

영어어문교육 12권 3호 2006년 가을

The Use of Listening Strategies among Korean Elementary Students

Unkyoung Maeng

(Ajou University)

Maeng, Unkyoung. (2006). The use of listening strategies among Korean elementary students. *English Language & Literature Teaching*, 12(3), 25-49.

Though a large amount of research concerning listening strategies has been conducted, the strategic behaviors of younger students in this area have received less attention. This study is a follow up study of an earlier case study by the author (2006). The purpose of this study is to verify what listening strategies Korean elementary learners use in a general L2 listening situation. 213 elementary students participated in this study, and a listening strategy questionnaire was used. ANOVA, MANOVA, Correlation and Multiple Regression Analysis were used to interpret the data. The results of this study reveal that younger participants used all four types of listening strategies, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive and affective, fairly often; however, the results also show that they differ in how frequently they use each strategy according to their listening proficiency. Overall, highly proficient learners use more strategies compared to less proficient learners. High proficiency learners use compensation strategies most and cognitive strategies least. Low proficient learners use affective strategies most and compensation strategies least. Moreover, the results showed no significant grade- or gender-related strategic behaviors, and also showed that L2 listening proficiency can be a significant predictor of strategic behavior of young learners. 12% of the variance in L2 strategic behaviors was attributable to L2 listening proficiency.

[listening strategies/listening proficiency/gender/grade, 듣기 전략/

듣기 능숙도/성/접수]

I. INTRODUCTION

Listening is a complex and active process of interpreting what is heard. It is a major component in language learning and a primary means of L2 acquisition (Brown, 2001; Krashen, 1997; Nunan, 2003). Listening plays an important role in developing other language skills, and many researchers (Feyten, 1991; Krashen, 1985; Oxford, 1993) have emphasized the important role of aural input in L2 acquisition.

Cognitive theory suggests that learners' attention to language and learning tasks and strategy use accelerate language development (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; MacIntyre, 1994). Strategies and the ability to use them effectively affect L2 listening. Specifically, a listening strategy can help students comprehend more input effectively, and strategy research can provide useful tools for language teaching. In order to construct meaning successfully from L2 oral input, it is essential for L2 learners to know how to choose, use and evaluate their listening strategies effectively.

A number of researchers have devoted themselves to identify listening strategies and the ways that learners use them. The research reveal ample evidence that the use of listening strategies improves listening comprehension. Some research has shown that successful listeners used many strategies and various types of strategies when they learn and use a second language (Bacon, 1992a, 1992b; Chamot & Kupper, 1989; Goh, 1998, 2002; Vandegrift, 1993, 1997b). A number of strategy studies have been conducted that consider variables such as gender, age, proficiency level and text difficulty (Chamot, 1990, Oxford, 1993; Vandergrift, 1993, 1996; Bacon 1992a; Thompson & Rubin, 1996). In addition, a number of listening specialists have suggested that listening teachers can and should teach listening strategies explicitly and implicitly to students (Chamot, 1995; Harley, 2000; Mendelsohn, 1994, 1995; Rubin, 1994; Vandergrift, 1996, 1997a, 1997b, 1999).

Thus, it is clear from a variety of studies that a listening strategy is an important factor in helping L2 learners become successful learners. In order to

help students improve their listening ability by explicit and implicit listening strategy instruction, EFL/ESL teachers should know what strategies their students use and do not use during the listening process. Furthermore, the enhancement of listening skills is a primary focus, especially at the elementary level, as this skill leads students to a successful achievement of communicative competence, the goal of English Education in Korea. However, the strategic behaviors of younger students are comparatively under reported. Moreover, though a previous study of three Korean elementary learners (Maeng, 2006) shed light on the strategic behaviors of younger Korean students, the results of that study need support in order to become more generalized due to the small number of participants in it.

For this reason, the purpose of the present study is to provide a more complete picture of the use of L2 listening strategies of Korean elementary learners. To be more precise, this study aims to provide statistical information concerning the use of listening strategies, and seeks to determine the frequency of the use of each listening strategy as well as the effects of the following variables on the use of listening strategies: age, gender and listening proficiency. A survey was used to investigate the following:

Q1. What listening strategies do Korean elementary students use? Do they use different types of listening strategies? Are there any significant differences in the frequency of the use of listening strategies among participants?

Q2. Is there any relationship between proficiency level and the use of different strategic behaviors? To what degree does L2 listening proficiency affect the use of different strategic behaviors?

Q3. Are there any age- or gender-related effects on the use of different strategic behaviors? To what degree do these variables affect the use of different strategic behaviors?

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Types of Listening Strategies

According to Oxford (1990), there are six different categories of language

learning strategies that can be organized into two types: direct strategies (memory, cognitive, and compensation strategies) and indirect strategies (metacognitive, affective, and social strategies). Memory strategies are used for remembering and retrieving new information and include grouping, associating/elaborating, placing new words into a context, using imagery, semantic mapping, using key words, representing sounds in memory, structured reviewing, using physical response or sensation and using mechanical techniques.

