

Listener Anxiety and Listening Strategies on Multiple-choice Items of EFL Learners*

Ji Young Choi · Yuah V. Chon*****
Hanyang University

Choi, Ji Young & Chon, Yuah V. (2014). Listener anxiety and listening strategies on multiple-choice items of EFL learners. *Journal of the Korea English Education Society, 13(4)*, 21-53.

Anxiety has been known to be a general trait of foreign language learning, but listening skill-specific anxiety has been less researched in understanding the listening process of EFL learners. Concomitantly, it is the employment of strategies that will help learners compensate for their listening problems, and it was within the interest of the present study to seek how anxiety may have facilitative-debilitative aspects on the learners' use of strategies. Also, there was need to be highlight listening strategies on multiple-choice questions since the learners' listening tasks are often associated with testing. The study was conducted with 121 adolescent high school learners who were asked to respond to questionnaires on anxiety felt towards concern for insufficient prior knowledge, lack of self-confidence, and testing. There was attention to cognitive and metacognitive listening strategies which the learners retrospectively reported after solving three multiple-choice items. There was reduced levels of anxiety with more proficient learners whereas testing anxiety was positively related to the use of listening strategies overall. Also, with any interaction among listening strategies, listening proficiency, and item type, there was an interaction effect only between strategies and listening proficiency. Implications for teaching L2 listening are suggested.

[listening anxiety/testing anxiety/cognitive strategies/metacognitive strategies/
/ / /]

* This work was supported by the research fund of Hanyang University.

** First author

*** Corresponding author

I. INTRODUCTION

Second language (L2) listening has been pointed out by numerous researchers as an important part of the second language learning process and defined as an active process during which the listener constructs meaning from oral input (Brown, 1990; Buck, 2001; Rost, 1990, 2001, 2006). Buck (2001) points out that “listening comprehension is an active process of constructing meaning and this is done by applying knowledge to the incoming sound” (p. 31) and involves different types of knowledge: both linguistic knowledge and non-linguistic knowledge.

The area of L2 listening warrants further research since learners have been found to have a multitude of problems (Andringa, Olsthoorn, van Beuningen, Schoonen, & Hulstijn, 2012) and it has been recognized as the least explicit of the four language skills (Vandergrift, 2004). Within the framework of three cognitive processing phases - perception, parsing, and utilization (Anderson, 2009), Goh (2002) found learners to have specific problems at each phase. As a whole, the problems will become exacerbated due to the transient nature of listening, which seems to be a major cause of L2 listener anxiety (Field, 2008), and therefore calls for further research on the variables that may have facilitative or debilitating effects on listening performance.

While there have been several individual difference variables such as aptitude, motivation, and learning strategies as being influential factors in L2 learning (Dörnyei & Skehan, 2003), anxiety has been pointed to be especially important (Arnold, 1999, 2000; Gregersen, 2005; MacIntyre, 1995; Oxford, 1999; Pae, 2013) due to its sustained recognition as a facilitative-debilitative factor in language learning. Other factors that have been known to be influential in language learning or use have been the use of strategies (Cohen, 1998) by learners to overcome their listening problems. However, to explain the process of L2 listening, the literature on the relationship between listening anxiety and listening strategies is still lacking. This relationship is important since the employment of strategies may help learners solve their listening problems, but the exhibition of anxiety is likely to have an effect on learners’ use of strategies.

The literature on L2 listening indicates that studies have often been conducted with listening performance of L2 learners being correlated with either listening anxiety or listening strategies respectively, but research exclusively investigating the relationships between ‘listening anxiety’ and ‘listening strategies’ with consideration of ‘listening ability’ have been less common. Also, the listening studies have rarely situated learners to solve listening test items previous to reporting on the listening strategies, but this data collection method may provide a refined view on the

employment of strategies by item type. The presentation of test items is meaningful since multiple-choice choices have been the most common type of listening tasks the learners have had to deal with in the Korean educational context. As such, with having recognized the importance of L2 listening as an independent skill with its own problems, a testing skill, and the facilitative-debilitative effects of anxiety on the listening process of L2 learners, the purpose of research is threefold:

First is to understand the process of L2 listening that Korean learners go through by examining the types and degrees of anxiety L2 learners experience in relation to listening proficiency. Second is to examine the relationship between different types of anxiety and the learners' use of listening strategies. Third, for a more comprehensive understanding on the factors that may influence L2 listening, variables related to private education and the learning materials utilized, listening anxiety, and listening strategies were submitted for analysis to identify the significant predictors of L2 listening proficiency. The results are expected to provide explanations on the L2 learners' listening process for informed teaching of L2 listening.

II. BACKGROUND

1. L2 Listener Anxiety

The current literature indicates that the relationship between the differential types and degrees of anxiety that L2 learners exhibit towards L2 learning has more often been associated with L2 speaking (Aida, 1994; Cheng, Horwitz & Schallert, 1999; Yan & Horwitz, 2008) rather than with the reciprocal skill, L2 listening. Also, a majority of research is documented on general foreign language anxiety and L2 performance (Aida, 1994; Atasheneh & Izadi, 2012; Chen & Chang, 2004; Cheng et al., 1999; Horwitz, 2001; Liu, 2006; Zhang, 2013).

In conceptualizing and measuring FL anxiety, Horwitz, Horwitz & Cope (1986) developed the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS), which taps communication apprehension, test anxiety, and fear of negative evaluation. Horwitz et al. argued that FL anxiety has unique components limited to the FL context that makes it different from other types of anxiety. However, FL anxiety can relate to a specific type of language skill such as listening or reading (Cheng et al., 1999; Elkhafai, 2005; Pae, 2013), and listening anxiety is of interest in the present study. While Field (2008) defines listener anxiety as the "fear that connected L2 speech is too difficult to make sense of" (p. 348), numerous researchers have associated

listening to a FL as highly anxiety-provoking (Elkhafaifi, 2005; Joo-hae Kim, 2000; Saito, Horwitz & Garza, 1999; Eunhui Sin, 2004; Vogely, 1998; Zhang, 2013), often demonstrating anxiety to relate negatively to FL performance.

Elkhafaifi (2005) constructed the FL listening anxiety scale (FLLAS) to assess FL listening anxiety of students learning Arabic in north American universities. The researcher saw that anxiety was playing an important role in FL students' classroom performance. When anxiety scores were correlated with final grades and listening comprehension scores, the results indicated that FL learning anxiety and listening anxiety are separate but related phenomena that both correlate negatively with achievement. The study also revealed significant negative correlations among FL learning anxiety, listening anxiety, and selected demographic variables. The results suggest that reducing student anxiety and providing a less stressful classroom environment might enable teachers and Arabic programs to help students improve both their listening comprehension proficiency as well as their overall course performance.

Using both quantitative and qualitative methods, Joo-hae Kim (2000) investigated the relationship between FL listening and FL anxiety. The quantitative component of the study examined the existence of listening anxiety and its relationship to listening proficiency or learner background factors. The qualitative component of the study further identified the sources and effects of listening anxiety. A total of two-hundred fifty-three Korean EFL university learners participated in the survey in which participants' listening anxiety was measured by the Foreign Language Listening Anxiety Scale (FLLAS) with 33-items, a newly developed scale for the study. Kim uncovered a negative correlation between FL listening anxiety and FL listening performance. The anxiety factor as in 'lack of confidence' in listening served as the best predictor of listening proficiency.

