Simultaneous Attention to Complex Linguistic Forms and Meaning During Input Processing

MURAOKA, Yuka

Abstract

The present study investigates whether it is possible for L2 learners to pay simultaneous attention to both meaning and forms during input processing, even when the forms are complex in nature. The study also examines whether there are any differences in the extent to which L2 learners can pay conscious attention to four target forms (the 3rd person singular marker, the plural marker, English articles, and indirect objects). The participants in this study were 41 Japanese college students randomly assigned into a Meaning-Only group (MO), a Form-Only group (FO), and a Form-Meaning group (MF). All of the groups engaged in a reading-comprehension activity by being exposed to a text containing errors regarding the four target forms. The MO group was asked to read a text only for comprehension; the FO group was instructed to read a text only for finding errors; and the MF group was directed to read a text both for comprehension and for finding errors. On the completion of the readings, all the groups were asked to write down as much of the text's content and errors that they could possibly remember. The rate of comprehension was assessed by means of idea unit analysis. The degree of noticing of erroneous forms was measured by calculating the number of the participants who reported to have detected errors during reading. The results appear to indicate that the participants could process meaning and forms concurrently to a certain extent; however, different structures resulted in different amounts of processing.

Introduction

Attention and noticing have been claimed to be central cognitive constructs to be importantly involved in SLA and necessary concepts to understand virtually

every aspect of SLA (Doughty, 2001; Schmidt, 2001; VanPatten, 1994, 1996, 2002). Schmidt (1990, 1993, 1994a, 1994b, 1995, 2001) argues that subjective experience of noticing is necessary for input to become intake. Since intake is part of input that is available for further language learning processing, it can be argued that L2 learning is largely driven by what L2 learners pay attention to and notice in input. Following this theoretical claim, a large number of studies (i.e., Focus on Form) have been conducted to explore any possible pedagogical ways of directing L2 learners' conscious attention to some linguistic forms within contexts where meaning is always primary (see Doughty & William, 1998 for detailed explanation). The underlying assumption of this strand of research is that L2 learners are able to shift their attention to forms while they mainly engage in meaning comprehension and production.

Nonetheless, whether second language (L2) learners can actually pay conscious attention to both forms and meaning concurrently during input processing has been a question in which a deep division exists. There are principally two contrasting perspectives. VanPatten (1990, 1996) and Skehan (1996, 1998) argue that attentional resources are limited and they compete for forms and meaning. They maintain that L2 learners can pay attention to both forms and meaning only when comprehension of content is automatized as a skill[1]. On the other hand, Robinson (2001a, 2001b, 2003) and other researchers (Dekeyser, Salaberry, Robinson, and Harrington, 2002) contend that attention to forms and meaning do not need to be in competition for attentional resources. It is practically possible to process forms and meaning at the same. These different claims are based on different cognitive theories that view attention either as a single-resource and limited-capacity (Kahneman, 1973) or as multiple resources (i.e., a collection of limited-capacity attentional resources) (Wickens, 1984, 1989). In the former case, due to the limited capacity of attention as a single resource pool, it is speculated that attention to meaning and forms may compete against each other. In the latter case, attention has multiple resource pools. It is argued that there is no general capacity limitation on attention as long as attentional resources are drawn from separate resource pools.

A large number of studies conducted under 'Focus on Form' seem to show some indirect evidence that L2 learners' conscious attention could be somehow drawn to forms through input enhancement techniques such as visual enhancement or corrective feedback while processing for meaning. These results seem to lend support to the position that simultaneous processing of forms and meaning is

possible. However, the study conducted by VanPatten (1990) appears to demonstrate that there is a trade-off effect between forms and meaning. Beside the question of whether or not attention to forms and meaning is possible, it is also significant to investigate whether L2 learners can pay conscious attention to all linguistic structures in the same manner. Since linguistic structures differ in a degree of complexity, it is logical to presume that different structures require different amounts of attention. Especially in the case of structures that are non-salient or complex in nature, it is questionable whether L2 learners can pay attention to those forms while processing primarily for meaning. The present study examines whether simultaneous attention to forms and meaning is still possible even when such forms are complex in nature. The elucidation of factors making structures complex or simple will be presented followed by two research questions and a description of the study method.