Cognitive strategies are typically used to manipulate information in order to accomplish a task by storing and recalling. They include repeating, formally practicing with sounds, recognizing and using formulas and patterns, recombining, practicing naturalistically, getting the idea quickly, using resources for receiving and sending messages, reasoning deductively, analyzing expressions, analyzing contrastively, translating, transferring, taking notes, summarizing and highlighting. They are the strategies that language learners commonly use most often. Compensation strategies are activities that have the intention of making up for an inadequate repertoire of grammar and vocabulary and include using linguistic clues, and using other clues. Metacognitive strategies direct and control mental learning. They include overviewing and linking with already known material, paying attention, delaying speech production to focus on listening, finding out about language learning, organizing, setting goals and objectives, identifying the purpose of a language task, planning for a language task, seeking practice opportunities, self-monitoring and self-evaluating.

Affective strategies control learners' emotional factors in an effort to involve the learner actively in language learning. Among these strategies are lowering anxiety, making positive statements, taking risks wisely, rewarding oneself, listening to one's body, using a checklist, and discussing one's feelings with someone else. Lastly, social strategies help communicate/learn with other people. These strategies include asking for clarification/verification, asking for correction, cooperation with peers/proficient users of the target language, developing cultural understanding and becoming aware of others' thoughts and feelings.

Vandergrift (1997b) suggested somewhat broad categories of listening

strategies: cognitive, metacognitive, and socioaffective strategies. Vandergrift combined memory and compensation factors into the cognitive category. According to Maeng's study (2006) cognitive strategies (translating, reconstructing, getting the idea quickly, reasoning, summarizing and recognizing and retrieving patterns), compensation strategies (repeating, using familiar content words, drawing on knowledge of the world, using tone of voice and speed and using visual clues), and metacognitive strategies (concentrating with effort, listening for familiar content words, listening for gist/details, and evaluating) are used among the young Korean learners.

2. Listening Strategic Behaviors

A number of researchers have reported that there are more similarities than differences in the listening strategic behaviors of high proficiency and low proficiency listeners. Goss (1982) and Maeng (2006) reported that successful listeners use many strategies and have the ability to know when to use which strategy. DeFilippis (1980) reported that high- and low-level listeners used similar strategies but more proficient listeners used the following strategies more often than less proficient listeners: automatic flow of the auditory stimulus, contextual inference strategies, grammar strategies, visualization strategies, cognate strategies, and role identification strategies. More proficient listeners were better at organizing auditory input and less proficient listeners used translating strategy and key word strategy more. Murphy (1986,1987) argued that more proficient listeners used a more specific strategy and a wider variety of strategies compared to less proficient listeners. Bacon (1992a, 1992b) found that proficient listeners seem to use various types of strategies, and can change strategies, and alter their motivation, self-control, maintenance of attention, and effective use of background knowledge flexibly. O'Malley, Chamot and Kupper (1989) found that more proficient listeners used self-monitoring, elaboration, and inferencing more. Vandergrift (1996) showed that regardless of a student's proficiency level, students use three types of strategies broadly: metacognitive, cognitive, and socioeffective strategies. However, cognitive strategies were used most often and metacognitive strategies least often. Furthermore, the number of strategies used was found to increase by students'

level.

Rost and Ross (1991) found that more proficient listeners used inference and continuation signals while less proficient listeners used lexical reprise and global reprise. Vandergrift (1993, 1997b) reported that both more- and less-proficient listeners use cognitive strategies more heavily while more proficient listeners use more metacognitive strategies. However less proficient listeners spent most of the time translating. Moreira (1996) determined that identical strategies are found among learners of low, middle, and high levels of listening proficiency; however, highly proficient listeners used strategies most frequently. They seemed to be more aware of their strategy use thus they have more ability to monitor their strategy use more flexibly. They are also good at distinguishing between important information and details in a recall task. Chao (1997) also found that more proficient listeners used strategies more frequently than less-proficient listeners.

Other studies (OKada, Oxford & Abo, 1996; Kawai, 2000) have shown that learners with higher motivation tend to use a wider variety of strategies more often. Erhman and Oxford (1995) reported that motivation especially enhances cognitive strategies. Goh (2000) suggested that teaching strategies is essential for helping learners to become better listeners. A direct strategy aimed at improving perception and strategy use and an indirect strategy aimed at raising learners' metacognitive awareness are needed to help learners not only improve their listening comprehension but also become more efficient at directing their own learning and development as L2 listeners. Goh (2000) also said that low-proficiency students seemed to have more low-level perception problems.

There are some studies concerning text difficulty, age and gender. Bacon (1992) mentioned that learners have a tendency to use top-down strategies such as knowledge of the world, situations, and human interactions and synthesis of information for less difficult passages, while they use bottom-up strategies heavily such as words, syntax, and grammar for more difficult passages. According to Harley (2000), there is no significant age-related difference in listening strategies. Bacon (1992a, 1992b) found that female participants use more cognitive than metacognitive strategies compared to male participants. Vandergrift (1996) reported that female students use more metacognitive strategies than male students. However, Philips (1990) and

Vandergrift (1993) showed no gender-related difference in strategic behaviors.

