

4

■ Implicit and Explicit SLA and Their Interface

NICK C. ELLIS

University of Michigan

■ **THIS CHAPTER PROVIDES** a historical and cross-disciplinary review of the *Interface Question in SLA* concerning the differences between implicit and explicit language knowledge and the ways in which they interact. The answer to this question is fundamental in that it determines how one believes second languages are learned and whether there is any role for instruction.

Implicit and Explicit Language Learning and Knowledge

Children acquire their first language (L1) by engaging with their caretakers in natural meaningful communication. From this “evidence” they automatically acquire complex knowledge of the structure of their language. Yet paradoxically they cannot describe this knowledge, the discovery of which forms the object of the disciplines of theoretical linguistics, psycholinguistics, and child language acquisition. This is a difference between explicit and implicit knowledge—ask a young child how to form a plural and she says she does not know; ask her “here is a wug, here is another wug, what have you got?” and she is able to reply, “two wugs.” The acquisition of L1 grammar is implicit and is extracted from experience of usage rather than from explicit rules—simple exposure to normal linguistic input suffices, and no explicit instruction is needed. Adult acquisition of second language (L2) is a different matter in that what can be acquired implicitly from communicative contexts is typically quite limited in comparison to native speaker norms, and adult attainment of L2 accuracy usually requires additional resources of consciousness and explicit learning.

History of the Interface in Language Education and Applied Linguistics

Differing assumptions about the nature of language representation and its promotion motivated different teaching traditions (Kelly 1969). Traditional Grammar Translation foreign language (FL) instruction and the Cognitive Code method popular in the 1960s and 1970s capitalized on the formal operational abilities of older children and adults to think and act in a rule-governed way. This allowed their instruction, through the medium of language, in pedagogical grammar rules, with lessons focusing on language forms such as, for example, particular tenses and inflectional patterns. These

explicit methods were motivated by the belief that perception and awareness of L2 rules necessarily precedes their use. In contrast, FL and L2 teaching methods like “Audiolingualism,” which held sway during World War II, and more recent “Natural” and “Communicative” approaches, maintained that adult language learning is, like L1 acquisition, implicit. Since language skill is very different from knowledge about language, they consequently renounced explicit grammar-based instruction. The defining distinction between implicit acquisition and explicit learning of L2 was that of Krashen (1982). He argued that adult L2 students of grammar-translation methods, who can tell more about a language than a native speaker, yet whose technical knowledge of grammar leaves them totally in the lurch in conversation, testify that conscious learning about language and subconscious acquisition of language are different things, and that any notion of a “Strong-Interface” between the two must be rejected. Krashen’s Input Hypothesis, an extreme “Non-Interface” position, thus countered that (a) subconscious acquisition dominates in second language performance; (b) learning cannot be converted into acquisition; and (c) conscious learning can be used only as a Monitor, that is, an editor to correct output after it has been initiated by the acquired system. In Krashen’s theory, SLA, just like first language acquisition, comes naturally as a result of implicit processes occurring while the learner is receiving comprehensible L2 input. The Input Hypothesis was the theoretical motivation behind Natural and Communicative approaches to instruction.

These foundations suggest that language learning can take place implicitly and explicitly, or, because we can communicate using language, it can be influenced by declarative statements of pedagogical rules (explicit instruction). The central issue of the Interface Question is just how much do explicit learning and explicit instruction influence implicit learning, and how can their symbiosis be optimized? Subsequent research took up this theme.

Empirical analyses of learners in “grammar-free” Communicative, Natural, or Immersion L2 and FL programs demonstrated significant shortcomings in the accuracy of their language (Lightbown, Spada, and White 1993). Critical theoretical reactions to Krashen’s Input Hypothesis (e.g., McLaughlin 1987), together with demonstrations that it is those language forms which are attended that are subsequently learned, prompted Schmidt (1990) to propose that conscious cognitive effort involving the subjective experience of noticing is a necessary and sufficient condition for the conversion of input to intake in SLA. Schmidt’s Noticing Hypothesis was the theoretical motivation for subsequent research efforts, both in laboratory experiments (Hulstijn and DeKeyser 1997) and in the classroom (Doughty and Williams 1998), into the role of consciousness in SLA. Together, the shortcomings in uptake, the consequently limited end state of naturalistic learners, and the demonstrable role of noticing in SLA, obliged in turn the rejection of the extreme No-Interface position.

