Reformulation and the Learning of French Pronominal Verbs in a Canadian French Immersion Context

In this article, we examine a subset of collaborative dialogues that occurred in a multistage task where 8 Canadian grade 7 French immersion students worked together in pairs. Each pair wrote a story, noticed differences between their text and a reformulator’s revision of that text, and reflected on their noticing. We analyze the transcripts of their talk in these 3 task sessions, identifying and describing the language-related episodes. We trace the development of the target language (French), with specific reference to pronominal verbs, from the learners’ first collaborative draft to their posttests. The study explores task differences and differences between lower- and higher-proficiency dyads. The language-related episodes selected for close analysis, along with the posttest data, provide evidence that in most cases, learners have progressed in their correct use of pronominal verbs in French.

IN THIS ARTICLE, WE EXAMINE A SUBSET OF collaborative dialogues that occurred while grade 7 French immersion students wrote, noticed differences between their text and a reformulator’s revision of that text, and reflected on their noticing. We also trace the development of the target language (French) during these activities, with specific reference to pronominal verbs, from the learners’ first collaborative draft to their posttests. Finally, we relate the students’ insights from their interviews to both process and product and explore pedagogical implications of the study.

CONTEXT AND RELEVANT LITERATURE

It has long been recognized that the listening and reading comprehension skills of French immersion students develop well and approach native-speaker levels on global comprehension measures by about the end of elementary school (e.g., Genesee, 1987; Swain & Lapkin, 1982). The productive skills of speaking and writing in the second language (L2), however, remain non-native-like even by the end of secondary school (e.g., Harley & Swain, 1985; Turnbull, Lapkin, Hart, & Swain, 1998; Wesche, 1993). Responses to these observations have been to provide learners with more opportunities for extended speech and writing (e.g., Kowal & Swain, 1997) and to address issues of accuracy in the L2 production of students whose classroom experiences have led them to be more concerned about communicating messages successfully than using the correct forms to do so.

Classroom treatment studies have been designed to address L2 features such as gender distinctions in French, sociolinguistic variation, and tense and aspect (many of these are reviewed in Lyster, 1995) with varying results (see Spada, 1997). The program of research we have undertaken over the past 7 years (Swain & Lapkin, 1995, 1998, 2001) puts the emphasis on output and collaborative dialogue (Swain, 1985, 1995, 1997) through tasks that entail a focus on both...
meaning and form. Collaborative dialogue is “dialogue in which speakers are engaged in problem-solving and knowledge-building” (Swain, 2000). In the study reported here, students are given the opportunity to solve language-related problems by being provided with a reformulation of a text they had written.

Reformulation is defined by Cohen (1983) as a technique consisting of “having a native writer of the target language rewrite the learner’s essay, preserving all the learner’s ideas, making it sound as nativelike as possible” (p. 4). Learners are then expected to compare their original version with the reformulated one, “with regard to vocabulary, syntax, cohesion, and rhetorical functions” (p. 5). As grammatical correctness is already likely to receive attention in standard teacher corrections, Cohen (1989) further suggested that “the issue is really one of style” (p. 1). Reformulation is seen as a chance to pay closer attention to appropriateness in students’ writing. Similarly, Thornbury (1997) described reformulation as going beyond “surface features of the text only” but did not go into detail on what aspects the reformulator is meant to concentrate on, while Hedge (1988) specified both “accuracy and appropriacy.” Allwright, Woodley, and Allwright (1988) stated that reformulation might “involve making changes at all levels” (p. 238). The details of reformulation are thus left to the native speaker who is charged with providing the native-like text without specific guidelines.

More information, however, emerges if reformulation is followed by noticing (Batstone, 1996), where learners compare their original text with the reformulated version. Schmidt (1990) defined noticing as conscious attention to input, and his noticing hypothesis proposes that noticing is a necessary condition for L2 development. Few L2 noticing studies offer direct empirical evidence that noticing leads to learning. The Schmidt and Frota (1986) case study provided some evidence for a close connection between noticing and subsequent L2 production, while Qi and Lapkin (2001) documented a relationship between noticing and learning and speculated that L2 learning may also be dependent on the quality of noticing.

In order to ensure effective noticing, some reformulation studies give detailed guidance to their students during the noticing stage. For example, to guide students’ comparisons, Sanaoui (1984) provided them with a list of six textual elements, ranging from vocabulary and syntax via cohesive devices, discourse functions, and overall organisation to stance towards the reader. Piper (1995) used the ESL Composition Profile (Jacobs, Zinkgraf, Wormuth, Hartfiel, & Hughey, 1981) as a basis for guided classroom discussion of reformulated texts. Thornbury (1997) suggested and enumerated a range of awareness-raising exercises to improve students’ noticing skills.

In the studies mentioned above, the students’ writing skills generally improved; however, how much of this improvement was due to the reformulation itself was not clear. Piper (1995) mentioned that, in addition to learners’ discussing reformulations in small groups, other phenomena, such as unobserved writing practices outside the classroom, could have contributed to gains in writing quality (p. 35). Working with adult FSL learners, Sanaoui (1984) reported that reformulation led to improvements in language form, text organization, and other aspects of effective writing. However, she was unable to demonstrate that these improvements resulted “solely from reformulation” (p. 143). Like Sanaoui (1984), we cannot demonstrate that the students’ changes to their original story resulted strictly from the reformulation. In fact, we believe that the multiple opportunities to revisit their text and to discuss the changes and why they might have been made on two occasions (in the noticing and stimulated recall stages) cumulatively resulted in improvements or learning.

Mantello (1996) compared reformulation to selective error correction in her teaching of the compound past tense (passé composé) to grade 8 extended French students. She found that in the reformulation group, learning went beyond the structure that was the focus of instruction. Furthermore, she reported that the performance of the students differed according to their level of proficiency in the target language: By comparison to weaker students, the stronger learners noticed many more differences between the texts they wrote and those same texts reformulated by Mantello, their teacher.

Allwright et al. (1988) presented reformulated texts to students for whole-class discussion and found that discussion was a key aspect of the technique. They suggested that future research focus on “what the learners themselves can tell us about the changes they make in their writing” (p. 254). The design of our study does just that by recording the dialogues of pairs of learners as they compared their texts to a native-speaker version, and as they reacted later (via “stimulated recall,” [Gass & Mackey, 2000]) to what they had said in their collaborative dialogues.
STUDY DESIGN

Participants

The data presented here come from four pairs of learners (see Table 1) from a grade 7 French immersion class in the greater Toronto area, where students are mainly from middle income families. Theirs is a typical French immersion program, where all instruction in the early years (from kindergarten through grade 2) is in French; English language arts is introduced in grade 3, and from then on the proportion of instruction in English increases until approximately grade 5, when half of the school subjects are taught in French and half in English.

The teacher provided ratings of overall proficiency in French for all the students in her class on a 7-point scale, where 7 indicated a high level of overall proficiency in the L2, and 1 a low level. The teacher also suggested the pairings when we told her we wanted, for each task, one pair of average students, and one pair composed of a strong and an average student.2 The pseudonyms of the participants are listed in Table 1, along with the proficiency rating assigned by the teacher.

Tasks

The jigsaw task involved pairs of students working together to construct, first orally and then in writing, a story based on a series of eight pictures (Appendix A) in a two-way information gap activity. The dictogloss task (Wajnryb, 1990) involved taking notes individually on a text read aloud twice at normal speed. The dictogloss was read twice by the teacher on the videotape who also taught the mini-lesson (see below). The students then worked with a partner to write the story they had heard, based on their two sets of notes. (For detailed information on these two tasks, see Swain & Lapkin, 2001.)

In designing the tasks for the data collection, we sought to make them as parallel as possible in terms of content. To arrive at the text in Appendix B, we showed the series of eight pictures to three adult native speakers of French and had them narrate the story. We then combined their transcribed narratives to form the dictogloss text which contains seven pronominal verbs. The pictures in the jigsaw condition therefore create a similar context for pronominal verbs.