Factors Making Structures Complex or Simple

There is considerable controversy as to which factors make a given linguistic structure more or less easy or difficult. The precise definition of what it is meant by a difficult or easy rule has not been clearly established yet (Dekeyser, 1995, 1998; Hultiijn, 1995; Hulstijn & DeGraaff, 1994; Robinson, 1996). However, some suggestions have been put forward by a number of researchers. Among many claims, Krashen's argument (1982) is widely known for the view that simple rules are those that are formally and functionally simple and whose meaning is clear and easily explained. One example of the simple rules is the 3rd person singular -*s* since it requires the mere addition of a bound morpheme and its meaning is straightforward[2]. On the other hand, difficult rules are those requiring "permutations, and movements of constituents from one part of a sentence to another" (1982, p. 97). One such example is the formation of the *wh*-question in English, which involves a large number of operations. With respect to the formal and functional simplicity of the 3rd person singular -*s* advocated by Krashen, Dekeyser (1998), however, contends that its form-function relationship is not transparent since "one morpheme expresses several semantic concepts at the same time (present tense, singular, third person), and the rule has a number of high-frequency exception (modals)" (p. 44). Dekeyser further argues that rather than focusing on the surface realization of formal simplicity such as a presence or absence of -*s*, functional complexity of the rules should be also taken

into consideration.

Doughty and Williams (1998), referring to Westney (1994), explicate that difficulty rules can be of two types: the first type contains rules that cannot be completely described without resource to exceptions (e.g., dative alternation in English), and the second is the type that is semantically and pragmatically complex (e.g., English articles). Doughty and Williams maintain that one important sense of complex structures is that rules are ultimately so complex that a complete and clear description of them is almost impossible. Similarly, Han (2004) points out that complex rules entail *fuzziness*, which affects the extent to which certain rules are hard to learn or teach. Some forms are *fuzzy* in a sense that they do not allow a formal analysis and a full account of the rules due to the requirements of multiple form-function mappings or intricate semantic-syntactic mapping. Thus, language teachers fail to describe rules in a comprehensible manner and learners cannot internalize such rules.

Hulstijn and de Graaff (1994) and Hulstijn (1995) take an elaborate approach to the distinction of an easy and difficult rule. It is claimed that the notion of difficulty cannot be easily described since it involves the following implications: difficulty in terms of prior metalinguistic knowledge (i.e., whether or not learners are familiar with notions such as subjects, verbs, etc.), contrasts between foreign and first language (i.e., whether or not L2 rules greatly differ from learners' L1 grammar), duration of acquisition (i.e., how much time is taken to acquire structures), reliability (i.e., whether rules have few or no exceptions), and purely formal vs. formal-semantic distinctions (i.e., whether form distinction has corresponding meaning distinction). Bearing various interpretations the term *difficulty* entails, Hulstijn (1995) proposes that factors such as scope (i.e., large scope rules cover a larger number of items than small scope rules), reliability (i.e., reliable rules have few exceptional rules), frequency, mode of command (i.e., the development of receptive knowledge, not of production, may be sufficient for beginners), and comprehensibility of explanation (i.e., rules have high comprehensibility if they can be delineated without grammatical jargon) should be called into account in considering the necessity of conscious attention. Overall, it is suggested that those forms which are frequently occurring in input and have larger scope and high reliability (i.e., forms with few or no exceptions) are best candidates for explicit instruction.

A distinction between difficult or easy structures can be also explicated from the perspective of input processing: some forms are more likely to be easily processed

than others. Taking the psycholinguistic perspective of input processing, VanPatten (1996, 2002) argues that L2 learners process input primarily for meaning (content words) and prefer processing lexical items to grammatical items (e.g., morphological marking) to detect meaning. In processing grammatical items, L2 learners process morphology with high communicative value before forms with less or non-communicative value. VanPatten maintains that communicative value is decided by the meaning that a form contributes to overall sentence meaning and is based on two features such as inherent semantic value and redundancy. If grammatical forms have inherent semantic value and are not redundant, those are more likely to capture learners' attention. One example falling within this category is progressive *-ing* in English, which encodes the progressive aspect (inherent semantic value) and seldom co-occurs with other lexical items to provide cues to aspect. However, if forms have inherent semantic value but are redundant, those might not receive learners' attention until the processing of content words and of lexical words becomes automatized. The English verbal inflection *-s* is one such example. It "has semantic value since it encodes the semantic notion of third person singular, but it is also redundant because a subject noun-phrase is almost always obligatory in English syntax" (p. 25). It is posited that grammatical features with less or no communicative value might be acquired only when L2 learners can process meaningful content at little cost to attentional resources.