In trying to identify the source of listening anxiety in the language classroom and propose solutions, Vogely (1998) looked at sources of listening anxiety among learners of Spanish at an American university, as reported by the students themselves. Half of their responses focused on the characteristics of the input (nature of the speech, level of difficulty, lack of clarity, lack of visual support, and lack of repetition) as being a major source of anxiety. In particular, they were concerned about speech that was spontaneous, too fast for them, poorly enunciated, or in an unfamiliar accent. The students also associated the level of difficulty with unknown vocabulary, complicated syntax, and unfamiliar topics. When asked to suggest how their listening anxiety could be reduced, about a third of the students' responses focused on input-related factors, such as making the input more informal and ungraded, selecting familiar and meaningful topics, and using known

vocabulary.

In a more recent study, Zhang (2013) explored the possible causal relations between foreign language (English) listening anxiety and English listening performance. Three hundred participants learning English as a foreign language (FL) completed the foreign language listening anxiety scale (FLLAS) and IELTS test twice with an interval of three and a half months. Exploratory causal models indicated that the FL listening anxiety could affect FL listening performance, but FL listening performance did not appear to affect FL listening anxiety systematically. Zhang attributes the causal relationships to the situation specific nature of FL listening anxiety.

2. L2 Listening Strategies, Listener Anxiety, and L2 Listening Proficiency

Acquiring 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).

Listening strategies are ‘conscious plans to manage incoming speech, particularly when the listener knows that he or she must compensate for incomplete input or partial understanding’ (Rost, 2001, p. 236). Based on O’Malley and Chamot’s taxonomy (1990), listening strategies can be classified into three main categories, including cognitive strategies, metacognitive strategies and affective strategies. Cognitive strategies refer to the direct manipulation or transformation of listening materials. This category includes such strategies as repeating the listening task, using imagery or keywords, transferring, translating, taking notes, summarizing, highlighting and contextualization. Metacognitive strategies go beyond cognitive strategies and help learners regulate their listening process, including planning, monitoring and evaluating their listening. Affective strategies, on the other hand, allow listeners to manage their emotions, both positive and negative.

The use of listening strategies have been found to be an important facet to the process of listening comprehension, but has not been used by all learners in the same fashion. One of the factors is due to the affective dimension of the learner,

such as in the different types and degrees of anxiety (Arnold, 1999; Gregersen, 2005; MacIntyre, 1995; Oxford, 1999). However, studies have been conducted often separately on either listening anxiety (Elkhafaifi, 2005; Joo-hae Kim, 2000; Saito et al., 1999; Eunhui Sin, 2004; Vogely, 1998; Zhang, 2013) or listening strategy use (Chang, 2008; Chao & Chin, 2005; Chien & Li, 1998; Goh, 2002; O'Malley, Chamot, & Kupper, 1989; Mi-Jeong Song, 2002) with respect to L2 listening proficiency. The less frequent studies on L2 listening strategies with regard to listener anxiety and listening proficiency have primarily shown the learners' use of strategies to be decreasing with increased anxiety (Golchi, 2012; Gonen, 2009; Yung Suk Jung, 2004; Unkyoung Maeng, 2007), and anxiety being negatively correlated with L2 proficiency/L2 listening proficiency (Golchi, 2012; Sung-Yeon Kim & Kyung-Rae Park, 2006; Unkyoung Maeng, 2007).

Gonen (2009), who investigated listening strategy use and listening anxiety in the Turkish English as a foreign language (EFL) context, found the students' use of listening strategy decreasing with increased anxiety at a significant level with a correlation coefficient at $-.68$. Gonen states that one possible explanation of this finding may be attributed to the past listening experiences of the students in the language classroom where listening is generally one of the most ignored skills; hence, being negatively associated.

Further, in a study exploring the relationship between learning anxiety and strategy use among Iranian learners, Golchi (2012) aimed at investigating listening anxiety and its relationship to listening strategy use and listening comprehension. The results revealed that listening anxiety had negative correlations with listening comprehension and listening strategy use. Moreover, the findings showed that the low anxious learners were using more metacognitive strategies than the high anxious learners. In relation to cognitive and social/affective strategies, it was also the learners exhibiting low anxiety levels that performed better in the listening comprehension tests. Regarding learner characteristics, female learners revealed to be more anxious than male learners.

In the Korean context, Unkyoung Maeng (2007) aimed to investigate the relationship among anxiety, listening strategies and proficiency among English learners in a Korean elementary school. For the purpose of research, one-hundred sixty-seven elementary students, who took the Primary English Level Test 1, participated in this study. When asked to respond to questionnaire items related to foreign language classroom anxiety and listening strategies, the findings revealed anxiety and L2 proficiency/L2 listening proficiency to be negatively correlated. Also, anxiety and the use of listening strategies were also negatively correlated whereas there was a positive correlation between grade (age) and anxiety. Multiple regression

revealed that listening strategy and anxiety are attributable to L2 proficiency/listening proficiency, although subcomponents of listening strategy contribute to the success of L2 learning more compared to those of anxiety.

For a population of high school freshmen learners, Sung-Yeon Kim & Kyung-Rae Park (2006) aimed to explore FL learner anxiety and strategy use associated with English listening and reading. When learners were asked to respond to questionnaire items constructed to measure their anxiety and strategy use in English listening, the students' listening anxiety indicated strong, inverse correlations with their listening proficiency, which seems to indicate that anxiety is interfering with the learners' attempt to use strategies, which are usually employed to solve problems met in the process of listening. Also, contrary to Unkyoung Maeng's (2007) results, the students' listening skills were found to be more influenced by anxiety than by strategy use, probably due to the different learner population that were studied.

The literature reviewed so far indicates that studies on the relationship between L2 learners' use of listening strategies and listener anxiety are limited. It is thus within the interest of the present study to investigate the relationship between L2 listener anxiety and L2 listening strategies. For this purpose, this study focuses on a list of factors, including listening anxiety, listening strategies for different multiple-choice item types, listening proficiency, form of private education received, and type of study material used to improve L2 listening. The following research questions guided the study:

- RQ1. What types and degrees of anxiety do L2 learners experience according to their L2 listening proficiency?
- RQ2. How do learners of different listening proficiency employ listening strategies according to different multiple-choice item types?
- RQ3. To what extent are the different types of anxiety associated with the learner's use of L2 listening strategies?
- RQ4. How do the learners' learning background (i.e., form of private education, type of study material utilized), listener anxiety, and listening strategies contribute to the L2 listening proficiency?

III. METHODS

1. Participants

The present study consisted of 121 (Grade 10) high school learners from the

Gyeonggi province, and data was collected during April of 2014. The participants consisted of 84 male (71.79%) and 33 female (28.21%) learners. However, due to some incomplete responses, 4 were eliminated which left 117 participants for investigation. For self-perceived listening proficiency, they regarded themselves as lacking in English proficiency ($M=2.35$) when asked on a 5-point Likert scale. As for overseas experience in English-speaking contexts, most of the students ($N=110$, 94%) reported as having none, a few ($N=6$, 5.1%) as having less than 6 months experience, and one student reported as having more than a year, but less than two years experience.

Background information was also obtained on the type or form of private education that the learners had been receiving for English (i.e., private institute, so called hagwon; private tutoring; online lectures; problem-solving booklets; or none), and the strategies that had been utilized for L2 listening (i.e., school, self-study, private education, miscellaneous, and 'don't do separately').

2. Materials

1) L2 Listening Proficiency Test

The learners' L2 listening proficiency scores were obtained by being able to access scores from the 10th year high school learners' National Unified Academic Ability Test administered by the Korean Metropolitan and Provincial Offices of Education on April 16th, 2014. The choice of the instrument stemmed from its validity and reliability knowing that the instrument has been developed and administered by an authoritative educational body. There were 20 items (i.e., x 5 points) totaling 100 points. On the test, the participants on average scored 12.07 out of 20 items, and this converts to 60.35% from a 100%.