Procedures

For each of the task sessions, the students were taken to a small room in the school where tape- and videorecorders were set up. Data collection occurred over a 2-week period according to the schedule shown in Table 2.

In the writing stage (stage 1), each pair saw a 5-minute videotaped lesson (see Appendix C for the text of the lesson) on pronominal verbs in French (les verbes réfléchis). The mini-lesson can be construed as a form of “input enhancement” (Sharwood Smith, 1993; White, 1998); the students were subsequently told to pay attention to pronominal verbs in doing the task.

Connors and Ouellette (1996) explained that “the possible readings for French pronominal-verbal constructions are (a) reflexive; (b) reciprocal; (c) intrinsic; and (d) passive” (p. 213). Most of the pronominal verbs that the students used and that we discuss in this article fall into the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants and Their Proficiency Ratings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pairs and Task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy and Monica (jigsaw)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nina and Dara (jigsaw)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam and Marnie (dictogloss)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim and Anna (dictogloss)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(a) category above, unless we note otherwise (see note 16). The metalinguistic term the immersion students are familiar with is *les verbes réfléchis.*

Details about how the mini-lesson was developed are provided in Lapkin and Swain (2000). The video included a short segment where 2 students modelled either the dictogloss (for the two dictogloss pairs) or the jigsaw (for the two jigsaw pairs). The model used a different set of pictures or a different dictogloss text from those shown in Appendixes A and B respectively; the latter stimuli were used in our study to prompt the pairs to write their story (pretest) collaboratively. The writing stage was done in French and took about 30 minutes. The students were given as much time as they needed to write their stories and throughout all stages of the task. They had no access to dictionaries or other such aids. The session was audio- and videotaped. Thereafter, a native French-speaking adult was asked to “revise the students’ text to reflect target-language usage, while preserving the students’ original meaning” or, in other words, to reformulate the story the pair had written.

In the noticing stage (stage 2) 2 days later, the pair was given their original story and the reformulation, both typewritten. The students were asked to notice differences between the two texts; some pairs used a highlighter to mark the differences they noticed, while others used a pen or pencil to underline or circle such differences. This stage was conducted in French and took approximately 10 minutes. It was also audio- and videotaped. The researchers then watched the videotapes, located where the students had verbalized differences between the two texts, and decided where the tape would be stopped during the stimulated recall session (stage 3).

Stage 3, the stimulated recall, occurred either 2 days (for dictogloss pairs; see Table 2) or 4 days (for jigsaw pairs) later (see Table 2). Each pair of students watched the tape of their stage 2 noticing activity. (In the case of Nancy and Monica, one of the students had said very little during the noticing stage, and so they did their stage 3 stimulated recall sessions separately in order to elicit more information from the quieter of the two students.) One research assistant stopped the tape at each feature they had noticed, while another identified the change and asked the students to comment on what they were thinking as they compared the two texts. This stage was conducted in English and took about 40 minutes.

Stage 4, the posttest stage, took place 4 days later. We returned their original (stage 1 or pretest) story to each pair, asking each student individually to make any changes he or she wanted. Each student took about 15 minutes to do this, rewriting the entire story.

We considered the stage 1 story to be a pretest and the stage 4 story, a posttest. The original (stage 1) stories were the product of negotiation and discussion during which language-related problems were raised and considered. The actual written product incorporated the pairs’ solutions to the problems that arose as well as errors they did not recognize as such. Thus their stories contained some undetected, unresolved, or incorrectly resolved problems (structures/sentences/text). These were the items or structures that the reformulator had changed. The stage 4 (posttest) stories that each student wrote

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2</th>
<th>Data Collection Timetable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>Noticing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 minutes, in French</td>
<td>10 minutes, in French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday of Week 1 for D pairs and Tuesday of Week 1 for J pairs</td>
<td>2 days after Stage 1, i.e., Wednesday for D pairs and Thursday for J pairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. D = dictogloss; J = jigsaw.

*For Marnie, Stages 4 and 5 were on the same day.*
included revisions that represent what he or she learned from the collaborative noticing of the feedback provided in the reformulated text and from the collaborative dialogue during the stage 3 stimulated recall.

The final stage (stage 5), held 1 day after stage 4, consisted of an interview, conducted individually, that took approximately 15 minutes. It was intended to elicit the students’ views on all stages of the task.

Unit of Analysis

We transcribed all the data and coded the data from the first three stages for language-related episodes (LREs), our operationalization of the construct of collaborative or problem-solving dialogue. We have defined LREs (see also Swain & Lapkin, 1995, 2001) as “any part of the dialogue where learners talk about the language they are producing or produced, question or reflect on their language use, or correct themselves or others.” We coded LREs in terms of their principal focus on lexis, form (grammar), or discourse.3

Rationale for Our Focus on Verbs, Specifically Pronominal Verbs

As we said above, the mini-lesson on French pronominal verbs (mainly reflexives) can be considered a form of input enhancement. In this article we focus on the subset of verbs that appear to have been influenced by this input.6 In so doing we are building on our earlier work on this topic (Lapkin & Swain, 2000).

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What lexical verbs and verb forms do students use when they write a story based on the jigsaw and dictogloss tasks? Do these differ quantitatively across tasks and by proficiency within task?
2. Do the participants make revisions to their original stories (i.e., learn) based on the reformulations and their collaborative dialogues?
3. What is the nature of the lexical and form LREs related to pronominal verbs? Are task or proficiency differences, or both, evident?
4. What insights do the students offer in their interviews (stage 5) about their learning of pronominal verbs?

FINDINGS

Question 1

Table 3 lists all the verbs found in the students’ original stories. The verbs in the first column occur in the stimulus text of the dictogloss; the verbs are given in their infinitive form, and verbs that can occur in either the pronominal or non-pronominal form (e.g., réveiller) are counted as two distinct verbs where both forms appear. Pronominal verbs are in bold face type because they are the focus of this study.

There are 14 different verbs in the dictogloss text (2 of which occur more than once). The dictogloss constitutes a model and constrains the number of different verbs used: $M = 9.5$ for the dictogloss pairs; $M = 13$ for the jigsaw pairs. Within tasks, the weaker pair in each case used fewer different verbs than the stronger counterpart: Compare Jim and Anna’s 8 different verbs to Sam and Marnie’s 11, and Nancy and Monica’s 9 to Nina and Dara’s 17.

From a semantic perspective (see Table 3), the verbs that appeared across at least three pairs (e.g., laver, chatouiller, dormir, s’habiller, se lever, réveiller, sonner) are included in or suggested by the text of the dictogloss and suggested by the nature of the pictures in the jigsaw. In our past work using the same stimuli in a collaborative writing task rather than a multistage task, we also found that the vocabulary use (based on a general rating of vocabulary) of jigsaw students was more wide-ranging than that of dictogloss students (Swain & Lapkin, 2001).

This finding appears to be substantiated with our current dataset in the sense that between them, at the pretest stage, the two dictogloss pairs used only four new verbs not in the original text (se réveiller, retourner, s’endormir, réveiller).8 Proficiency differences are evident too when we examine obligatory contexts for pronominal verbs: The stronger pairs created more obligatory contexts for pronominal verbs (Sam and Marnie—6; Nina and Dara—8) than the weaker pairs (Jim and Anna—3; Nancy and Monica—4).9

Questions 2 and 3

Number and Length of LREs Involving Pronominal Verbs. Table 4 shows the number of sets of lexical and form LREs, where pronominal verbs are the focus of discussion, and the variation in length of those LREs. At first inspection, no dramatic between-task differences in the number of LREs seem to have been generated, with the exception
TABLE 4
Number of Sets of LREs Relating to Pronominal Verbs by Student Pair

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs and Task</th>
<th>Number of Sets of Lexical Pronominal Verb LREs</th>
<th>Number of Sets of Form Pronominal Verb LREs</th>
<th>Number of Turns in Sets of LREs (Range)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sam and Marnie, Dictogloss (Stronger Pair)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19 to 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim and Anna, Dictogloss (Weaker Pair)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1(^a) to 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nina and Dara, Jigsaw (Stronger Pair)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13 to 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy and Monica, Jigsaw (Weaker Pair)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Two of Jim and Anna’s LREs are one turn in length and involve noticing a spelling error.

