

Integrating Metacognitive Knowledge for Planning in Self-Directed Language Learning

Mayumi Abe, Waseda University

This paper focuses on planning by self-directed learners. The process of self-directed learning such as planning is called metacognitive activities in which judgment and decision-making in the process are supported by metacognitive knowledge. In this study I specifically focus on metacognitive knowledge and investigate how learners developed and integrated it for planning through classroom instruction, with an assumption that if learners apply multiple types of metacognitive knowledge, they can make more effective learning plans. Qualitatively analyzing the class reflections and learning plans written by two university students who took a course titled Self-Directed Learning, I found that development and integration of metacognitive knowledge can be promoted by intervention in class. However, the two students sometimes failed to integrate and act on their metacognitive knowledge, while at other times they successfully did this without teacher intervention.

本研究では、自律学習者のプランニングに焦点を当てる。プランニングなどの自律学習のプロセスはメタ認知的活動と呼ばれ、そこでの判断や意思決定を支えるのはメタ認知的知識である。本研究では、特にそのメタ認知的知識に着目し、学習者がよりよい学習計画を立てるには多様なメタ認知的知識を組み合わせて活用する方がよいとの仮定に基づき、クラスでの指導を通して、学習者がどのようにメタ認知的知識を発達・統合させていったかを調査した。調査対象は、大学1年生対象の必修授業「Self-Directed Learning (自律学習)」の履修学生2名が作成した授業リフレクションと学習計画である。それらを質的に分析した結果、授業での介入によるメタ認知的知識の発達や統合は確認されたものの、重要であるはずのメタ認知的知識が適用されなかったり、介入とは無関係にメタ認知的知識が向上し活用された場合もあった。

Keywords

self-directed learning, planning, metacognition, metacognitive knowledge, learner development

キーワード

自律学習、プランニング、メタ認知、メタ認知的知識、学習者の成長

As a language learning advisor and English instructor, I have seen many language learners struggling to find effective learning strategies or failing to make learning plans that truly fit their own goals and needs. Some learners make a start to learning but are always unsure if they are on the right track. Other learners select strategies without knowing what effects they can expect from those strategies. I began the current study assuming that such learners could become more effective self-directed learners if they knew more about themselves and could connect various aspects of that knowledge in planning their language learning. I have been interested in metacognition for a long time as a teacher and learning advisor and as a researcher. In my practices as a teacher, I have wanted to help my students learn better even out of class by raising their metacognitive awareness about their own learning. As a learning advisor, I encourage learners to reflect, listen to their stories, and make suggestions by synthesizing their descriptions of their learning activities with the knowledge I have about them as learners, applying, as best I can, a metacognitive perspective on second language learning. As a researcher, I have explored questions such as how metacognition helps learners manage learning, how we can enhance learners' metacognition, and how metacognition works in the minds of successful learners. In this study, I try to bring these perspectives together by looking in particular at how learners use metacognitive-knowledge in planning for their self-directed learning.

Metacognition involves visualization of one's cognition and is thought to be necessary for self-directed learning. Metacognition consists of two dimensions, *metacognitive knowledge* and *metacognitive activities*, where metacognitive knowledge is defined as forming the basis for metacognitive activity. Although there are a number of research studies on both metacognitive knowledge and metacognitive activities as well as metacognition for self-regulation, only a few have explored the relationship between metacognitive knowledge and metacognitive activities in any depth. In particular, little attention has been paid to how multiple types of metacognitive knowledge are connected and integrated in learners' minds and how learners apply these to planning, which is a fundamental part of metacognitive activities. This study, therefore, focuses on this dimension and explores how individual learners applied and connected their metacognitive knowledge as they put together and developed their learning plans. The learners in this study were given explicit instruction in language learning strategies, so I not only consider in what ways the learners' plans changed over time, but I also explore how effective such language learning strategy instruction was in helping learners to visualize the development of their learning.