2) Foreign Language Listening Anxiety Scale (FLLAS)

In order to measure L2 listening skill-specific anxiety, which reportedly has different constructs from Horwitz et al.'s (1986) FLCAS (Cheng et al., 1999; Elkhafaifi, 2005; Saito et al., 1999), existing questionnaires were utilized and adopted to collect data on learners' perceived L2 listening anxiety. Joo-hae Kim's (2000) Foreign Language Listening Anxiety Scale (FLLAS) questionnaire consists of four sub-constructs as in 'fear of spoken English', 'process-related anxiety', 'lack of self-confidence', and 'concern about insufficient prior knowledge.' For the purpose of the study, 'lack of self-confidence' and 'concern about insufficient prior

knowledge’ were adopted as sub-constructs of listening anxiety. Questions for ‘testing anxiety’ was also incorporated from Eunhui Sin (2004) who adopted questions for ‘testing anxiety’ based on FLCAS, FLLAS, and Spielberger’s (1972) Test Anxiety Inventory. The sub-constructs of anxiety were selected when felt most relevant to the Korean high school learners’ anxiety traits via informal student interviews that one of the researchers knew. The questionnaire statements were allotted so that five items were for ‘concern for insufficient prior knowledge’, another five for ‘lack of self-confidence’, and the last five for ‘testing anxiety’ resulting in a total of fifteen items for the learners to check on 5-point Likert scales as seen in Table 1 (See Appendix for the questionnaire items in Korean).

Table 1
Type of Anxiety and Questionnaire Items

Type of Anxiety	Items
Concern for Insufficient Prior Knowledge	[Anx1] I become tense when I listen to English on a topic I am not familiar with.
	[Anx7] I feel comfortable when I listen to subject matter that I am familiar with.
	[Anx8] I feel comfortable during listening when I hear words I know.
	[Anx9] When I listen to complex sentences, I am anxious since I am not sure where the sentence breaks up.
	[Anx12] I feel tense and nervous when I hear English words I don’t know.
Lack of Self-Confidence	[Anx2] I am confident about English listening.
	[Anx4] I am fearful of English listening classes.
	[Anx5] I would feel anxious if I had the chance to talk to an English speaking person.
	[Anx10] I am anxious when the interlocutor speaks fast.
	[Anx15] I think I have a high listening proficiency.
Testing Anxiety	[Anx3] I feel tense and nervous when I hear English words I don’t know on a listening test.
	[Anx6] I feel anxious and worried when I miss something while I momentarily lose concentration/ think of sth else.
	[Anx11] I worry when I’m not sure about what I have heard during a listening exam.
	[Anx13] I feel so tense during a listening test that I sometimes cannot remember what I have heard.
	[Anx14] I feel tense when I have to solve a test problem just after ‘one’ listening.

3) Listening Strategy Questionnaire and Listening Multiple-choice Items

The listening strategy questionnaire was adopted and modified based on the instruments developed by Mi-Jeong Song (2002), who utilized Oxford’s (1990) and

O'Malley and Chamot's (1990) taxonomy. Also, given that we were more interested in the learners' transient use of strategies occurring almost immediately after the problem-solving process rather than what they usually do (i.e., general strategies), we adopted a strategy taxonomy only for cognitive and metacognitive strategies. At the end of selecting and refining the statements, we were able to derive 10 statements on cognitive strategies and 6 statements on metacognitive strategies for the learners to check on 5-point Likert scales (Table 2).

Table 2
Cognitive and Metacognitive Strategies of L2 Listening

Strategy Items	
<u>Cognitive Strategies</u>	
[Cog1]	I took notes of what I thought was important.
[Cog2]	I tried to understand the gist of the listening material rather than the individual words or expressions.
[Cog3]	I tried to picture what was happening in the conversation or situation.
[Cog4]	I tried to understand the meaning rather than translate words or sentences.
[Cog5]	I tried to understand what I heard based on my background knowledge.
[Cog6]	I tried to summarize what I heard as I am was attending to the listening problems.
[Cog7]	When I cannot understand certain words or sentences, I try to infer meaning from the context.
[Cog8]	I tried to make predictions on the forthcoming information.
[Cog9]	After listening, I tried to organize what I had heard.
[Cog10]	When the sentences I hear are difficult, I try to concentrate on the words rather than the sentences.
<u>Metacognitive Strategies</u>	
[Meta1]	I did not cling onto sentences I've missed but concentrated on the next piece of information.
[Meta2]	I check on my comprehension to ask if I am listening well.
[Meta3]	Before listening, I try to concentrate and keep my mind on listening.
[Meta4]	Before listening, I look at the item and figure out what the item is trying to ask me.
[Meta5]	As listening, I tried to think about the difficulty level of the test.
[Meta6]	Before listening, I try to figure out the item type, and I think about what may be the most efficient way to listen to the listening passage.

In order to prompt the use of strategies for test-taking, the learners were presented with three multiple-choice items from the instrument that had been used to assess the learners' L2 listening proficiency (Refer back to the section 2) 'L2 Listening Proficiency Test'). The choice of items stemmed from trying to select those of different testing constructs of listening (See Appendix). One was selected for assessing 'inferential understanding' (i.e., Where is the conversation taking place according to the dialogue heard?), another for 'comprehensive understanding' (i.e., What is the main

idea of the dialogue heard?), and the last item was on ‘application’ (i.e., What is the woman’s most appropriate response to what the man has said?). According to previous literature (Cohen & Upton, 2006; Sung Hye Kim & Yuh V. Chon, 2014), the three items were expected to prompt different listening strategies since each of the items would have triggered different listening problems. This decision was cross-checked by a veteran teacher, who has been an English teacher at high school for seventeen years (See Appendix for the questionnaire items in Korean).

4) Learner Interviews

Semi-structured interviews were also conducted after questionnaire data was collected. Learners were selected from each of the levels: one high proficiency and low proficiency student who were from the high school where the questionnaire data had been collected. The high proficiency student had scored within the range of 19-20 points on school-run listening tests of 20 points. In comparison, the low proficiency student had scored within the range of 3-4 on the same listening tests.

As in the questionnaire, the learners were interviewed on the same listening problems. In the interviews, learners were asked to talk about the process that they had gone through while trying to solve each of the problems. They were prompted to talk while looking at the questionnaire responses that they had marked in the previous session. All interviews were conducted in the learners’ L1, recorded under the students’ consent and lasted for roughly forty minutes for each student.

3. Procedure and Data Analysis

With the aim of collecting data on the learners’ listening anxiety and listening strategies, there was first need to collect data on the learners’ L2 listening proficiency which had been evaluated via the National Unified Academic Ability Test held by the Metropolitan and Provincial Offices of Education on April 16th, 2014 (See section 2) ‘L2 Listening Proficiency Test’). On the next day, four classes from the population of 10th year high school learners were randomly selected, equaling 121 learner-participants to respond to the questionnaires. Since the purpose of the study was to collect data on the learners’ perceived use of listening strategies, it was important to see that the learners were prompted to recall and report on their listening process as soon as possible after the listening proficiency test.

