Modern English Education, Vol. 16, No. 2, Summer 2015
http://dx.doi.org/10.18095/meeso.2015.16.2.05

Metacognitive Listening Strategies and Academic Motivation of Korean EFL Adolescent Learners

Yuah V. Chon
Hanyang University

Chon, Yuah V. (2015). Metacognitive L2 listening strategies and academic motivation of Korean EFL adolescent learners. *Modern English Education*, *16*(2), 91-119.

While the role of metacognition has proven to be critical in L2 listening instruction, the connection between the learners' metacognitive L2 listening strategies and academic motivation has been scantly researched. The purpose of the study was to research 312 middle school learners' metacognition during L2 listening in relation to motivation they exhibited towards studying English. The learners were asked to complete the Metacognitive Listening Awareness Questionnaire and Academic Self-Regulation Questionnaire. There was use of descriptive statistics, MANOVA, and multiple regression to analyze the data. Results indicated that there was increased use of metacognitive L2 listening strategies with rising levels of proficiency. For academic motivation, amotivation, identification and intrinsic motivation related significantly to the employment of metacognitive L2 listening strategies with the exclusion of person knowledge. For predicting L2 listening ability, planning & evaluation, directed attention and person knowledge were significant. This indicated that the listeners' attempt to stay focused on the task, and solve listening problems with existing knowledge were helpful for successful comprehension. However, increased person knowledge that reflected learners' listening anxiety was found to be detrimental to listening performance. The results of the study are presented in light of teaching implications.

**[L2 listening/metacognition/academic motivation/listening proficiency/
제2언어 듣기/상위인지/학습동기/듣기능숙도]**

I. INTRODUCTION

With the introduction of the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) methodology,

more concern has evolved with the need to teach listening for oral communication. According to Goh (2008), the focus of teaching since the 1990s has been on developing metacognitive awareness about L2 listening within the social-cognitive models of comprehension. Metacognition, which was introduced in cognitive psychology more than 40 years ago was termed by Flavell (1976, 1979) to refer to an individual's awareness of thinking and learning: what we are thinking, how we are thinking in relation to a learning task or situation and why we are thinking in a particular way. Metacognition also includes the ability to regulate these thinking processes. The growing number of empirical studies on strategy training and process-oriented reflections also support the importance of metacognitive strategies in raising learners' awareness of the listening process (Cohen & Macaro, 2007; Goh, 2008; Graham & Macaro, 2008; Vandergrift & Goh, 2012; Vandergrift & Tafaghodatari, 2010). In the end, higher levels of metacognition is expected to help learners take control of their listening process, such as for planning, evaluating and goal-setting.

In tandem with interest on understanding metacognitive strategies within the cognitive domain, there was also the need to understand the affective domain of the 14-16 year-old Korean middle school learners. The researcher was inspired to examine the specific learner population since they, within the Korean school system, have formally begun to deal with English listening in exam formats. Through researching metacognitive L2 listening strategies and academic motivation, the researcher hoped to shed light on some guidelines that would help L2 learners develop metacognitive listening strategies by also sustaining appropriate types of motivation in relation to L2 listening. There is concern that the exam-oriented approaches utilized in L2 listening in the Korean middle school are likely to deter learners' interest in English. As such, the researcher felt that this study was required to look into how learners' metacognitive competence was related to learners' self-driven academic motivation for learning English.

Academic motivation would concern the development of persistence in order to maintain long-term motivation and investment of identity as an active user of the L2 (Csizer & Dörnyei, 2005; Deci & Ryan, 1985, 1995; Rost, 2014). Although the explanation on the relationship between academic motivation, metacognitive L2 listening strategies (MLLS, hereafter) and L2 listening ability may not be conclusive, Dörnyei (1996) hypothesized that learner strategies may be an intervening variable of motivation and L2 proficiency. To the researcher's best knowledge, there are few studies that focus specifically on MLLS and motivation orientations. The exceptions are studies by Rahimi and Abedi (2015) and Vandergrift (2005). To examine the learners' motivation with reference to metacognitive listening strategies, motivational orientations of self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985) was adopted where self-regulated learning (Ryan & Deci, 2000b) and autonomy (Dickinson 1995; Ehrman & Dörnyei 1998) are

important factors for facilitating better learning.

To this end, the present study aimed: 1) To research the MLLS that Korean EFL middle school learners employ for solving multiple-choice listening problems; 2) To investigate the relationship between the employment of MLLS and academic motivation, and 3) To identify the predictors of L2 listening ability when constructs of metacognitive L2 listening strategies and academic motivation were submitted for analysis. Also, in the context where the study was conducted, the learner group of focus was middle school learners since there has been lack of research on these early adolescent learners. These learners can be profiled as those who are not yet under the influence of experiencing L2 mainly through the high-stakes tests so that their level of motivation for learning English may be different from other EFL group learners (e.g., high school) (C. Kim & H. Lee, 2015) to have effects on the use of MLLS.

II. BACKGROUND

1. Learners' Metacognition of L2 Listening Strategies

Listeners use a variety of strategies to make sense of incoming messages and compensate for their lack of knowledge in EFL contexts. Acquiring second language (L2) listening comprehension remains a highly complex problem solving process in which listeners must discriminate among sounds, understand vocabulary and grammatical structures, identify stress and intonation, retain what they have gathered, and interpret the language output within the relevant sociocultural context (Vandergrift, 1999; Vandergrift & Goh, 2012). To understand such a complex process, research in listening comprehension has shifted its focus from comprehension to the sequence through which comprehension takes place, that is, listening strategies (e.g., Ahmadi & Yamini, 2003; Chang, 2008; Golchi, 2012; Gonen, 2009; Vandergrift, 1999).

While listening strategy literature conventionally indicates strategies to be divided into three main categories: cognitive, metacognitive, and socioaffective strategies (Goh, 2002; O'Malley, Chamot & Küpper, 1989; Vandergrift, 2003a; Vandergrift & Goh, 2012), more than the past two decades have seen growing interest in the role of cognitive and metacognitive listening strategies (Goh, 1997, 1998, 2000, 2002; Goh & Taib, 2006; O'Malley et al., 1989; Vandergrift, 1999, 2003b; Vandergrift, Goh, Mareschal & Tafaghodatari, 2006). In particular, metacognitive strategies refer to skills such as planning, monitoring, evaluating, and problem solving are used by learners to manage, regulate, and guide their learning. There is some empirical evidence that an important difference between more-skilled and less-skilled L2 listeners lies in their use of metacognitive

strategies (e.g., Bacon 1992; Goh 1998, 2000; O'Malley & Chamot 1990; Vandergrift 1998, 2003b). However, metacognition for L2 listening has received attention only in recent years (Cross, 2010; Goh & Hu, 2014; Vandergrift & Tafaghodatari, 2010). As such, there was need to develop a more comprehensive understanding of what learners do as they listen.

Goh (1998, 2002) studied the cognitive and metacognitive strategies and tactics used by ESL learners, and compared the way high- and low-ability listeners applied them. Goh (1998) had 16 students selected from a group of 80 to form two groups, higher and lower listening ability learners, and found that lower ability listeners were failing to use certain strategies that higher ability used successfully (i.e., contextualization, real-time assessment of input, and comprehension evaluation). In particular, Goh found the higher ability listeners to be using a larger number of metacognitive strategies where the learners were able to also keep on listening and not be distracted by unfamiliar words. Goh (2002) examined a group of Chinese ESL learners' listening strategies and the tactics that operationalized these strategies. An exploratory analysis of the way these tactics interacted in the processing sequences of two learners revealed that the higher ability listener demonstrated more effective use of both cognitive and metacognitive tactics.