To recapitulate, VanPatten (1996, 2002) suggests that during input processing, learners pay attention to content words, lexical items, and communicatively-valued morphology in a liner fashion. This in turn implies that they do not pay attention to functional words, grammatical items (e.g., suffix of verbs), and less or non-communicatively meaningful morphology (e.g., the 3rd person marker *-s* or tense marker). Beside the communicative value of forms, VanPatten (1996) also suggests that linguistic forms that are perceptually non-salient are difficult to notice. Saliency involves acoustic features (e.g., syllabicity), stress, and position in a word, sentence, or utterance. Or it may be related to frequency or the context of a given message (VanPatten, Williams, & Rott, 2004). Items that are nonsyllabic, unstressed, in the middle position in a word or an utterance are unlikely to be noticed by learners.

Infrequency in input would be also another possible factor that makes structures difficult and simple. For instance, Swain (1991) reports that some linguistic forms are not merely frequently occurring both in natural language environment and language classrooms. In classrooms, Swain found that the immersion students' use of

verb forms was strikingly skewed. This is because teacher talk revealed that 75% of the verbs were used mostly in the present or imperative contexts, 15% in the context of past tense, 6% in the future tense, and 3% in the conditional. This distorted occurrence of verbs was reflected in the learners' performance. It is also reported that French *tu* and *vous* (i.e., both forms are used as a signal for grammatical information and a marker of politeness or deference) were both frequently used in the classroom; however, French *vous* was hardly used as a marker of politeness or deference. The unequal distribution of French *tu* and *vous* as markers of politeness seemed to result in immersion students' restrictive use of *tu* in both contexts. VanPatten et al. (2004), however, maintain that the effect of frequency does not have the same impact on all aspects of language. Lexical learning would be more influenced by frequency in comparison to the learning of grammatical forms, which often represent "underlying formal abstractions, which learners can neither notice nor compute" (VanPatten et al., 2004, p. 16). It is further argued that frequency may be not so effective if learners are not ready and if a form in question is not salient and requires explicit learning due to its complexity. Therefore, frequency may or may not be a factor which makes forms more or less difficult.

Besides the objective difficulty of the structures themselves elucidated above, Dekeyser (2003) states that individual differences such as intelligence, motivation, and aptitude would play a part to make forms difficult or simple. Dekeyser points out that "rule difficulty is an individual issue that can be described as the ratio of the rule's inherent linguistic complexity to the student's ability to handle such a rule" (p. 331). Two individual students who vary in their language learning aptitude or learning experience process certain structures in a different manner. The structure which is difficult for one student is not so difficult for another student; therefore, together with the objective difficulty, there is "subjective difficulty of the rule" (p. 332).

To summarize, complex or simple structures can be defined in a variety of ways and there seems to be no explicit set of objective criterion. Various features appear to be involved: formal, functional, semantic, psycholinguistic features, and individual differences, all of which are interwoven to render forms more complex or less complex. Objectively speaking, it seems that linguistic forms that are formally and functionally complex, and those that are not semantically and perceptually salient, and those that are redundant and infrequent in input can be classified as complex forms while forms with opposite features as simple forms. One clear point, however,

is that the distinction between complex and simple structures is not clearly evident; rather, a degree of difficulty can be determined along a continuum and in consideration of individual differences.

Target Structures

Based on the discussions presented above, the present study focuses on the following four linguistic structures: the 3ʳᵈ person singular marker -*s*, the plural marker -(*e*)*s*, English articles, and dative verbs. All of the forms can be categorized as complex linguistic structures and have been reported to be problematic for L2 learners to acquire regardless of their native languages and regardless of sufficient amounts of exposure and instruction as 'fossilization' studies have shown (Han, 2004). In order to examine if L2 learners can pay conscious attention to these four complex structures while processing mainly for meaning, the study created a text containing errors with respect to each target form (see Appendix A). The text includes eight grammatical errors: two omissions of the 3ʳᵈ person singular -*s*, two omissions of the plural marker -(*e*)*s*, two omissions of the articles *a* and *the* (i.e., one omission of each type), and two errors of indirect objects (e.g., two indirect objects were mistakenly placed after the dative verbs such as *drive* and *open* that obligatorily take the prepositional phrase complements). It is empirically interesting to investigate how much L2 learners can notice those errors within the contexts where meaning comprehension is the primary purpose.