There is strong evidence that strategy instruction enhances listening performance. Training the use of listening strategies has been shown to enhance L2 listening comprehension (Rubin 1990; Thompson & Rubin, 1996) and according to a number of researchers, this can and should be applied to L2 learners (O'Malley, Chamot, & Kupper, 1989; Rost & Ross 1991; Bacon 1992; Vogely 1995). Mendelsohn (1994, 1995) emphasized to teach students the following: predicting, hypothesizing, and inferencing; Vandergrift (1996, 1997b, 1999) stressed metacognitive strategies. Both researchers also concluded that teachers should encourage students to transfer listening strategies from an L1 to an L2 context and that teachers should give students many opportunities to practice listening meaningfully. Vandergrift (1997a) also argued that strategy instruction help students, especially beginning students, to solve communication problems and enhance communication. Chamot (1995) and Goh (1997) suggested that raising students' awareness about listening strategies and how to use them is useful for developing better strategic approaches. Other studies also indicate that strategy instruction should be implemented gradually over an extended period of time in order to be effective (O'Malley 1987; Chamot, Barnhardt, El-Dinary, Carbonaro, & Robbins, 1993).

III. METHOD

1. Participants

The participants in the present study were 213 elementary school students in Korea, made up of 110 male and 103 female students. They all attended the same elementary school in Bundang (South of Korea), and their grade ranged from 5th to 6th grade. There were 109 students in the 5th grade and 104 students in the 6th grade. The participants in the 5th grade had been exposed to at least 2.3 years of formal English instruction and those of 6th grade students had 3.3 years of this instruction. They were taking a total of two English classes per week: one class taught by a Korean teacher and the other class taught by a native-speaking English teacher. In addition to regular

English classes at school, all participants were receiving a private English language instruction at a private language school at least three times a week.

TABLE 1
Participants' Information and Listening Ability

	Grade(213)		Gender(213)		Level (PELT Listening Raw Score)		
	5th	6th	M	F	H(36/40↑)	M(35/40-30/40)	L(29/30↓)
N	109	104	110	103	111	69	33

The participants were divided into three groups according to their PELT listening scores (See Table 1) (as compared within the group of subjects) for the purpose of this study, with the groups labeled High, Middle and Low. There were 111 high-level listening proficiency students, 69 intermediate-level students and 33 low-level students in this study. A majority of the students mentioned that they had not been taught listening strategies.

2. Materials and Procedures

For the purposes of this study, the Primary English Level Test (PELT) and a listening strategy questionnaire (LSQ) were used for data collection. All participants took the Primary English Level Test. The result of the standard test was used to determine the level of each participant's listening skill in this group of students. The PELT contains 60 multiple-choice questions (40 for listening and 20 for reading). The listening components of the PELT test a variety of listening skills: listening for gist, facts, and details, and making inferences. Listening passages contain various forms: short dialogues or passages and conversations.

The LSQ was conducted in order to collect data regarding the listening strategies of the subjects. The LSQ required participants to respond to questions using a Likert-type scale. The questionnaire was designed based on the learning strategy suggested by Oxford (1990), Vandergrift (1997a, 1997b) and Goh (2002), as used in Maeng's study (2006). Questions were categorized into four different types of strategies. There were two direct strategies (cognitive strategies and compensation strategies) and two indirect strategies

(metacognitive strategies and affective strategies). There were twenty three questions for the cognitive strategies (1 to 23), nine questions for the compensation strategies (24 to 32), five questions for the metacognitive strategies (33 to 37) and five questions for the affective strategies (38 to 42). A reliability analysis was conducted for the 42 items of the LSQ, and the Cronbach's alpha for these items was found to be .903. To be more precise, the Cronbach's alpha for the items in the cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, and affective categories were .83, .62, .61, and .67, respectively.

The PELT was administered in a regular English class. The LSQ was administered in another regular English class directly after a ten-minute practice session of the listening and speaking sections of Lesson 5 of the elementary English textbook. The instructions concerning the standard test and the directions and questions for the LSQ were given in Korean. For the LSQ, participants were to indicate on the questionnaire to what extent they used the strategy described using one of choices on a five scale form: (1) Never to (5) Always. Participants completed the LSQ within 30 minutes. The data of the LSQ were analyzed statistically.

First, an overall listening strategy was used as a dependent variable in an analysis of variance (ANOVA) with level, gender and grade (age) as factors. Second, the 42 strategies were divided into four different categories (cognitive, compensation, metacognitive and affective) and they were used as the dependent variables in a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) with level, gender and grade (age) as factors. Lastly, a correlation analysis was used to verify the relationships between dependable variables (cognitive, compensation, metacognitive and affective) and independent variables (level, gender, and grade/age), with a multiple regression analysis computed to verify the significant predictors in the use of listening strategies.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 2 presents the results from the descriptive statistics of the overall listening strategy, and Table 3 presents the descriptive statistics of ANOVA of the overall listening strategy. Table 2 shows that participants' behavior in

terms of using strategies varied according to grade, gender and level. More precisely, 5th graders appeared to use listening strategies more than 6th graders, and female participants used listening strategies more compared to male participants. The higher the level of listening ability, the greater use of listening strategies. For example, highly proficient participants used listening strategies most often while low-proficiency participants used them least.