Note. (a) Pronominal verbs are in boldface; numbers in parentheses indicate how many times the verb was used in the text.
(*Note*) These verbs should be pronominals, so these are incorrect forms.
of Jim and Anna’s three form LREs. Two of the latter involve minor spelling mistakes and only one turn. Leaving the latter two LREs aside, there are a total of nine sets of LREs involving pronominal verbs across the pairs. Therefore there are 18 relevant posttest responses (9 sets of LREs × 2 students in each pair), that is, possible revisions based on the reformulations and ensuing collaborative dialogues. We regard such revisions as clear evidence of learning.

Table 5 then lists all the posttest verbs in pronominal contexts that the learners used in response to reformulated verb items. This table shows that the learners were correct or improved on 12 (66%) of these 18 items in their posttests. In the case of the form LREs, 4 students correctly supplied the reflexive pronoun se where it was required, while one student at least changed the verb form to the correct infinitive (but neglected to add se as well). In the case of the lexical LREs, six pronominal verbs were revised to conform to the reformulation (the seventh item, Monica’s se brosse remained unchanged but had already been correct in the original).

In addition, Table 4 provides some evidence of proficiency differences: The lengths of the sets of LREs are shorter (i.e., fewer turns are involved) for the less proficient pairs than for the more proficient pairs (see last column of Table 4). In fact, for Nancy and Monica, the weaker jigsaw pair, the only LRE related to a pronominal verb is two turns in length and occurred at the writing stage, where they worked out a correct solution:

Monica: Elle se brosse les cheveux et brosse les dents . . .
Nancy: . . . elle se . . . brosse . . . les . . . dents

Because this LRE does not result from noticing an item in the reformulation, it is not relevant to this article. Nancy and Monica, then, are not considered further here. (Their original story, its reformulation, and their posttests can be consulted in Appendix G.)

Qualitative Analysis of Selected LREs. We have selected six representative sets of LREs for qualitative analysis. Through these examples we explore to what extent the learners accepted changes made to their stories by the reformulator and whether their collaborative dialogue through multiple task stages provided occasions for learning (Swain & Lapkin, 1998). The examples below provide excerpts from the dialogues that took place during the writing, noticing, and stimulated recall stages. A chart for each example discussed presents the item or structure written by the dyad, its reformulation, and its realization in each student’s posttest. The full text of each pair’s story, its reformulation by the native speaker, and each learner’s posttest is found in Appendixes D, E, F, and G. Translations appear in Appendix H.

We begin with the stronger dictogloss pair, Sam and Marnie (Appendix D), who produced two extended (in terms of number of turns) sets of LREs related to pronominal verbs. These LREs yield important insights about the learners’ cognitive processes and language development.

We first present an example of a set of lexical LREs relating to se recoucher, followed by a set of form LREs relating to the same verb.

**Dictogloss Task (Lexical LRE)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Se recoucher (Lexical): Sam and Marnie</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Story (pretest)</th>
<th>Reformulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>elle retourne au lit</td>
<td>elle se recouche</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Posttest Sam</th>
<th>Posttest Marnie</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>elle se recouche</td>
<td>elle se recouche</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 5**

Posttest Verbs in Pronominal Contexts by Student

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form LREs</th>
<th>Lexical LREs</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unchanged from</td>
<td>Anna: réveillé</td>
<td>Dara: s’endort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect Pretest Item</td>
<td>Nina: brosse ses dents</td>
<td>Nina: brosse ses dents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dara: en brossant ses dents</td>
<td>Dara: en brossant ses dents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correct or Improved Item</td>
<td>Sam: se recouche</td>
<td>Sam: se recouche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marnie: se recouche</td>
<td>Marnie: se recouche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jim: réveiller</td>
<td>Jim: se rendort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nina: se souvient</td>
<td>Anna: se rendort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dara: se souvient</td>
<td>Nina: se rendort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nancy: se lave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monica: se brosse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| a Indicates a spelling error that was ignored for the purposes of this analysis. |
| b Jim correctly changed the form to the infinitive, but neglected to add the reflexive pronoun. |
Excerpt 1: Sam and Marnie, Writing Stage

M 56: Elle veut . . . elle veut . . . elle redorme ou quelque chose.
S 57: Non, . . . ah . . . elle retourne au lit.
M 58: Oui! Oui, oui, oui.
S 59: Elle . . . retourne . . . au lit.

In Excerpt 1 from the writing stage, Sam and Marnie negotiate the lexical verb to use, with Marnie proposing (the nonexistent) redorme in turn 56, and Sam countering with retourne (au lit) in turn 57. Marnie accepts this alternative in turn 58, and Sam writes it down while reading it aloud in turn 59. It is clear that both students know the morpheme re, though perhaps not how to produce its variant ren- (as in se rendormir), given that Marnie generates redorme and Sam, retourne. The solution they find does communicate (indeed, is a calque of) 'going back (returning) to bed,' but in a non-target-like manner.

Excerpt 2: Sam and Marnie, Noticing Stage

M 35: Elle . . .
S 36: Elle . . . se . . . recouche . . . OK.
M 37: se recouche.
S 38: Alors, um . . . Elle se . . .
M 39: Recouche.

In their stage 2 noticing discussion, Sam reads the reformulated se recouche, accepting it (“OK”) in turn 36; Marnie repeats it in turn 37, and in sequence they repeat it in turns 38 and 39.

Excerpt 3: Sam and Marnie, Stimulated Recall Stage

Researcher 141: OK why did you use se recouche there?
M 142: We had
S 143: We had retourne au lit.
M 144: se recouche which is . . .
S 145: It makes more sense.
M 146: Yes. [repeating to herself] Se recouche.
S 147: Retourne au lit would be more like wake up to go to the bathroom,
M 148: Yeah. It’s like come back.
S 149: but she was, she just she woke up and she was still in her bed and she went back to sleep.
M 150: Yeah and she went back to sleep [in a lower voice]. So it makes more sense.

In the stimulated recall in Excerpt 3 (stage 3), when the research assistant draws their attention to se recouche in turn 141 of the stage 3 stimulated recall, Sam states what they had used originally (turn 143) and Marnie repeats the reformulated item (se recouche) in turn 144. Sam asserts in turn 145 that “it makes more sense,” Marnie agrees in turn 146, and Sam explains further in turn 147 that retourne au lit “would be more like wake up to go to the bathroom,” thus recognizing that if one were in the bathroom, one would “go back to” or “return” to bed. Sam further realizes (turn 149) that the key idea is that “she went back to sleep” (although that verb in French is se rendormir), and Marnie agrees and states again: “So it makes more sense.” Both students get this item correct in their posttests (i.e., it corresponds to the reformulation), though Marnie makes a spelling mistake, omitting the final e.

Dictogloss Task (Form LRE)

Se recoucher (Form): Sam and Marnie

Original Story (pretest) Reformulation
elle retourne au lit elle se recouche

Posttest Sam Posttest Marnie
elle se recouch elle se recouche

elle se recouche elle se recouche

Next we present a set of LREs relating to the same verb but focusing on its formal properties, rather than on its lexical meaning. Even within this set of LREs focusing on form, there remain meaning components as Sam and Marnie discuss what a verbe réfléchi (pronominal verb) implies about meaning.

Excerpt 4: Sam and Marnie, Noticing Stage

M 35: Elle . . .
S 36: Elle . . . se . . . recouche . . . OK.
M 37: se recouche.
S 38: Alors, um . . . Elle se . . .
M 39: Recouche.

Excerpt 4 from the noticing stage contains the same LRE as we saw in the noticing stage of the corresponding lexical LRE. Here we view it as the first form LRE in a set of two relating to se recouche.