The paper presents a case study examining outcomes written by students in the Self-Directed Learning course at a Japanese private university. The course aims at fostering life-long self-directed English learners and lasts one semester, with students meeting once a week for 90 minutes. As the instructor of the course, I regularly gave lectures and presented activities in class to raise students' metacognitive knowledge and encourage them to integrate their awareness into their practices as learners. Specifically, I wanted to see whether the students were able to connect their metacognitive knowledge to their planning and goal-setting practices in ways that better fit their needs as a result of the instruction provided. In order to look closely at these issues, I qualitatively analyze the class reflections and learning plans written by two students.

Literature Review

Metacognitive Knowledge and Metacognitive Activities

It is widely recognized that metacognition plays an important role in self-directed learning. Metacognition consists of two dimensions: metacognitive knowledge and metacognitive activities. Metacognitive knowledge includes the self-concepts that learners have about themselves, their learning strategies and learning tasks, while metacognitive activities refer to metacognitive learning process consisting of planning, monitoring and evaluation phases. Metacognitive knowledge is generally described as a prerequisite for metacognitive activities, in which learners plan, monitor and evaluate their learning based on their metacognitive knowledge (e.g., Anderson, 2012; Flavell, 1979; Pitrich, 2002).

Although metacognitive activities are variously described as metacognitive experiences (Flavell, 1979), metacognitive strategies (Wenden, 1998), and metacognitive skills (Veenman, 2006), I have chosen to use the phrase "metacognitive activities" as introduced by Sannomiyaya (2008), considering it the most useful descriptor, inclusive of experiences, strategies, and skills.

Types and Features of Metacognitive Knowledge

The best-known categorization of metacognitive knowledge is *person*, *task*, and *strategy* proposed by Flavell (1989). Several researchers have elaborated this concept by presenting various aspects that these three types comprise. "Person," for instance, includes knowledge about universal human traits, knowledge of the self, where self-knowledge includes individual fea-

tures such as one's age, preferences, strengths and weaknesses, breadth and depth of one's knowledge, as well as the cognitive and affective dimensions of significant others and communities surrounding the self. "Task knowledge" includes knowledge of task purpose, task demands, familiarity or unfamiliarity, well or poorly organized and so forth (Flavell, 1989; Pintrich, 2002; Wenden, 1998). Since most of the research studies on metacognitive activities were conducted in contexts of in-class activities or at formal education, task usually refers to assignments given by a teacher and learning strategies discussed there generally mean how students learn or complete the given assignments effectively and efficiently (Zimmerman, 2002). In self-directed learning settings, however, learners need to choose their own tasks independently. They determine their needs, set goals, and consider how to attain their goals, redefining those tasks as fulfilling the aims of and for self-directed learners. In other words, task in self-directed learning is interchangeable with a goal in self-directed learning (Anderson, 2012), and it can be conceived of as a big picture framework or smaller short-term step. Task, as a concept, also includes decisions learners may make when they need to work on deliberate learning practices necessary to achieving their goal (Wenden, 1998). "Strategy" includes general strategies for learning and thinking as well as concrete detailed step-by-step strategies (Pintrich, 2002). Although Oxford (2011) claimed that those three strategies would provide insufficient information, and presented six types instead, including person, group or culture, task, whole-process, strategy, and conditional knowledge (pp. 19-21), all of these could be included in the three types of metacognitive knowledge as described by Flavell above.

None of these aspects of metacognitive knowledge, however, is absolute. Rather they are self-concepts that learners conceive through their own perceptions. Therefore, understandings of their metacognitive knowledge might be correct or incorrect (Flavell, 1979; Pintrich, 2002; Veenman et.al, 2006) as Anderson (2012) argued that self-assessment could be superficial or hyper-critical in contrast to healthy, appropriate self-assessment. In addition, learners may experience varying degrees of stability in metacognitive knowledge; some types of metacognitive knowledge may be retained as a stable, core element in the learner's sense of self, interchangeable with belief, according to Wenden (1998), while others are more prone to fluctuate as dynamic or peripheral elements (Mercer, 2012).