The quantitative analysis was conducted with SPSS 21.0 when the learners had been asked to mark their degree of anxiety and frequency in the use of listening strategies on 5-point Likert scales. Cronbach’s alpha was calculated for internal

consistency as seen in Table 3. Although ‘Concern for insufficient prior knowledge’ only reached moderate levels of reliability (i.e., 0.545), internal reliability reached 0.861 for total anxiety. For the listening strategies, Cronbach’s alpha was only moderate for metacognitive strategies (See Table 4), but for the total listening strategies on all items, Cronbach’s alpha satisfied the acceptable level of 0.7.

Table 3
Internal Consistency for Sub-Constructs of Anxiety

Listening Anxiety	No. of Items	Cronbach’s	
Concern for Insufficient prior knowledge	5 Items	0.545	0.861
Lack of self-confidence	5 Items	0.735	
Testing Anxiety	5 Items	0.753	

Table 4
Internal Consistency for Sub-Constructs of Listening Strategies

Listening Strategies	No. of Items	Cronbach’s	
‘Inferential Understanding’	Cognitive Strategies	10 Items	0.649
	Metacognitive Strategies	6 Items	0.559
‘Comprehensive Understanding’	Cognitive Strategies	10 Items	0.673
	Metacognitive Strategies	6 Items	0.575
‘Application’	Cognitive Strategies	10 Items	0.709
	Metacognitive Strategies	6 Items	0.578

In order to ascertain the learners’ types and degrees of anxiety that L2 learners experience according to their L2 listening proficiency, there was calculation of descriptive statistics for anxiety and the employment of one-way ANOVA with post-hoc tests for group comparisons. Different listening proficiency groups were identified with access to visual binning for group cutpoints, available by SPSS. Also, given that our interest was in exploring the relationship between listening proficiency and the listening strategies employed according to different MC item types, mixed three-way repeated measures ANOVA was conducted with listening proficiency as a between-groups variable; and listening strategies and three MC item types as within-subjects variables.

Another interest of the study was to examine how different types and degrees of anxiety had a facilitative-debilitative effect on the use of listening strategies so that multiple regression (MR) was conducted for this purpose. For a more comprehensive

analysis on the study of L2 learners, variables on learners' learning background (i.e., form of private education, type of study material utilized), listener anxiety, and listening strategies were also submitted for analysis with MR with general L2 listening proficiency as the dependent variable.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. L2 Learners' Anxiety across L2 Listening Proficiency Levels

This section provides an overview of the different types and levels of anxiety that the learners exhibited. The high school learners' anxiety level was most high for 'testing anxiety', followed by 'concern for insufficient prior knowledge' and 'lack of self-confidence' (See Table 5). In fact, there was a significant difference between the three sub-constructs of anxiety ($F=39.873$, $p < .05$) with repeated-measures one-way ANOVA.

Table 5
Types and Level of Anxiety

(N=117)		M	SD	F	Sig.
Listening Anxiety	Concern for insufficient prior knowledge	2.77	.56	39.873	0.000***
	Lack of self-confidence	3.20	.72		
	Testing Anxiety	3.17	.73		

Note: *** $p < .001$

As indicated in Table 6, post-hoc tests with Bonferroni indicated significant differences ($p < .001$) where 'lack of self-confidence' seemed to cause higher levels of anxiety over 'insufficient prior knowledge.' It seems that for L2 listeners, listening is associated with provoking anxiety, but more due to lacking confidence towards the skill per se rather than lack of content or linguistic knowledge (e.g., knowledge of topic, unknown vocabulary). For 'lack of self-confidence', learners seemed most anxious when L2 listening situated them to be able to understand an interlocutor whose talk was too rapid for them to process ($M=2.73$, $SD=1.055$). Since not being able to interact regularly with an English native-speaker, it seems that the learners had exhibited some level of apprehension towards having to deal with the language that was demanding and overly rapid to process. In fact, a native-speaker did not exist at the school so that they may have lacked the experience of interacting with a native-speaker. Joo-hae Kim (2000) in her study also found 'lack of confidence'

in listening to be the best predictor of listening proficiency. ‘Testing anxiety’ also seemed to arouse more anxiety over ‘insufficient prior knowledge’ ($p < .001$). Plausibly ‘testing anxiety’ can be expected to be frequent since Korean high school students are often placed under testing situations (Sung Hye Kim., & Yuah V. Chon, 2014). The learners exhibited the highest level of testing anxiety for ‘I worry when I am not sure about what I’ve heard during a listening exam’ ($M=3.50$, $SD=.979$). The cause of testing anxiety may be several for a learner (e.g., speed, accent, contraction, assimilation of sounds, unknown vocabulary), but the results indicate that the testing situation adds to the already problematic nature of L2 listening (Buck, 1991; Cheng, 2004; In’nami, 2006; Yi’an, 1998).

Table 6
Post-hoc Tests for Types of Anxiety

		Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval for Difference	
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Concern for insufficient prior knowledge	Lack of self-confidence	-.432	.000***	-.556	-.309
	Testing anxiety	-.405*	.000***	-.534	-.276
Lack of self-confidence	Testing anxiety	.027	1.000	-.115	.170

Note: *** $p < .001$, * $p < .05$

For anxiety felt towards ‘concern for insufficient prior knowledge’ (i.e., consist of learners feeling anxious towards unfamiliar topics or subject matter, unknown vocabulary, and complex sentences), learners most frequently reported on ‘becoming tense when they listen to English on an unfamiliar topic’ ($M=3.46$, $SD=1.079$) followed by ‘feeling tense and nervous when hearing English words they don’t know’ ($M=3.37$, $SD=.952$). The responses indicate that listening instruction initially requires learners to listen to familiar topics, or have listening built on sufficient pre-listening activities which will in turn help learners reduce anxiety levels since their newly acquired topical and linguistic knowledge can step in to process the incoming input. Considering that some learners are reliant on key words when listening (Vogely, 1998), the results also indicate that hearing unknown words is bound to cause some level of apprehension for the learners, and that there is need for teachers to spend time on pre-listening tasks (Wilson, 2008) through which learners can be scaffolded to learn unknown words.

Examination on the type and level of anxiety warranted a follow-up analysis by listening proficiency (i.e., high, mid, low). As seen in the mean values of Table 7,

dropping values for each type of anxiety is apparent with higher proficiency, and significant differences between groups was noted for ‘concern for insufficient prior knowledge’ ($F=14.581, p < .001$) and ‘lack of self-confidence’ ($F=17.262, p < .001$). Post-hoc tests with Bonferroni indicated that there were significant differences between the low-high ($p < .001$) and mid-high proficiency groups ($p < .05$) for ‘insufficient prior knowledge’ in which reduced levels of anxiety were evidenced in the higher proficiency groups (See Table 8). Although the relationship is more reciprocal than causal, the results attest to how reduced levels of anxiety may contribute to improved listening ability or vice versa. Similarly, ‘lack of self-confidence’ also showed significant differences between all groups in the degree of anxiety perceived by the L2 learners reaching the lowest with the more proficient learners. The results are in accordance with previous studies where anxiety was found to negatively correlate with L2 proficiency or L2 listening proficiency (Golchi, 2012; Unkyoung Maeng, 2007). On the other hand, ‘testing anxiety’ did not show any significant difference between groups so that it can be considered more of a general type of anxiety that L2 learners exhibit regardless of proficiency.