Excerpt 5: Sam and Marnie, Stimulated Recall Stage

Researcher 151: Why would you use se there?
M 152: Se because it’s herself.
S 153: Yes, she does . . .
M 154: She, like, not to anybody else.
S 155: C’est un verbe réfléchi?
M 156: réfléchi. [laughter]
R 157: Is it possible to use this verb uh, without se? Like, for example Elle recouche le bébé? Elle se recouche?
S 158: Yes.
M 159: Yeah, yeah.
S 160: But it makes more sense if, like, uh,
M 161: You mean in this sentence or any other sentence?
R 162: In general, in general.
M 163: Yes, you could use it.
R 164: You could use it?
S 165: Probably yes.
M 166: Yes, yes you could use it without probably.
R 167: Do you know of other verbs that work like that?
S 168: Se?
R 169: That could work with or without?
M 170: Se peigne les cheveux to, like, to someone else cause...
S 171: or a dog or something [laughter]
M 172: and s’habille I guess you can...
M 173: Yes, like if you dress a baby.

The set of LREs carries through into the stage 3 stimulated recall where, in turn 151, the research assistant asks: “Why would you use se there?” A sustained conversation ensues in which the learners engage in metatalk centering on what constitutes a pronominal verb as they understand it. In this discussion they are aided by the research assistant’s questions. In turns 152 to 154, Marnie tries to state a principle underlying one subset of pronominal verbs: The rule is stated as follows in Ollivier (1999): “Quand le sujet fait l’action sur une partie de son corps, on emploie un verbe pronominal et l’article défini à la place du possessif” (p. 142). (“When a subject does an action to a part of his or her body, one uses a pronominal verb and the definite article in the place of the possessive.”) This principle applies to verbs other than personal care verbs also. Connors and Ouellette (1996) expressed it this way: “the action of such verbs is reflected back onto the subject, their meaning remains the same when they are used in their non-pronominal form” (p. 219).

In turn 155, Sam asks “C’est un verbe réfléchi?” Marnie laughingly confirms that it is a pronominal verb (turn 156), and then the research assistant asks (turn 157) if the verb can be used in its non-pronominal form, providing contrasting examples (Elle recouche le bébé/Elle se recouche). Sam’s response (turn 158) seems definite (“Yes”), Marnie also agrees (turn 159), and Sam then starts to qualify his response (turn 160). Marnie asks the research assistant for clarification in turn 161, and the research assistant replies (turn 162) that she is looking for the general principle. In turn 163, Marnie asserts that recouche could be used on its own, Sam agrees with some hesitation (“probably,” turn 165), and Marnie agrees in turn 166.

In turn 167, the research assistant asks if the students know other verbs that function in the same way, specifying in turn 169, “[verbs] that could work with or without [se].” In the ensuing dialogue (turns 174 to 180) Sam and Marnie together generate several verbs that do indeed work in the same way, among them [se] peigner, [se] brosser, [s’]habiller.

In the above examples (Excerpts 1–5), the learners accept the reformulator’s change (to se recouche), offering no reason or explanation in the noticing stage in the case of the lexical LRE and a correct explanation in the stage 3 stimulated recall (when prompted by the research assistant) for both the lexical and form LREs. Sam and Marnie appear to learn the item se recouche and to consolidate their knowledge of a rule about a subset of pronominal verbs, those with a reflexive reading.

Accepting a change may not necessarily mean that learning occurs, either because the learners misunderstand the reformulated item or structure, or because the opportunity for discussion is limited. These two cases are illustrated in two examples from the collaborative dialogue of Jim and Anna, the “average” dictogloss pair (Appendix E).

Dictogloss Task (Form LRE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Se réveiller (Form): Jim and Anna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original Story (pretest)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ne veut pas réveillé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest Jim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ne veut pas réveiller</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excerpt 6: Jim and Anna, Noticing Stage

In Excerpt 6, Jim and Anna read aloud from their own text in the noticing stage (turn 29), ne veut pas réveillé, failing to notice that the refor-
mulator made two changes: She supplied the infinitive form of the verb, spelled correctly, and she pronominalized the verb as required by the meaning. Jim (turn 30) erroneously infers that their structure represents the present perfect (le passé composé) and that it should be in the present (turn 32). Anna is uncertain (turn 33), and Jim further confuses the issue by proposing l’indicatif (he probably means the infinitive).

Excerpt 7: Jim and Anna, Stimulated Recall Stage

R 170: Right. [snippet of video]. OK. Do you remember what part you are at there?
J 171: Yeah.
R 172: So which word were you talking about?
J 173: Réveiller.
R 174: Réveiller? OK. So, uh, which verb tense do you think réveiller is?
J 175: Let’s see, eh, it’s the uh, indicatif with [inaudible]
R 176: Um-hum. That’s what you think too, Anna?
A 177: Oh, who are you asking?
R 178: Either one, either one. We are looking at Jim because he was the one who said something out loud so I wanted to make sure we had the right word that you were looking at.
A 179: Yeah.

In the stimulated recall stage, the research assistant asks in turn 174, which verb tense réveiller is, and Jim answers that it is the indicatif. The indicative is a mode rather than a tense in French, but the learners seem to feel they have adequately answered the research assistant’s question.

From the posttest responses, we infer that Jim was confused between the terms indicatif and infinitif given that he changed réveillé to réveiller. Anna did not engage in the discussion of this LRE and made no change to this item in her posttest.

The reformulator’s second change, pronominalization of the verb, was not discussed by the pair at any stage and remained unchanged.

Dictogloss Task: (Lexical LRE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Story (pretest)</th>
<th>Reformulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sendors encore</td>
<td>se rendort</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excerpt 8: Jim and Anna, Stimulated Recall Stage

A 224: OK, uh, what else, S’endors encore, encore, that doesn’t sound right. Like I don’t know why why we put it.
J 225: No, no it’s se rendort.
A 226: No, I know but when you put it down, it doesn’t sound right. And I, sort of, s’en-got the sound but I didn’t didn’t know enough. Oops!
R 227: Actually they are different verbs s’endormir and there’s se rendormir.
J 228: Ah, OK.
R 229: They are different verbs. Have you heard of both of them?
J 230: No, I’ve only heard the one.
R 231: S’endormir and se rendormir?
J 232: No, I didn’t hear two.
A 233: I’ve heard rendormir.
R 234: Rendormir, that’s familiar?
A 235: Yeah, I’ve heard both of those but not with the se.
J 236: Not with the se.

In Excerpt 8, Jim and Anna discuss the lexical items s’endormir and se rendormir, focusing particularly on the meaning of the prefix re[n]. The LRE arises in the pair’s dialogue in the stage 3 stimulated recall, where Anna (turn 224) finds that s’endors encore “doesn’t sound right” (Swain & Lapkin, 1995). Jim asserts in turn 225, “no, no it’s se rendort,” and Anna repeats (turn 226) that it does not sound right. The research assistant then draws the students’ attention to the fact that these are different verbs (she does not point out that they are closely related semantically), and Jim says (turn 230) that he has only heard of one of them (he does not state which one). The research assistant asks again about both verbs in turn 231. Jim says that he has not heard both of them, and Anna states (turn 233) that she has heard rendormir, adding in turn 235 that she has heard both verbs “but not with the se.” Jim repeats that phrase.

In the posttest, aside from Anna’s spelling mistake, both learners get the lexical item correct (se rendort), but Jim retains the redundant (and incorrect) encore, whereas Anna sticks to her claim that the adverb did not sound right and adopts the reformulator’s change.

Jigsaw Task (Lexical LRE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Story (pretest)</th>
<th>Reformulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Et elle s’endore sans bruit</td>
<td>se rendort</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Posttest Nina</th>
<th>Posttest Dara</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>se rendore</td>
<td>s’endore</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nina and Dara (Appendix F), the high proficiency jigsaw pair, engage in a prolonged negotiation around the same lexical item, se rendormir.

