2007) stated that it was only recently that the importance of metacognitive skills came to be experimentally supported. Especially for listening, empirical supports might be highly important. The role of metacognition in listening instruction has not been proved but instead benefited from the findings on that in reading, as Goh (2008: 202) admitted, the effect of metacognitive instruction for L2 listening comprehension has not been empirically proved. In addition, though some activities were suggested, it was yet uncertain how the students would react to the activities. It would be possible to experiment on whether the assumed effective listening strategies actually help students enhance their listening performance.

3.3.2 Inconclusive Long-term Effect

The long-term effect of metacognition instruction did not seem to be empirically approached yet. Though the importance was suggested of prolonged training for guaranteed maintenance of metacognitive activity (Veenman et al., 2006), the experiment did not test the learners' retention of the strategic knowledge and language performance later than 6 months. The proved helpfulness was tested for short-term. For example, we can not be sure whether the improvement in listening

scores was due to development of the strategic skills in Annevirta et al. (2007).

3.3.3 Effectiveness of Individual Strategies

The effect of individual listening strategy instruction remains. Most of the researches focused on general effectiveness of strategies but not cared to see into that of individual ones. This kind of research interest was found in Goh (2002). With special interest in figuring out how each strategy is worked on, Goh (2002) observed that Chinese ESL listeners used 44 listening tactics to operationalize more number of existing strategies.

3.4 Underspecified Conditions for Instruction

The provided instructional methods were not fully described enough to see how to apply them in teaching. The given directions were not divided according to learner age, proficiency, or teaching purpose.

3.4.1 Need for Detailed Description for Pedagogical Application

The provided pedagogical guidelines were not concrete enough. The steps and descriptions were too general for average teachers to recognize the specific methods for classroom teaching. The researchers suggested a set of activities but without actual implement and demonstrations to students. For instance, it was difficult to understand how to really apply Goh (2008)'s integrated experiential listening tasks (integrate everyday listening activities with metacognitive coursebook materials) and guided reflections on listening (to draw out listeners' implicit knowledge about L2 listening and to help them construct new knowledge (Refer to Table 3 of this paper). In addition, it was not certain how much and how often is required for strategic development.

Learners need for some strategic types and learners' response could be investigated further. Differences might exist between the areas that students need help in

listening strategies and those that teachers or researchers see the need. Chand (2007) found that learners had different perceptions on listening skills and strategies from the teachers and that the classroom teaching did not reflect what was suggested in researches.

3.4.2 Need for the Effect of Learner and Context on Instructional Effectiveness

Specific conditions might need to be further researched under which the instructions would work for different students and in different contexts. Especially those for Korean EFL learners and Korean context should be focused in order to apply the metacognitive strategy instructions to Korean English classrooms. No attempt was indicated about Korean learners and Korean context, although there were empirical observations about how different learners responded to different strategy and instruction. Globally, other variables could also be further researched. It did not seem to be verified on what kind of metacognitive knowledge would be useful for whom and in what social context, or what kind of instruction on such would be more effective again for whom and where. The same instructional methods can operate differently according to the characteristics of the learner and the learning context. Although different strategies were discovered to be used by different learners (Kaylani, 1996, Wharton, 2000, discussed in Chamot, 2004) and in different environments (Lee & Oxford, 2008; Keatley et al, 2004, cited in Chamot, 2004; Griffiths, 2003), some of the corresponding pedagogical approaches and their effectiveness were not empirically examined. There must be varying impact of the instructional methods according to learners and contexts. Annevirta et al. (2007) shared this need by stating that challenges still remain on how, when and under which conditions metacognitive knowledge and strategies are developed.First, the metacognitive knowledge and use need to be separately categorized according to the age of the learners, stages of listening, proficiency level, etc. Considerable variations were indicated in the proper use by students (Veenman et al., 2006). Though the learners to some extent learned the strategies naturally as time passed, the kinds and amount of the use varied among the learners (Veenman et al., 2006).