Table 7
Types of Anxiety for Different Proficiency Groups

	Low (N=46) M ± SD	Mid (N=35) M ± SD	High (N=36) M± SD	F (Sig.)
Concern for insufficient prior knowledge	3.03±0.58	2.78±0.45	2.42±0.45	14.581(0.000)***
Lack of self-confidence	3.59±0.64	3.13±0.59	2.76±0.68	17.262(0.000)***
Testing anxiety	3.30±0.68	3.21±0.73	2.98±0.78	1.996(0.141)

Note: *** $p < .001$

Table 8
Post-hoc Tests for Types of Anxiety and Proficiency Groups

				Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Concern for insufficient prior knowledge	Low	Mid		.249	.088	-.025	.523
		High		.604	.000***	.332	.876
	Mid	High		.355	.011*	.065	.645
Lack of self-confidence	Low	Mid		.460*	.005**	.111	.809
		High		.830*	.000***	.484	1.176
	Mid	High		.370*	.049*	.001	.740

Note: *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$

2. L2 Listening Strategy across L2 Listening Proficiency Levels

In this section, we examine the extent to which the different types of L2 listening strategies were employed by L2 learners to solve the different MC items. Before submitting the variables for inferential analysis, there was preliminary examination of the mean for the total cognitive and metacognitive strategies. The use of cognitive strategies ($M=3.24$, $SD=0.45$) slightly surpassed the use of metacognitive strategies ($M=3.19$, $SD=0.54$), but the difference was not significant ($t=-1.505$, $p=.135$) so that the contribution of the strategies is not necessarily different for solving listening problems.

Examination of the strategies within each category indicated that learners had most often ‘Tried to understand the gist of the listening material rather than the individual words or expressions’ (Cognitive: $M=3.68$, $SD=0.83$), and ‘Before listening, had looked at the item to figure out what the item was trying to ask them’ (i.e., Advance organizer; Vandergrift, 2003) (Metacognitive: $M=3.57$, $SD=0.84$). The least favored in each strategy category were ‘Taking notes of what learners thought was important’ (Cognitive: $M=2.31$, $SD=0.96$), and ‘Checking on their comprehension to ask themselves if they were listening well’ (Metacognitive: $M=2.84$, $SD=0.85$). As such, the overall pattern in the employment of strategies illustrates that learners were keener in the use of strategies that took immediate effect. However, the interview with a student indicated note-taking to be helpful, which is shown in the following with a high proficiency learner. In the target item, the learner had to provide the woman’s appropriate response to the man’s last utterance by examining the options in the MC items.

- Researcher: Was this item difficult?
 Learner [High]: I thought I had understood everything, but when I saw the distracters...it was confusing
 Researcher: How did you go about solving this item?
 Learner [High]: I paid the most attention to the man’s last words. But because you can’t solve the item by just that...I take notes, listen to what was said last, and then look at the notes...
 Researcher: The way you take notes is a bit different.
 Learner [High]: For short messages, I take notes in English...when it gets longer...since there’s no time, I write in Korean.

It can be seen how the high proficiency learner, when the listening task is felt increasingly demanding, flexibly modifies and orchestrates the use of strategies

(Vandergrift, 2003). There is use of selective attention (i.e., knowing what to pay attention to), modification of the note-taking strategy, and contextualization to see if the woman's response to the man's utterance fits in. On the other hand, the employment of strategies with the low proficiency learner illustrates that the learner is more drawn to bottom-up processing to compensate for his lexical deficiency, which is in accordance with O'Malley and Chamot's (1990) finding that the ineffective listeners use bottom-up processing only rather than both top-down and bottom-up processing.

- Researcher: After you had figured out where the conversation was taking place, how did you go about solving the item?
- Learner [Low]: I only tried to listen to the words.
- Researcher: Why is that?
- Learner [Low]: It's easier to just listen to the words rather than the sentences.

Regarding our main research question 2, interaction effect was checked between the three variables. That is, proficiency (between-groups), item type (within-subjects) and listening strategies (within-subjects) were submitted for analysis with three-way (3*3*2) mixed ANOVA. There was an interaction effect between the learners' use of strategies and listening proficiency ($F=3.711$, $p=.027$), but not for item type and strategies ($F=.490$, $p=.613$). The results indicate that learners were using different strategies according to their ability to listen whereas different item types did not necessarily prompt the use of specific listening strategies. This was actually surprising given that learners have been evidenced to use different strategies for different L2 reading MC items (Cohen & Upton, 2006; Sung Hye Kim & Yuh V. Chon, 2014). Although we had designed the listening tasks so that the learners would have to self-initiate the use of strategies for the different items, the results were contrary to our expectations. We attribute this to how the learners were cognitively overloaded to process the incoming input (e.g., decoding unknown words, making a match between written form of a word and what is heard, parsing) so that leisure was not available for them to execute various strategies. Another possible speculation is that there is weak awareness on the use of listening strategies since strategy-based instruction has been found to be relatively infrequent in the Korean EFL context, in particular, in comparison to the complementary skill, L2 reading. Accordingly, our information of the learners' also demonstrated that 34.2% ($N=40$) of the learners were 'not receiving any' instruction on L2 listening.

Regarding interaction between listening strategies and listening proficiency, post-hoc tests (Table 9) illustrate that there was a significant difference in the use of cognitive strategies between the low and high groups ($p=.000$) indicating the higher proficiency learners to be more frequent in using cognitive strategies.

Table 9
Post-hoc Tests for Cognitive and Metacognitive Strategies

			Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval for Difference	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
COG	Low	Mid	-.158	.096	.105	-.349	.033
		High	-.355	.096	.000***	-.544	-.165
	Mid	Low	-.197	.102	.056	-.399	.005
META	Low	Mid	-.124	.122	.310	-.366	.117
		High	-.138	.121	.256	-.377	.102
	Mid	Low	-.014	.129	.916	-.269	.242

Note: *** $p < .001$

The descriptive statistics for cognitive strategies (Table 10) indicate the high proficiency learners to have been most avid in ‘trying to understand the gist of the listening material rather than the individual words or expressions’ ($M=4.22$, $SD=0.57$) whereas the mid and low proficiency learners had reported that ‘in the face of hearing difficult sentences, they would concentrate on the words rather than the sentences’ (Mid: $M=3.68$; Low: $M=3.52$). The employment of strategies indicates that the high proficiency learners had been more test-wise (Cohen & Upton, 2006) or efficient in the choice of strategies. The more proficient learners seemed to have concentrated on the use of strategies that seemed facilitative in ascertaining the global meaning of the listening passage. The less proficient learners had been taking their chances to derive the critical information by listening to important words or phrases. In an earlier study, O’Malley et al. (1989) found effective learners usually attending to larger chunks (or parsing) of information and only attending to individual words when there is some message breakdown. Ineffective listeners, on the other hand, tended to focus more on word-by-word translations – a bottom-up strategy.