Excerpt 9: Nina and Dara, Writing Stage

D 196: Non, elle est encore endormie parce que le soleil se lève à si . . . si . . . alors,
N 197: OK. OK.
D 198: et puis à six heures un,
N 199: OK. Il est, il est maintenant six heures un . . . un,
D 200: elle se dormie encore,
N 201: et elle . . . elle um,
D 202: essaye d’arrête,
N 203: Est-ce que c’est un verbe réfléchi?
D 204: Elle . . .
N 205: Il est maintenant six heures un et elle sss . . .
D 206: Elle se dormie encore?
N 207: Non [laughs softly] um.
D 208: Um, elle . . .
N 209: Il est maintenant . . .
D 210: Marie . . . France . . . ah
N 211: six heures un et Marie-France est encore au lit.
D 212: Oui.
N 213: Non, on a déjà utilisé
D 214: Et Marie, et Marie
N 215: ça.
D 216: est encore . . .
N 217: Et elle s’endort . . . Et elle s’endort encore.
D 218: Elle . . .
N 219: Elle s’endort sans bruit.

Excerpt 9 presents the stage 1 writing where the students are working out the story from pictures. They begin by describing the girl (whom they named Marie France) as asleep (elle est encore endormie, turn 196), Dara tries out a nonexistent pronominal verb, se dormir (turn 200), and Nina (turn 203) asks if it is a pronominal verb. Dara persists in turn 206, adding the adverb encore (elle se dormie encore?). In turn 207, however, Nina rejects Dara’s suggestion, and several turns later (turn 217) Nina comes up with s’endort. In an earlier study, Lapkin and Swain (2000) noted the tendency of students exposed to the same mini-lesson to overgeneralize the pronominal form of the verb: In fact, se dormir was used by 7 of 26 student dyads who were exposed to the mini-lesson in that study.

Excerpt 10: Nina, Noticing Stage

N 58: Se . . . se rendort. Oui, parce que . . .
N 140: Oui, et rendort. On n’a pas utilisé ça.

In the stage 2 noticing activity, Nina notices se rendort in two places, but she and Dara do not discuss it except in relation to LREs with a different focus.

Excerpt 11: Nina and Dara, Simulated Recall Stage

R 81: OK. Good [snippet of video] OK. So here you’ve got s’endore and it’s changed, you’re changing it to se rendort. What do you think that the difference is there?
N 82: We used a verbe réfléchi and I guess, I don’t think I was wrong, but I think in the context if you wanted to use, we should have been . . .
D 83: We weren’t focused enough on trying to use the verbe réfléchi. And I also think that, like, because we had just heard about it, we didn’t completely get it at first. Uh, but now, it’s, like . . .
N 84: I think we could have, we could have used a lot of verbes réfléchis in more places. But we just, like . . .
D 85: We weren’t thinking about it as much. We were more focused on writing the story, that we weren’t, like, thinking about anything else.
N 86: If, like, sometimes, if we didn’t really know what a verbe réfléchi was, sometimes we just used it, when writing we didn’t even know what it was. So we were just, like, if it was there, then good, if it wasn’t . . .
R 87: ‘Cause you did use a reflexive verb. You did say s’endore and, and that’s reflexive, and then you say se rendort.
N 88: I don’t really get why se rendort. I think it sounds pretty better s’endore, but if it’s proper French then I guess that . . .
R 89: There’s a difference between those two verbs. S’endore is when you first fall asleep. Se rendort would be . . .
D 90: Fall asleep again?
R 91: Right, yeah, because . . .
D 92: Ah, OK.
R 93: This isn’t the first time she woke up, right?
D & N 94: Um-hum.
R 95: So it’s a very small difference.
D 96: Um-hum, OK.

When the research assistant draws their attention to the fact that they changed s’endore (spelled incorrectly) to se rendort in turn 81 of the stimulated recall, at first Nina and Dara spend five turns commenting on the need to use pronominal verbs in the task, appearing to miss the point (turns 82 through 86) that both the lexical items are pronominal verbs.

The research assistant points this out in turn 87, and Nina reflects on the two verbs (turn 88), saying that s’endort which she had proposed in the
writing stage “sounds pretty better.” In turn 89, the research assistant starts to explain the difference in meaning and elicits from Dara (turn 90) that se rendort is “fall asleep again.” Dara and Nina accept this explanation, although no one explicitly says that the notion of again is captured in the morpheme re[n]. Dara sticks to s’endore, however, in her posttest, and Nina uses the correct se rendort, though she spells it incorrectly.

The above excerpts from Nina and Dara’s writing, noticing, and stimulated recall stages, then, present a case where the learners negotiate the meaning represented by se rendormir by moving from être endormie to the overgeneralized (and morphologically incorrect) se dormie. Through their noticing the reformulation se rendort in stage 2, and with the help of the research assistant in stage 3, Nina learns the correct item and uses it in her posttest.

Jigsaw Task (Form LRE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Se souvient (Form): Nina and Dara</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Original Story (pretest)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elle souvient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Posttest Nina</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elle se souvient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This chart presents a case where the learners accepted the reformulated item and appeared to learn it during stages 2 and 3.

Excerpt 12: Nina and Dara, Writing Stage

```
D 334: Elle . . .
N 335: Elle se souvient, non, elle souvient qu’elle a un . . . une pratique de chorale, alors elle se lève
D 336: Tout à coup . . .
N 347: Elle sse, elle souv . . .
. . .
D 350: Elle souvient . . .
N 351: Se souvient ou souvient?
D 352: Elle souvient . . . ahh, elle se souvient . . . Elle souvient . . . Elle se souvient, non.
N 353: Pas . . .
D 354: Elle souvient qu’elle doit aller au band . . .?
N 355: Chorale.
D 356: Chorale.
N 357: [inaudible] Tout à coup elle souvient qu’elle . . . doit aller à la chorale.
D 358: [very softly] Elle se souvient . . . non.
D 359: Alors elle . . .
N 360: Non, wait . . . tout à coup elle . . . se souvient?
D 361: Je pense pas que c’est se souvient.
N 362: Oh, souvient . . . souvient.
D 363: Elle souvient qu’elle a le chorale.
```

Excerpt 13: Nina and Dara, Noticing Stage

```
D 79: Tout à coup, elle souvient . . .
N 80: Elle se souvient?
D 81: Ahh.
N 82: Oh! Je t’ai dit!
D 83: Non, tu n’as pas!
N 84: Oui!
D 85: Oh. Tu écris.
N 86: OK, um. Elle se souvient.
D 87: Souvient.
```

In the noticing stage, Dara reads from their own text, elle souvient (turn 79), Nina queries the reformulated se souvient? (turn 80), and then the students play a game of “I told you so!” Nina’s “je t’ai dit” in turn 82 probably reflects the fact that she was the one to question which form was correct in stage 1 (turn 335). Dara highlights with a marker the correct se souvient and they move on.

Excerpt 14: Nina and Dara, Stimulated Recall Stage

```
R 173: So why did you need se in any case?
N 174: Because, because it’s like something that is happening to her.
D 175: It’s sort of like suddenly I think.
N 176: No, it’s not like that. Something is happening to her, like the action is happening to her. So it has to be a verbe réfléchi.
```

Prompted by the researcher in the stimulated recall, Nina states the rule for pronominal verbs in turns 174 and 176. In the posttests, both learners get the item right, suggesting that their noticing in stage 2 and their collaborative dialogue in stage 3 played a role in their ability to produce the correct pronominal form of the verb. Their producing se souvient in the posttest
suggests that they were ready for the feedback provided by the reformulated text.