Research Questions

The following two research questions were addressed in the present study:
(1) Is it possible for L2 learners to pay simultaneous attention to meaning and forms, even when such forms are complex in nature ?
(2) Is there any difference in the extent to which L2 learners are able to pay conscious attention to four complex linguistic forms (the 3rd person singular marker -*s*, the plural marker -(*e*)*s*, English articles, and indirect objects) ?

Method

Participants

The participants were 41 Japanese college students enrolled in a private university in Tokyo between the ages of 19-20. They were at the intermediate level of English, consisting of two intact classes. The participants in each class were randomly assigned into three different condition groups: Meaning-Only Group [MO; n = 13], Form-Only Group [FO; n = 16], and Meaning-Form Group [MF; n = 12].

Procedures

All of the participants received a package containing a series of tasks. On the first page, they engaged in the activity of reading comprehension by being exposed to the same reading text containing four types of errors (see Appendix A). However, different instruction was provided to each group. The MO group was instructed to read a text only for comprehension; the FO group was instructed to read a text only for finding grammatical errors; and the MF group was instructed to read a text both for comprehension and for finding grammatical errors at the same time. Immediately after the readings were completed, the MO group and the MF group were asked to go to the next page and write down whatever messages they remembered without looking at the text. On the other hand, the FO was asked to write down whatever grammatical errors they found in the text. Then, on the next page, the MO group and the MF group were asked to write down as much of the content that they could possibly remember from the text. Since both the MO group and the FO group did not know in advance that they would be asked to report grammatical errors or to write down the contents of the text, their performances would reflect standard achievements of this population. Thus, the data obtained from the MO group and the FO group at this stage were used as a baseline in this study. On the last page, they were exposed to the same text in which the errors were corrected and asked to write any comments on the reasons why they could not notice such errors. The comments the participants made on this page were used as secondary data to interpret findings.

Scoring and Analyses

The amount of comprehension was assessed by means of free written recalls in Japanese, following VanPatten (1990). According to VanPatten, recall protocols

would reflect how much attention learners paid to the content. Less attention to content would result in lower recall protocols or vice versa. The amount of the recalls was further evaluated by using an idea unit analysis. In this analysis, learners' recall protocols were analyzed based on the idea unit of the original passage[3] (See Appendix B). One point was assigned for one idea unit, producing 16 points as a maximum. Therefore, the free-written-recall scores consisted of the raw number of idea units that were recalled. In order to assess the rate at which complex grammatical errors were noticed during input processing, the number of the participants who noticed the errors regarding four linguistic forms was calculated. This way of analysis may demonstrate which error was more likely to be noticed or not noticed by the participants while engaging in meaning comprehension.

To address Research Question 1, the scores on the written recalls were submitted to the Kruskal-Wallis test to check for significant differences among the three groups. The Mann-Whitney U tests were further performed to investigate significant differences in each possible pair. To address Research Question 2, the number of the participants who detected the errors were carefully examined and analyzed.

Results

Table 1 presents descriptive statistics for the written-recall scores. Table 1 shows the MO and the MF groups performed similarly in terms of the free-written-recall scores, but they are different from the FO group. The results of the Kruskal-Wallis test showed that there were significant differences in the three groups, χ^2 (2, N=41) = .004, p < .05. The results of the Mann-Whitney U tests revealed that there was a significant difference between the MO and the FO, z = − 3.046, p <.05. However, significant differences were not found between the MO and

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for the Written Recalls Scores

MO (n = 13)	FO (n = 16)	MF (n = 12)
M = 10.31	M = 6.56	M = 9.00
SD = 2.562	SD = 3.577	SD = 2.148

Note. MO refers to Meaning-Only Group; FO to Form-Only Group; and MF to Meaning-Form Group. The possible maximum points were 16.

Table 2

Number of Participants who Noticed Errors

Structures	MO (n = 13)	FO (n = 16)	MF (n = 12)	Average (n = 41)
3rd Person Marker -*s*	0	14 (88%)	7 (58%)	21 (51%)
Plural Marker -(*e*)*s*	0	9 (56%)	8 (67%)	17 (41%)
Articles *a/the*	0	5 (31%)	1 (8 %)	6 (15%)
Indirect Object	2 (15%)	9 (56%)	3 (25%)	14 (34%)

Note. MO refers to Meaning-Only Group; FO to Form-Only Group; and MF to Meaning-Form Group. Average percentages of the participants who noticed each type of error are presented in the parentheses.

the MF, $z = -1.678$, p = .098 and between the FO and the MF, $z = -1.924$, p = .054. The inspection of the distribution patterns of the MO and FO groups appears to suggest that there were significantly more participants who got high scores on the written recalls in the MO group than in the FO group. This result may be due to the different instructions provided to each group.