Applied Linguistics was thus left with something in between, some form of a Weak Interface position (Ellis 1994; Long 1991) whereby explicit knowledge plays various roles (a) in the perception of, and selective attending to, L2 form by facilitating the processes of “noticing” (i.e., paying attention to specific linguistic features of the input); (b) by “noticing the gap” (i.e., comparing the noticed features with those

the learner typically produces in output); and (c) in output, with explicit knowledge coaching practice, particularly in initial stages, with this controlled use of declarative knowledge guiding the proceduralization and eventual automatization of language processing, as it does in the acquisition of other cognitive skills.

The Weak Interface position motivated renewed interest in explicit instruction, but the pendulum didn't swing back all the way to the decontextualized and often meaningless grammar drills of traditional Grammar Translation instruction, which Long (1991) termed Focus on Forms. Instead, instruction was to be integrated into the meaningful communication afforded by more naturalistic approaches: learner errors should be picked up by a conversation partner and corrected in the course of meaningful, often task-based, communication by way of negative evidence which offers some type of explicit focus on linguistic form (Doughty and Williams 1998; Ellis 2000). The period from 1980 through 2000 was a time of concerted research to assess the effectiveness of different types of explicit and implicit L2 instruction. Reviews of these investigations (Ellis and Laporte 1997; Hulstijn and DeKeyser 1997; Lightbown, Spada, and White 1993; Spada 1997), particularly the comprehensive meta-analysis of Norris and Ortega (2000) that summarized the findings from forty-nine unique sample studies experimental and quasi-experimental investigations into the effectiveness of L2 instruction, demonstrate that focused L2 instruction results in large target-oriented gains, that explicit types of instruction are more effective than implicit types, and that the effectiveness of L2 instruction is durable.

Implicit and Explicit Knowledge and Their Interface in Psychological Research

These developments ran in parallel to research in psychology demonstrating the dissociations of implicit and explicit memory, and of implicit and explicit learning (Ellis 1994). The separation between explicit and implicit memory was evidenced in anterograde amnesic patients who, as a result of brain damage, lost the ability to consolidate new explicit memories (those where recall involves a conscious process of remembering a prior episodic experience) to update their autobiographical record with their daily activities, to learn new concepts, or to learn to recognize new people or places. Nevertheless, amnesiacs maintained implicit memories (those evidenced by the facilitation of the processing of a stimulus as a function of a recent encounter with an identical or related stimulus but where the person at no point has to consciously recall the prior event) and were able to learn new perceptual skills such as mirror reading and new motor skills (Schacter 1987; Squire and Kandel 1999). They also showed normal classical conditioning, thus the famous anecdote of the amnesic patient who, having once been pricked by a pin hidden in the hand of her consultant, refused thereafter to shake him by his hand while at the same time denying ever having met him before.

The dissociation between explicit and implicit learning was made by Reber (1976) who had people learn complex letter strings (e.g., MXRMXT, VMTRRR) generated by an artificial grammar. In the course of studying these for later recognition, they unconsciously abstracted knowledge of the underlying regularities, to be able to later distinguish between novel strings that either accorded or broke the rules of the

underlying grammar. However, like young children who can pass “wug tests” in their native language, these adult participants, too, were unable to explain their reasoning. Such research illustrated quite different styles of learning, varying in the degree to which acquisition is driven by conscious beliefs, as well as in the extent to which they give rise to explicit verbalizable knowledge: Implicit learning is acquisition of knowledge about the underlying structure of a complex stimulus environment by a process that takes place naturally, simply, and without conscious operations. Explicit learning is a more conscious operation, where the individual attends to particular aspects of the stimulus array and volunteers and tests hypotheses in a search for structure.

In brain science, neuropsychological investigations of the results of brain damage demonstrated that different areas of the brain are specialized in their function and that there are clear separations between areas involved in explicit learning and memory and those involved in implicit learning and memory (Ellis and Young 1988). Explicit learning is supported by neural systems in the prefrontal cortex involved in attention, the conscious apperception of stimuli, and working memory; the consolidation of explicit memories involves neural systems in the hippocampus and related limbic structures. In contrast, implicit learning and memory are localized, among other places, in various areas of perceptual and motor cortex.