Integration of Metacognitive Knowledge

As seen above, metacognitive knowledge has a variety of aspects, and it is generally agreed that self-directed learners must connect multiple pieces of their metacognitive knowledge and apply the combined view to create effective learning plans appropriate to their own situations (Flavell, 1979). For example, let us imagine a university student who wants to study abroad as an undergraduate in order to realize their dream of working in international business after graduation. In order for them to actually start their learning, they need to know what skills are required for their goals (task knowledge), their current weak points (person knowledge), and what learning strategies might be effective and available for their learning (strategy knowledge). In addition, they also need to know when and where they should use the learning strategies (conditional components of strategy knowledge) and what affective strategy is effective for them to sustain motivation (affective dimension of person knowledge). As such, if learners can connect multiple aspects of metacognitive knowledge, it could lead to more effective self-directed learning. Although the integration of metacognitive knowledge is thought to play an important role in self-directed learning, much of the research regarding relations between metacognitive knowledge and metacognitive activities focuses on adopting a single piece of metacognitive knowledge to modify a learning strategy as seen in the cyclical process defined as *self-oriented feedback loop* by Zimmerman in 1990.

Some researchers call this view meta-metacognition, as it is an overview of metacognition from one level higher, and state that for students to acquire this point of view entails the support of experts such as advisors or instructors (e.g., Sannomiya, 2008). In the course I am teaching, I have attempted to address these concerns by helping learners develop advanced metacognitive skills through explicit intervention in the context of classroom instruction. Although I have sometimes feel that learners' self-assessment routines are superficial, or that their understanding of their own metacognitive knowledge may be inaccurate in some ways, I believe it is essential that learners be encouraged to integrate the knowledge they have with their planning efforts in order to maximize the effectiveness of their learning plans.

Thus, my research is based on the following two assumptions: integration of multiple pieces of metacognitive knowledge leads to better planning, and integration of metacognitive knowledge can be promoted by explicit educational intervention. Therefore, the research questions of this study are as follows:

1. Was integration of metacognitive knowledge promoted by explicit intervention in the context of this study?
2. If yes, did it lead to better planning?

Method

I conducted this research in a required English course for first-year students titled Self-Directed Learning at a private university in Japan. The course aimed at helping students become more independent English learners by guiding the development of better self-directed learning skills. It was held for one semester from April to July in 2016 with a 90-minute class per week through 14 weeks. I was the instructor of the course and taught two groups of students, one consisting of 24 students (10 male, 14 female) and the other 23 (9 male, 14 female), through the semester, applying the same syllabus and instructions to the two groups.

The students were provided with many opportunities in class to raise their metacognitive knowledge on various aspects of themselves and their English learning. In-class activities included lecture-style input, demonstrations and experiences of learning strategies and resources, worksheets for self-assessments and reflections, and pair or group sharing and discussions. After each class, they were assigned to write a class reflection for submission on an online learning management system, Moodle, with a deadline of two days after each class. The reason for setting the deadlines at this interval was to have them review their learning in class while they still remembered it and give them enough time for deep reflections. It was also explained that a class reflection should not be only a summary or simple review of the class but they should connect what they learned in class to their own personal learning preferences and experiences outside of class.

In addition, activities to enhance integration of the students' metacognitive knowledge were explicitly presented three times during the semester. The first intervention was in Class 6, after the students had explored strategies for learning vocabulary and the four language skills in Class 2 to Class 6. It consisted of a worksheet aiming at leading the students to review their own awareness in the past classes, consider an order of priority, and make a learning plan for the next week (see Appendix A), which was followed by a group sharing and discussion in class. The second intervention was attempted in Class 8, when the students were assigned to design a one-month learning plan after contemplating their goals in Class 7. They were given a worksheet (see Appendix B) to integrate their awareness raised in the past classes including metacognitive knowledge about themselves as an English learner (Class 1), English learning strategies (Class 2 to 6) and their goals (Class 7), after which they shared what

they had written in groups. The third intervention was given in Class 13, when they designed a learning plan for the two-month summer holiday, having considered time management in Class 10 and motivational strategies in Class 11. The worksheet provided to the students in Class 13 included goal-setting (Class 7), learning strategies (Class 2 to 6), self-motivational strategies (Class 11) and time management (Class 10) (see Appendix C), and was followed by a group discussion in the same way as in Class 6 and 8. Table 1 gives an overview of the topics and interventions in the course.