Table 10
Cognitive Strategies of High Mid, Low Proficiency Learners

	High		Mid		Low	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
[Cog2] I tried to understand the gist of the listening material rather than the individual words or expressions.	4.22	0.57	3.64(2)	0.80	3.30(2)	0.82
[Cog4] I tried to understand the meaning rather than translate words or sentences.	3.88	0.76	3.55(3)	0.70	3.03(7)	0.79
[Cog9] When I cannot understand certain words or sentences, I try to infer meaning from the context.	3.87	0.64	3.54(4)	0.75	3.27(4)	0.77
[Cog3] I tried to picture what was happening in the conversation or situation.	3.85	0.75	3.50(5)	0.72	3.28(3)	0.76
[Cog14] After listening, I tried to organize what I had heard.	3.44	0.75	3.19(8)	0.80	2.91(8)	0.76
[Cog6] I tried to understand what I heard based on my background knowledge.	3.39	0.84	3.22(6)	0.75	3.12(6)	0.84
[Cog15] When the sentences I hear are difficult, I try to concentrate on the words rather than the sentences.	3.33	1.00	3.68(1)	0.89	3.52(1)	0.99
[Cog7] I tried to summarize what I had heard as I was attending to the listening problems.	3.24	0.76	3.20(7)	0.77	3.21(5)	0.73
[Cog10] I tried to make predictions on the forthcoming information.	2.86	0.92	2.64(9)	0.76	2.86(9)	0.75
[Cog1] I took notes of what I thought was important.	2.30	1.03	2.27(10)	0.96	2.36(10)	0.94

3. L2 Listener Anxiety and Use of Listening Strategies

In order to investigate how anxiety may affect the use of strategies, multiple regression was conducted for each strategy (i.e., cognitive and metacognitive strategies). When the sub-components of anxiety were submitted as predictors for analysis in the learners' use of cognitive and metacognitive strategies respectively, the regression model accounted for 19.1% in the employment of cognitive strategies, and 6.1% for metacognitive strategies (Tables 11 and 12), which indicates that other individual variables that we have not covered in the context of the present study

may explain for the variance. Nevertheless, the regression analysis warranted a closer examination in the use of strategies regarding variance in the types and degrees of anxiety.

Table 11
Anxiety as Predictors of Cognitive Strategies

	Unstandardized Coefficients		t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error		
(Constant)	3.422	.211	16.222	.000
Concern for insufficient prior knowledge	-.241	.101	-2.379	.019*
Lack of self-confidence	-.148	.077	-1.921	.057
Testing anxiety	.302	.074	4.090	.000***

Note: *** $p < .001$, * $p < .05$

Table 12
Anxiety as Predictors of Metacognitive Strategies

	Unstandardized Coefficients		t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error		
(Constant)	3.311	.266	12.433	.000
Concern for insufficient prior knowledge	-.265	.128	-2.075	.040*
Lack of self-confidence	-.026	.097	-.272	.786
Testing anxiety	.219	.093	2.349	.021*

Note: * $p < .05$

For cognitive strategies, ‘concern for insufficient prior knowledge’ and ‘testing anxiety’ were significant, however, offering different interpretations in the use of strategies. Learners who were anxious in being concerned with insufficient prior knowledge (i.e., unfamiliarity with topic, vocabulary, sentence structures) did not favor the use of cognitive strategies, which evidenced a drop ($B = -.241$, $p = .019$) in the use of the strategy. The results may point to how the particular type of anxiety is an interfering factor for learners to execute cognitive strategies, which are utilized to solve while-listening problems ranging from understanding gist to predicting. Also, anxiety towards ‘concern for insufficient prior knowledge’ resulted in a fall ($B = -.265$, $p = .040$) for the use of metacognitive strategies. The results are indicative of how learners with high anxiety levels (i.e., low proficiency learners as we saw previously) are prone to have less self-regulation over their test-taking strategies. The type of learners will need to be strengthened in their listening skills regarding exposure to various topics, or to use their background knowledge (i.e., top-down

processing). Since anxiety towards ‘concern for insufficient prior knowledge’ also includes lack of lexical and syntactic knowledge, the learners would also need training in listening from simple to complex sentences so that they can parse sentences for main clauses or gist of messages. Foremost, there is need for learners to make ongoing efforts to expand vocabulary size (i.e., single word items, prefabricated expressions) by matching written forms to how they are heard in spoken discourse.

Testing anxiety, on the other hand, was shown to have facilitative effects on the use of both cognitive ($B=.302$, $p=.000$) and metacognitive strategies ($B=.219$, $p=.021$). Testing anxiety, which was operationalized as statements related to loss of concentration or memory during a test, experience of nervousness during exams, of hearing unknown words, and having the opportunity to listen only once, contributed to the use of both cognitive and metacognitive strategies. For instance, the cognitive strategy as in ‘I tried to understand what I heard based on my background knowledge’ correlated most positively ($r=.373$, $p=.000$) with testing anxiety. This provides evidence on some of the strategic actions that learners will take to persevere anxiety-provoking testing situations. As a whole, while anxiety has been known to have a detrimental effect on performance in numerous studies (Golchi, 2012; Joo-hae Kim, 2000; Sung-Yeon Kim & Kyung-Rae Park, 2006; Unkyoung Maeng, 2007), test anxiety for the Korean high school learners seemed to facilitate learners to execute strategic competence in their effort to solve L2 listening.

4. Predictors of L2 Listening Proficiency

With regards to RQ 4, it was also within the interest of the present study to identify variables that appear as being significant in predicting the learners’ listening proficiency from the variables on L2 listener anxiety, listening strategies, and learning strategies (i.e., form of private education, institutions attended or materials used to improve L2 listening). This question was asked to obtain a comprehensive view of how the learners’ usual learning styles regarding L2 listening, the anxiety exhibited towards their frequent testing of L2 listening, and the listening strategies that were utilized to overcome their listening problems had an effect on L2 listening proficiency. This type of analysis is expected to potentially help learners regulate their learning for the improvement of L2 listening ability, and in the analysis the regression model accounted for 46.9% of L2 listening proficiency (See Table 13).

Table 13
Predictors of Listening Proficiency

		Unstandardized Coefficients		t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error		
(Constant)		17.615	3.146	5.599	0.000
Anxiety	Concern for insufficient Previous Knowledge	-2.253	0.84	-2.683	0.008**
	Lack of Self-confidence	-2.348	0.661	-3.552	0.001**
	Testing Anxiety	1.629	0.65	2.505	0.014*
Strategies	Cognitive Strategies	2.15	1.072	2.006	0.048*
	Metacognitive Strategies	-0.844	0.891	-0.948	0.346
Form of Private Education	Private Ed vs. School Lessons	-1.337	1.111	-1.203	0.232
	Private Ed vs. Self- Study	0.47	1.118	0.42	0.675
	Private Ed vs. Miscellaneous	-1.145	1.505	-0.761	0.448
Institutions attended or Materials used for Listening	Private Ed vs. Don't do any	-0.778	0.967	-0.805	0.423
	Hagwon vs. Private Lessons	-1.625	0.965	-1.683	0.095
	Hagwon vs. Online Lectures	0.044	1.852	0.024	0.981
	Hagwon vs. Problem Solving Booklets	-5.404	2.095	-2.579	0.011*
	Hagwon vs. <i>I don't receive any</i>	-0.918	0.895	-1.025	0.308
		F=7.001, p=.000, R ² =0.469			

Note: Dependent variable = Listening Proficiency; ** p <.01, * p <.05

As indicated in Table 12, all sub-constructs of anxiety were significant as predictors of L2 listening proficiency, however, where 'concern for lack of insufficient prior knowledge' (p=.008) and 'lack of self-confidence' (p=.001) all had negative effects on learners' L2 listening proficiency. Unstandardized coefficients on 'concern for lack of prior knowledge' (i.e., unfamiliarity towards particular topics, and linguistic difficulty) indicates that those learners who expressed anxiety towards lacking topical and linguistic knowledge were likely to score lower by 2.253 points (i.e., equivalent to over two testing items) out of a 20 point listening test. In a similar vein, 'lack of self-confidence' towards L2 listening (e.g., due to rapid speed of listening, anxiety towards native speakers and listening classes) also had detrimental effects on the learners' L2 performance by 2.348 points.