**Question 4: The Interviews of Stage 5**

From the extensive interview data, here we focus on the learners’ comments about pronominal verbs. Usually in response to the question “What did you learn from this activity?” most of the students (all of the stronger students and one of the four average students) made some reference to their learning of these verbs. Nina and Dara separately come up with pronominal verbs as their first example in their interviews.

\[ N 4: \text{Uh, the, the } \text{verbes réfléchis some of them, and . . . yeah [laughs].} \]
\[ R 5: \text{OK, so, verbs, verb forms.} \]
\[ N 6: \text{Yeah.} \]
\[ \ldots \]
\[ D 16: \text{Uh, I’ve learned about uh, different reflexive verbs. And, like how to use them and how to use other kinds of words like } y \text{ and } a \text{ and like just the proper way, how to use most words like . . . Yeah, that’s pretty much it.} \]

Whereas Nina does not expand on the verbs and only confirms the interviewer’s suggestion that form as well as lexis would have been involved in her learning, Dara makes it clearer that she has learned about lexis (“different reflexive verbs”) as well as form (“And, like, how to use them . . .”).

In his interview, Sam mentions pronominal verbs among other items learned:

\[ S. 3: \text{Uh, well, I think I’ve learned a bit more about stories and how to arrange the main events and also a bit about verbs.} \]
\[ R. 4: \text{Um-hum, like what? Can you give me an example?} \]
\[ S. 5: \text{Oh, like the } \text{verbe réfléchi. I only knew a bit before. Now I know a bit more. And also some words and some adjectives that were in the story that I didn’t know.} \]

Marnie gets the terminology wrong; she probably means to refer to \textit{verbes réfléchis}:

\[ M. 6: \text{Like, uh, how do . . . Also I’ve learned a lot more about } \text{se réfléchir. I knew it but it kind of helped me a bit more.} \]

But she is not convinced that her level of proficiency permits her to make fine distinctions:

\[ M. 91: \text{Well, I thought that some of the parts like } \text{se peigner, like some of it, it wouldn’t have mattered if we did it, well, I don’t think it would have mattered if we did it our way or of the written way [i.e., the reformulation] but some of it I thought it was a lot better the way that you’d wr-, probably had written it because it made more sense once you think about it. But I guess we were, like, we don’t know that much, I am not like that fluent to like know these things yet. Some people are.} \]

Although Marnie thinks that her first version \textit{se peigne les cheveux} is acceptable for her level (and it is technically correct), she actually follows the example of the reformulation in the posttest and drops \textit{les cheveux}.

Pronominal verbs do not seem to have made a great impression on Anna:

\[ A. 112: \text{But we didn’t really use a lot of that, I forget what it’s called, the one like doing the verb to yourself, like we didn’t talk a lot about that, though. I mean, the story had some of them in it but not a lot, so. I don’t know, I don’t know why that was in the first thing [i.e., the mini-lesson]. Like, it was but it wasn’t. OK. [laughs].} \]

Although no task difference emerges in these comments about pronominal verbs, there appear to be proficiency differences, with the stronger students making some comments that indicate that they feel they learned something from the mini-lesson and the multistage task, and weaker students generally not indicating this.

**CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION**

The sets of LREs selected for close analysis in this study, along with the posttest data, provide evidence that learning has occurred, in this case with respect to pronominal verbs. Even the weaker of the two dictogloss pairs used and learned \textit{se rendormir}. Overall, 66% of the pronominal verb changes made by the reformulator were either adopted by the students in the posttests or, in Monica’s case, correctly rejected as unnecessary.

Our earlier research indicated that there were noteworthy differences between the two tasks used in our continuing series of studies (Swain & Lapkin, 2001). The current study substantiates this finding by adding further evidence that the dictogloss constrains and focuses the number and variety of verbs generated by the participants.

Within each task, the stronger pairs created more contexts for pronominal verb forms than their weaker counterparts. Furthermore, the length and quality of the sets of LREs differed (see also Qi & Lapkin, 2001). In fact, we could not include the weaker jigsaw pair in our qualitative analysis of LREs because they did not pro-
duce any sustained LRE relating to pronominal verbs. In the LREs and interviews of the stronger pairs, we see more detailed noticing of the reformulations and richer collaborative dialogues. The opportunity to revisit particular items and structures afforded by the multistage task appears more fruitful for the stronger learners (see also Mantello, 1996).

We also observed that the presence of the research assistant and her role in the stage 3 simulated recall encouraged metatalk (cf. Swain & Lapkin, 2002). She filled a teacher-like role, especially important in the case of average or weak students, who, like Jim and Anna, may state grammatical rules incorrectly. Teachers can, of course, offer more than did our research assistant (whom we asked to play a minimal instructional role). For example, based on information presented here, teachers could do mini-lessons drawing attention to the overuse (among anglophone learners of French) of the adverb encore and the meaning of the prefix re[n]. Stronger students may well be called upon to help: We saw Sam and Marnie do some system (as well as item) learning (Harley, 1998) when they generalized from their learning of the item se recoucher to other similar pronominal verbs (e.g., s’habiller, see Excerpt 5).

Although it may not be possible to implement as intensive a multitask in the immersion classroom, our study suggests that teacher-fronted discussion should follow collaborative tasks in order to clear up unresolved problems that the collaborative dialogues and posttests reveal (see also Kowal, 1997).

The reformulated texts presented to the learners seem to have been effective in providing occasions for learning, although we cannot attribute improvements in the posttests to the reformulations alone. First, the mini-lesson served to draw attention to pronominal verbs. Second, during the stage 2 noticing, the learners verbalized the differences as they compared their written stories to the reformulated text and highlighted or underlined the changes they noticed. Finally, the LREs produced in stages 1, 2, and 3 of the multistage task, along with the interview data, suggest that learning was facilitated by multiple opportunities to reflect on pronominal verbs in a meaningful context.
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**NOTES**

1 In an extended French program, students take French language arts and one or two additional subjects through the medium of French; that is, extended French is a less intensive form of immersion.

2 We wanted to be in a position to explore the effects of pairing a strong and an average student in order to create an “expert/novice” relationship and of pairing two average students in order to assess whether the expertise might shift between the two learners and whether such a pairing can be effective.

3 We asked the research assistant who interacted with the students not to assist them. Such assistance might have taken the form of providing a vocabulary item or a grammatical rule, for example. In fact, occasionally the research assistant did provide such help, almost inadvertently; it is very difficult to avoid scaffolding students who are asking for assistance as one interacts with them in a stimulated recall session (see also Swain & Lapkin, 2002).

4 After an initial working session in which members of the project team discussed and coded a subset of LREs, the transcripts were coded by two graduate assistants, working independently. They discussed and agreed on any problematic cases and then brought back remaining problems to the entire team for resolution.

5 Our participants did not produce any discourse LREs related to pronominal verbs; our discussion of LREs in this paper therefore includes only lexical and form LREs.

6 The literature on reformulation in L2 writing reviewed above suggests that our study could have considered aspects (e.g., style) other than lexis, grammar, and discourse; however, the latter were the focus of the larger study of which the data discussed are a part.

7 We did not include être, avoir, or the semi-auxiliaries commencer à and vouloir.

8 At the posttest stage (stage 4), however, we can see the impact of the reformulation on the inventory of pronominal verbs used. Three pronominal verbs, se re-
coucher, se rendormir, and se souvenir, appear to have been added to the lexicon of the participants through the multistage task.

9 These numbers are not shown on any of the tables, but the information can be seen in the original stories provided in Appendixes D through G.

10 Monica: She brushes her hair and brushes [obligatory clitic pronoun se is omitted] her teeth; Nancy: . . . she . . . brushes [correct form of reflexive verb] . . . her . . . teeth. All other translations can be found in Appendix H.

11 It was not possible to include all 12 sets of LREs involving pronominal verbs because of length limitations. The 6 chosen are, in the judgment of the authors, the most interesting.

12 Harley (1992) documented the form redormir occurring in an obligatory context for se rendormir in 4 of her 12 grade 1 French mother-tongue participants.

13 Such verbs, including se recoucher, are detransitivized. Connors and Ouellette (1996) would assign two readings to se recoucher, both a reflexive (i.e., the “rule” the students are trying to apply here) and a passive reading.

14 For the purposes of the discussion here we ignore the spelling error in the stem of the verb. The correct spelling is réveiller.