Table 1. Overview of the Course

Class	Topic	Class Reflections (CR) and Learning Plans (LP)	Explicit Intervention for Integration
1	“My English Learning History”	CR1	
2	Learning Strategies: Vocabulary	CR2	
3	Learning Strategies: Reading	CR3	
4	Learning Strategies: Listening	CR4	
5	Learning Strategies: Speaking	CR5	
6	Learning Strategies: Writing	CR6	✓
	Integrating Learning Strategies	LP1 (for 1 week)	
7	Goal setting	CR7	
8	Designing Learning Plan 2	LP2 (for 1 month)	✓
9	Sharing Learning Plan 2	n/a	
10	Time Management	CR10	
11	Sustaining Motivation	CR11	
12	Sharing Results of Learning Plan 2	n/a	
13	Designing Learning Plan 3	LP3 (for 2-month holiday)	✓
14	Sharing Learning Plan 3	n/a	

I provided the worksheets but did not collect them so that the students could review them when they wrote their class reflections and complete learning plans after class. However, they submitted their class reflections and learning plans on Moodle, which automatically made it possible for each student to save their submissions in one place and review them easily at any later time. In other words, the learning management system functioned as a portfolio for individual students through the semester, which could promote integration of their metacognitive knowledge as well (Reynolds & Patton, 2014; Yang, 2003). In contrast to the formatted worksheets used during class activities, I set neither rules nor forms for online class reflections and learning plans so that the students could present them as they liked.

In-class activities and out-of-class assignments were all conducted in English because the course was a part of the English curriculum at the university and instruction was supposed to be provided through the medium of English. Since the first language of all the students was Japanese, it is possible that using their second language placed an extra load on their thoughts and expressions.

Analysis

I chose one student from each group as a research subject based on the following criteria: (a) they attended all the class meetings, (b) they submitted all the course work, and (c) they wrote the largest number of words in total in their class reflections and learning plans. Because I did not provide any direction for either word limit or minimum word requirement, they could be among the layer of the students who worked through the course more seriously in the groups.

I submitted three learning plans (LP1, 2 and 3) and nine reflections (CR1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, and 11) written by the respective two students to qualitative analysis, which I conducted in two cycles. In the first cycle, I focused on identifying metacognitive knowledge in their writings, and in the second cycle, I looked at how they had integrated metacognitive knowledge into their learning plans and reflections.

In the following sections I analyze and discuss the learning plans and reflections of two students who participated in the course: Mari, a female student, from group 1, and Dai, a male student, from group 2. Both Mari and Dai are pseudonyms.

Results

Case 1: Mari

In the process of preparing her first learning plan (LP1), Mari wrote in her first reflection (CR1) that she did not “know clearly the way of studying English.” She therefore decided to try a variety of learning resources and strategies during CR2 through CR6. These included vocabulary learning with a textbook and dictionary, reading graded readers, reading news articles, listening to songs, watching news on TV, watching YouTube, shadowing practice with TED talks, self-talk for speaking practice, message exchange on LINE, and keeping a diary in English. In LP1 following these explorations, she made a weekly plan including: (a) listening to English songs, (b) using a smartphone application for vocabulary learning, and (c) reading and listening to online news articles. For the strategies she selected in LP1, she explained that she chose songs as a resource because she liked listening to music, and news articles because it was less time-consuming than reading books, which she had tried, but could not keep up on account of her tight schedule. In other words, Mari connected her metacognitive knowledge about her preferences and life style (person knowledge) to the resources and strategies (strategy knowledge) she selected in LP1.

In LP2 in Class 8, two weeks after making LP1, Mari attempted to apply the strategies for goal-setting covered in Class 7, in which the students considered the big goals in their lives and learned how to break them down into smaller goals. Mari described her big goal as “to communicate with a lot of people around the world more fluently”, and continued, “I like travel abroad and I want to communicate with them more comfortably” in CR7, which is similar to the description seen in CR1. Reflecting on her English learning experience, she wrote in CR1:

Today, I remembered my language history for the first time...I found I have been to a lot of countries, because my parents love to travel around the world. And I realize this experiences made me feel “I want to be the fluent speaker of English!”