Second, although there found proficiency effect, further experiments need to be done. The benefit of the same instruction might differ according to learners with different proficiencies. Rost (2007) fount that repeated input and topic provision were effective for both language proficiency groups with differing degree of advantage. He also revealed that the effect of previewing questions depended on the ability learners can interpret the questions. Rost (2007) also showed for high-proficiency learners negative effects of vocabulary instruction of providing key words. One such effort was made by Sun (2006) that examined the applicable ways of narrow and broad teaching listening methods with a central consideration on EFL Korean context. This study, however, failed to empirically support the effectiveness of the suggested method but unfortunately ended up with argumentation.

IV. CALLS FOR APPLICATION TO KOREAN ENGLISH CLASSROOMS

Extending from understanding the suggested ways of instruction for L2 listening, researchers and teachers might have to further figure out whether and how to apply the findings to Korean English classrooms. Teachers and researchers need to seek for ways to adapt and make listening inputs more comprehensible and meaningful to English learners (Krashen, 2008; Field, 2008; Rodrigo, et al., 2004; Beasley et al, 2008). Importance was suggested of finding out instructional methods of producing better listeners rather than being satisfied with merely providing more exposure to spoken second languages (Field, 2008). Nevertheless, little effort seems to have been made for understanding the adaptability and appropriately adapting the recent findings to Korean context of English education. This can be easily observed in current English classrooms. First, despite the wide support for the significant role of exposure to spoken language through listening and speaking on developing general language skills, scarce listening instruction seems to be administered in English classrooms in Korean public schools. Awareness can be

raised about the significant role of listening on language learning (Vandergrift, 1999). Reform of national or school testing system can affect the change. Second, though the research trend has much advanced, listening instruction methods in Korean classrooms seem far behind the fashion. Seen by the history of listening instructional trends provided in Goh (2008:190), listening instructions in Korean classrooms seem to fall under those of 50s and 60s, regardless of perspectives of input, instructional focus, main listening activities, or dominant theoretical paradigms of learning and comprehension. Many of the teachers still use written texts read aloud clearly. The instructional focus has still been usually on mere drilling practices or dictations and the like. Common activities are drilling of sounds, dictations, or answering comprehension passages based on recorded listening scripts. Although the administration claims that they reflect current communicative, interactional, sociolinguistic approaches for second language acquisition, the theory still seems to base on behaviorist assumptions.

As discusses right above, Korean English classrooms might not have changed much to reflect significant role of listening in learning and the methods recommended in recent researches. Chances are good that this might have partially resulted from lack of critical thinking and sincere considerations on applicability of the theories and practices to Korean learners of English studying in Korean context, let alone other various factors. Although different forces are interwoven in solving this matter, such as reform of consciousness and of testing, gradual and steady efforts need to be made in order to improve the educational conditions in Korea. After figuring out the appropriate teaching methods for Korean English education, it might be necessary to actually apply the findings to classrooms and to experiment the effectiveness of the instructions, in order to continuously adapt the instructions to Korean learners and Korean context. This process might be facilitated with shard understanding among students, parents, and administrators, as well as teachers and researchers.*

---

* 본 논문은 2010. 5. 7. 투고되었으며, 2010. 5. 20. 심사가 시작되어 2010. 6. 1. 심사가 종료되었음.

❖ REFERENCES

Anderson, N. J. (2002). The role of metacognition in second language teaching and learning. ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics. Retrieved from the web on http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/digest_pdfs/0110_Anderson.pdf

Annevirta, T., & Vauras, M. (2006). Developmental changes of metacognitive skill in elementary school children. Journal of Experimental Education, 74, 197-225.

Annevirta, T., Laakkonen, E., Kinnunen, R., & Vauras, M. (2007). Developmental dynamics of metacognitive knowledge and text comprehension skill in the first primary school years. Metacognition Learning, 2, 21-39.

Beasley, R. E., & Chuang, Y. (2008). Web-based music study: the effects of listening repetition, song likeability, and song understandability on EFL learning perceptions and outcomes. TESL-EJ, 12(2), 1-17.

Buck, G. (1995). How to become a good listening teacher. In D. J. Mendelsohn and J. Rubin (eds.), A guide for the teaching of second language listening. San Diego: Dominie Press, 113-128.

Carrier, K. A. (2003). Improving high school English language learners' second language listening through strategy instruction. Bilingual Research Journal, 27(3), 383-408.

