Cabot, M. A. & Brodal, J. (2025). 'Here, I should have used the talk move challenge ...': Video-stimulated reflections on rehearsing vocabulary learning-friendly whole-class discussions. In M. A. Cabot, S. M. Høisæter & V. Vangsnes (Eds.), *Rehearsing for teaching: Theoretical and empirical approaches to a practice-based teacher education* (pp. 203–229). Fagbokforlaget. DOI: https://doi.org/10.55669/oa600510

10

'Here, I should have used the talk move challenge ...'

Video-stimulated reflections on rehearsing vocabulary learning-friendly whole-class discussions

Michel Alexandre Cabot[1] and Jon Brodal[1]

[1] Western Norway University of Applied Sciences

Abstract: There is little research on preservice teachers' (PSTs') video-stimulated reflections on whole-class discussions that can be useful for vocabulary learning at elementary school. This qualitative small-scale case study examines the following research questions: What use of various talk moves did the PSTs articulate in their reflections? What reflections did the PSTs put forth when describing how talk moves created used or lost moments of vocabulary learning? The study is based on term papers and reflection dialogues after rehearsing on campus and enactment at practicum schools. To analyse the data, we used Michaels and O'Connor's (2015) and Hardman's (2020) description of talk moves and Swain's (2005) functions of output. The PSTs identified that using basic talk moves can lead to noticing vocabulary gaps, whilst advanced moves facilitate hypothesis-testing and metalinguistic reflection. The study emphasises the importance of dialogic whole-class discussions as a method to strengthen vocabulary learning in EFL/ESL teacher education.

Keywords: whole-class discussion (WCD), talk move (TM), vocabulary learning, teacher education

Sammendrag: Denne kvalitative studien tar for seg lærerstudenters videostimulerte refleksjoner rundt helklassesamtale som middel til ordinnlæring. Følgende problemstillinger undersøkes: Hvilken bruk av ulike samtaletrekk kom fram i lærerstudentenes refleksjoner? Hva var deres refleksjoner rundt nyttiggjørelse og manglende nyttiggjørelse av potensielle ordinnlæringssituasjoner fremkalt ved bruk av samtaletrekk? Studien tar utgangspunkt i studentenes semesteroppgaver og reflekterende samtaler etter gjennomføring av øvelser på campus og utøving av undervisning i praksisskole. Beskrivelser av samtaletrekk i Michaels og O'Connor (2015) og Hardman (2020), samt Swains (2005) teori om outputtets funksjoner ble brukt i analysen av data. Lærerstudentene slo fast at elever kan gjøres oppmerksomme på tomrom i ordforrådet ved bruk av basale samtaletrekk, mens mer avanserte samtaletrekk kan benyttes til å fremkalle hypotesetesting og metaspråklig refleksjon. Studien peker på betydningen av dialogisk helklassesamtale som middel til å fremme ordinnlæring i undervisning av engelsk som fremmed- eller andrespråk.

Nøkkelord: helklassesamtale, samtaletrekk, ordinnlæring, lærerutdanning

Introduction

International research has argued for the importance of vocabulary learning that can be improved by dialogic whole-class discussions (e.g. McKeown, 2019, p. 472). However, there is little research in Norway on how dialogic discussions and vocabulary learning are facilitated. Norway's most recent English subject curriculum (NDET, 2019) points to the importance of both dialogic teaching and vocabulary learning at primary school. For example, the competence aims in year 2 mention explicitly that students must 'participate in rehearsed dialogues and spontaneous conversations about one's own needs and feelings, daily life, and interests' (dialogic dimension), and 'find words that are common to English and other languages with which the student is familiar' (p. 5) (lexical dimension).

The purpose of this qualitative case study is to elucidate preservice teachers' (PSTs') video-stimulated reflections after practicum on how talk moves can promote vocabulary learning through dialogic teaching. More specifically, the study examines PSTs' reflections after rehearsing and enacting dialogic, vocabulary learning-friendly whole-class discussions in English as a Foreign or Second Language (EFL/ESL).

We look into the following two research questions:

- What use of various talk moves did the PSTs articulate in their reflections?
- What reflections did the PSTs put forth when describing how talk moves created used or lost moments of vocabulary learning?