In psychology, subsequent research in implicit and explicit learning of artificial languages, finite-state systems, and complex control systems showed: (a) When the material to be learned is simple, or where it is relatively complex but there is only a limited number of variables and the critical features are salient, then learners gain from being told to adopt an explicit mode of learning where hypotheses are to be explicitly generated and tested and the model of the system updated accordingly. As a result they are also able to verbalize this knowledge and transfer to novel situations. (b) When the material to be learned is more randomly structured with a large number of variables and when the important relationships are not obvious, then explicit instructions only interfere and an implicit mode of learning is more effective. This learning is instance-based but, with sufficient exemplars, an implicit understanding of the structure will be achieved. Although this knowledge may not be explicitly available, the learner may nonetheless be able to transfer to conceptually or perceptually similar tasks and to provide default cases on generalization (wug) tasks. (c) Whatever the domain, learning the patterns, regularities or underlying concepts of a complex problem space or stimulus environment with explicit instruction, direction, and advances clues, heuristics, or organizers is always better than learning without any cues at all (Reber et al. 1980; MacWhinney 1997a). (d) Although Reber had emphasized that the results of implicit learning were abstract, unconscious, and rule-like representations, subsequent research showed that there was a very large contribution of concrete memorized knowledge of chunks and sequences of perceptual input and motor output that unconscious processes tally and identify to be frequent across the exemplars experienced in the learning set (Stadler and Frensch 1998).

On the broader stage of cognitive science, the period 1980–2000 showed a parallel shift away from an almost exclusively symbolic view of human cognition to one that emphasised the overwhelming importance of implicit inductive processes in the statistical reasoning which sums prior experience and results in our generalizations

of this knowledge as schema, prototypes, and conceptual categories. These are the aspects of cognition that are readily simulated in connectionist models (Elman et al. 1996; Rumelhart and McClelland 1986) and which subsequently have had considerable influence upon our understanding of implicit knowledge of language and its acquisition (Christiansen and Chater 2001).

In cognitive neuroscience technological advances in functional brain imaging using electro-encephalographic (EEG) and functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) triangulated the findings of earlier cognitive neuropsychological studies of brain areas involved in implicit and explicit memory. Subsequent improvements in the temporal and spatial resolution of these techniques afforded much more detailed descriptions of the dynamics of brain activity, promoting a shift of emphasis from knowledge as static representation stored in particular locations to knowledge as processing involving the dynamic mutual influence of interrelated types of information as they activate and inhibit each other over time (Eichenbaum 2002; Frackowiak et al. 2004).

Thus, in the latter part of the twentieth century, research in these various disciplines converged on the conclusion that explicit and implicit knowledge of language are distinct and dissociated, they involve different types of representation, they are substantiated in separate parts of the brain, and yet they can come into mutual influence in processing.

Implicit and Explicit Knowledge and Their Interface in SLA

What is the nature of the implicit knowledge that allows fluency in phonology, reading, spelling, lexis, morphosyntax, formulaic language, language comprehension, grammaticality, sentence production, syntax, and pragmatics? How are these representations formed? How are their strengths updated to statistically represent the nature of language, and how do linguistic prototypes and rule-like processing emerge from usage? These difficult and complex issues are certainly not resolved, and they remain the focus of the disciplines of linguistics, psycholinguistics, and child language acquisition. Nevertheless, there has been a growing consensus over the last twenty or thirty years that the vast majority of our linguistic processing is unconscious, its operations tuned by the products of our implicit learning, which has supplied a distributional analysis of the linguistic problem space, that is, a statistical sampling of language over our entire history of prior usage. Frequency of usage determines availability of representation and tallies the likelihoods of occurrence of constructions and the relative probabilities of their mappings between aspects of form and their relevant interpretations. Generalizations arise from conspiracies of memorized utterances collaborating in productive schematic linguistic constructions (Ellis 2002; Bybee and Hopper 2001; Christiansen and Chater 2001; Bod, Hay, and Jannedy 2003). Implicit learning collates the evidence of language, and the results of this tallying provide an optimal solution to the problem space of form-function mappings and their contextualized use, with representational systems modularizing over thousands of hours on task.

But if these implicit learning processes are sufficient for first language acquisition, why not for second? One part of the answer must be transfer. Transfer phenomena pervade SLA (Weinreich 1953; Lado 1957; Odlin 1989; MacWhinney 1997b).