TABLE 2
Descriptive Statistics of Overall Listening Strategy

		M	SD	N
Grade	5	3.2534	.5745	109
	6	3.2091	.5012	104
Gender	Male	3.1489	.5391	110
	Female	3.3203	.5275	103
Level	L	2.8935	.5976	33
	M	3.1752	.5013	69
	H	3.3675	.4961	111

TABLE 3
The Results of ANOVA for Overall Listening Strategy ($p < .05$)

	Sum of Square	df	Mean of Square	F	Sig
Grade	.686	1	.686	2.648	.105
Gender	.923	1	.923	3.565	.060
Level	4.935	2	2.467	9.529	.000*

However, the results of the ANOVA (see Table 3) indicate that only the means of the use of listening strategies among different proficiency levels of participants were significantly different ($F=9.529$, $p=.000$). Although different strategic behaviors between male and female participants were not supported statistically at the .05 level, this strategic behavior difference is statistically supported at the .10 level. Therefore, the results approached significance for gender-related differences in terms of using listening strategies, as mentioned above. These results reveal that high-proficiency participants use more listening strategies compared to low-proficiency participants, which is comparable to the results of numerous previous studies (Chao, 1997; Goss, 1982; Moreira, 1996; Murphy 1986, 1987; Vandergrift, 1996).

Tables 4 and 5 present the results of descriptive statistics of different types of listening strategies: direct (cognitive and compensation) and indirect (metacognitive and affective) listening strategies, respectively. Overall, participants used all of the different strategies, although the frequency of the use of each strategy varied. Participants used more indirect strategies than direct strategies ($t = -12.436$, $p = .016$). Unlike the results of Oxford (1990) and Vandergrift (1993, 1996, 1997b), younger participants used cognitive strategies least and affective strategies most.

Among the direct strategies, participants used compensation strategies more than cognitive strategies ($F = 2.497$, $p = .000$), which partially supports the result of Maeng's study (2006) in which participants used compensation strategies more than cognitive strategies in a general listening setting. Female participants appeared to use more cognitive and compensation strategies compared to male participants. 5th graders seemed to use more cognitive strategies than 6th graders, but 5th and 6th graders seemingly used compensation strategies somewhat similarly. Not unlike the results of the frequency of the use of an overall listening strategy, the frequency of the use of cognitive and compensation strategies varied according to the listening proficiency of the participants. High proficient participants used these strategies most often; low-proficiency participants used these strategies least often.

TABLE 4
Descriptive Statistics of Direct Listening Strategies

Strategy	Grade	Gender	Level	M	SD	N
Cognitive	5	M	L	2.8757	.74629	15
			M	3.0954	.50831	16
			H	3.1716	.52035	24
		F	L	3.2127	.47506	7
			M	3.0809	.55692	17
			H	3.4995	.56812	30
	6	M	L	2.5918	.56623	7
			M	3.1366	.49605	20
			H	3.2831	.43873	27
		F	L	2.9022	.35566	4
			M	3.0810	.662490	14
			H	3.2981	.40172	30

			L	2.8901	.63269	33
		Total	M	3.1010	.53127	67
			H	3.3215	.49376	111
			Total	3.1051	.55061	211
	5	M	L	2.6731	.5957	15
			M	3.1832	.51653	16
			H	3.3229	.92437	24
		F	L	3.3968	.76135	7
			M	3.2639	.78485	17
			H	3.5403	.56607	30
Compensation	6	M	L	2.6786	.60516	7
			M	3.1951	.62935	20
			H	3.4218	.58776	27
		F	L	2.8889	.25660	4
			M	3.0972	.57019	14
			H	3.4412	.54375	30
			L	2.8540	.65229	33
		Total	M	3.1893	.62552	67
			H	3.4377	.65464	111
			Total	3.2675	.67560	211
Total				3.2272	.5579	

TABLE 5
Descriptive Statistics of Indirect Listening Strategies

Strategy	Grade	Gender	Level	M	SD	N
	5	M	L	2.9667	.58269	15
			M	3.3219	.81833	16
			H	3.2688	.78655	24
		F	L	3.1214	1.08469	7
			M	3.4941	.6407	17
			H	3.6617	.70242	30
Metacognitive	6	M	L	2.6000	.73030	7
			M	3.4500	.72801	20
			H	3.2593	.69463	27
		F	L	3.0000	.67330	4
			M	2.9714	.80329	14
			H	3.3667	.68699	30
			L	2.9258	.73804	33
		Total	M	3.3306	.75498	67
			H	3.3991	.72491	111
			Total	3.3033	.75159	211

Affective	5	M	L	3.0933	.78510	15
			M	3.3938	.83942	16
			H	3.0750	.89601	24
		F	L	3.3429	.59682	7
			M	3.4471	.66155	17
			H	3.6700	.80907	30
	6	M	L	2.3143	1.08233	7
			M	3.3450	.51245	20
			H	3.4593	.78214	27
			F	L	2.8000	.87939
		M		2.9571	.55569	14
		H		3.4200	.86996	30
		Total		L	2.9455	.87360
			M	3.3015	.66023	67
H	3.4225		.85320	111		
Total	3.3095		.81375	211		
Total				3.3070	.6818	

Among the indirect listening strategies, participants used metacognitive and affective strategies somewhat equally. This indirectly supports the results of Maeng's previous study (2006) in which affective strategies were used in a general listening setting, unlike in the test-oriented setting. 5th graders used metacognitive and affective strategies more compared to 6th graders. Female participants used more metacognitive and affective strategies compared to male participants. Similar to the results of the frequency of the use of the overall listening strategy and direct strategies, the frequency of the use of metacognitive and affective strategies also varied according to the listening proficiency of the participants. Highly proficient participants used these strategies most often and low-proficiency participants used them least often.