Table 2 presents the number of the participants who noticed the errors regarding the four linguistic forms. As Table 2 shows, the MO failed to notice most of the errors; only the indirect object error was noticed by two participants. On the other hand, all types of the errors were detected by the FO and the MF groups; but degrees of noticing differ according to the structures. The error regarding the 3rd person singular marker -*s* was noticed by many participants in both groups (88% in the FO group and 58% in the MF group). More than half of the participants in the FO group and the MF group noticed the plural error (56% and 67% respectively). Regarding the error of English articles, only a few participants could notice such errors (31% in the FO group and 8% in the MF group). The error with respect to indirect objects was recognized by 56% of the FO group while only 25% of the MF group could detect this type of error. The detailed discussions on these findings will follow in the next section.

Discussion

The present study investigates whether or not L2 learners can pay conscious attention to complex forms while mainly engaging in meaning comprehension. The study also examines if there are any differences in the degrees of noticing of errors regarding the four complex linguistic structures. With respect to the first question, the results seem to indicate that it is possible for L2 learners to pay simultaneous attention to meaning and complex forms. In this study, the MO group and the FO group served as a baseline for the study. The MF group was the only group that was asked to process meaning and forms simultaneously. The MO group was asked to read a text only for comprehension, therefore, the results of the written recall demonstrated by this group can be taken as a standard achievement of this population. When comparing the MO and MF groups in terms of the written recalls, there was no significant difference between them. Therefore, regardless of the instruction provided to the MF group to read the text and find errors at the same time, this group showed almost the same degree of comprehension as the MO group. Conversely, the FO group was directed to find errors only; thus, the results regarding the errors revealed by this group can be taken as the average performance of the population. The results shown in Table 2 generally indicate that the FO group and the MF group did not remarkably differ in the extent of detecting the errors. All errors were recognized by both groups although the degrees vary depending on the forms. Since the MF group presented similar behaviors in terms of the detection of the errors to the FO group, it can be said that the MF group succeeded in finding errors and comprehending the contents of the assigned text. To recapitulate, the results of the present study appear to imply that simultaneous processing of meaning and forms was possible even when forms were complex structures.

As to the second question, the results clearly present that there were clear differences in degrees of noticing of the errors with respect to the four linguistic forms. The data seem to show that not all the forms attracted the participants' attention in the same manner. According to Table 2 presented above, the hierarchy of difficulty was as follows: articles *a/the* > indirect objects > the plural marker -*(e)s* > the 3rd person singular -*s*. The errors regarding the plural marker and the 3rd person singular maker were detected by more than half of the participants in the FO and the MF groups, which seem to indicate that noticing the errors of these two

forms while engaging in meaning comprehension was not so difficult for them. However, one caveat is that none of the participants in the MO group noticed the errors of the plural and the 3rd person markers when they were just asked to read the text only for comprehension. The comments made by the MO group seem to imply that the students failed to notice such errors not because they did not know the grammatical rules, but rather because they simply did not pay attention to those forms during input processing. This result seems to imply that the omissions of the plural and the 3rd person singular markers did not seriously impede the comprehension of overall meaning, as suggested by VanPatten (1996) that verbal morphologies do not carry heavy communicative value. In addition, it appears that the participants in the MO group mainly engage in lexical processing as a default mode. If syntactic processing had been operated, at least one participant in this group would have detected these types of errors. The fact that none of the participants in the MO group were able to notice these errors may suggest that both the 3rd person singular and plural markers are easy to be noticed consciously but they are difficult to be processed subconsciously. This result might shed light on why so many L2 learners fail to add
-$(e)s$ when speaking and writing.