Chamot, A. U. (1995). Learning strategies and listening comprehension. In D. J. Mendelsohn and J. Rubin (eds.), A guide for the teaching of second language listening. San Diego: Dominie Press, 13-30.

Chamot, A. U. (2004). Issues in language learning strategy research and teaching. Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, 1(1), 14-26.

Chamot, A. U. (2005). Language learning strategy instruction: current issues and research. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 25, 112-130.

Chand, R. (2007). Same size doesn't fit all: insights from research on listening skills at the university of the South Pacific (USP). The International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning, 8(3), 1-22.

Chang, A. C., & Read, J. (2006). The effects of listening support on the listening

performance of EFL learners. TESOL Quarterly, 40(2), 375-397.

Chen, Y. (2007). Learning to learn: the impact of strategy training. ELT Journal, 61(1), 20-29.

DeKeyser, R. (2003). Implicit and explicit learning. In C. J. Doughty and M. H. Long (eds.), The Handbook of Second Language Acquisition. Blackwell Publishing, 313-348.

Derwing, T. M., Munro, M. J., & Thomson, R. I. (2008). A longitudinal study of ESL learners' fluency and comprehensibility development. Applied Linguistics, 29(3), 359-380.

Field, J. (1998). Skills and Strategies: towards a new methodology for listening. ELT Journal, 52, 110-118.

Field, J. (2003). Promoting perception: lexical segmentation in second language listening. ELT Journal, 57(4), 325-334.

Field, J. (2008). Guest editor's introduction emergent and divergent: A view of second language listening research. System, 36, 2-9.

Goh, C. (2000). A cognitive perspective on language learners' listening comprehension problems. System, 28, 55-75.

Goh, C. (2002). Exploring listening comprehension tactics and their interaction patterns. System, 30, 185-206.

Goh, C. (2008). Metacognitive instruction for second language listening development: theory, practice and research implications. RELC Journal, 39(2), 188-211.

Goh, C., & Taib, Y. (2006). Metacognitive instruction in listening for young learners. ELT Journal, 60(3), 222-232.

Graham, S. (2006). Listening comprehension: the learners' perspective. System, 34, 165-182.

Graham, S., Santos, D., & Vanderplank, R. (2008). Listening comprehension and strategy use: a longitudinal exploration. System, 36, 52-68.

Griffiths, C. (2003). Patterns of language learning strategy use. System, 31, 367-383.

Harris, V. (2003). Adapting classroom-based strategy instruction to a distance learning context. TESL-EJ, 7(2), 1-19.

Hasan, A. (2000). Learners' perceptions of listening comprehension problems. Language,

Culture and Curriculum, 13, 137-153.

Harley, B. (2000). *Listening strategies in ESL: do age and L1 make a difference?* TESOL Quarterly, 34(4), 769-777.

Krashen, S. (2008). Language education: past, present, and future. Regional Language Centre Journal, 39(2), 178-187.

Lee, K., & Oxford, R. (2008). Understanding EFL learners' strategy use and strategy awareness. The Asian EFL Journal, 10(1), 7-32.

Liu, X. L., & Goh, C. (2006). Improving second language listening: awareness and involvement. Language Teacher Research in Asia, 91-106.

Long, M. H. (2007). Recasts in SLA: the story so far. Problems in SLA, 75-116.

Macaro, E., Graham, S., & Vanderplank, R. (2007). A review of listening strategies: focus on sources of knowledge and on success. In E. Macaro and A. Cohen (eds.), Language Learning Strategies: 30 years of research and practice, 165-185.

Mendelsohn, D. J. (1995). Applying learning strategies in the second/foreign language listening comprehension Lesson. In D. J. Mendelsohn and J. Rubin (eds.), A guide for the teaching of second language listening. San Diego: Dominie Press, 132-150.

Mendelsohn, D. J. (1998). Teaching listening. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 18, 81-101.

Murray, B. (2007). Metacognitive strategies and the achievement of listening proficiency in the language classroom. Korean Journal of Applied Linguistics, 23(1), 1-15.

O'Malley, J. M, Chamot, A. U., & Küpper, L. (1989). Listening comprehension strategies in second language acquisition. Applied Linguistics, 10(4), 418-437.