Within each level, high proficient participants used compensation strategies most often, affective strategies second, metacognitive strategies third and cognitive strategies least often. Both low and middle proficiency level of participants used affective strategies most often and metacognitive strategies second. The middle proficiency level of participants used cognitive strategies third and compensation strategies least often but the low-proficient participants showed the opposite pattern.

Table 6 presents the results of the MANOVA for the listening strategies.

The results reveal that only the means of using affective listening strategies between two different grade groups (5th and 6th graders) were significantly different ($F=4.908$, $p=.028$). This suggests the possibility that the younger the learners are, the more they use affective strategies. Though gender-related strategic behaviors were not statistically significant at the .05 level, this strategic behavior difference is statistically supported at the .10 level. Therefore, gender-related differences approached significance in the use of cognitive and compensation strategies, as mentioned above. However, the means of using each strategy among three different groups were significantly different. This strongly suggests that high-proficiency participants use more and various listening strategies compared to low-proficiency participants, as in the results of many previous studies (Chao, 1997; Goss, 1982; Maeng, 2006; Moreira, 1996; Murphy 1986, 1987; Vandergrift, 1996). The above results indirectly reveal that the listening proficiency of younger participants has a large effect on different strategic behaviors compared to any other variable.

TABLE 6
The Results of MANOVA for Listening Strategies ($p<.05$)

		Sum of Square	df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Grade	Cognitive	.417	1	.417	1.501	.222
	Compensation	.436	1	.436	1.047	.308
	Metacognitive	1.423	1	1.423	2.666	.104
	Affective	3.009	1	3.009	4.908	.028*
Gender	Cognitive	.855	1	.855	3.076	.081
	Compensation	1.343	1	1.343	3.223	.074
	Metacognitive	.566	1	.566	1.060	.304
	Affective	.924	1	.924	1.507	.221
Level	Cognitive	4.522	2	2.261	8.133	.000*
	Compensation	6.772	2	3.386	8.123	.000*
	Metacognitive	4.673	2	2.337	4.378	.014*
	Affective	5.768	2	2.884	4.705	.010*

TABLE 7
The Results of Correlation between Strategies and Other Variables

	Cog	Comp	Meta	Affect	Level	Gender	Grade
Cog	1	.662**	.614**	.591**	.291**	.153*	-.027
Comp		1	.535**	.560**	.306**	.138*	.003
Meta			1	.508**	.196**	.099	-.088
Affect				1	.194**	.114	-.069
Level					1	.144*	.101
Gender						1	-.024
Grade							1

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed)
 ** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed)

Table 7 represents the results of the correlation between each type of strategy and the variables of grade, gender and level. The results show that a correlation exists between each listening strategy and proficiency (level) difference at the .01 level. However, the correlation between level and indirect strategies is lower compared to the correlation between level and direct strategies. There was a relationship between strategies and gender. Though the correlations between cognitive strategy and gender and between compensation strategy and gender were significant at the .05 level, they are very low. However, there was no correlation between types of strategy and grade. Once again, this shows that grade (age) is the variable that affects strategic behaviors least and that listening proficiency is the variable that affects strategic behaviors most among Korean elementary learners.

TABLE 8
The Results of Multiple Regression with Strategies and Other Variables (p<.05)

Strategy Type	Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		Sig(R ²)
		B	SE	Beta	t	
Cog	Level	.208	.050	.280	4.201	.000*(.102)
	Gender	.122	.073	.112	1.681	.094
	Grade	-.057	.072	-.052	-.792	.425
Comp	Level	.270	.061	.295	4.432	.000*(.104)
	Gender	.128	.089	.095	1.439	.152
	Grade	-.033	.089	-.025	-.373	.710

Meta	Level	.201	.070	.197	2.877	.004*(.055)
	Gender	.102	.102	.068	.997	.320
	Grade	-.160	.102	-.107	-1.575	.117
Affect	Level	.210	.076	.191	2.778	.006*(.053)
	Gender	.136	.111	.084	1.225	.222
	Grade	-.141	.111	-.087	-1.275	.204
Overall Strategy	Level	.220	.048	.301	4.559	.000*(.115)
	Gender	.123	.071	.114	1.734	.084
	Grade	-7.41E-02	.070	-.069	-1.052	.294

Table 8 represents the results of the multiple regression analysis. The results show that L2 listening proficiency (level) was a significant predictor of strategic behaviors in all four types of listening strategies. Gender and grade, however, did not prove to be significant in predicting the L2 strategic behaviors of participants. The value of R^2 indicates that 12% of the variance in the L2 strategic behaviors can be explained by L2 listening proficiency as a predictor. To be more specific, 10% of the variance in the cognitive strategic behaviors, 10% in the compensation strategic behaviors, 6% in the metacognitive strategic behaviors and 5% in the affective strategic behaviors are attributable to L2 listening proficiency.