The error regarding indirect objects (e.g., "Dr. Smith drives Mary the car" and "He always opens Mary the door.") was detected not only by the FO group and the MF group, but also by the MO group. In fact, the indirect object was the only error the MO group noticed during input processing. As discussed above, it seems that the MO group mainly engaged in lexical processing during reading comprehension, not in syntactic processing. On that account, it can be presumed that the processing of indirect objects may be more lexical-oriented rather than syntactic-oriented. As compared to the errors of the 3rd person singular and plural markers, which can be nonsalient features due to their morphosyntactic status, the errors regarding indirect objects seem to be more noticeable for the participants. Thus, even though the grammatical rules relating to indirect objects are relatively complex, the participants could still pay conscious attention to such forms to a certain extent during input processing.

The data in this study show that English articles were the most difficult feature to be noticed. Only 31 percents of the FO group could notice the errors of English articles even though they were directed to find errors. The comments made by the participants seem to indicate that they simply did not have sufficient knowledge

about the rules of English articles. Their insufficient knowledge might in turn imply that the grammatical properties of English articles are quite complex to be fully understood regardless of their high-frequent appearance in input. Therefore, it can be assumed that when forms are inherently complex, L2 learners may not be able to pay conscious attention to those forms while engaging in meaning comprehension.

Conclusion

The present study explores the perplexing question whether L2 learners can process meaning and complex forms simultaneously during input processing. The analyses appear to indicate that different structures have produced different results. In the case of the 3rd person singular and plural markers, high percentages of the participants in the FO group and the MF group could notice these types of errors without affecting their comprehension negatively. Therefore, when they were asked, they could detect the errors of the 3rd person singular and plural markers to a certain extent. The errors of indirect objects were detected by all the three groups. Since the MO group seemed to have engaged in lexical processing and could still detect this type of error, it can be presumed that the processing of indirect objects may be more lexical-oriented. With respect to English articles, the participants showed considerable difficulty in processing these forms. Such a difficulty may be due to the inherent complexity that English articles entail.

Some implications of the results found in this study would be that for L2 learning to take place their conscious attention has to be somehow directed to grammatical aspects within meaningful contexts. This is because paying attention to some linguistic forms does not occur naturally as revealed by the MO group, who failed to notice the errors of the 3rd person singular and plural markers when they were asked to read a text only for comprehension. The automatization of comprehension as a skill does not appear to guarantee learners' involuntary focus on forms although VanPatten claims it does (1990, 1996). Therefore, more studies are called for to explore any pedagogical ways to direct learners' attention to forms during meaning comprehension and production. Furthermore, the present study appears to indicate that not all the linguistic forms attract L2 learners' attention in the same manner. Thus, examining which linguistic structure requires certain degrees of conscious attention is significant for future research.

Notes

1. According to VanPatten and Skehan, meaning has priority over form in the case of adult L2 learners. Therefore, most of the attentional resources are primarily allotted to meaning comprehension and not enough resource left for forms.

2. Even though both Krashen (1982) and Ellis (1990) consent that forms that are formally and functionally simple and transparent can constitute an easy rule, Ellis (1990) does not regard the third person -s as formally simple. Ellis argues that the third person singular -s involves complex processing operations, following Pienemann's account that "it is an example of non-local morphemes, as the learner has to transfer information from the grammatical subject to the verb" (p. 173). Also, Ellis argues that the third person singular -s is not perceptually salient and does not carry heavy communicative value.

3. Idea units are composed of a single main or subordinate clause. Infinitival construction, gerundive, nominalized verb phrases, conjunct, optional and/or heavy prepositional phrases can be also counted as separate idea units.

References

Dekeyser, M. R. (1995). Learning second language grammar rules: An experiment with a miniature linguistic system. *SSLA, 17*, 379-410.

Dekeyser, M. R. (1998). Beyond focus on form: Cognitive perspectives on learning and practicing second language grammar. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 42-63). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Dekeyser, M. R. (2003). Implicit and explicit learning. In C. Doughty and M. Long (Eds.) *The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 313-348). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Dekeyser, N. R., Salaberry, R., Robinon, P., & Harrington, M. (2002). What gets processed in processing instruction? A commentary on Bill VanPatten's "Processing instruction: An update." *Language Learning, 52* (4), 805-823.

Doughty, C. (2001). Cognitive underpinning of focus on form. In P. Robinson (Ed.) *Cognition and Second Language Instruction* (pp. 206-257). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Doughty, C., & Williams, J. (1998). *Focus on form in classroom second language*

acquisition. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, R. (1990). *Instructed second language acquisition.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Han, Z-H. (2004). *Fossilization in adult second language acquisition.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters LTD.