Testing anxiety, on the other hand led to an increase of 1.629 points (i.e., equal to almost two items) on the listening test (p=.014). While exams have usually been associated with bringing negative washback effects on learners (Alderson 2004;

Weir, 1990), the results indicate that an adequate amount of anxiety related towards testing (e.g., worrying about unknown words on a test, loss of concentration, memory shortage during a test) is actually facilitating for improving L2 listening performance. As for strategies, as indicated in Table 11, the learners' use of cognitive strategies also brought an increase of 2.15 points on the listening test. As seen previously, the high proficiency learners had been more frequent in use of strategies, for instance, as in 'trying to understand the gist of the listening material rather than the individual words or expressions' ($M=4.22$) and 'trying to understand the meaning rather than translate words or sentences' ($M=3.88$).

Another inquiry raised in the analysis of the predictors of L2 listening proficiency was to seek if any particular type of instruction versus 'private education' had been effective for improving L2 listening. In comparison to private education, the analysis revealed that neither of the choices as in 'Self-study', 'Miscellaneous' or 'Don't do any' had made any difference in the performance of L2 listening. The improvement of L2 listening proficiency was rather influenced by the type of material that learners had utilized to improve L2 listening. Compared to those who had been relying on materials provided through 'hagwon' (i.e., private institute), the use of 'problem solving booklets' worked out to be a negative significant predictor ($B=-5.404$, $p=.011$), indicating that those who had been relying on study materials and methods utilized at 'hagwon' had been better on the general L2 listening test. Other materials, such as 'online lectures' (e.g., aired by the Educational Broadcasting System) had not been any more effective. For better or worse, it seems that the L2 learners' reliance on private education ('hagwon') cannot be ignored since the method of study had a contributing effect.

V. CONCLUSION

The level of testing anxiety was found to be salient among the L2 high school learners, having facilitative effects on the learners' use of both cognitive and metacognitive listening strategies. The connection is important since the learners' use of strategies, a component of L2 learners' strategic competence (Canale & Swain, 1980, O'Malley & Chamot, 1990) is a trait of effective learners. Learners' concern for lack of prior knowledge, in comparison, had a debilitating effect on the use of strategies. A similar pattern occurred when the different types of anxiety were submitted for analysis to explain for the variance in L2 listening proficiency.

In seeking any differences in the employment of strategies for three different MC items, not any difference was observed and this was surprising due to the different

constructs of listening operationalized by the researchers. The implication of this finding may indicate that learners do not attend strategically to solve L2 listening problems. If this is the case, this raises a point on the need to employ more strategy-based instruction (Oxford, 1990) for L2 listening since different MC items have been recognized for prompting item-specific strategies (Cohen & Upton, 2006; Sung Hye Kim & Yuah V. Chon, 2014). The other possibility seems to be that the L2 listening MC items may have been beyond what some of the learners could handle. For instance, the less proficient learners' cognitive process may have been distracted by the length of the text or the number of unknown words encountered. According to O'Malley et al. (1989), when there is listening failure, low proficiency learners will do little to redirect their attention to the text.

The study leaves us with implications for teaching L2 listening, in particular for the lower proficiency learners. As seen in our study, lower proficiency learners paid too much attention to words, but Vogely (1998) has documented that it is vocabulary that will arouse listening anxiety when foreign language (FL) learners may pay too much attention to new sounds, and can cause comprehension deficits while listening. Hence, appropriate treatments should be given to deal with new vocabulary. Although word lists are gradually falling out of favor among FL teachers, FL teachers can provide a list of new words with phonetic symbols before listening to familiarize learners with the new words and formulaic expressions to alleviate anxiety. When this type of pre-listening task is provided, the learners may be able to extend their effort to grasp the gist of the message.

To reduce L2 learners' anxiety level, foreign language teachers should also help learners to build confidence and self-esteem by providing them with encouragement, empathy and comforts (Atasheneh & Izadi, 2012). Other ways to alleviate FL listening anxiety have been offered by Kondo and Ying-Ling (2004) and Oxford (2008). For example, Oxford has encouraged FL teachers to teach "direct strategies" such as association and elaboration (see pp. 60-69) to alleviate language anxiety. All these strategies may help learners cope with listening anxiety. In a similar vein, Chang and Read (2006), who pursued an empirical evaluation of how different types of support may help learners reduce anxiety, was able to demonstrate how four forms of listening support (i.e., pre-teaching of content and vocabulary, question preview, and repeated input) can help affect the anxiety levels of learners when taking a multiple-choice achievement test. The study was also able to conclude that strategy instruction may enhance the effectiveness of support in listening tests.

All things considered, whatever the means may be to reduce anxiety, it seems that the pre-requisite to effective listening is L2 proficiency. For further research, a question that would need to be addressed is on the vocabulary level (i.e., lexical

threshold) that is required for effective L2 listening, for instance, at the 95~98% comprehension level. Also, since the predictors in the regression model for L2 proficiency was only able to explain a small variance of L2 listening proficiency, further studies would need to be conducted on other variables to ascertain those needing more attention. We leave these topics for future studies.

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 http://www.sid.ir/en/VEWSSID/J_pdf/874200318704.pdf
- Aida, Y. (1994). Examination of Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope's construct of foreign language anxiety: The case of students of Japanese. *Modern Language Journal*, 78, 155-168.
- Alderson, J. C. (2004). Foreword. In L. Cheng, Y. Watanabe, & A. Curtis (Eds.), *Washback in language testing: Research contexts and methods*. (pp. ix-xii). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Anderson, J. R. (2009). *Cognitive psychology and its implications*. New York: Worth Publishers.
- Andringa, S., Olsthoorn, N., van Beuningen, C., Schoonen, R., & Hulstijn, J. (2012). Determinants of success in native and non-native listening comprehension: An individual differences approach, *Language Learning*, 62(2), 49-78.
- Arnold, J. (1999). *Affect in language learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Arnold, J. (2000). Seeing through listening comprehension exam anxiety. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34, 777-786.
- Atasheneh, N., & Izadi, A. (2012). The role of teachers in reducing/increasing listening comprehension test anxiety: A case of Iranian EFL learners. *English Language Teaching*, 5, 178-187.
- Brown, G. (1990). *Listening to spoken English*. London: Longman.
- Buck, G. (1991). The test of listening comprehension: An introspective study. *Language Testing*, 8, 67-91.
- Buck, G. (2001). *Assessing listening*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1, 1-47.
- Chang, A. C -S. (2008). Listening strategies of L2 learners with varied test tasks. *TESL*

- Canada Journal*, 25(2)1-26.
- Chang, A. C. -S., & Read, J. (2006). The effects of listening support on the listening performance of EFL learners. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40, 375-397.
- Chao, Y. -G., & Chin, L.-Y. (2005). College English majors' listening strategies and difficulties while taking TOEFL. *Selected papers from the 14th International symposium on English teaching* (pp. 292-301). Taipei, Taiwan: Crane.
- Chen, T. -Y., & Chang, B. Y. (2004). The relationship between foreign language anxiety and learning difficulty. *Foreign Language Annals*, 37, 279-289.
- Cheng, H. (2004). A comparison of multiple-choice and open-ended response formats for the assessment of listening proficiency in English. *Foreign Language Annals*, 37, 544-555.
- Cheng, Y. S., Horwitz, E. K., & Schallert, D. L. (1999). Language writing anxiety: Differentiating writing and speaking components. *Language Learning*, 49, 417-446.
- Chien, C. N., & Li, W. (1998). The strategy use in listening comprehension for EFL learners in Taiwan. *RELC Journal*, 29, 66-91.
- Cohen, A. D. (1998). *Strategies in learning and using a second language*. New York: Longman.
- Cohen, A. D., & Upton, T. A. (2006). *Strategies in responding to the new TOEFL reading tasks* (Monograph No. 33). Princeton, NJ: ETS. Retrieved June 16, 2012, from www.ets.org/Media/Research/pdf/RR-06-06.pdf
- Dörnyei, Z., & Skehan, P. (2003). Individual differences in second language learning. In C. Doughty, & M. Long (Eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 589-630). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Elkhafaifi, H. (2005). Listening comprehension and anxiety in the Arabic language classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, 89, 206-220.
- Field, J. (2008). *Listening in the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goh, C. (2002). Exploring listening comprehension tactics and their interaction patterns. *System*, 30, 185-206.
- 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).
- Gregersen, T. S. (2005). Nonverbal clues: clues to the detection of foreign language