Vandergrift (2003b) found skilled listeners using twice as many metacognitive strategies as their less-skilled counterparts. More importantly, a qualitative analysis of the differences pointed to a systematic approach used by skilled listeners in 'a continuous metacognitive cycle where new material interacts with listener inferences and is monitored against world knowledge and expectations generated by the conceptual framework and the developing mental representation of the text in memory' (p. 487). The study pointed out that the use of successful strategies is not simply related to the number of them, but rather more to the skillful 'orchestration' of a number of metacognitive and cognitive strategies used to control learning processes and achieve comprehension.

A recent questionnaire study was conducted by Goh and Hu (2014) to explore the relationship between metacognitive awareness and listening performance by eliciting from 113 English-as-a second-language (ESL) Chinese learners their metacognitive awareness. Data was collected via the Metacognitive Awareness Listening Questionnaire (MALQ) (Vandergrift et al., 2006) with regard to knowledge of listening strategies used and perceptions of difficulty. The results showed a significant positive relationship between learners' metacognitive awareness scores and listening performance where metacognitive awareness accounted for 22% of the variance in listening performance. Analysis of individual factors also showed a significant relationship between listening performance and the strategies of directed attention and problem solving as well as an overall moderate-to-low sense of confidence among the participants in the study. It also revealed considerable intrapersonal variation in different aspects of metacognitive awareness. It was the intention

in the present study to use the questionnaire as an instrument for eliciting and interpreting learners' metacognitive awareness about listening with the MLAQ.

2. Motivational Orientations and L2 Listening

Motivation is usually understood to refer to the desire to initiate L2 learning and the effort employed to sustain it. In the late 1950s, Canadian researchers Robert Gardner and Wallace Lambert developed what was to become the dominant model of L2 learning motivation, which they placed within a wider model of L2 learning motivation (Gardner, 1985; Gardner & Lambert, 1972). This model posited two orientations (clusters of reasons for learning an L2): an integrative orientation through an interest in interacting with the L2 language group; and an instrumental orientation through an interest in the more practical advantages of learning a new language, such as job advancement.

Beginning in the 1990s, however, the model underwent serious criticisms for being too restrictive and unresponsive to wider developments in psychology (Crookes & Schmidt, 1991; Dörnyei, 1994, 2005; Oxford & Shearin, 1994; Ushioda, 2001). There was a shift towards viewing motivation as a more dynamic factor, more cognitive in nature, and more grounded in the educational contexts where most L2 learning takes place. This understanding views motivation as a continuously evolving construct, subject to various internal and external influences confronted by the learner (Dörnyei, 2001). This reconceptualization of motivation opened up the research agenda for investigation of relationships between motivation and other aspects of language learning behavior commonly associated with the classroom (Crookes & Schmidt, 1991; Ushioda, 2001).

One formulation which captures both the dynamic dimension of motivation and its relevance for classroom applications is self-determination theory (SDT), developed in the late 1970s by Deci and Ryan (1985, 1995). The theory focuses on "the degree to which people endorse their actions at the highest level of reflection and engage in the actions with a full sense of choice" (Ryan & Deci, 2000a, p. 68). In SDT, the focus is mostly on two general orientations to motivation: one based on intrinsic interest in the activity *per se*, and the other based on rewards extrinsic to the activity. Deci and Ryan (1985) argue that different types of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation can be classified on a continuum according to the extent to which the motivation is self-determined or internalized within the learner.

The self-determination framework consists of three orientations to motivation that lie on a continuum of increasing self-determination: amotivation, extrinsic motivation, and intrinsic motivation (Ryan & Deci, 2000b). First, amotivation (AM), the least self-determined end of the continuum, is reflected by learners who see no relation between their actions and the consequences of those actions. Amotivated language learners have the

impression that they are wasting their time studying the L2. They do not value language learning, do not feel competent to do it or do not expect to be successful. AM implies a lack of motivation; this may be case where L2 learners express resentment at what feels like a waste of their time. AM is not to be confused with demotivation which refers to a reduction of motivation due to some specific external force (Dörnyei, 200l).

Extrinsic motivation (EM) is manifested through a focus on achieving some kind of instrumental end, and it can be noted for its refined conceptualization in which extrinsic motivation is differentiated into types of regulation that vary in their degree of relative autonomy (Ryan & Connell, 1989; Ryan & Deci, 2000b). EM can be divided into three subtypes, each one increasingly self-determined: external regulation, introjected regulation, and identified regulation, and this was dependent on the extent to which people have been successful in internalizing the initial external regulation of the behavior.

External regulation refers to pressure or reward from the social environment to learn a language, for example getting a good job. In this case, individuals construe their behavior as structured by pragmatic, instrumental causation that is imposed from the outside, and their sense of self-causation and autonomy is low. Second, introjection refers to taking in a regulation but not accepting it as one's own; this is the case when people 'buy into' the external pressure, by developing feelings of guilt or shame that then can only be avoided via compliance with the expected behavior. Identified regulation, the most self-determined form of EM, is closer to the intrinsic pole. It happens when external values are accepted and adopted as one's own and an individual comes to see the relevance and meaningfulness of an activity that in principle was not self-determined. The most self-determined form of motivation is intrinsic motivation (IM), and refers to when behavior is triggered by internal factors such as enjoyment and satisfaction for oneself. This is the case when individuals engage in behavior that they understand as self-initiated by choice and largely sustained by inherent enjoyment in the activity. According to Ryan and Deci (2000b), the feelings of satisfaction in IM come from a sense of competence, autonomy, and relatedness.

All in all, the intrinsic and extrinsic orientations of motivation, as conceptualized in self-determination theory, constitute a useful framework for studying motivation in educational contexts. It supports a dynamic view of motivation that can be affected by the teacher. Dörnyei and Skehan (2003) argue that if one accepts a dynamic view of motivation "the effective use of learning strategies may be precisely the sort of behavior which causes motivational levels to be sustained within the learning situation. Their use may give encouragement to the learner, provide benchmarks for evaluation and progress, and enable motivating goal-setting to be accomplished" (p. 623).

One of the few studies that examine the relationship between metacognitive awareness of L2 listening strategies, academic motivation and L2 listening proficiency was conducted

by Rahimi and Abedi (2015). They researched 369 high-school learners' metacognitive awareness of listening strategies and listening proficiency among language learners with different levels of academic self-regulation (low, mid, and high). In their study, they were able to reject the primary hypothesis that the degree of association between metacognitive awareness and listening comprehension is the strongest among highly self-regulated students. Further, by regression analysis they were able to demonstrate that metacognitive awareness power value to predict listening proficiency was only gained when the mid self-regulated students were considered in the analysis.

Vandergrift's (2005) study is another that examined the relationship among motivation, metacognition and proficiency in listening comprehension. When the adolescent learners of French (n = 57) completed questionnaires, students reporting greater use of metacognitive strategies also reported more motivational intensity, with some evidence of a self-determination continuum evident in the response patterns. Listening proficiency correlated negatively with amotivation; however, correlations with intrinsic and extrinsic motivation were not as high as anticipated. With having found that examining relationships between MLLS and the role of motivation has been insufficiently researched, the present study was guided by the following research questions:

1) How do L2 adolescent middle school learners of English exhibit metacognitive awareness in employing L2 listening strategies when attending to solving multiple-choice listening problems? If any, what differences were found between the learners of different proficiency levels?
2) How do the learners' different types and levels of academic motivation on the self-determination continuum relate to the learners' employment of metacognitive L2 listening strategies?
3) For explaining L2 listening proficiency, which subscales of metacognitive L2 listening strategies and academic motivation can be considered the predictors of L2 listening proficiency?