Paris, S. G., & Newman, R. S. (1990). Developmental aspect of self-regulated learning. Educational Psychologist, 25, 87-102.

Perry, N. (1998). Young children's self-regulated learning and contexts that support it. Journal of Educational Psychology, 90, 715-729.

Perry, N. E., VanderKamp, K. J. O., Mercer, L. K., & Nordby, C. J. (2002). Investigating teacher-student interactions that foster self-regulated learning. Educational Psychologist, 37, 5-15.

Pressley, M., Borkowski, J. G., & Schneider, W. (1989). Good information processing: what it is and how education can promote it. International Journal of Educational Research, 13, 857-867.

Pressley, M., & Afflerbach, P. (1995). Verbal protocols of reading: the nature of the constructively responsive reader. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Richards, J. C. (2005). Second thoughts on teaching listening, RELC, 36(1), 85-92.

Rodrigo, V., Krashen, S., & Gribbons, B. (2004). The effectiveness of two comprehensible-input approaches to foreign language instruction at the intermediate level. System, 32, 53-60.

Rost, M. (2002). Teaching and researching listening. Harlow: Longman.

Rost, M. (2007). I'm only trying to help: a role for interventions in teaching listening. Language Learning and Technology, 11(1), 102-108.

Sun, K. (2006). Contextualized language instruction in the EFL context: the case of listening skills. Primary English Education, 12(2), 131-155.

Vandergrift, L. (1999). Facilitating second language listening comprehension: acquiring successful strategies. ELT Journal, 53(3), 168-176.

Vandergrift, L. (2002). It was nice to see that our predictions were right: developing metacognition in L2 listening comprehension. The Canadian Modern Language Review, 58(4), 555-575.

Vandergrift, L. (2003a). From prediction through reflection: guiding students through the process of L2 listening. The Canadian Modern Language Review, 59(3), 425-440.

Vandergrift, L. (2003b). Orchestrating strategy use: toward a model of the skilled second language listener. Language Learning, 53, 463-496.

Vandergrift, L. (2004). Listening to learn or learning to listen. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 24, 3-25.

Vandergrift, L. (2006a). Relationships among motivation orientations, metacognitive awareness and proficiency in L2 listening. Applied Linguistics, 26, 70-89.

Vandergrift, L. (2006b). Second language listening: listening ability or language proficiency? The Modern Language Journal, 90(1), 6-18.

Vandergrift, L. (2006c). The metacognitive awareness listening questionnaire:

development and validation. Language Learning, 56(3), 431-462.

Vandergrift, L. (2007a). Teaching learners how to listen does make a difference. Paper presented at the meeting of the Canadian Association of Applied Linguistics.

Vandergrift, L. (2007b). Recent development in second and foreign language listening comprehension research. Language Teaching, 40, 191-210.

Vauras, M., Kinnunen, R., & Rauhanummi, T. (1999). The role of metacognition in the context of integrated strategy intervention. European Journal of Psychology of Education, 14, 555-569.

Veenman, M. V. J., Van Hout-Wolters, B. H. A. M., & Afflerbach, P. (2006). Metacognition and learning: conceptual and methodological considerations. Metacognition Learning, 1, 3-14.

Wenden, A. L. (1998). Metacognitive knowledge and language learning. Applied Linguistics, 19(4), 515-537.

Whitebread, D. (1999). Interactions between children's metacognitive abilities, working memory capacity, strategies and performance during problem solving. European Journal of Psychology of Education, 4, 489-507.

Wong, B., & Wong, R. (1986). Study behavior as a function of metacognitive knowledge about critical task variables: an investigation of above average, average, and learning disabled readers. Learning Disabilities Research, 1, 101-111.

Zohar, A., & Peled, B. (2008). The effects of explicit teaching of metastrategic knowledge on low- and high-achieving students. Learning and Instruction, 18, 337-353.

Zhang, L. J. (2003). Research into Chinese EFL learners strategies: methods, findings and instructional issues. RELC, 34(3), 284-322.

Zhang, D., & Goh, C. C. M. (2006). Strategy knowledge and perceived strategy use: Singaporean students' awareness of listening and speaking strategies. Language Awareness, 15(3), 199-219.