15 Harley (1992) documented reasonably frequent use of encore among grade 4 and grade 10 immersion students in the analytic use of, for example, dormir encore or s’endormir encore, rather than derived verbs such as se rendormir which are almost inevitably used by native francophones.

16 Se souvenir is inherently pronominal (Connors & Ouellette, 1996, use the term “intrinsic”), so the rule Nina invokes does not apply to this verb.

17 Both se peigne and se peigne les cheveux are correct; our reformulator preferred the former.
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APPENDIX A
Pictures Used in Jigsaw Task

1. Sunrise
2. Alarm clock ringing
3. Man being woken up
4. Man turning off alarm clock
5. Man getting dressed
6. Man carrying suitcase
7. Woman washing her hair
8. Woman walking away
Le réveil-matin de Martine

Il est six heures du matin et le soleil se lève. Martine dort tranquillement dans son lit. Elle fait de beaux rêves, la tête au pied du lit et les pieds sur l’oreiller. Quand le réveil sonne, Martine ne veut pas se lever. Elle sort son pied et avec le gros orteil, elle ferme le réveil. Elle se rendort tout de suite. Mais elle a le réveil qu’il faut pour ne pas être en retard. À six heures et deux minutes, une main mécanique tenant une petite plume sort du réveil et lui chatouille le pied. C’est efficace! Finalement Martine se lève. Elle se brose les dents, se peigne les cheveux et s’habille pour prendre le chemin de l’école. Encore une journée bien commencée!

Translation

Martine’s Alarm Clock

It’s six a.m. and the sun is rising. Martine is sound asleep in her bed. She’s having sweet dreams, her head at the foot of the bed and her feet on the pillow. When the alarm clock rings, Martine doesn’t want to get up. She sticks her foot out, and with her big toe, she shuts off the alarm. She falls asleep again immediately. But she has the kind of alarm clock you need to avoid being late. At 6:02, a mechanical hand holding a small feather comes out of the alarm clock. It tickles her foot. To good effect! Finally Martine gets up. She brushes her teeth, combs her hair, and gets dressed to go to school. Another great start to the day!

APPENDIX C

Text of Mini-Lesson (Transcribed from the Videotape)


On n’a qu’à penser aux soins corporels. Plusieurs activités que l’on exécute lorsque l’on fait sa toilette nécessitent l’utilisation de verbes réfléchis, par exemple, si je dis: je me brosse les dents, c’est un verbe réfléchi, ou une action réfléchie. Si je vous dis: je me brosse les cheveux, je me peigne, je me lave les mains, j’exprime une action réfléchie. C’est moi qui à la fois fait l’action et subit l’action.

Maintenant, voici d’autres exemples. Les actions non-réfléchies. Si je dis: je coupe mon gâteau d’anniversaire, ce n’est pas une action réfléchie. Par contre, si je dis: je me coupe les ongles, c’est une action réfléchie. Je fais l’action sur moi-même. Si je dis: tu prepares une salade, ce n’est pas une action réfléchie. Par contre, si je dis: tu te prépares pour l’école, c’est une action réfléchie. Le sujet fait l’action sur lui-même.

Maintenant, la forme du verbe. Un verbe qui exprime une action réfléchie est composé de deux éléments. Il y a le pronom réfléchi (writing on board) qui est suivi du verbe. Par exemple, si je parle d’un verbe qui exprime une action réfléchie, un verbe qui parle des soins corporels, le meilleur exemple ce serait: se laver. Je me lave, tu te laves, il ou elle se lave, nous nous lavons, vous vous lavez, ils ou elles se lavent. Alors, on peut remarquer ici qu’il y a effectivement un pronom réfléchi qui est suivi d’un verbe.

Maintenant, comment les reconnaître? Ils sont faciles à reconnaître. Puisque nous avons déjà les critères que nous avons élaborés: pronom réfléchi suivi du verbe. On les rencontre à l’infinitif (writing) sous la forme suivante. Par exemple: se laver, comme nous l’avons vu; se couper; s’évanouir; se préparer. Mais il faut faire attention, puisque certains verbes nécessitent la forme réfléchie, comme s’évanouir, ou encore se souvenir, qui ne peuvent s’exprimer autrement. Ce ne sont pas tous les verbes qui expriment une action réfléchie, ou qui peuvent s’exprimer sous la forme réfléchie. Voilà—un pronom réfléchi et un verbe pour une action réfléchie.
APPENDIX D
Dictogloss Task: Sam and Marnie (Stronger Pair)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sam + Marnie</th>
<th>Native Speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pretest (collaboratively written)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Reformulation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il est 6h et quand le soleil se lève et Martine dort tranquillement. Elle a des beaux rêves puis le réveille-matin sonne et elle le ferme avec son pied. Martine ne veut pas se réveiller. Elle <strong>recouche</strong>, mais à 6h02, une main mécanique chatouille les pieds de Martine avec une plume. Martine se lève car elle ne veut pas être en retard pour l’école. Elle se brosse les dents, se peigne et s’habille. Une autre journée bien commencée!</td>
<td>Il est 6h et quand le soleil se lève, et Martine dort tranquillement. Elle fait de beaux rêves. Quand le réveille-matin sonne, elle l’arrête d’un coup de pied. Martine ne veut pas se réveiller. Elle <strong>recouche</strong>, mais à 6h02, une main mécanique chatouille les pieds de Martine avec une plume. Martine se lève car elle ne veut pas être en retard pour l’école. Elle se brosse les dents, se peigne et s’habille. Une autre journée bien commencée!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Items or structures in boldface are those discussed in detail in the text of this article.

APPENDIX E
Dictogloss Task: Jim and Anna (Weaker Pair)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jim + Anna</th>
<th>Native Speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pretest (collaboratively written)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Reformulation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il est 6h00 heure du matin, quand le réveille sonne. Tête a pil d’oreille, Martine <strong>ne veut pas réveiller</strong>. Elle fermente le réveille en <strong>sendors encore</strong>. A 6h02 un main mécanique tien un plume au pied du Martine est la réveille. Finalement elle sort du lit, elle sabille pour un autre jour d’école.</td>
<td>Il est 6h du matin quand le réveil sonne. La tête aux pieds, et la tête sous l’oreiller, Martine <strong>ne veut pas se réveiller</strong>. Elle éteint la sonnerie du réveil et <strong>se rendort</strong>. A 6h02 une main mécanique chatouille le pied de Martine avec une plume, et la réveille. Finalement elle sort du lit, et elle s’habille pour un autre jour d’école.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Posttest—Jim**

| Il est 6h du matin quand le réveille sonne. Tête aux pieds, et la tête sous l’oreiller, Martine **ne veut pas réveiller**. Elle étaient la sonnerie et **se rendort encore**. A 6h02 un main mécanique tien un plume au pied de Martine est la réveille. Finalement elle sort du lit et elle s’abille pour un autre jour d’école. | Il est 6h du matin quand le réveille sonne est Martine **ne veux pas réveillé**. Tête aux pieds du pil et tête su l’oreille, elles étaillent le sonnerie et **se rendors**. À 6h02 une main mécanique chatouille le pied de Martine avec une plum. Finalement elle sort du lit, elle s’habille pour un autre jour d’école. |

**Posttest—Anna**

**Note.** Items or structures in boldface are those discussed in detail in the text of this article.
APPENDIX F
Jigsaw Task: Nina and Dara (Stronger Pair)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nina + Dara</th>
<th>Native Speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest (collaboratively written)</td>
<td>Reformulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dormir où ne pas dormir?</td>
<td>Dormir où ne pas dormir?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C’était un jeudi matin et le soleil se lève. Marie-France est encore endormi. C’est 6:00 du matin et soudainement, elle entend la sonnerie de son alarome. Elle essaie de dormir malgré le bruit. Finalement, elle en a assez. Elle décide d’arrêter la sonnerie avec son orteil. Il est maintenant 6:01 et elle s’endort sans bruit. Quand elle ne se lève pas, l’arme devient frustrée. Un bras y sort et commence de la chatouiller avec une plume. Tout à coup, elle se souvient qu’il y a une pratique de chorale. Elle se force à sortir du lit et elle se prépare pour l’école en brossant ses dents et cheveux. 20 minutes plus tard elle sort du maison en courant et essaie d’attraper son ami Mike pour se rendre à l’école.