Our neural apparatus is highly plastic in its initial state. It is not entirely an empty slate, since there are broad genetic constraints upon the usual networks of system-level connections and upon the broad timetable of maturation and myelination, but nevertheless the cortex of the brain is broadly equipotent in terms of the types of information it can represent (Elman et al. 1996). In contrast to the newborn infant, the L2 learner's neocortex has already been tuned to the L1, incremental learning has slowly committed it to a particular configuration, and it has reached a point of entrenchment where the L2 is perceived through mechanisms optimized for the L1. Thus the L1 implicit representations conspire in a "learned attention" to language and in the automatized processing of the L2 in nonoptimal, L1-tuned ways. Details of these constituent processes of contingency, cue competition, salience, interference, overshadowing, blocking, and perceptual learning can be found in Ellis (2006a, 2006b).

Gathering these strands together, we can conclude:

- (a) Implicit and explicit learning are distinct processes.
- (b) Implicit and explicit memory are distinguished in their content, their form, and their brain localizations.
- (c) There are different types of knowledge of and about language, stored in different areas of the brain, and engendered by different types of educational experience.
- (d) A large part of acquisition involves the implicit learning of language from usage.
- (e) L1 transfer, learned attention, and automatization all contribute to the more limited achievements of exclusive implicit learning in SLA than in L1A.
- (f) Pedagogical responses to these shortcomings involve explicit instruction, recruiting consciousness to overcome the implicit routines that are non-optimal for L2.
- (g) Evaluation research in language education demonstrates that such Focus on Form instruction can be effective.

What then are the detailed mechanisms of interface? What are the various psychological and neurobiological processes by which explicit knowledge of form-meaning associations has an impact upon implicit language learning? In the remainder of this chapter I will bring to bear current research in cognitive neuroscience as it relates to this question. I believe that this research broadly supports a Weak Interface position and that additionally it provides an important emphasis for our understanding of language learning and instruction, namely that we must concentrate on dynamic processes (Ellis and Larsen Freeman 2006, 2009) rather than on static conceptualizations of language, representation and physical interface. The interface, like consciousness, is dynamic, situated, and contextualized: It happens transiently during conscious processing, but the influence upon implicit cognition endures thereafter (Ellis 2005).

Consciousness Provides the Weak Interface

Learning is a dynamic process; it takes place during processing, as Hebb (1949), Craik and Lockhart (1972), and O'Grady (2003) have reminded us from their neural,

cognitive, and linguistic aspects on learning. In fluency in our native language, both language processing and language tallying are typically unconscious; our implicit systems automatically process the input, allowing our conscious selves to concentrate on the meaning rather than the form. Implicit, habitual processes are highly adaptive in predictable situations. But the more novelty we encounter, the more the involvement of consciousness is needed for successful learning and problem solving (Baars 1997). As with other implicit modules, when automatic capabilities fail, there follows a call recruiting additional collaborative conscious support (Baars and Franklin 2003): We think about walking only when we stumble, about driving only when a child runs into the road, and about language only when communication breaks down. In unpredictable conditions, the capacity of consciousness to organize existing knowledge in new ways is indispensable.

The psychological processes of interface are exactly that—they are dynamic processes, synchronous with consciousness. The last ten years have seen significant advances in our scientific study of consciousness and its roles in learning and memory (Baars, Banks, and Newman 2003). There have been three major strands of development: (a) cognitive neuroscientific investigation of the neural correlates of consciousness (NCC) (see Koch 2004 for review), (b) cognitive analysis of consciousness (particularly Global Workspace Theory: Baars 1988, 1997), and (c) computational modeling of the events underlying the emergence of self-amplifying resonances across a global network of neuronal coalitions, the dynamic competition among the massively parallel constituency of the unconscious mind that elects (Koch 2004, 24, 173) the current oneness of the fleeting stream of conscious experience (Dehaene and Changeux 2004). These developments inform three issues relating to the Weak Interface: the neurobiology of implicit tallying, the NCC, and the role of consciousness in learning.

The Neurobiology of Implicit Tallying

For the first time, it is now possible, using fMRI and ERP techniques, to image the implicit processing of words which, despite being presented below the threshold for conscious noticing, nevertheless result in subsequent implicit memory effects. The implicit statistical tallying that underlies subsequent priming effects can be seen to take place in various local regions of primary and secondary sensory and motor cortex (Dehaene et al. 2001).

The Neural Correlates of Consciousness

The NCC is a huge, difficult, and fascinating question, and it is generating a correspondingly massive collaborative research effort. A lot more will have been discovered in another ten years. But what is already known is potent enough in its implications for the interface: implicit learning occurs largely within modality and involves the priming, or chunking, of representations or routines within a module; it is the means of tuning our *zombie agents*, the menagerie of specialized sensorimotor processors, such as those identified in Dehaene's research, that carry out routine operations in the absence of direct conscious sensation or control (Koch 2004, chapter 12). In contrast, conscious processing is spread wide over the brain and

unifies otherwise disparate areas in a synchronized focus of activity. Conscious activity affords much more scope for focused long-range association and influence than does implicit learning. It brings about a whole new level of potential associations.