- anxiety. *Foreign Language Annals*, 38, 388-396.
- Horwitz, E. K. (2001). Language anxiety and achievement. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 21, 112-126.
- Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope J. A. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *Modern Language Journal*, 70, 125-132.
- In'nami, Y. (2006). The effects of test anxiety on listening performance. *System*, 34, 317-340.
- Jung, Yung Suk. (2004). Listening strategies and listening anxiety in EFL environment. *English Language Teaching*, 16(2), 261-284.
- Kim, Joo-hae. (2000). *Foreign language listening anxiety: A study of Korean students learning English*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Texas, Austin.
- Kim, Sung Hye, & Chon, Yuah V. (2014). Test-taking strategies of L2 adolescent learners: Three multiple-choice items and L2 proficiency. *English Teaching*, 69(1), 61-90.
- Kim, Sung-Yeon, & Park, Kyung-Rae. (2006). An investigation into the association between learner anxiety and strategy use and English listening and reading. *Foreign Languages Education*, 13(2), 93-120.
- Kondo, D. S., & Ying-Ling, Y. (2004). Strategies for coping with language anxiety: the case of students of English in Japan. *ELT Journal*, 58(3), 258-265.
- Liu, M. (2006). Anxiety in Chinese EFL students at different proficiency levels. *System*, 34, 301-316.
- MacIntyre, P. D. (1995). How does anxiety affect second language learning? A reply to Sparks and Ganschow. *Modern Language Journal*, 79, 90-99.
- Maeng, Unkyoung. (2007). Learning anxiety, listening strategies and the proficiency of elementary school learners. *English Language and Linguistics*, 24, 259-284.
- 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(4), 419-437.
- Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. New York, USA: Newbury House.
- Oxford, R. L. (1999). Anxiety and the language learner: New insights. In J. Arnold (Ed.), *Affect in language learning* (pp. 58-67). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oxford, R. L. (2008). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Beijing: Beijing World Publishing Corporation.
- Pae, T. -I. (2013). Skill-based L2 anxieties revisited: Their intra-relations and the

- inter-relations with General Foreign Language Anxiety, *Applied Linguistics*, 34(2), 232-252.
- Rost, M. (1990). *Listening in language learning*. London: Longman.
- Rost, M. (2001). *Teaching and researching listening*. Harlow, UK: Longman.
- Rost, M. (2006). Areas of research that influence L2 instruction. In E. Uso-Juan & A. Martinez-Flor (Eds.), *Current trends in the development and teaching of the four language skills* (pp. 47-74). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Saito Y., Horwitz, E. K., & Garza, Y. J. (1999). Foreign language reading anxiety. *Modern Language Journal*, 83, 202-218.
- Sin, Eunhui. (2004). Korean high school students' foreign language listening test anxiety. *Foreign Languages Education*, 11(4), 107-131.
- Song, Mi Jeong. (2002). The effect of listening strategy use on listening ability: Using an immediate retrospective data collection method. *English Teaching*, 57(3), 19-40.
- Spielberger, C. D. (1972). *Anxiety: Current trends in theory and research*. New York: Academic Press.
- Vandergrift, L. (1999). Facilitating second language listening comprehension: Acquiring successful strategies. *ELT Journal*, 53, 168-176.
- Vandergrift, L. (2003). Orchestrating strategy use: Toward a model of the skilled second language listener. *Language Learning*, 53, 463-496.
- Vandergrift, L. (2004). Listening to learn or learn to listen? *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 3-25.
- Vandergrift, L., & Goh, C. (2012). *Teaching and learning second language listening: Metacognition in action*. New York: Routledge.
- Vogely, A. J. (1998). Listening comprehension anxiety: Students' reported sources and solutions. *Foreign Language Annals*, 31, 67-80.
- Weir, C. (1990). *Understanding and developing language tests*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Wilson, J. J. (2008). *How to teach listening*. London: Pearson.
- Yan, X., & Horwitz, E. K. (2008). Learners' perceptions of how anxiety interacts with personal and instructional factors to influence their achievement in English: A qualitative analysis of EFL learners in China. *Language Learning*, 58, 151-183.
- Yi'an, W. (1998). What do tests of listening comprehension test? A retrospective study of EFL test-takers performing a multiple-choice task. *Language Testing*, 15(1), 21-44.
- Zhang, X. (2013). Foreign language listening anxiety and listening performance: Conceptualizations and causal relationships. *System*, 41, 164-177.

- _____
5. _____ , _____ 가 _____ .
- ① _____ ② _____
 ③ _____ ④ _____
 ⑤ _____

Listening script
 M: Lucy, look at that.
 W: What is that?
 M: It's a fish tank made out of a public phone booth.
 W: Amazing! Fish are swimming inside the public phone booth like it's an aquarium.
 M: I heard an artist and a designer made it to express their feelings about the removal of public phone booths.
 W: Good idea! Nowadays so many phone booths are being removed due to the increase in cellphone use.
 M: Right. And some people have started to think of alternative uses for old phone booths.
 W: Like what?
 M: They can be used as safe zones for women in distress.
 W: Great idea. In an emergency situation they can go inside the booths and lock the doors to protect themselves.
 M: Exactly. I also think that phone booths could be equipped to provide free Wi-Fi in public areas.
 W: Cool!

- ※ 5 _____ .
- ① _____ ② _____ ③ _____
 ④ _____ ⑤ _____

		①	②	③	④	⑤
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						

19. 가 .
- ① Sorry. You can't purchase that book online.
 - ② Unfortunately, those books are already sold out.
 - ③ Sure, they buy used books at a reasonable price.
 - ④ Don't worry. You can save a lot by buying used books.
 - ⑤ Trust me. They sell not only books but also other items.

Listening script

M: Jane, what are you reading?

W: I'm reading a novel that I bought last week.

M: But why does the cover look a little worn?

W: It's a used book I bought online. Delivery took just two days.

M: Wow, so quick! How much was the book?

W: It was only \$3. Isn't that really cheap?

M: Yes, it is. Can you tell me the website of the bookstore?

W: Sure. The name of the web site is getusedbooks.com.

M: Thank you.

W: Do you want to buy used books online, too?

M: No, I'm wondering if they buy used books, too. I have so many books I don't need anymore.

W: _____

[F Listening Strategy Questionnaire as in No. 5 presented HERE]

Applicable Level: Secondary

Ji Young Choi

409-1301 Doraetul-maeul,

Deokyang-gu, Goyang-si

Gyeonggi-do 412-060, Korea

H.P.: 010-2315-8947

Email: jjjustyou@nate.com

Yuah V. Chon

Dept. of English Education

College of Education

Hanyang University

222 Wangsimni-ro, Seongdong-gu

Seoul 133-791, Korea
Tel: (02) 2220-1144
Email: vylee52@hanyang.ac.kr

Received September 15, 2014
Revised October 24, 2014
Accepted November 4, 2014