This indicates that the listening proficiency of the participants does affect the strategic behaviors, as mentioned above. Highly proficient participants used more strategies compared to low-level participants for all four types whereas grade and gender did not affect the strategic behaviors significantly. However, the results of the regression analysis show that listening proficiency contributes to participants' strategic behaviors only by a relatively small amount. Thus, other variables such as motivation, listening situation, text difficulty, strategy instruction and L1 listening ability, which were considered in other studies (Bacon, 1992; Erhman & Oxford, 1995; Goh, 2000; Maeng, 2006; Rubin, 1990; Thompson & Rubin, 1996; Vandergrift, 1996, 1997b, 1999), should be considered.

Overall, the results of the LSQ reveal the following: first, the participants used all four types of strategies (cognitive, compensation, metacognitive and affective) though the frequency of the use of each strategy varied. Younger learners used more indirect strategies (metacognitive and affective) than direct strategies (cognitive and compensation). Affective strategies were used most often by low and middle proficiency levels participants and compensation

strategies most often by highly proficient participants. Cognitive strategies were used least often by middle and high proficiency levels of participants and compensation strategies were used least often by low-proficiency participants. Second, proficiency level affected the choice of strategic behaviors significantly, but there were no significant gender-related or grade-related (age) strategic behaviors. Third, though there were significant correlations between the four types of strategies and proficiency level as well as between direct strategies and gender, only the proficiency level predicted participants' strategic behaviors significantly. However only 12% of the variance in the L2 strategic behaviors was attributable to the L2 listening proficiency of the participants.

V. CONCLUSION

The results of this study reveal that elementary learners typically use all four types of strategies (cognitive, compensation, metacognitive and affective strategies) in a general listening setting as mentioned in Maeng's previous case study (2006). Unlike the results of her previous case study, participants used more indirect strategies than direct strategies in a general listening setting. Overall, affective strategies were used most often and cognitive strategies were used least often. These results do not support Oxford's study (1990), in which cognitive strategies were found to be used most often by L2 learners. The results also contrast with both the findings of Vandergrift's study (1996), in which cognitive strategies were used most often and metacognitive strategies least often, and with those of Maeng's study (2006) where participants used compensatory strategies most often and cognitive strategies second. This indirectly suggests that young learners, especially young EFL learners, behave differently from older L2 learners in their use of listening strategies. This also indirectly suggests that the frequency of the use of strategies varies according to the purpose of listening or by the listening situation. For example, L2 learners used cognitive and compensation strategies more in a test-oriented situation but not necessarily in a general listening setting (Maeng, 2006).

This study strongly proposes that listening proficiency affects learners' strategic behaviors, as shown in many studies (Chao, 1997; Goss, 1982; Maeng,

2006; Moreira, 1996; Murphy 1986, 1987; Vandergrift, 1996). Highly proficient learners used more strategies compared to low-proficient learners. The frequency of the use of each strategy varied according to the listening proficiency of the participants. Highly proficient learners used compensation strategies most often, as shown in Maeng's study (2006), affective strategies second, metacognitive third and cognitive strategies least often. Middle- and low-proficiency learners used affective strategies most and metacognitive second. However, they differed in the use of cognitive and compensation strategies. Low-proficiency learners used compensation strategies least often while the middle proficiency level of learners used cognitive strategies least often. Unlike the variable of L2 listening proficiency, there were no grade (age)- or gender-related strategic behaviors among the Korean elementary learners who participated in this study. However the result of the MANOVA showed that the mean difference of the use of affective listening strategies between the two grades were significant ($F=4.908$, $p=.028$). The results of the MANOVA also approached significance for gender difference in the use of cognitive and compensation strategies ($F= 3.076$, $p=.081$, $F=3.223$ $p=.074$). These results indirectly support the inconsistent results of previous studies (Bacon, 1992a, 1992b; Harley, 2000; Phillips, 1990; Vandergrift, 1992).

Additionally, this study shows that only L2 listening proficiency was a significant predictor of strategic behaviors among young learners in all four types of listening strategies. Gender and grade did not prove to be significant in predicting the L2 strategic behaviors of young learners. However, the results of the multiple regression analysis reveal that only 12% of the variance in L2 strategic behaviors can be explained by L2 listening proficiency. This result is supported by a previous study (Kang, 1999) and it suggests that other variables such as motivation, listening situation, text difficulty, strategy instruction and L1 listening ability, which were considered in other studies (Bacon, 1992; Erhman & Oxford, 1995; Goh, 2000; Lee, 2002; Maeng, 2006; Rubin, 1990; Thompson & Rubin, 1996; Vandergrift, 1996, 1997b, 1999), should also be considered when planning to enhance learners' listening ability. This also indirectly suggests that good strategic behaviors can be easily developed, even at the beginning level. Strategy instruction is an important factor that can affect strategic behaviors, even at the lowest level, as mentioned in

Vandergrift's study (1997a). Therefore, strategy instruction considering motivation, the listening situation, and the difficulty of the text will help learners develop good strategic behaviors and can gradually lead to successful L2 learning. Thus, EFL/ESL teachers should teach listening strategies, even at the lowest level, and give learners ample opportunities to practice them.