Consciousness and Learning: The Collaborative Mind

Compared with the vast number of unconscious neural processes happening in any given moment, conscious capacity evidences a very narrow bottleneck. But the narrow limits of consciousness have a compensating advantage: consciousness seems to act as a gateway, creating access to essentially any part of the nervous system. Baars's (1988, 1997) *Global Workspace Theory* holds that consciousness is the publicity organ of the brain. It is a facility for accessing, disseminating, and exchanging information and for exercising global coordination and control: consciousness is the interface. "Paying attention—becoming conscious of some material—seems to be the sovereign remedy for learning anything, applicable to many very different kinds of information. It is the universal solvent of the mind" (Baars 1997, sec. 5, 304).

Global Workspace Theory and parallel research into NCC illuminate the mechanisms by which the brain interfaces functionally and anatomically independent implicit and explicit memory systems involved variously in motoric, auditory, emotive, or visual processing and in declarative, analogue, perceptual, or procedural memories, despite their different modes of processing, which bear upon representations and entities of very different natures. Biological adaptations tend to be accretive (Gould 1982). The speech system, for example, is overlaid on a set of organs that in earlier mammals supports breathing, eating, and simple vocalization. Language is overlaid upon systems for the visual representation of the world. Yet, however different the symbolic representations of language and the analogue representations of vision are, they interact so that through language, we create mental images in our listeners that might normally be produced only by the memory of events as recorded and integrated by the sensory and perceptual systems of the brain (Jerison 1976). Likewise, the global broadcasting property of consciousness is overlaid on earlier functions that are primarily sensori-motor. In his major review culminating a lifetime's pioneering work in human neuropsychology, Luria (1973), having separately analyzed the workings of the three principal functional units of the brain (the unit for regulating tone or waking, the unit for obtaining, processing, and storing information, and the unit for programming, regulating, and verifying mental activity), emphasized that it would be a mistake to imagine that each of these units carry out their activity independently: "Each form of conscious activity is always a *complex functional system* and takes place through the *combined working of all three brain units*, each of which makes its own contribution . . . *all three principal functional brain units work concertedly*, and it is only by studying their interactions when each unit makes its own specific contribution, that an insight can be obtained into the nature of the cerebral mechanisms of mental activity" (99–101, italics in original).

Some Component Processes of the Weak Interface

This, then, is the broad framework: Language representation in the brain involves specialized localized modules, largely implicit in their operation, collaborating via

long-range associations in dynamic coalitions of cell assemblies representing—among others—the phonological forms of words and constructions and their sensory and motor groundings (Pulvermüller 1999, 2003; Barsalou 1999). L1 usage tunes and automatizes them to perform in particular ways, resulting in our highly specialized L1 processing modules. To break out of these routines, to consolidate the new connections, networks, and routines necessary for L2 processing, consciousness is necessary.

The Weak Interface theory of second language instruction proposed that explicit processing plays a role in SLA by means of “noticing,” “noticing the gap,” and guided output practice. The remainder of this chapter outlines relevant research on each in turn.

Noticing

The primary conscious involvement in SLA is the explicit learning involved in the initial registration of pattern recognizers for constructions that are then tuned and integrated into the system by implicit learning during subsequent input processing. Neural systems in the prefrontal cortex involved in working memory provide attentional selection, perceptual integration, and the unification of consciousness. Neural systems in the hippocampus then bind these disparate cortical representations into unitary episodic representations. ERP and fMRI imaging confirm these neural correlates of consciousness, a surge of widespread activity in a coalition of forebrain and parietal areas interconnected via widespread cortico-cortico and cortico-thalamic feedback loops with sets of neurons in sensory and motor regions that code for particular features, and the subsequent hippocampal activity involved in the consolidation of novel explicit memories. These are the mechanisms by which Schmidt’s noticing helps solve Quine’s problem of referential indeterminacy (Ellis 2005).