III. METHODS

1. Participants and Educational Backgrounds

A total of 312 students at a girls' middle school in Seoul participated in the current study. The learners were recruited on the basis of availability and willingness to respond to the questionnaire in the Fall of 2014. There was use of female participants in the study due to the incidental interest of the intact group of learners. The researcher was aware that this

would only provide a view of female learners regarding the variables of interest. Of the participants, 79 were 1st year, 90 were 2nd year, and 143 were 3rd year students. Nonetheless, the learners could be considered a group of learners with similar educational backgrounds; only eight of them reported on having lived abroad for more than six months, and the variable could be considered negligible. The 309 learners that chose to report on their primary method for studying English reported in using school materials (n = 177, 57.3%), Educational Broadcasting System (EBS) materials (n = 1, 0.3%), Private education (n = 80, 25.9%), which includes private tutoring, online media, and hagwon (i.e., after-school institute), Miscellaneous (n = 19, 6.1%), and 'Don't study separately' (n = 32, 10.3%). For Miscellaneous, 13 of the learners reported on taking benefit of the after school English classes.

2. Instruments

1) Metacognitive Awareness Listening Questionnaire (MALQ)

The Metacognitive Awareness Listening Questionnaire (MALQ), an L2 listening questionnaire, was adopted in the study to assess second language (L2) listeners' metacognitive awareness and perceived use of strategies while listening to oral texts. The instrument validated by Vandergrift et al. (2006) is designed for researchers and instructors to assess the extent to which language learners are aware of and can regulate the process of the L2 listening comprehension. As a result of the validation procedure (Vandergrift et al., 2006), five distinct factors emerged: problem solving (6 items), planning & evaluation (5 items), mental translation (3 items), person knowledge (3 items), and directed attention (4 items) totaling 21 items. The original questionnaire was modified to be provided in the learners' L1. There was help from a middle school teacher to assure that the wording was comprehensible to the target students. After taking care of any statement that needed to be reverse coded, the Cronbach alpha index of internal consistency for the total 21-item scale was .84 and the reliability of the five subscales ranged from .73 to .79. (See Appendix for the questionnaire).

2) Academic Self-Regulation Questionnaire

In order to examine the adolescent middle school learners' degree of academic motivation orientation in relation to the learners' perceived use of MLLS, one section of the Self-Regulation Questionnaire (Ryan & Connell, 1989), the Academic Self-Regulation Questionnaire (ASRQ), which was previously developed for assessing domain-specific individual differences in the types of motivation or regulation, was utilized. The questions

have been constructed based on the theoretical framework of self-determination theory (SDT) (Deci & Ryan, 1985), which differentiates types of behavioral regulation in terms of the degree to which they represent autonomous or self-determined functioning. The items on the questionnaire ask why the respondent does a behavior (or a class of behaviors) and then provides several possible reasons that have been preselected to represent the different styles of regulation or motivation. In our study, learners were asked questions in the domain of why they study English, and questionnaire items were utilized to obtain information on the learners' degree of regulation on five different types of behavioral motivation or regulation–amotivation, external regulation, introjection, identification, and intrinsic motivation. In total, there were twenty questionnaire items across the five types of regulation which were provided to the learners in their Ll. The Cronbach alpha index of internal consistency for the total 20-item scale was .85 and alphas for the five sub-scales varied from .74 to .94. (See Appendix for the questionnaire).

3) L2 Listening Proficiency Test

The L2 proficiency test which had been developed by the Seoul Dongbu District Office of Education for administration on October, 21st, 2014 was utilized as a means of assessing the learners' L2 listening ability. There were separate versions of the test for the 1st to 3rd year middle school students, and the three tests were all presented in the form of multiple-choice questions consisting of dialogues between a man and a woman. The options or distracters in the items were offered in either Korean or English. Regardless of year, there were identically 20 items for each test (Total score = 20 points). Later for the analysis, the learners' scores were classified as low, mid and high proficiency groups. The procedure of categorizing the learners of different years into the three proficiency groups was conducted by submitting the learners' listening scores for visual binning at Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) 21.

3. Procedure

On the day of the L2 listening test, oral texts were played once to the students with presentation of the test items. A day after the administration of the L2 listening test, which had been held on the same day for all students, the MALQ and ASRQ were administered to the students. It was planned this way so as to stimulate the students to think about the listening test-taking process that they had been involved in on the previous day. In the questionnaire, the learners were asked to think about the process that they had experienced while trying to solve the listening items on the test. Although it would have been best to administer the questionnaires on the same day of the test, it was not feasible to do this with

the 312 students since this incurred conflict with the students' class schedule which was not the same for all. Also, asking the students to attend to the questionnaire the next day did not seem to greatly influence their responses since they were used to regularly solving the listening items in the form of multiple-choice items.

Several days after the listening test, the scores for the listening tests became available via the school authority which had granted permission under the condition that the students' names remain anonymous. The listening sores were matched with the learners' ratings on MALQ and ASRQ.

4. Data Analysis

The results of the questionnaire were coded and submitted for analysis with SPSS 21.0 to assess the L2 listeners' ratings on the MALQ and ASRQ. After calculation of descriptive statistics for MALQ and ASRQ, one-way MANOVA (Multivariate Analysis of Variance) was conducted to analyze if there was any significant effect of proficiency (high, mid, low) on the combined dependent variable of MLLS (i.e., Planning & Evaluation, Directed Attention, Person Knowledge, Mental Translation, and Problem Solving) and Academic motivation (i.e., Amotivation, External Motivation, Introjected Motivation, Identified Motivation, and Intrinsic Motivation). Thereafter, the subscales of MLLS and academic motivation were submitted for analysis with standard multiple regression to ascertain the significant predictors of L2 listening proficiency.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Metacognitive Awareness of L2 Listening Strategies

Regarding RQ1, calculation of descriptive statistics and analysis with one-way Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) conducted on the five MLLS subscales (i.e., planning & evaluation, directed attention, person knowledge, mental translation, and problem-solving) by proficiency produced a significant effect on the combined dependent variable: $F_{10, 606} = 8.07$, $p < .01$; Wilks' Lambda = .779; partial eta squared = .117). Table 1 indicates the descriptive statistics for the subscales of MLLS. Analysis with Bonferroni adjusted alpha level of $p < .01$ showed that the three proficiency groups differed in terms of all MLLS subscales (i.e., planning & evaluation: $F_{2,307} = 24.560$, $p = .000$; directed attention: $F_{2,307} = 29.514$, $p = .000$; person knowledge: $F_{2,307} = 6.214$, $p = .002$; mental translation: $F_{2,307} = 7.089$, $p = .001$; problem solving: $F_{2,307} = 19.399$, $p = .000$).

TABLE 1

Metacognitive L2 Listening Strategies by Listening Ability

Total N = 312 (Low = 112, Mid = 109, High = 89)	Low		Mid		High		TOTAL	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Planning & evaluation	3.05	0.63	3.29	0.72	3.73	0.71	3.33 (4)	0.74
Directed attention	3.60	0.66	3.88	0.67	4.30	0.58	3.90 (1)	0.70
Person knowledge	3.07	0.87	2.86	0.68	2.66	0.92	2.88 (5)	0.84
Mental translation	3.16	0.75	3.39	0.70	3.52	0.62	3.34 (3)	0.71
problem solving	3.30	0.58	3.60	0.58	3.80	0.56	3.55 (2)	0.61

Note: ( ) indicates the rank by mean values

Directed attention (DA) which recorded the highest mean (M = 3.90) was perceived by the learners as being most frequently employed during the learners' listening process. According to Vandergrift et al. (2006), DA represents strategies that listeners use to concentrate and stay on task. The items consisted of strategies such as getting back on track when losing concentration, focusing harder when having difficulty understanding, recovering concentration when one's mind wanders, and not giving up when one experiences difficulties understanding. These strategies all represent the important role played by the learners to sustain consciousness in paying attention to the process of listening comprehension, particularly when learners notice that their attention is waning. This may occur for various purposes, such as for constructing meaning or listening out for new parts of the text to compensate for what they have not understood or check on what they have understood so far. The learners in particular reported using the most strategies for 'When my mind wanders, I try to recover my concentration right away' (M = 4.00). DA revealed in the present study bore some similarities to the profile of strategy use by Chinese ESL learners in Goh and Hu's (2014) study where learners reported using the most strategies for DA.