The listening proficiency test, PELT was inadequate by itself to measure the level of listening proficiency. It did not effectively distinguish highly proficient learners from the mid-level learners or the mid-level learners from the low-level learners. Other assessments such as SLEPT (Secondary Level English Proficiency Test) could have been used in addition to differentiate the levels of listening proficiency more clearly. There was no control for participants' background knowledge or L2 learning experience, both of which may affect learners' strategic behaviors.

However, this study supports the idea that more successful listening learners use a greater number of strategies, and that strategy instruction helps learners develop good strategic behavior, which leads to more successful L2 learning. This study also suggests that proficiency level does affect strategic behaviors, but other factors in addition to strategy use are more deeply involved in successful L2 listening. Therefore, when teaching listening strategies, instructors should consider other factors such as motivation, L1 listening ability, text difficulty and the listening setting in addition to L2 listening proficiency.

REFERENCES

- Bacon, S. M. (1992a). The relationship between gender comprehension, processing strategies and cognitive and affective response in foreign language listening. *The Modern Language Journal*, 76(2), 160-178.
- Bacon, S. M. (1992b). Phases of listening to authentic input in Spanish: A descriptive study. *Foreign Language Annals*, 25, 317-334.
- Brown, H. D, (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. NY: Pearson Education.
- Chamot, A. U. (1990). Cognitive instruction in the second language classroom. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.). *Linguistics, language teaching and language*

- acquisition: The interdependence of theory, practice, and research* (pp. 496-513). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Chamot, A. U. (1995). Learning strategies and listening comprehension. In D. J. Mendelsohn & J. Rubin (Eds.). *A guide for the teaching of second language listening* (pp. 13-30). San Diego: Dominie Press.
- Chamot, A. U., Barnhardt, S., El-Dinary, P. B., Carbonaro, & Robbins, J. (1993). *Methods for teaching learning strategies in the foreign language classroom and assessment of language skills for instruction: Final report*. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 365 157)
- Chamot, A. U., & Kupper, L. (1989). Learning strategies in foreign language instruction. *Foreign Language Annals*, 22, 13-24.
- Chao, J. Y. (1997). The influence of strategy use on comprehension and recall of authentic listening texts by Chinese EFL students in Taiwan. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, Twin cities, 1996). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 57, 3366A.
- Defilippis, D. A (1980). A study of the listening strategies used by skillful and unskillful college French students in aural comprehension tasks. Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1980. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 41, 2481A.
- Ehrman, M. E., & Oxford, R. L. (1995). Cognition plus: Correlates of language learning success. *Modern Language Journal*, 79, 67-89.
- Feyten, C. M. (1991). The power of listening ability: An overlooked dimension in language acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal*, 75, 173-180.
- Goh, C. (1997). Metacognitive awareness and second language listeners. *ELT Journal*, 51, 361-369.
- Goh, C. (1998). How ESL learners with different listening abilities use comprehension strategies and tactics. *Language Teaching Research*, 2(2), 124-147.
- 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.
- Goss, B. (1982, April). *Listening to language: An information processing*

- perspective*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Speech Communication Association, Hot Springs: AR.
- Harley, B. (2000). Listening strategies in ESL: Do age and L1 make a difference? *TESOL Quarterly*, 34(4), 769-776.
- Kang, S. W. (1999). Relationships between the use of ESL learning strategies and English language proficiency of Asian students. *English Language & Literature Teaching*, 5, 1-25.
- Kawai, Y. (2000). Effects of cultural contextualization in listening materials on motivation and strategy use. *I.T.L. Review of Applied Linguistics*, 127-128, 101-126.
- Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The input hypothesis*. London: Longman.
- Krashen, S. D. (1997). *Foreign language education: The easy way*. Culver City, CA: Language Education Associates.
- Lee, I. Y. (2002). An analysis of the predisposition of learners of English focusing on motivation and learning strategies. *English Language & Literature Teaching*, 8(2), 151-176.
- MacIntyre, P. D. (1994). Toward a social psychological model of strategy use. *Foreign Language Annals*, 27(2), 185-195.
- Maeng, U. K. (2006, July). *Listening comprehension strategies of EFL learners: A case study of three Korean elementary students*. Paper presented at the 2006 International Conference of the 11th Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics, Chuncheon, Korea.
- Mendelsohn, D. J. (1994). *Learning to listen: A strategy-based approach for the second-language learner*. San Diego, CA: Dominic.
- Mendelsohn, D. J. (1995). Applying learning strategies in the second/foreign language listening comprehension lesson. In D. J. Mendelsohn & J. Rubin (Eds.), *A guide for the teaching of second language listening* (pp. 132-150). San Diego, CA: Dominic Press.
- Moreira, M. L. (1996). On listening comprehension: Linguistic strategies used by second language learners in non-collaborative discourse. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1995), *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 56, 3562A.
- Murphy, J. M. (1986). An investigation into the listening strategies of ESL college students. (Doctoral dissertation, Teachers College of Columbia