Hulstijn, H. J. (1995). Not all grammar rules are equal: Giving grammar instruction its proper place in foreign language teaching. In R. Schmidt (Ed.), *Attention & awareness in foreign language learning* (pp. 359-386). Honolulu, Hawai'i: University of Hawai'i Press.

Hulstijn, H. J., & de Graaff, R. (1994). Under what conditions does explicit knowledge of a second language facilitate the acquisition of implicit knowledge? A research proposal. *AILA Review, 11,* 97-113.

Kahneman, D. (1973). *Attention and effort.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition.* Oxford: Pergamon.

Robinson, P. (1996). Learning simple and complex second language rules under implicit, incidental, rule-search, and instructed conditions. *SSLA, 18,* 27-67.

Robinson, P. (2001a). Task complexity, task difficulty, and task production: Exploring interactions in a componential framework. *Applied Linguistics, 22* (1), 27-57.

Robinson, P. (2001b). Task complexity, cognitive resources, and syllabus design: a triadic framework for examining task influences on SLA. In P. Robinson (Ed.) *Cognition and Second Language Instruction* (pp. 287-318). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Robinson, P. (2003). Attention and Memory during SLA. In C. Doughty and M. Long (Eds.) *The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 631-678). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics, 11,* 129-158.

Schmidt, R. (1993). Awareness and second language acquisition. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 13,* 206-226.

Schmidt, R. (1994a). Implicit learning and the cognitive unconscious: Of artificial grammars and SLA. In N. Ellis (Ed.), *Implicit and explicit learning of languages* (pp. 165-209). London: Academic Press.

Schmidt, R. (1994b). Deconstructing consciousness in search of useful definitions for Applied Linguistics. *AILA Review, 11,* 11-26.

Schmidt, R. (1995). Consciousness and foreign language learning: A tutorial on the

role of attention and awareness in learning. In R. Schmidt (Ed.), *Attention and awareness in foreign language learning* (pp. 1-63). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii's Press.

Schmidt, R. (2001). Attention. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 3-32). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Skehan, P. (1996). A framework for the implementation of task-based instruction. *Applied Linguistics, 17,* 38-62.

Skehan, P. (1998). *A cognitive approach to language learning.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Swain, M. (1991). French immersion and its offshoots: Getting two for one. In B. F. Freed (Ed.), *Foreign language acquisition research and the classroom* (pp. 91-103). Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.

VanPatten, B. (1990). Attending to form and content in the input: An experiment in consciousness. *SSLA, 12,* 287-301.

VanPatten, B. (1994). Evaluating the role of consciousness in second language acquisition: Terms, linguistic features & research methodology. *AILA Review, 11,* 27-36.

VanPatten, B. (1996). *Input processing and grammar instruction.* New York: Ablex.

VanPatten, B. (2002). Processing instruction: An update. *Language Learning, 52* (4), 755-803.

VanPatten, B., Williams, J., & Rott, S. (2004). Form-meaning connection in second language acquisition. In B. VanPatten, J. Williams, & S. Rott (Eds.), *Form-meaning connections in second language acquisition* (pp. 1-26). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Westney, P. (1994). Rules and pedagogical grammar. In T. Odlin (Ed.), *Perspectives on pedagogical grammar* (pp. 72-96). New York: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Wickens, C. (1984). Processing resources in attention. In R. Parasuraman & D. R. Davies (Eds.), *Varieties of attention* (pp. 63-102). New York: Academic Press.

Wickens, C. (1989). Attention and skilled performance. In D. Holding (Ed.), *Human skills* (pp. 71-105). New York: John Wiley.

APPENDIX A: Reading Texts Containing Errors

Dr. Smith is a dentist in New York. His wife, Mary, is nurse. She work in a hospital in New York. Hospital where Mary works is near the Central Park. They are

rich. They own two house and three car. Dr. Smith is a gentle man. Every morning, Dr. Smith drives Mary the car. He makes coffee for Mary. He always opens Mary the door. Mary is always happy.

APPENDIX B: Idea Unit Analysis

1. Dr. Smith is a dentist
2. in New York
3. His wife, Mary, is a nurse.
4. She works in a hospital
5. in New York
6. Hospital where Mary works is
7. near the Central Park
8. They are rich
9. They own two house
10. and three car.
11. Dr. Smith is a gentle man.
12. Every morning,
13. Dr. Smith drives Mary the car
14. He makes coffee for Mary
15. He always opens Mary the door
16. Mary is always happy.