To achieve her goal, Mari analyzed her current skills and explained that she would improve her speaking skill by increasing vocabulary and practicing listening and pronunciation. In LP2, therefore, she selected: (a) listening to English songs during her bath time; (b) using a smartphone application for vocabulary learning in her spare moments; (c) listening to on-

line news articles; and, (d) using English on LINE to practice daily phrases. These practice activities were quite similar to those listed in LP1, but she confirmed that they also matched her goals. One point to note here is that she connected learning strategies with the idea of utilizing spare moments in her schedule as clearly mentioned in (a) and (b). In other words, while Mari attempted to integrate several pieces of her metacognitive knowledge in her planning in accordance with the topics and contents presented in class, she also connected person and strategy aspects of her metacognitive knowledge on her own and applied the combination to her planning. This concept formed the foundation for a more stable metacognitive self-knowledge and was used as the basis for her later planning efforts.

LP3 in Class 13 was created after exploring time management in Class 10 and motivation in Class 11. Mari included six learning resources in this plan, which was much more than the previous plans. However, this may be related to the fact that the plan was for a two-month summer holiday, a longer period of time than covered in her previous learning plans. The resources selected here included applications and websites for vocabulary, speaking, listening and reading practice, all of which could be done in a short time, for as she put it, "I may feel very hot and tired every day [because of club activities]. So I must study English in my spare time, as well as my usual school days." Since there is no mention of either her goals or motivation dealt with in Class 11, it is difficult to infer if she seriously considered them in spite of having applied the concept of goal setting in LP2 and having written about the motivational strategies she wanted to use in CR11.

Case 2: Dai

Dai made a weekly plan selecting two learning strategies in LP1, after the first explicit instruction for integration. One was watching news, presentations and movies, which he had selected in CR4, and the other was intensive reading, which he had selected in CR3. In addition, he observed, "I could notice which self-directed learning was appropriate for me ... I could find my weakness points through learning." However, he had already claimed, "I want to improve my grammar skills and increase my vocabulary," in CR1. Looking back on his CR1 more closely, he explained that he was not confident about using English even though he was educated at an international school and wrote "mistakes will lose a person's confidence such as grammatically mistakes and spelling mistakes. Therefore, I would like to remember more vocabulary, and improve my grammar skills." Taking his reflections into account, it could be said that his awareness of his weak points, and his belief in the importance of correct grammar and vocabulary use, do not provide evidence of new metacognitive knowledge raised by the course instruction. Instead, they show a confirmation of his original beliefs about his language learning goals and practices, though perhaps articulated in a more metacognitive way as a result of the course activities. The point to note here is the reasons Dai chose the learning strategies mentioned above. He explained that he would read scripts when watching videos to make sure his comprehension was correct in CR4, and would do intensive reading for learning new vocabulary and writing styles in CR3. In other words, he connected these pieces of new metacognitive knowledge about learning strategies to the beliefs he held since the beginning of the course.

LP2 was made in Class 8, one week after he went through goal setting in Class 7. In CR7, Dai set a goal of obtaining a high score in TOEFL®iBT and claimed, "it needs an enormous amount of vocabulary and a lot of practice in reading, listening, speaking and writing to do." In LP2, therefore, he selected learning strategies and resources for each language skill, particularly the ones that he had tried before such as listening speeches with scripts (CR4), intensive reading (CR3), and vocabulary applications (CR2) with addition of writing practice

by imitating model essays or articles. We can see here that he integrated his metacognitive knowledge about his goal (task knowledge) from CR7, learning strategies (strategy knowledge) from CR2, 3 and 4 and himself (person knowledge) from CR1 or earlier.