Further, the post-hoc pairwise comparisons indicated that the employment of DA was significantly different between the three proficiency groups ($p < .01$) (See Table 2). Not surprisingly, it was the higher proficiency learners that had reported using more strategies than those at the lower proficiency levels (Vandergrift, 1997). It seems that the low proficiency learners lacked the strategic competence to stay on the task when asked to solve the listening problems. One of the reasons may have been due to how they were not able to hear the next part of a text because they spent too much time thinking about something they had just heard (Goh, 2000).

TABLE 2

Post-hoc Pairwise Comparisons for Metacognitive Awareness of L2 Listening

			Mean difference (I-J)	Std. error	*Sig.*	95% Confidence interval for difference	
						Lower bound	Upper bound
Planning & evaluation (PE)	Low	Mid	-.238	.093	.010	-.421	-.056
		High	-.680	.098	.000*	-.872	-.488
	Mid	High	-.442	.098	.000*	-.635	-.249
Directed attention (DA)	Low	Mid	-.276	.086	.002*	-.446	-.106
		High	-.699	.091	.000*	-.879	-.520
	Mid	High	-.424	.092	.000*	-.604	-.243
Person knowledge (PK)	Low	Mid	.214	.111	.056	-.005	.432
		High	.412	.117	.001*	.181	.643
	Mid	High	.198	.118	.094	-.034	.431
Mental translation (MT)	Low	Mid	-.228	.094	.016	-.412	-.043
		High	-.365	.099	.000*	-.560	-.170
	Mid	High	-.137	.100	.170	-.333	.059
Problem-solving (PS)	Low	Mid	-.299	.078	.000*	-.452	-.146
		High	-.501	.082	.000*	-.662	-.340
	Mid	High	-.202	.082	.015	-.364	-.040

Note: * $p < .01$

Problem solving (PS) ($M = 3.55$), the second ranking subscale of MLLS, is concerned with inference strategies, such as, using known words to deduce the meaning of unknown words, using the general idea of a text to deduce unknown words, and using one's experience and general knowledge in interpreting the text. Such cognitive processes have been reported as being readily activated when listening in L2 (Mendelsohn, 1995). Another set of strategies were adjusting one's interpretation upon realizing that it is not correct, monitoring the accuracy of one's inferences for congruency with the developing interpretation, and comparing the developing interpretation with one's knowledge of the topic. These are metacognitive strategies that involve planning, monitoring and evaluating (Vandergrift et al., 2006). In fact, examination of the post-hoc pairwise comparisons indicated that the low proficiency group learners had reported less use of PS than those in the mid ($p = .000$) and high proficiency groups ($p = .000$) (See Table 2). When learners listen, they have to pay attention to the text, construct meaning, plan, monitor, and evaluate their understanding of the text. However, the scores of the low proficiency group learners may point out that they were not using all the strategies or to a lesser extent due to being constrained by other listening difficulties. To the low proficiency group learners, the additional cognitive capacity may have not been available for them to take strategic moves to solve listening problems in real time (Goh & Hu, 2014).

The third most employed strategy was mental translation (MT) ($M = 3.34$). Interestingly, the literature (Goh, 1998; Vandergrift, 2003a) sees MT as a strategy used by low

proficiency listeners. However, with the group of learners in the present study, this strategy was used relatively more with the higher level learners. Post-hoc pairwise comparisons indicated a significant difference between the high-low group learners (p = .000) (See Table 2). Models of listening processes have often been explained within the interactive approaches where bottom-up and top-down processes (Vandergrift & Goh, 2012) are concurrently used to solve the listening problems. However, the middle school learners' reported use of strategies indicated that they were still relying heavily on the bottom-up process to comprehend incoming text. This may indicate that their listening process was unlike the proficient listeners of English. For the learners, the basic decoding process seems to have been a rudimentary yet the most important process of listening. Goh and Hu (2014) in fact found a similar pattern of strategy use with MT in their study and they attributed this to the way the learners had been trained to listen. They explain that those who have experienced instruction in bottom-up processes, where the focus is on using words to build up their understanding of a text, will resort to translating what they hear either word for word or as chunks and phrases (p. 267). Other learner problems may have also occurred when the learners lacked vocabulary knowledge (Bonk, 2000) or when they were unable to recognize the sounds of words that they knew in print (Goh, 2000). These are feasible explanations for the middle school learners in our study since their L2 listening instruction has been largely practiced in the form of multiple-choice items (according to background information obtained on the students) rather than through the more interactive forms of authentic communication. The listening approach employed when under testing situations may have conditioned the learners to be involved primarily in literal translation. Vandergrift (2003a) points out that MT is a strategy profiling low proficiency learners and claims that this must be overcome for them to become skilled L2 learners.

Planning & evaluation (PE) (M = 3.33) was the fourth ranking MLLS that the learners reported using and the strategies represent those that listeners use to prepare themselves for listening, and to evaluate the results of their listening efforts. The items in this subscale include strategies, such as, having a plan for listening, thinking about similar texts as a guide for listening, having a goal in mind while listening, periodically checking one's satisfaction with the ongoing interpretation while listening, and evaluating the strategic effectiveness of one's listening efforts. Post-hoc pairwise comparisons indicated the high proficiency learners reporting on the use of more strategies than the mid (p = .000) and low proficiency group learners (p = .000) (See Table 2). The pattern of strategies indicates that the high proficiency learners' strategic moves were more purposeful and goal-oriented in the comprehension process (Vandergrift & Goh, 2012). Since they were asked to reflect on the testing situation, the learners may have employed test-taking strategies (e.g., Going back/ rereading the question; Considering the options before listening to grasp idea of listening task), monitoring, and online appraisals of whether their comprehension goals

were being realized for finding the key to the multiple-choice items.

The least employed MLLS reported was person knowledge (PK) (M = 2.88). While the strategies for the subscale represent listeners' perceptions concerning the difficulty presented by L2 listening and their self-efficacy in L2 listening, this factor includes items assessing the perceived difficulty of listening compared with other language skills, learners' linguistic confidence in L2 listening, and the level of anxiety experienced in L2 listening. Report on this subscale decreased with rising levels of listening proficiency (See Table 1), indicating that levels of anxiety or difficulty felt towards L2 listening decreased among the higher proficiency learners (J. -Y. Choi & Y. V. Chon, 2014). Post-hoc pairwise comparisons indicated the high proficiency learners reporting less of PK than those in the low proficiency group (p = .001) (See Table 2). This indicates that the learners' level of anxiety needs to be low for effective listening. This is not surprising since anxiety and self-efficacy have been extensively documented to be significantly related to academic performance, including strategy use (Yang, 1999; Zimmerman & Schunk, 2001).

2. Academic Motivational Orientations and Metacognitive L2 Listening Strategies

This section is on RQ2 regarding how the learners' different types and levels of academic motivation may be connected to the learners' employment of MLLS. Before examining this relationship, the middle school learners' academic motivation was examined.

The strongest level of motivation was exhibited for identification (M = 3.64) on the 5-point Likert scale (See Table 3). To a lesser extent, the learners' reasons for learning English were regulated by external regulation (M = 2.99) and introjection (M = 2.99). Identification, while being the most self-determined form of extrinsic motivation, indicates that the middle school learners have accepted the external values of learning English by adopting them as one's own and have come to see the relevance and meaningfulness of the activity of learning English, which in principle was not self-determined. On the other hand, the learners were least driven to learn English by intrinsic motivation (M = 2.66). This indicates that the learners' activity of learning English was not triggered by internal factors such as enjoyment and satisfaction.