This means is most relevant where the language form is of low salience and where L1 experience has tuned the learner’s attention elsewhere: “Since many features of L2 input are likely to be infrequent, non-salient, and communicatively redundant, intentionally focused attention may be a practical (though not theoretical) necessity for successful language learning” (Schmidt 2001, 23). Instruction is thus targeted at increasing the salience of commonly ignored features by firstly pointing them out and explaining their structure and, secondly by providing meaningful input that contains many instances of the same grammatical meaning-form relationship (Terrell 1991). Once consolidated into the construction, it is this new cue to interpretation of the input whose strengths are incremented on each subsequent processing episode. The cue does not have to be repeatedly noticed thereafter; once consolidated, mere use in processing for meaning is enough for implicit tallying.

A meta-analysis of Norris and Ortega (2000) of twenty-five explicit form-focused treatments from a wide variety of studies with interventions including consciousness raising, input processing, compound focus on form, metalinguistic task essentialness, and rule-oriented focus on form, demonstrated an average effect size of these various treatments in excess of 1.2. More generally still, the same meta-analysis demonstrated average effect sizes in excess of 1.0 for sixty-nine different explicit instructional treatments, whether they involved focus on form or more traditional

focus on forms. It is true that explicit instruction evidences greater effect on outcome measures that are themselves more explicit and metalinguistic in content (Norris and Ortega 2000), but form-focused instruction results in a medium-sized effect on free constructed production measures too (Norris and Ortega 2000). We need more studies to look at the effects of explicit instruction using outcome measures that particularly focus on different aspects of implicit knowledge and processing (Doughty 2004), but the weight of the evidence to date is in favor of significant interface by the means of attention being focused upon relevant form-meaning connections.

Noticing the Gap

A learner's flawed output can prompt negative feedback in the form of a "corrective recast," that is, a reformulation of his or her immediately preceding erroneous utterance, replacing non-target-like (lexical, grammatical, etc.) items by the corresponding target-language forms. Recasts arguably present the learner with psycholinguistic data that is optimized for acquisition because they make the gap apparent—in the contrast between their own erroneous utterance and the recast they highlight the relevant element of form at the same time as the desired meaning-to-be-expressed is still active, and the language learner can engage in focused input analysis. Long (2006) reviews more than forty descriptive, quasi-experimental, and experimental studies of the occurrence, usability, and use of recasts in classrooms, laboratory settings, and non-instructional conversation, showing that these techniques are generally effective in the promotion of uptake.

Output Practice

Explicit memories can guide the conscious building of novel linguistic utterances through processes of analogy. Formulas, drills, and declarative pedagogical grammar rules can all contribute to the conscious creation of utterances whose subsequent usage promotes implicit learning and proceduralization. Thus, by various means, the learner can use explicit knowledge to consciously construct an utterance in working memory. Anderson's (1988) ACT model described the move from declarative to procedural knowledge as three broad stages: a cognitive stage, where a declarative description of the procedure is learned; an associative stage, where the learner works on productions for performing the process; and an autonomous stage, where execution of the skill becomes rapid and automatic. McLaughlin (1987) described processes of L2 automatization, from the novice's slow and halting production by means of attentive control of construction in working memory to fluent automatic processing with the relevant programs and routines being executed swiftly and without reflection. DeKeyser (2001) provides more recent reviews of automatization and SLA as skill acquisition.

The balance of experimental findings supports the effectiveness for SLA of encouraging learners to produce output. Norris and Ortega (2000) summarized the results of six studies that involved explicit focus on forms followed by output practice which demonstrated a substantial average effect size of 1.39. DeKeyser et al. (2002) report five more recent studies, all of which substantiated that output-based treatments promoted learners to significant improvement on uses of the Spanish subjunctive, ac-

quisition of Spanish copulas, interpretation and production of the Italian future tense, and acquisition of the French causative. Keck et al. (2006) reported a meta-analysis of interaction studies showing that tasks involving opportunities for *pushed output* ($d = 1.05$) produced larger effect sizes than tasks without pushed output ($d = 0.61$) on immediate posttests. Taken together, these studies provide good reason to consider an interface of explicit knowledge upon implicit learning during output too.