The contents of LP2 were maintained into LP3 as well. Since his goal was unchanged, he decided that he should continue the same learning strategies during the summer holiday too. However, contradictorily, he confessed in LP3 that he had not actually been able to carry out his LP2 in the past month. He said, “I think I could not control myself well and the time management was bad. However, I don’t want to quit this plan.” What is interesting here is that although he stressed the importance of self-control and time management in his reflections, he did not apply strategies that would help him strengthen these practices, even though those topics were dealt with in Class 10 and 11, in between LP2 and LP3. This means that his integration occurred in his choice of goal-setting and language learning strategies but not with strategies to control his motivation and time management even though all of them were covered in class in similar ways. Also, it would be worth noting that in the latter part of LP3, he added, “I need to achieve this goal by some useful grammar and vocabulary books because I need to improve these skills especially.” One interpretation of this is that his core metacognitive knowledge, or belief, seen in CR1 remained constant until the end of the course.

Discussion

I would like to return here to the research questions introduced at the beginning of the chapter:

1. Was integration of metacognitive knowledge promoted by explicit intervention in the context of this study?
2. If yes, did it lead to better planning?

The answer is both yes and no. Although integration of some types of metacognitive knowledge was observed in both cases, there were also several types of metacognitive knowledge that were not applied to the learning plans.

Mari connected her metacognitive knowledge of her learning preferences as explored in her first Class Reflection (CR1) through CR6 in her first Learning Plan (LP1), in those listed in CR1 through CR7 in LP2, and from those listed in CR1 through CR6 and CR10 in LP3. This linking suggests that we may consider the intervention to have promoted these integrations. However, as also noted, CR7 was not used in LP3 even though the concept was once applied in LP2. Although it is possible that learners do not utilize a certain metacognitive knowledge intentionally if they consider it is unnecessary or irrelevant, CR7 focused on goal setting, one of the most important factors in planning. In other words, in spite of the fact that goal setting constitutes a fundamental kind of metacognitive knowledge, and should logically be integrated in learning plans, integration was not induced for LP3 in spite of the intervention.

Dai connected his metacognitive knowledge observations from CR1 through CR6 in LP1, and from CR1 through CR7 in his LP2 and LP3. This linking could also be considered evidence of the intervention as having promoted the integrations. However, CR10 and CR11 observations were not applied to the LP3, which he composed following those classes. His “confession,” reported in LP3, that he could not sustain his previous plans because of his poor time management and motivational strategies, which had been covered in Class 10 and 11, suggests that he recognized them as important elements in achieving his goals. Therefore, he should have integrated these concepts into his LP3 for better planning.

Another issue recognized in both cases was that some integration took place even with-

out intervention. In Case 1, Mari had begun the practice of integrating time management and skill-based learning strategies, before the concept of time management was explicitly covered in the course itself. In Dai's case, the integration of his metacognitive knowledge about himself with language use with skill-based learning strategies started before any explicit intervention for integration was presented in class. The learners' metacognitive knowledge in both cases was stable enough to be sustained throughout the semester, and was consistently connected to newly developed metacognitive knowledge even without external intervention.

To bring things together, the analysis of the two cases suggests that integration of metacognitive knowledge can be promoted by explicit intervention. However, it does not mean that intervention can always induce integration, and sometimes fails even when the integration is considered important for the learner's development. At the same time, some integration may occur even without intervention; particularly when the metacognitive knowledge is a part of a stable belief-system for the learner.

Conclusion

I began the study assuming that the integration of multiple kinds of metacognitive knowledge is important for self-directed language learners to make more effective learning plans. To test this hypothesis, I examined the results of interventions designed to promote the integration of metacognitive knowledge by two students, Mari and Dai, enrolled in the Self-Directed Learning course. The results showed that although integration was promoted by the intervention, it did not occur in all cases. The learner reflections also showed that even though the integration of all aspects of metacognitive knowledge is not always necessary for better planning, there is room for improvement in future practices to enhance greater integration of metacognitive knowledge with goal setting and strategy adoption. Learning advisors or instructors must also consider the possibility that integration will sometimes not take place even when it is crucial to improve learning outcomes.

In order to encourage greater integration of metacognitive knowledge into students' learning plans, I am now evaluating several possible revisions to the course. These include:

1. Increasing the frequency of interventions;
2. Making integration practices more explicit on worksheets;
3. Developing new models in the design of learner portfolios;
4. Changing the order of the topics of instruction; and,
5. Including one-to-one short advisory sessions with individual students.