TABLE 3

Academic Motivational Orientations and L2 Listening Proficiency

Total N = 310 (Low = 112, Mid = 109, High = 89)	Low		Mid		High		Total	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Amotivation	2.96	0.86	2.90	0.91	2.62	0.95	2.84 (4)	0.91
External regulation	3.04	0.69	3.09	0.71	2.81	0.79	2.99 (2)	0.73
Introjection	2.92	0.86	3.04	0.82	3.02	0.85	2.99 (2)	0.84
Identification	3.43	0.78	3.66	0.77	3.89	0.83	3.64 (1)	0.81
Intrinsic motivation	2.48	0.98	2.61	0.88	2.97	1.08	2.66 (5)	0.99

Note: ( ) indicates the rank by mean values

When one-way MANOVA was conducted on the subscales of AM by proficiency (high, mid, low), a significant effect appeared on the combined dependent variable: $F_{10, 606}$ = 3.308, $p < .01$; Wilks' Lambda = .889; partial eta squared = .052). Analysis of each AM subscale with Bonferroni adjusted alpha level of $p < .01$ showed that the three proficiency groups differed in terms of identification ($F_{2,307}$ = 8.377, p = .000) and intrinsic motivation ($F_{2,307}$ = 6.435, p = .002). Further post-hoc multiple comparisons showed that there were noticeable differences only between the low-high groups respectively for identification (p = .000) and intrinsic motivation (p = .001). It was in these most internally-driven forms of AM that had encouraged the high proficiency learners to be interested in learning English, whose orientations were significantly different from those in the low proficiency groups. The results led us to examine how AM may have a relationship to the learners' employment of MLLS.

Another Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was conducted with the subscales of AM (i.e., amotivation, external motivation, introjection, identification, and intrinsic motivation). The levels for AM were divided for high, mid, and low levels according to visual binning at SPSS. With the analysis, there were significant effects of the level of amotivation ($F_{10, 610}$ = 6.229, $p < .01$; Wilks' Lambda = .823), level of identification ($F_{10, 610}$ = 11.899, $p < .01$; Wilks' Lambda = .700), and level of intrinsic motivation ($F_{10, 610}$ = 8.570, $p < .01$; Wilks' Lambda = .769) on the combined dependent variables of MLLS. Table 4 indicates the descriptive statistics for MLLS according to the three types of motivational regulation.

TABLE 4

Academic Motivational Orientations and Metacognitive L2 Listening Strategies

Low: N = 117, Mid: N = 102, High: M = 93		Amotivation		Identification		Intrinsic motivation	
		M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Planning & evaluation (PE)	Low M	3.62	0.77	2.90	0.60	2.96	0.65
	Mid M	3.27	0.65	3.41	0.61	3.39	0.64
	High M	3.01	0.64	3.74	0.76	3.75	0.70
	Total	3.32 (4)	0.74	3.32 (4)	0.74	3.32 (4)	0.74
Directed attention (DA)	Low M	4.22	0.55	3.50	0.65	3.61	0.75
	Mid M	3.84	0.65	4.02	0.59	3.90	0.58
	High M	3.57	0.74	4.28	0.61	4.31	0.52
	Total	3.90 (1)	0.70	3.90 (1)	0.70	3.90 (1)	0.70
Person knowledge (PK)	Low M	2.74	0.92	2.85	0.84	2.96	0.87
	Mid M	2.93	0.75	2.94	0.76	2.90	0.78
	High M	2.99	0.80	2.84	0.92	2.73	0.85
	Total	2.88 (5)	0.84	2.88 (5)	0.84	2.88 (5)	0.84
Mental translation (MT)	Low M	3.46	0.72	3.03	0.74	3.13	0.76
	Mid M	3.35	0.71	3.46	0.55	3.37	0.60
	High M	3.16	0.68	3.58	0.72	3.59	0.69
	Total	3.34 (3)	0.71	3.34 (3)	0.71	3.34 (3)	0.71
Problem-solving (PS)	Low M	3.71	0.61	3.20	0.58	3.32	0.61
	Mid M	3.55	0.55	3.62	0.46	3.56	0.53
	High M	3.33	0.62	3.88	0.59	3.84	0.57
	Total	3.54 (2)	0.61	3.54 (2)	0.61	3.54 (2)	0.61

Note: ( ) indicates the rank by mean values

As indicated in Table 4, overall patterns indicated that there were increased uses of listening strategies (i.e., PE, DA, MT, PS) with falling levels of amotivation, and rising levels of identification and intrinsic motivation. On the other hand, PK (which is an indicator on levels of anxiety) increased with rising levels of amotivation and falling levels of identification and intrinsic motivation. The general trend indicates that different levels of motivation are related to learners' metacognitive use of listening strategies. However, this occurred mainly for the extreme forms of motivation at both ends of the SDT continuum scale, with the least determined form (amotivation) and the most determined form (identification, intrinsic motivation) of motivation. Further, post-hoc multiple comparisons using Bonferroni adjusted alpha level of .01 showed differences in the employment of PE and DA by different levels of amotivation. For PE, there were differences between 'low-mid' (p = .000) and 'low-high' (p = .000) levels of amotivation, and there were differences between all levels of amotivation for DE (p < .01) (See Table 5).

TABLE 5

Post-hoc Multiple Comparisons of MLLS by Academic Motivational Orientations

			Amotivation	Identification	Intrinsic motivation
			Mean difference (I-J)	Mean difference (I-J)	Mean difference (I-J)
Planning & evaluation (PE)	Low M	Mid M	.347*	-.511*	-.432*
		High M	.605*	-.833*	-.796*
	Mid M	High M	.258	-.322*	-.364*
Directed attention (DA)	Low M	Mid M	.378*	-.521*	-.287*
		High M	.648*	-.788*	-.694*
	Mid M	High M	.271*	-.266*	-.407*
Person knowledge (PK)	Low M	Mid M	-.197	-.085	.058
		High M	-.249	.014	.223
	Mid M	High M	-.053	.099	.165
Mental translation (MT)	Low M	Mid M	.113	-.428*	-.247*
		High M	.302*	-.552*	-.460*
	Mid M	High M	.188	-.124	-.212*
Problem-solving (PS)	Low M	Mid M	.161	-.419*	-.239*
		High M	.381*	-.673*	-.518*
	Mid M	High M	.220	-.254*	-.279*

Note: * $p < .01$

Although amotivation can be considered a psychological state where there is a lack of motivation (seen often in learners who see no connection between their actions and consequences), the results show that the learners of lower amotivation levels were willing to utilize strategic resources via PE and DA to solve listening problems. In other words, amotivation refers to the state where there is hardly any level of determination, in this case, to study English, but the results indicate that controlling the learners' levels of amotivation is worth doing for the effective employment of PE and DA in solving L2 listening problems.

Amotivation was further related to MT; a significant difference was noted between the learners of high and low levels of amotivation (p =.002). Those exhibiting low levels of amotivation were found to be keen on using more MT. While MT was a strategy favored by the higher proficiency learners in the present study (See previous section 1), this was also a strategy favored by those exhibiting low levels of amotivation. By the use of MT, these learners will have made an effort to make sense of what they hear by trying to translate word by word or by phrases to construct meaning of the oral text. Although MT has been associated as an impoverished type of strategy that learners should overcome (Vandergrift et al., 2006), this seemed to be frequent strategy for the middle school learners at the lower amotivation level. An explanation can be provided by the listening items that the learners are used to dealing with. Within the learners' context, their usual encounters with the listening items have been in the form of multiple-choice items, and it is likely that

this will have conditioned learners to listen word-by-word, and this was prevalent among the learners who exhibited lower levels of amotivation.