Conclusion

In sum, although much of first language acquisition involves implicit learning (Ellis 2002), these mechanisms do not suffice for second language acquisition (SLA) because of learned attention and transfer from L1. SLA must therefore overcome the processing habits of the L1 by recruiting additional resources of explicit learning. The interface between explicit and implicit knowledge is dynamic: It happens transiently during conscious processing, but the influence upon implicit cognition endures thereafter. The various roles of consciousness in SLA include learners noticing negative evidence; their attending to language form, their perception focused by social scaffolding or explicit instruction; their voluntary use of pedagogical grammatical descriptions and analogical reasoning; their reflective induction of meta-linguistic insights about language; and their consciously guided practice that results, eventually, in unconscious, automatized skill. Consciousness creates access: its contents are broadcast throughout the brain to the vast array of our unconscious sources of knowledge, and by these means, consciousness is the interface.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, John R. 1988. Acquisition of cognitive skill. In *Readings in cognitive science: A perspective from psychology and artificial intelligence*, ed. Allan M. Collins and Edward Smith, 362–80.
- Baars, Bernard J. 1988. *A cognitive theory of consciousness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1997. In the theatre of consciousness: Global Workspace Theory, a rigorous scientific theory of consciousness. *Journal of Consciousness Studies* 4:292–309.
- Baars, Bernard J., William P. Banks, and James B. Newman, eds. 2003. *Essential sources in the scientific study of consciousness*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press/Bradford Books.
- Baars, Bernard J., and Stan Franklin. 2003. How conscious experience and working memory interact. *Trends in Cognitive Science* 7:166–72.
- Barsalou, Laurence W. 1999. Perceptual symbol systems. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 22:577–660.
- Bod, Rens, Jennifer Hay, and Stephanie Jannedy, eds. 2003. *Probabilistic linguistics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Bybee, Joan, and Paul Hopper, eds. 2001. *Frequency and the emergence of linguistic structure*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Christiansen, Morten H., and Nick Chater, eds. 2001. *Connectionist psycholinguistics*. Westport, CO: Ablex.
- Craik, Fergus I. M., and Robert S. Lockhart. 1972. Levels of processing: A framework for memory research. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 11:671–84.
- Dehaene, Stanislas, and Jean-Pierre Changeux. 2004. Neural mechanisms for access to consciousness. In *The cognitive neurosciences*, ed. by M. Gazzaniga. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Dehaene, Stanislas, Lionel Naccache, Laurent Cohen, Denis Le Bihan, Jean-François Mangin, Jean B. Poline, and Denis Riviere. 2001. Cerebral mechanisms of word masking and unconscious repetition priming. *Nature Neuroscience* 4 (7): 678–80.
- DeKeyser, Robert 2001. Automaticity and automatization. In *Cognition and second language acquisition*, ed. Peter Robinson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- DeKeyser, Robert, Rafael Salaberry, Peter Robinson, and Michael Harrington. 2002. What gets processed in processing instruction? A commentary on Bill VanPatten's "Processing Instruction: An Update." *Language Learning* 52:805–24.
- Doughty, Catherine. 2004. Effects of instruction on learning a second language: A critique of instructed SLA research. In *Form-meaning connections in second language acquisition*, ed. Bill VanPatten, Jessica Williams, Suzanne Rott, and Mark Overstreet. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Doughty, Catherine, and Jessica Williams, eds. 1998. *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Eichenbaum, Howard. 2002. *The cognitive neuroscience of memory*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, Andrew W., and Andrew W. Young. 1988. *Human cognitive neuropsychology*. Hove, Sussex, UK: Erlbaum.
- Ellis, Nick C., ed. 1994. *Implicit and explicit learning of languages*. San Diego: Academic Press.
- . 2002. Frequency effects in language processing: A review with implications for theories of implicit and explicit language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 24 (2): 143–88.
- . 2005. At the interface: Dynamic interactions of explicit and implicit language knowledge. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 27:305–52.
- . 2006a. Language acquisition as rational contingency learning. *Applied Linguistics* 27 (1): 1–24.
- . 2006b. Selective attention and transfer phenomena in SLA: Contingency, cue competition, salience, interference, overshadowing, blocking, and perceptual learning. *Applied Linguistics* 27 (2): 1–31.
- Ellis, Nick C., and Nadine Laporte. 1997. Contexts of acquisition: Effects of formal instruction and naturalistic exposure on second language acquisition. In *Tutorials in bilingualism: Psycholinguistic perspectives*, ed. Annette M. DeGroot and Judith F. Kroll. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Ellis, Nick C., and Dianne Larsen Freeman. 2006. Language emergence: Implications for Applied Linguistics. *Applied Linguistics* 27 (4): Whole issue.
- . 2009. Language as a Complex Adaptive System (Special Issue). *Language Learning* 59: Supplement 1.