Although the challenges in developing advanced metacognitive skills, or meta-metacognitive awareness, especially through classroom instruction, must be acknowledged, I believe that it is still a goal worth pursuing so that I can support the development of skillful self-directed learning, not only in advisory sessions with individual learners but also through instruction for larger groups of students.

References

- Anderson, J. N. (2012). Metacognition: Awareness of language learning. In S. Mercer, S. Ryan, & M. Williams (Eds.), *Psychology for language learning* (pp. 169–187). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Flavell, J. H. (1979). Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: A new area of cognitive developmental inquiry. *American Psychologist*, 34(10), 906–911.
- Mercer, S. (2012). Self-concept: Situating the self. In S. Mercer, S. Ryan, & M. Williams (Eds.), *Psychology for language learning* (pp. 10–25). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Oxford, R. L. (2011). *Teaching and researching language learning strategies*. Edinburgh Pearson Education.
- Pintrich, P. R. (2002). The role of metacognitive knowledge in learning, teaching, and assessing. *Theory Into Practice*, 41(4), 219–225.
- Reynolds, C., & Patton, J. (2014). *Leveraging the ePortfolio for integrative learning: A faculty guide to classroom practices for transforming student learning*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.
- Sannomiya, M. (Ed). (2008). メタ認知—学習力を支える高次認知機能— [Metacognition: Higher order cognitive function to support learning skills]. Kyoto: Kitaoji-shobou.
- Veeman, M. V. J., Van Hout-Wolters, Bernadette H. A. M., & Afflerbach, P. (2006). Metacognition and learning: Conceptual and methodological considerations. *Metacognition and Learning*, 1, 3–14.
- Wenden, A. (1998). Metacognitive knowledge and language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 19(4), 515–537.
- Wenden, A. (1999). An introduction to metacognitive knowledge and beliefs in language learning: Beyond the basics. *System*, 27(4), 435–441.
- Yang, N. D. (2003). Integrating portfolios into learning strategy-based instruction for EFL college students. *IRAL*, 41(4), 293–317.
- Zimmerman, B. J. (1990). Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: An overview. *Educational Psychologist*, 25(1), 3–17.
- Zimmerman, B. J. (2002). Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview. *Theory into Practice*, 41(2), 64–70.

Review Process

This paper was double-blind reviewed by members of the Review Network. (*Contributors have the option of open or blind review.*)

Author Bio

Mayumi Abe has been a language learning advisor for 10 years and is currently an instructor at Gakushuin University. She also works with ALC, a publishing company, in charge of the management and training of advisors. She received her master's degree from Temple University Japan Campus and is now studying in the doctoral program of Waseda University. Her research interests include self-directed learning, metacognition, motivation, and language learning strategies.

Appendix A
Worksheet in Class 6
Review of Class 1 to 6

CL#	Topic	Reflection (Resources & strategies that worked for you)	Priority
2	Vocabulary		
3	Reading		
4	Listening		
5	Speaking		
6	Writing		



Integrate the ideas above and make a plan for this week

Appendix B**Worksheet in Class 8****SDL I Class 8 Designing Learning Plan 1****A My English Tree (Needs analysis)****B My big goal and small goals (related to English skills and learning)**

Big goal

--

Small goals

--

C My schedule**Weekly**

Date	What to do

Appendix C

Worksheet in Class 13

SDL I Class 13 Designing Learning Plan 2

My Goal(s)

My English Tree (Needs analysis)

----- my current skill ----- my goal by the end of summer

Learning Resources & Strategies

Target skill(s) (e.g. listening, vocabulary)	Resources / Strategies	when, where, how long, how often	Goals (What to achieve by the end of summer)

My Self-Motivational Strategies (how to maintain motivation)

--

My schedule
Weekly

Date	What to do

Daily

	Mon.	Tue.	Wed	Thu.	Fri.	Sat.	Sun.
6:00							
7:00							
8:00							
9:00							
10:00							
11:00							
12:00							
13:00							
14:00							
15:00							
16:00							
17:00							
18:00							
19:00							
20:00							
21:00							
22:00							
23:00							
24:00							
Total SDL time	min	min	min	min	min	min	min