Learners with the lowest level of amotivation were also profiled as employing more PS, such as for inferencing unknown words, and monitoring their listening process (p = .000). Although amotivation indicates a state where learners hardly exhibit any level of self-determination, the learners seemed to have taken some strategic action in the process of listening, such as via PS. In a similar vein, Vandergrift (2005) found a positive relationship between amotivation and strategies such as giving up when having difficulty, but a negative relationship between amotivation and listening strategies (i.e., listening for overall meaning, paying attention and focusing when in difficulty, and looking ahead even when in difficulty).

For identified and intrinsic motivation, the two most internally self-determined forms of regulation, the higher proficiency learners were found to employ more strategies for PE, DA, and PS, and there were significant differences between all levels at the alpha level of p = .01 (i.e., low-mid, low-high, mid-high) for both identified and intrinsic motivation. Also, learners at the mid and high levels of both identified and intrinsic motivation were profiled as using more MT than those at the lower motivational levels. The pattern in the reported use of strategies indicates that those profiled as exhibiting the more self-determined, autonomous levels of regulation were found to be more conscious in the ways they tried to solve the listening problems, that is, by employment of PE, DA, MT, and PS. Similar patterns were to be found in Vandergrift's study (2005) where there was an increasingly strong relationship between student reported use of listening strategies and the more self-determined forms of motivation for language learning (p. 81).

The relationships indicate that the learners' different levels of amotivation, identification and intrinsic motivation are factors that are expected to be related to the employment of MLLS. Since learners at the higher proficiency levels were found to use more MLLS (See previous section 1), the results indicate that these listening strategies can be more successfully employed when the learners can identify with the most self-determined forms of motivation. This implies that trying to help learners feel more internally-driven to learn English, such as by stimulating them to find a reason for learning English, will be important in helping learners improve L2 listening in the long-term and this has been validated from the results.

3. Predictors of L2 Listening Ability

To obtain a comprehensive view on what constitutes L2 listening ability, RQ3 was posed to investigate the contribution of learners' different constructs of MLLS, and academic motivation to learners' L2 listening ability. One of the evolving interests was to

observe which of the subscales would be a stronger predictor relative to others in explaining the variance in L2 listening ability.

Prior to conducing a standard multiple regression, the relevant assumptions of this statistical analysis were tested. A sample size of 310 was deemed adequate given ten independent variables to be included in the analysis (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). An examination of correlations revealed between the constructs of metacognitive listening strategies and academic motivation were not highly correlated (i.e., r values being under .70). The collinearity statistics (i.e., Tolerance and VIF) were also all within accepted limits (under 5 for VIF), so the assumption of multicollinearity was deemed to have been met (Heiberger & Holland, 2004, p. 243). An examination of the Mahalanobis distance scores indicated no multivariate outliers.

When multiple regression with the enter method was conducted to seek how academic motivational orientations together with MLLS would contribute to L2 listening ability, a significant regression model emerged ($F_{10,299} = 9.325$, $p < .0005$; $R^2 = 23.8$) with all the middle school learners (i.e., N = 310; 1st ~ 3rd year) (See Table 6). The results indicated PE, DA and PK to be the significant predictors of L2 listening proficiency ($p < .05$). The former two predictors indicate that the learners' conscious plans and deliberate attention expended on the listening problems led learners to do well on the L2 listening test. However, PK which was a subscale used to assess the learners' level of confidence and the challenge they felt towards listening relative to the other language skills, proved to be a negative predictor (Beta = - .122) and the unstandardized coefficients (B) indicated that a scale for PK would bring a fall of -.538 on the L2 listening test (Total = 20 points). This indicates that the learners' perceived anxiety and lack of confidence would be a debilitative factor for L2 listening. For the Korean middle school learners, this implies that they would sometimes need time away from the listening multiple-choice questions and be provided with more opportunities to practice L2 listening in stress-free environments, such as by being exposed to media with which they would feel comfortable preferably with the support of visual aids (e.g., videos, podcasts). This may possibly help learners form a liking for English and contribute to lowering levels of anxiety.

TABLE 6

Predictors of L2 Listening Proficiency

		Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	*t*	*Sig.*
		B	Std. error	Beta		
	(Constant)	4.818	2.003		2.405	.017
AM	Amotivation	.496	.309	.122	1.603	.110
	External motivation	-.566	.342	-.113	-1.658	.098
	Introjection	.133	.291	.030	.457	.648
	Identification	.159	.340	.035	.468	.640
	Intrinsic motivation	-.145	.249	-.039	-.582	.561
MLLS	Planning & evaluation	1.353	.395	.270	3.423	.001*
	Directed attention	1.048	.409	.198	2.566	.011*
	Person knowledge	-.538	.233	-.122	-2.311	.022*
	Mental translation	-.327	.335	-.063	-.975	.330
	Problem solving	.769	.462	.127	1.665	.097

Note: * $p < .05$

In order to seek how learners need more help with L2 listening, there was analysis by the different years of study (i.e., 1st ~3rd year) and significant predictors emerged. For the 3rd year learners, unstandardized coefficient of B (-1.501) ($p < .05$) indicated that a scale increase of external motivation would result in a fall of 1.501 points on the L2 listening proficiency test. This made sense since external motivation is the least self-determined form of motivation of extrinsic motivation. The learners motivated to learn English by pragmatic or instrumental causation (i.e., money, jobs), because their sense of autonomy is low, are also expected lag behind in L2 listening. This also points out that these final year middle school learners need to be exposed to L2 listening via tasks which may situate them to find more internally-driven reasons for learning English, such as through finding enjoyment or by identifying that L2 listening is needed for their realization of a long-term personal goal.

For the 2nd year learners, the regression model was at a borderline significance level for explaining L2 listening proficiency ($F_{10,78} = 1.937$, $p = .052$). For the 1st year middle school learners, a scale increase with PE brought an increase of 2.106 points on the listening test. As such, for the 1st year middle school learners, execution of PE was found to be crucial for obtaining higher scores on the listening test. These would consist of having a plan for listening, having a goal in mind while listening, periodically checking one's satisfaction with the ongoing interpretation while listening, and evaluating the strategic effectiveness of one's listening efforts. These strategies all represent the important role that metacognition plays in the process of listening. However, the 1st year learners' employment of MT was found to be detrimental with a negative predictor (B = -1.491) for listening proficiency ($p < .05$). This indicates how the 1st year middle school learners need

to be sensitized to the interactive approach to listening through which they can be told that listening is a process where contextual cues and existing background knowledge can be used together with decoding of the aural input. However, before learners can be instructed to do this, the learners' cognitive capacity needs to be made available for the use of top-down processes. In a similar vein, Macaro, Graham and Vanderplank (2007) have claimed that the deployment of top-down strategies can be successful when certain criteria are fulfilled: when information contained in a text is congruent with the listener's prior knowledge of the topic, when learners' lexical knowledge exceeds a 'threshold' level, and when learners can make effective use of prior knowledge by deploying it flexibly and in combination with linguistic information contained in the input (p. 179).

V. CONCLUSION

The results of the present study provide some empirical support for the hypothesized links between self-determination theory and metacognition in the area if L2 listening. The examination on the middle school learners' use of MLLS demonstrated that more strategies were deployed with higher proficiency listeners (Goh, 1998, 1999; O'Malley, Chamot & Küpper, 1989; Vandergrift 1997) and this indicates that metacognition is a factor for successful listening comprehension. The Korean middle school learners reported the highest level of metacognition in L2 listening strategies for DA and the pattern evidenced indicates that the L2 middle school learners were primarily involved in expending their cognitive resources for staying focused on the listening task due to the transitory and fleeting nature of listening that the learners were involved in. After DA, the learners reported on employing the most metacognitive strategies in the order of PS, MT, PE and PS. The listening process is likely to prompt a number of listening problems (Goh, 2000), and the PS strategies indicated that the learners were using inference strategies to compensate for lexical gap problems. Although the literature on MLLS labels MT as an inferior strategy that represents the strategic profile of low proficiency learners (Vandergrift, 2003b; Vandergrift et al., 2006), the strategy was reported more with rising levels of proficiency in the present study. This may have occurred when the Korean 14-16 year old adolescent learners were mostly accustomed to decoding word-by-word or by phrases in their usual listening practices. Frequent levels of PE were also evident among the high proficiency learners and this indicated that they were goal-oriented and conscious in selecting strategies that were appropriate for solving their target listening tasks.