- Ellis, Rod. 1994. A theory of instructed second language acquisition. In *Implicit and explicit learning of languages*, ed. Nick C. Ellis. San Diego: Academic.
- . 2000. *Learning a second language through interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Elman, Jeff L., Elizabeth A. Bates, Mark H. Johnson, Annette Karmiloff-Smith, Dominic Parisi, and Kim Plunkett. 1996. *Rethinking innateness: A connectionist perspective on development*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Frackowiak, Richard S. J., Karl J. Friston, Chris D. Frith, Raymond J. Dolan, Cathy J. Price, Semir Zeki, John Ashburner, and William Penny, eds. 2004. *Human brain function*. 2nd ed. *Human brain function*. London: Academic Press.
- Gould, Stephen J. 1982. *The Panda's thumb: More reflections on natural history*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Hebb, Donald O. 1949. *The organization of behaviour*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Hulstijn, Jan, and Robert DeKeyser, eds. 1997. Testing SLA theory in the research laboratory. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 19:2 (Special Issue).
- Jerison, Harry J. 1976. Paleoneurology and the evolution of mind. *Scientific American* 234:90–101.
- Keck, Casey M., Gina Iberri-Shea, Nicole Tracy, and Safari Wa-Mbaleka. 2006. Investigating the empirical link between interaction and acquisition: A quantitative meta-analysis. In *Synthesizing research on language learning and teaching*, ed. Lourdes Ortega and John Norris. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kelly, Louis G. 1969. *Twenty five centuries of language teaching*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Koch, Christof. 2004. *The quest for consciousness: A neurobiological approach*. Englewood, CO: Roberts and Company.
- Krashen, Stephen D. 1982. *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Lado, Robert. 1957. *Linguistics across cultures: Applied linguistics for language teachers*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Lightbown, Patsy M., Nina Spada, and Lydia White. 1993. The role of instruction in second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 15 (Special issue).
- Long, Michael H. 1991. Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective*, ed. Kees d. Bot, Ralph Ginsberg, and Claire Kramsch. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- . 2006. Recasts in SLA: The story so far. In *Problems in SLA*, ed. Michael Long. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Luria, Alexander R. 1973. *The working brain: An introduction to neuropsychology*. New York: Basic Books.
- MacWhinney, Brian. 1997a. Implicit and explicit processes: Commentary. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 19:277–82.
- . 1997b. Second language acquisition and the Competition Model. In *Tutorials in bilingualism: Psycholinguistic perspectives*, ed. Annette M. B. De Groot and Judith F. Kroll. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- McLaughlin, Barry. 1987. *Theories of second language learning*. London: Arnold.
- Norris, John, and Lourdes Ortega. 2000. Effectiveness of L2 instruction: A research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis. *Language Learning* 50:417–528.
- Odlin, Terence. 1989. *Language transfer*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- O’Grady, William. 2003. The radical middle: Nativism without Universal Grammar. In *Handbook of second language acquisition*, ed. Catherine Doughty and Michael H. Long. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Pulvermüller, Friedman. 1999. Words in the brain’s language. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 22:253–336.
- . 2003. *The neuroscience of language. On brain circuits of words and serial order*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Reber, Arthur S. 1976. Implicit learning of synthetic languages: The role of instructional set. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Learning and Memory* 2:88–94.
- Reber, Arthur S., Saul M. Kassin, Selma Lewis, and Gary W. Cantor. 1980. On the relationship between implicit and explicit modes in the learning of a complex rule structure. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Learning and Memory* 6:492–502.
- Rumelhart, David E., and James L. McClelland, eds. 1986. *Parallel distributed processing: Explorations in the microstructure of cognition*. Vol. 2, *Psychological and biological models*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Schacter, Daniel L. 1987. Implicit memory: History and current status. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition* 13:501–18.
- Schmidt, Richard. 1990. The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics* 11:129–58.
- . 2001. Attention. In *Cognition and second language instruction*, ed. Peter Robinson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Spada, Nina. 1997. Form-focused instruction and second language acquisition: A review of classroom and laboratory research. *Language Teaching Research* 30:73–87.
- Squire, Larry R., and Eric R. Kandel. 1999. *Memory: From mind to molecules*. New York: Scientific American Library.
- Stadler, Michael A., and Peter A. Frensch, eds. 1998. *Implicit learning handbook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Terrell, Tracy. 1991. The role of grammar instruction in a communicative approach. *The Modern Language Journal* 75:52–63.
- Weinreich, Uriel. 1953. *Languages in contact*. The Hague: Mouton.