- University, 1985). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 46, 2677A.
- Murphy, J. M. (1987). The listening strategies of English as a second language college students. *Research and Teaching in Developmental Education*, 4, 27-46.
- Nunan, D. (2003). *Practical English language teaching*. McGraw Hill.
- Okada, M., Oxford, R. L., & Abo, S. (1996). Not all alike: Motivation and learning strategies among students of Japanese and Spanish in an exploratory study. In R. L. Oxford (Ed.), *Language learning motivation: Pathways to the new century* (pp. 105-119). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.
- O'Malley, J. M. (1987). The effects of training in the use of learning strategies. In A. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.), *Learner strategies in language learning* (pp. 133-143). Great Britain: Prentice Hall.
- O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- O'Malley, J. M., Chamot, A. U., & Kupper, L. (1989). Listening comprehension strategies in second language acquisition. *Applied Linguistics*, 10, 418-437.
- Oxford, R. (1990). *Language learning strategies*. Heinle & Heinle publishers.
- Oxford, R. (1993). Research update on L2 listening. *System*, 21, 205-211.
- Phillips, V. J. (1990). *English as a second language learner strategies of adult Asian students using the strategy inventory for language learning*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of San Francisco, San Francisco, CA.
- Rost, M., & Ross, S. (1991). Learner use of strategies in interaction: Typology and teachability. *Language Learning*, 41, 235-273.
- Rubin, J. (1990). Improving foreign language listening comprehension. In J. A. Alatis (Ed.), Georgetown University Roundtable on Language and linguistics 1990; *Linguistics, language teaching and language acquisition: The interdependence of theory, practice, and research* (pp. 309-316). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Thompson, I., & Rubin, J. (1996). Can strategy instruction improve listening comprehension? *Foreign Language Annals*, 29(3), 331-342.
- Vandergrift, L. (1993). The comprehension strategies of second language

- (French) listeners. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada, 1992). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 54, 850A.
- Vandergrift, L. (1996). The listening comprehension strategies of core French high school students. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 52(2), 200-223.
- Vandergrift, L. (1997a). The cinderella of communication strategies; Reception strategies in interactive listening. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81(4), 494-505.
- Vandergrift, L. (1997b). The comprehension strategies of second language (French) listeners: A descriptive study. *Foreign Language Annals*, 30(3), 337-409.
- Vandergrift, L. (1999). Facilitating second language listening comprehension: Acquiring successful strategies. *ELT Journal*, 53(3), 168-176.
- Vogely, A. (1995). Perceived strategy use during performance on three authentic listening comprehension tasks. *The Modern Language Journal*, 79, 41-56.

APPENDIX

Listening Survey Questionnaire

When I am listening/ While I am listening

1. I create a mental image about the text.
2. I try not to translate the text into L1 (Korean).
3. I try to understand the text using my background knowledge.
4. I try to summarize mentally.
5. I listen again if I don't understand the text.
6. I try to guess what I will hear next based on what I have heard.
7. I translate words and sentences into Korean to grasp overall meaning.
8. I just ignore the sounds that I can't hear clearly.
9. I listen to the stressed words.

To enhance my English listening ability

10. I put emphasis on English intonation and pronunciation.
11. I try to read English texts or dialogues out loud like native speakers.
12. I read English texts (newspaper, magazines, and novels).
13. I study English grammar.
14. I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or listen to the radio spoken in English.
15. I listen to popular English songs and try to comprehend the meaning of the songs.
16. I try to talk to native English speakers.
17. I listen to English tapes for the purpose of studying English.
18. I practice dictating English texts.
19. I listen carefully to the way native English speakers/ English teachers pronounce words/sentences.
20. When the listening text is difficult, I try to understand the meaning based on the meaning of each word rather than the meaning of sentences.
21. I try to understand the listening text by associating the meaning of each word in L1 rather than by associating the meaning of each sentence in L1.
22. It is difficult for me to understand fast spoken English even if the linguistic contents (words/structures) are simple and easy.
23. I try to summarize the content after listening.

When I am listening/ While I am listening

24. I jot down L2 words which I think are important.
25. I try to guess the overall meaning instead of interpreting every word or expression.
26. I don't linger on what I can't understand or hear but instead move to the next thing quickly.
27. I try to find some clues from the context, especially when I can't guess the meaning by hearing certain words or sentences.
28. I look at the comprehension questions first to get some ideas on what to listen for.
29. Before listening, I look at pictures/charts/figures/tables to guess the content of the listening texts.

30. Before listening, I skim the content words in the comprehension section to guess what I am going to hear.
31. I write down what I think is important in L1.
32. When I don't understand, I ask my teacher for help.
33. I constantly check whether I understand what I heard or not.
34. I judge whether the listening materials are easy or difficult.
35. I check my progress/achievement in listening.
36. I have a clear goal for improving my English skills.
37. I go to a private language school or take a conversation class to improve my listening skills.
38. I listen better when I am tense.
39. I try to listen in a quiet and neat place.
40. I try to relax and force myself to focus on what I am listening.
41. I give myself a treat or motivate myself to listen well.
42. I give myself confidence to listen well.

예시 언어(Examples in): English

적용가능 언어(Applicable Languages): English

적용가능 수준(Applicable Levels): Primary/Secondary

Unkyoung Maeng
Ajou University
Graduate School of Education
San 5 Wonchung-dong, Youngtong-gu
Swon, Kyungi-do 443-749, Korea.
Tel: (031)219-1883
Fax: (031)219-2096
Email: my5329@ajou.ac.kr

Received in July, 2006

Reviewed by Aug, 2006

Revised version received in Sept. 2006