The learners were noticeable for exhibiting the highest level of academic regulation for identification. When relationships were sought between academic motivation and MLLS, it was mainly the three types of academic motivation—amotivation, identification and

intrinsic motivation— that were related to the learners' execution of MLLS (excluding PK). The multiple regression analysis with the subscales of MLLS and academic motivation demonstrated that PE and DA were the effective strategies for improving L2 listening comprehension. However, PK which was related to representing learners' anxiety and lack of confidence towards L2 listening, was found to hold the learners back from doing well on L2 listening.

The study offers several implications. The examination on the middle school learners' increased use of MLLS that rose with L2 listening proficiency levels demonstrates that metacognitive instruction has much to offer language learners. Previous research has also validated the effectiveness of metacognitive instruction (Goh, 2008; Vandergrift & Tafaghodtari, 2010), and results of the present study indicated that strategies such as DA and PE can be expected to increase learners' strategic competence. However, a point that needs to be made for the low proficiency level learners is that instruction of metacognitive strategies and being able to implement them can be a challenge for them since they may be tied to unknown words in the process of listening. The word may be known to the learners only in print form so that the sound of the word is not known, or it may simply be a case where the learner has a small lexicon. This calls our attention to how learners of lower proficiency levels will need support with the systematic teaching of vocabulary for both the written and spoken forms. The findings obtained for MLLS and academic motivation revealed that specific types of academic motivational orientations, particularly near the intrinsic pole, need to be controlled for effective use of MLLS for successful listening comprehension. Teachers may need to think of ways to sustain identified and intrinsic motivational orientations while keeping amotivaion at a minimum level.

For future research, since the present study was restricted to researching the MLLS of girls in a Korean middle school, research will need to be validated for other kinds of learner population (i.e., Co-Ed or Boys' school). Also, questionnaire studies of the present kind may need further triangulation or follow-up studies via qualitative methodologies (e.g., diary studies, think-aloud, interviews) to validate results on the learners' use of MLLS.

REFERENCES

Ahmadi, A., & Yamini, M. (2003). Relationship between field dependence/independence and listening comprehension strategy use by female Iranian English majors. Retrieved June 20, 2014, from the World Wide Web: http://www.sid.ir/en/VEWSSID/J_pdf/874200318704.pdf.

Bacon, S. M. (1992). Phases of listening to authentic input in Spanish: A descriptive study. *Foreign Language Annals, 25*(4), 317-334.

Bonk, W. J. (2000). Second language lexical knowledge and listening comprehension. *International Journal of Listening, 14*(1), 14-31.

Chang, A. C. -S. (2008). Listening strategies of L2 learners with varied test tasks. *TESL Canada Journal, 25*(2), 1-26.

Choi, J. -Y., & Chon, Y. V. (2014). Listener anxiety and listening strategies on multiple-choice items of EFL learners. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 20*(3), 21-53.

Cohen, A., & Macaro, E. (2007). (Eds.). *Language learner strategies: 30 years of research and practice*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Crookes, G., & R. W. Schmidt. (1991). Motivation: Reopening the research agenda. *Language Learning, 41*(4), 469- 512.

Cross, J. (2010). Raising L2 listeners' metacognitive awareness: A sociocultural theory perspective. *Language Awareness, 19*(4), 281-297.

Csizer, K., & Dörnyei, Z. (2005). The internal structure of language learning motivation and its relationship with language choice and learning effort. *Modern Language Journal, 89*(1), 19-36.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1995). Human autonomy: The basis for true self-esteem. In M. H. Kernis (Ed.), *Efficacy, agency and self-esteem* (pp. 31- 48). New York: Plenum.

Dickinson, L. (1995). Autonomy and motivation: A literature review. *System, 23*(2), 165-74.

Dörynei, Z. (1994). Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal, 78*(3), 273-284.

Dörynei, Z. (1996). Moving language learning motivation to a larger platform for theory and practice. In R. Oxford (Ed.), *Language learning motivation: Pathways to the new century* (pp. 71-80). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.

Dörnyei, Z. (2001). *Teaching and research motivation*. Harlow, UK: Pearson Education.

Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Dörnyei, Z., & Skehan, P. (2003). Individual differences in second language learning. In C. J. Doughty & M. H. Long (Eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 589-630). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Ehrman, M. E., & Dörnyei, Z. (1998). *Interpersonal dynamics in the second language classroom*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Flavell, J. H. (1976). Metacognitive aspects of problem solving. In L. B. Resnick (Ed.), *The nature of intelligence* (pp. 231 - 235). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Flavell, J. H. (1979). Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: A new area of cognitive

development enquiry. *American Psychologist, 34*(10), 906-911.

Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation.* London: Edward Arnold.

Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1972). *Attitudes and motivation in second language learning.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Goh, C. C. M. (1997). Metacognitive awareness and second language listeners. *ELT Journal, 51*(4), 361-369.

Goh, C. C. M. (1998). How learners with different listening abilities use comprehension strategies and tactics. *Language Teaching Research, 2*(2), 124-147.

Goh, C. C. M. (1999). What learners know about the factors that influence their listening comprehension. *Hong Kong Journal of Applied Linguistics, 4*(1), 17-42.

Goh, C. C. M. (2000). A cognitive perspective on language learners' listening comprehension problems. *System, 28*(1), 55-75.

Goh, C. C. M. (2002). Exploring listening comprehension tactics and their interaction patterns. *System, 30*(2), 185-206.

Goh, C. C. M. (2008). Metacognitive instruction for second language listening development: Theory, practice and research implications. *RELC Journal, 39*(2), 188-213.

Goh, C. C. M., & Hu, G. (2014). Exploring the relationship between metacognitive awareness and listening performance with questionnaire data. *Language Awareness, 23*(3), 255-274.

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

Golchi, M. (2012). Listening anxiety and its relationship with listening strategy use and listening comprehension among Iranian IELTS learners, *International Journal of English Linguistics, 2*(4), 115-128.

Gonen, M. (2009). The relationship between FL listening anxiety and foreign language listening strategies: The case of Turkish EFL learners. Proceedings of the 5th WSEAS/IASME International Conference on Educational Technologies (EDUTE' 09)

Graham, S., & Macaro, E. (2008). Strategy instruction in listening for lower-intermediate learners of French. *Language Learning, 58*(4), 747-783.

Heiberger, R. M., & Holland, B. (2004). *Statistical analysis and data display: An intermediate course with examples in S-Plus, R, and SAS*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Kim, Chunyong., & Lee, Hikyoung. (2015). The interaction of L2 motivation constructs and learner variables in Korean middle school learners of English. *Modern English Education, 16*(1), 81-105.

Macaro, E., Graham, S., & Vanderplank, R. (2007). A review of listening strategies: Focus on sources of knowledge and on success. In A. D. Cohen & E. Macaro (Eds.), *Language learner strategies: 30 years of research and practice* (pp. 165-185). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Mendelsohn, D. (1995). Applying learning strategies in the second/foreign language listening comprehension lesson. In D. Mendelsohn & J. Rubin (Eds.), *A guide for the teaching of second language listening* (pp. 132-150). San Diego, CA: Dominie Press.

O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition* . Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

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

Oxford, R. L., & Shearin, J. (1994). Language learning motivation: Expanding the theoretical framework. *The Modern Language Journal, 78*(1), 12-28.

