**1. Introduction**

**1.1 Background of the Study**

One of the distinct characteristics of human beings is being able to reflect on their own thoughts and actions. John Flavell was the first researcher to use the term, metacognition, in order to explain this human behavior (Akturk & Sahin, 2011). Flavell (1976) first introduced the concept of metacognition as an individual’s awareness of their own thinking and learning which consists of three specific domains: *Metacognitive knowledge*, *metacognitive experiences*, and *metacognitive strategies*. *Metacognitive knowledge* is stored knowledge about one’s cognitive processes and those of others (Flavell & Wellman, 1977). It consists of three major factors: person knowledge – individual beliefs about what one can do, task knowledge – knowledge of information to understand tasks, and strategy knowledge – knowledge of using strategies (Flavell, 1979). Flavell defined m*etacognitive experiences* as conscious cognition that occurs in any intellectual enterprise, and *Metacognitive strategies*as cognitive strategies for self-regulation on thoughts, self-evaluation, and monitoring on cognitive processes. In other studies, metacognition was defined with expanded concepts. Among the three domains previously mentioned, research has found that metacognitive knowledge can improve the quality of learning for students (Hartman, 2001; McCormick, 2003) and positively affect student’s academic success (Zimmerman & Bandura, 1994). Other researchers expanded the definition of metacognition as thinking processes in the stages of planned learning and problem-solving (Brown, 1978), one’s awareness and management of learning processes (Baker & Brown, 1980), “thinking about thinking or a person’s cognition about cognition” (Wellman, 1985, p.1), and a form of cognition and active control over the cognitive procedure (Devine, 1993). Even though those researchers differently defined the concept of metacognition, they emphasized the link to monitoring strategies for learning processes (Bonner, 1988). Research into learners’ metacognition in the field of English language learning has pointed to the importance of metacognition in the enhancement of language development (Anderson, 2002, 2008; Chamot, 2005; Wenden, 1998).

In addition to the concept of metacognition, metacognitive instruction to enhance metacognition has been studied in the field of cognitive psychology since the 1970s (See, for instance: Brown, 1977; Flavell, 1976, 1979). Metacognitive instruction is designed to enhance the level of a learner’s metacognition and learning explicitly (Veenman, Elshout & Busato, 1994). Explicit metacognitive instruction fosters metacognition in students and promotes the regulation of learning by themselves in setting goals, monitoring, regulating, and controlling their cognition (Pintrich, 200). Despite the importance of metacognition in effective L2 learning and development, only a few studies were conducted to examine the effectiveness of metacognitive instruction in enhancing learners’ metacognition; for example, researchers found the positive correlations between improved metacognition by metacognitive instruction and speaking accuracy (Sato & Loewen, 2018), listening comprehension (Cho, 2017; Kim & Chung, 2016; Lee, 2015, 2016; Vandergrift & Baker, 2015), reading comprehension (Karimi, 2015), and writing proficiency (Teng & Zhang, 2016). Nevertheless, up to now, only a little attention has been paid to the effect of corrective feedback combined with metacognitive instruction especially on communicative interaction and speaking development even though it may suggest a new stream of SLA research with ultimately enhanced L2 instruction (Sato & Loewen, 2018). According to Sato and Loewen, metacognitive instruction has the potential to enhance the effects of corrective feedback, and it may be more effective than corrective feedback alone in L2 development. According to Wenden’s five steps to design metacognitive instruction for corrective feedback (1998), the concept of corrective feedback should be explicitly explained, discussed and reminded during classes. Through this instruction, students may be able to enhance the level of metacognition of corrective feedback and apply it in their learning.

Therefore, this current study will explore further whether it is more effective when metacognitive instruction is given in conjunction with corrective feedback than solely using corrective feedback.

**1.2. Research Gap / Need for the Study**

Surprisingly, the impact of corrective feedback with metacognitive instruction on speaking proficiency has not been studied in South Korea yet despite the positive evidence of enhanced metacognition on L2 learning. This study hopes to provide new insights into the impact of corrective feedback with metacognitive instruction in L2 speaking development because of the lack of studies about metacognitive instruction and L2 speaking accuracy.

Although a positive correlation between metacognitive instruction, corrective feedback, and L2 speaking accuracy was found in one study (Sato & Loewen, 2018), it could not determine how metacognitive instruction affects learners’ metacognitive knowledge of corrective feedback. In other words, the researchers were not able to find if the participants achieved more knowledge regarding corrective feedback as a result of the metacognitive instruction. Thus, the researchers recommended examining how metacognitive instruction impacts on both metacognitive knowledge and L2 knowledge. Most importantly, the effects of metacognitive instruction on L2 speaking development have rarely been explored in the field of language education as stated above. For these reasons, the necessity of the study about corrective feedback with metacognitive instruction and L2 speaking accuracy arises, and this paper aims to provide a further investigation of the effect of metacognitive instruction on corrective feedback and speaking accuracy.

**1.3. Purpose of the study**

The purpose of this study is to explore relationships among the variables: metacognitive instruction, corrective feedback, and L2 speaking accuracy. As a result, it would contribute to the research of second language development and the impact of metacognition on uptake and corrective feedback. By providing a further study of metacognitive instruction, linguistic researchers in the same field would be supported for their research on metacognition or metacognitive instruction in L2 development. In a classroom environment, teachers may be able to utilize the concept of metacognitive instruction and corrective feedback for better classroom management with the results of this study. Finally, L2 learners may understand the meaning of metacognition in their learning and find how effective it is in their L2 development so that they know their own learning styles.

**1.4. Research questions**

Thus, this study will investigate how metacognitive instruction impacts students’ uptake of teachers’ corrective feedback and L2 speaking development in the Korean EFL context. It aims to explore the effects of corrective feedback with metacognitive instruction in the context of speaking proficiency of Korean students by examining the following two research questions: 1) How does metacognitive instruction combined with corrective feedback affect speaking accuracy in Korean adult learners of English? 2) How does metacognitive instruction affect learner’s performance in a picture-description task? And 3) How does metacognitive instruction affect maintenance of target structure in a delayed posttest?