Posttest—Dara
Dormir où ne pas dormir?

C’est un jeudi matin et le soleil se lève. Marie-France est encore endormi. C’est 6:00 du matin, et soudainement, elle entend la sonnerie de son alarome. Elle essaie de dormir malgré le bruit. Finalement, elle en a assez, et décide d’arrêter la sonnerie avec son orteil. Il est maintenant 6:01h, et elle s’endore silencieusement. Voyons qu’elle ne lève pas, l’arme devient frustrée. Un bras en sort et commence de la chatouiller avec une plume. Tout à coup, elle se souvient qu’il y a une pratique de chorale. Elle se force à sortir du lit et se prépare pour l’école: en brossant les dents et les cheveux. 20 minutes plus tard, elle sort de la maison en courant et essaie d’attraper son ami Mike pour se rendre à l’école.

Posttest—Nina
Dormir où ne pas dormir?

C’est un jeudi matin et le soleil se lève. Marie-France dort encore. Il est 6:00 du matin et soudain, elle entend la sonnerie de son réveil. Elle essaie de dormir malgré le bruit. Finalement, elle en a assez et décide d’arrêter la sonnerie avec son orteil. Il est maintenant 6:01, et elle se rendort dans le silence. Voyant qu’elle ne se lève pas, le réveil décide d’agir. Un bras en sort et commence à la chatouiller avec une plume. Tout à coup, elle se souvient qu’il y a une pratique de chorale. Elle se force à sortir du lit, et elle se prépare pour l’école: elle se lave les dents et se brouse les cheveux. 20 minutes plus tard, elle sort de la maison en courant et essaie de rattraper son ami Mike pour se rendre à l’école avec lui.

Note. Items or structures in boldface are those discussed in detail in the text of this article.
APPENDIX G
Jigsaw Task: Nancy and Monica (Weaker Pair)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nancy + Monica</th>
<th>Native Speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pretest (collaboratively written)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Reformulation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C'est une belle matin quand Sylvie dorme à 6:00 du matin. La cloche de Sylvie commence à sonner. Elle ne veut pas se réveillé alors elle arrête la cloche. À 6:01 Sylvie est encore endormit. Une minute plus tard, un main du cloche la reveille avec une plume. Elle se le ve et va au toilette. Elle se brose les dents et en même temps, c'est cheveux. Et puis, elle s'habille et parte à l'école.</td>
<td>C'est un beau matin, il est 6:00 et Sylvie dort. Le réveil de Sylvie sonne. Elle ne veut pas se réveiller, alors elle arrête la sonnerie. À 6:01, Sylvie dort encore. Une minute plus tard, la main du réveil la reveille avec une plume. Elle se lève et va à la salle de bains. Elle se lave les dents et se brosse les cheveux. Puis elle s'habille et part à l'école.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Posttest—Monica</th>
<th>Posttest—Nancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C'est une belle matin. Sylvie dorme à 6:00 du matin. La cloche sonne, elle ne veut pas se reveiller. À 6:01, Sylvie, est encore endormit. Une minute plus tard, une main avec une plume reveille Sylvie. Elle se leve et va au salle de bain. Elle se brose les dents et les cheveux. Puis, elle s’habille et parte à l’école.</td>
<td>C’est un beau matin quand à 6 heures, Sylvie dort. La sonnerie de Sylvie commence à sonner. Elle ne veut pas se reveillé alors elle arrête la sonnerie. À 6:01, Sylvie dort encore. Une minute plus tard, une main de la sonnerie la reveille avec une plume. Elle se lève et va à la salle de bains. Elle se lave les dents et se brosse les cheveux. Et puis, elle s’habille et part à l’école.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX H
Translations

Excerpt 1: Sam and Marnie, Writing Stage
M 56: She wants . . . she wants . . . she goes back to sleep or something
S 57: No . . . uh . . . she returns to her bed.
M 58: Oh! Yes, yes, yes.
S 59: She . . . returns . . . to her bed.

Excerpts 2 and 4: Sam and Marnie, Noticing Stage
M 35: She
S 36: She . . . goes back to bed . . . OK.
M 37: Goes back to bed.
S 38: So, uhm . . . she
M 39: Goes back to bed.

Excerpt 5: Sam and Marnie, Stimulated Recall Stage
S 155: It’s a reflexive verb?
M 156: reflexive. [laughter]
R 157: Is it possible to use this verb uh, without se? Like, for example “She puts the baby to sleep”?
“‘She puts herself to sleep’?”
S 174: There are a lot of things here like “combs her hair.” “To comb” you could probably use “to comb the hair” to, like, to someone else ‘cause . . .
M 175: “To brush” too.

Excerpt 6: Jim and Anna, Noticing Stage
J&A 29: Does not want to wake up . . .
J 30: Oh, this is the present perfect. But, this . . . we put it in the present perfect but it should have . . .
A 31: Hmmmm.
J 32: Been in the present.
A 33: Mhmm . . . oh, no . . . ?
J 34: Oh, no, the indicative.
A 35: OK.

Excerpt 9: Nina and Dara, Writing Stage
D 196: No, she is still asleep because the [sun] rises at si . . . si . . . well,
N 197: OK, OK.
D 198: And then at six oh one,
N 199: OK. It is, it is now six oh one . . . um,
D 200: She sleeps again [se dormie is a nonexistent form in French],
N 201: And she . . . she um,
D 202: Tries to stop,
N 203: Is that a reflexive verb?
D 204: She . . .
N 205: It is now six oh one and she ssss . . .
D 206: She sleeps again?
N 207: No [laughs softly] um.
D 208: Um, she . . .
N 209: It is now . . .
D 210: Marie . . . France . . . ah
N 211: Six oh one and Marie France is still in bed.
D 212: Yes.
N 213: No, we have already used
D 214: And Marie, and Marie
N 215: this.
D 216: is still . . .
N 217: And she goes to sleep . . . And she goes to sleep again.
D 218: She . . .
N 219: She goes to sleep without a sound.

Excerpt 10: Nina, Noticing Stage
N 58: Falls . . . asleep again. Yes, because . . .
N 140: Yes, and falls asleep again. We didn’t use this.

Excerpt 12: Nina and Dara, Writing Stage
D 334: She . . .
N 335: She remembers [se souvient, correct], no, she remembers [souvient, incorrect] that she has . . .
D 336: Suddenly . . .
N 347: She rrre, she rem . . .
D 350: She remembers [souvient] . . .
N 351: Se souvient or souvient?
D 352: She souvient . . . ahh, she se souvient . . . Elle souvient . . . Elle se souvient, no.
N 353: Not . . .
D 354: She remembers that she has to go to band . . .?
N 355: Choir.
D 356: Choir.
N 357: [inaudible] Suddenly she remembers that she . . . must go to choir.
D 358: [very softly] Elle se souvient . . . no.
D 359: So she . . .
N 360: No, wait . . . suddenly she . . . se souvient?
D 361: I don’t think it’s se souvient.
N 362: Oh, souvient . . . souvient.
D 363: She remembers that she has choir.
N 364: That she has to prepare
D 365: Yes.
N 366: For choir . . . no, suddenly she remembers [souvient] that she has choir practice
Excerpt 13: Nina and Dara, Noticing Stage
D 79: Suddenly she remembers [souvient] . . .
N 80: She remembers [se souvient]?
D 81: Ahh.
N 82: Oh! I told you so!
D 83: No, you didn’t!
N 84: Yes!
D 85: Oh. You write.
N 86: OK, um. She remembers [se souvient].
D 87: Souvient.
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