Rahimi, M., & Abedi, S. (2015). The role of metacognitive awareness of listening strategies in listening proficiency: The case of language learners with different levels of academic self-regulation. In A. Pena-Ayala (Ed.), *Metacognition: fundamentals, applications, and trends* (pp. 169-192). Cham, Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.

Rost, M. (2014). Listening in a multilingual world: The challenges of second language (L2) listening. *International Journal of Listening, 28*(3), 131-148.

Ryan, R. M., & Connell, J. P. (1989). Perceived locus of causality and internalization: Examining reasons for acting in two domains. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57*(5), 749- 76l.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000a). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist, 55*(1), 68-78.

Ryan. R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000b). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25*(1), 54-67.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2001). *Using multivariate analysis*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Ushioda, E. (2001). Language learning at university: Exploring the role of motivational thinking. In Z. Dörnyei & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and second language acquisition* (pp. 93-125). Honolulu: University of Hawaii, Second Language Teaching Center.

Vandergrift, L. (1997). The Cinderella of communication strategies: Reception strategies in interactive listening. *The Modern Language Journal, 81*(4), 494-505.

Vandergrift, L. (1999). Facilitating second language listening comprehension: Acquiring

successful strategies. *ELT Journal, 53*(3), 168-176.

Vandergrift, L. (2003a). From prediction through reflection: Guiding students through the process of L2 listening. *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*(3), 463-496.

Vandergrift, L. (2005). Relationships among motivation orientations, metacognitive awareness and proficiency in L2 listening. *Applied Linguistics, 26*(1), 70-89.

Vandergrift, L., & Goh, C. (2012). *Teaching and learning second language listening: Metacognition in action*. New York: Routledge.

Vandergrift, L., Goh, C., Mareschal, C., & Tafaghodatari, M. H. (2006). The metacognitive awareness listening questionnaire (MALQ): Development and validation. *Language Learning, 56*(3), 431-462.

Vandergrift, L., & Tafaghodatari, M. H. (2010). Teaching L2 learners how to listen does make a difference: An empirical study. *Language Learning, 60*(2), 470-497.

Yang, N. -D. (1999). The relationship between EFL learners' beliefs and learning strategy use. *System, 27*(4), 515-535.

Zimmerman, B. J., & Schunk, D. H. (2001). *Self-regulated learning and academic achievement*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

APPENDIX

Metacognitive Awareness Listening Questionnaire (MALQ) and Academic Self-Regulation Questionnaire

★다음은 여러분들이 영어듣기 평가를 할 때 어떻게 생각하는지를 묻는 문항들입니다. 각 문항을 잘 읽고 본인이 느끼고 생각하는 정도와 가장 잘 일치한다고 생각하는 번호에 ☑해 주십시오. 모든 문항에 빠짐없이 솔직하고 정확하게 응답해주시기 바랍니다.

MALQ	[영어듣기평가를 할 때 _____]	전혀 아니다	그렇지 않다	보통이다	그렇다	매우 그렇다
1	나는 듣기평가를 하기 전에, 내가 어떻게 들을지에 대해 계획을 세운다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
2	이해하기 어려울 때, 듣기지문에 더 집중한다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
3	나는 영어로 하는 읽기, 말하기, 쓰기평가보다 듣기평가가 더 어렵다고 생각한다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
4	나는 들으면서 머리 속으로 해석한다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
5	나는 내가 모르는 단어가 나오면 원래 알고 있던 단어로 뜻을 추측한다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
6	나는 듣다가 문장의 뜻을 놓쳤을 때, 즉시 정신을 차리려고 노력한다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
7	내가 들은 내용이 내가 알고 있는 지식과 일치하는지 비교한다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
8	나는 영어로 듣고 이해하는 것이 나에게 쉽지 않은 일이라고 생각한다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
9	문장의 내용을 잘 이해하기 위해 내 경험과 지식을 총동원한다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
10	듣기평가 직전에 받은 시험지의 내용을 보고 문제의 유형 및 선택지를 미리 살펴보면서 듣기평가에 대비한다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
11	나는 들으면서 중요한 단어를 우리말로 해석해 본다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
12	나는 집중력이 떨어지면 다시 정상적으로 집중하려고 노력한다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
13	듣기평가 중에, 내가 생각한 답이 아니라고 생각할 때는 즉시 답을 고친다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
14	듣기평가 채점 후, 내가 틀린 문항의 원인을 찾고 다음 듣기평가에서는 어떻게 할지 생각해 본다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
15	나는 영어를 들을 때, 초조하다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
16	나는 내가 들은 것을 이해하기 어려울 때, 포기하고 듣기를 중단한다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
17	모르는 단어가 들렸을 때 주변문장의 내용으로 그 뜻을 추측한다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
18	나는 듣기를 하는 동안 한 단어 한 단어씩 해석한다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
19	모르는 단어의 뜻을 알아 맞추려고 할 때, 내가 추측한 것이 맞았는지 확인하기 위해 전체적인 듣기내용을 다시 생각해본다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
20	나는 듣기평가를 하면서 내가 문제를 잘 풀고 있는지 계속 점검한다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
21	나는 듣기를 할 때, 높은 점수를 받고 싶다.	①	②	③	④	⑤

★다음 문항부터는 여러분이 평소에 영어를 공부하는 이유에 대한 관점을 이해하기 위한 것입니다. 각 문항을 잘 읽고 본인이 평소 느끼고 생각하는 정도와 가장 잘 일치한다고 생각하는 번호에 ☑해 주십시오.

ACMT	[영어 공부를 하는 이유는 _____]	전혀 그렇지 않다	그렇지 않다	보통이다	그렇다	매우 그렇다
1	영어를 배우는 게 정말 재미있어서	①	②	③	④	⑤
2	공부를 안 하면 죄책감이 느껴져서	①	②	③	④	⑤
3	단지 내가 원하는 성적을 받기 위해서	①	②	③	④	⑤
4	장래의 꿈이나 목표를 이루는데 도움이 되어서	①	②	③	④	⑤
5	내게 중요한 분들 (예: 부모님, 선생님 등)을 실망시키지 않으려고	①	②	③	④	⑤
6	영어에 매우 큰 흥미를 느껴서	①	②	③	④	⑤
7	필수적으로 하라고 하니까 / 해야만 해서	①	②	③	④	⑤
8	주변 분들의 기대를 저버리지 않기 위해서	①	②	③	④	⑤
9	다양한 종류의 능력개발에 도움이 되는 교과목이어서	①	②	③	④	⑤
10	왜 영어공부를 꼭 해야 하는지 잘 모르겠지만 그냥 한다	①	②	③	④	⑤
11	만일 안 하면 벌을 받거나 문제가 생기기 때문에	①	②	③	④	⑤
12	만일 안 해도 된다면, 굳이 영어공부를 하지는 않을 텐데	①	②	③	④	⑤
13	영어실력이 향상될수록 내 삶에 유익하니까	①	②	③	④	⑤
14	무엇인가를 배운다는 자체가 내게는 가치 있고 중요해서	①	②	③	④	⑤
15	영어를 꼭 공부 해야하는 중요성은 잘 모르지만, 일단 하라고 하니까	①	②	③	④	⑤
16	나중에 돈을 버는데 도움이 될 테니까	①	②	③	④	⑤
17	영어가 그냥 좋아서	①	②	③	④	⑤
18	만일 영어를 잘 못하면 창피하니까	①	②	③	④	⑤
19	왜 굳이 영어공부를 해야 하는지 잘 모르겠다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
20	영어를 배우는 게 즐거워서	①	②	③	④	⑤

Examples in: English
Applicable Languages: English
Applicable Levels: Secondary

Yuah V. Chon
Dept. of English Education

Hanyang University
222 Wangsimni-ro, Seongdong-gu,
Seoul, 133-791
Tel: (02) 2220-1144
Email: vylee52@hanyang.ac.kr

Received 16 March 2015
Revised 8 May 2015
Accepted 23 May 2015