Theoretical framework and existing research

Meaningful vocabulary learning-friendly classroom discussions

We coined the term 'vocabulary learning-friendly' to emphasise PSTs' responsibility in creating a classroom atmosphere in which students are allowed to try and fail when speaking English. An accepting learning environment is crucial for L2 vocabulary learning, not only for learners' willingness to produce output, but also in terms of their ability to take in input, in accordance with Krashen's (1982) affective filter and input hypotheses. The affective

filter is an invisible filter that can either facilitate or hinder language acquisition, including vocabulary (see also Sparks & Ganschow, 2007; Wang, 2020). When the learners' affective filter is lowered, they will acquire new words, particularly in situations of input being slightly above the current level of the learner's language (pushed input: i+1). When the filter is high, the learners experience stress and are reluctant to participate and seek out opportunities to collaborate. The main affective variations pointed out by Krashen are motivation, self-confidence, and anxiety, which can foster or inhibit success in acquiring vocabulary.

Moreover, PSTs must ask themselves how they fostered vocabulary learning during their practicum. One possible method to increase students' vocabulary learning is to carry out whole-classroom discussions. Indeed, language production in classroom discussions provides what Selinker (1972) and Corder (1982) qualify as communicative needs – that is, the opportunity for meaningful practice. In other words, if the students experience no needs when they speak or write, they will not learn English. However, if they must express themselves and find the right words, they will learn.

In this context, Swain (1995, 2005) distinguishes three functions of output (e.g. speaking, writing): (1) noticing function, (2) testing and hypothesis formulation, and (3) metalinguistic function. In the first function, English learners might encounter lexical problems, leading them to notice what they do not know or know only partially. In the second function of output, English learners are liable to test out new words. Swain advocated that learners become much more aware of input when they are desperately searching for a word in reaction to something they hear. These situations of pushed output (o+1) somehow resemble Krashen's (1989) above-mentioned pushed input situations (i+1), as language acquisition in both cases is facilitated by supportive classroom environments and positive learner affect. The third function of output refers to a negotiation over form and meaning, which might occur in collaborative dialogues when learners use language to talk about language.

Vocabulary learning is a gradual process that can be fostered by receptive and/or productive activities (e.g. pushed input and output), which seem mutually constitutive of communicative situations, and thus equally important in teaching (Nation, 2007).

Much research (e.g. Cabot, 2018; Min, 2008) links vocabulary learning to receptive skills (i.e. reading and listening). In contrast, the present case study examines the combination of vocabulary learning and productive skills.

International researchers (e.g. Lee, 2009; Swain, 2006) have shown that students who were involved in actively producing language became more proficient than those just using receptive skills.

Interestingly, many Scandinavian studies (e.g. De Wilde et al., 2021; Sundqvist, 2009, 2024) have shown that vocabulary learning often occurs outside school (extramural English). There is, however, little research in relation to in-school learning at primary school (intramural English).

Drew et al. (2007) do not examine specific oral activities but conclude in broad terms that primary EFL/ESL in Norway is mainly directed towards developing oral communicative competence.

A recurring problem in many EFL/ESL classrooms is getting students to speak out loud in activities. According to Dahl (2022), whole classroom discussions are often avoided.

Little research (e.g. Drew et al., 2007) exists in relation to intramural English focusing on whole-class discussions and dialogic teaching instigated by TMs at grades 1–7, which are under scrutiny in the present study.

Dialogic teaching and talk moves

McKeown (2019) has shown that vocabulary learning can be improved by dialogic talk in whole-class discussions (WCDs), as both definitional and contextual information is presented, encounters with words in multiple contexts are provided, and students' active processing of word meanings is engaged.

WCDs may be qualified as dialogic when students and teachers use words to talk to each other, as illustrated by the etymology of the term itself: in ancient Greek *dia* (English: via) and *logos* (English: word). Indeed, dialogue can mean 'conversation, discussion, deliberation and argumentation' (Alexander, 2020, p. 49).

It moves beyond other forms of classroom talk, such as rote and recitation, and not only has greater cognitive potential for students, but also

demands more of a teacher's subject knowledge and pedagogical skills, especially through the use of effective questioning.

Researchers have studied dialogic discourses in many subjects, inter alia in mathematics (Tabach et al., 2020; Myklebust et al., 2024), English, and social studies (Hardman, 2020; Nystrand et al., 2003).

Talk moves (TMs) are 'simple families of conversational moves intended to accomplish local goals' (Michaels & O'Connor, 2015, p. 334). Teachers can use them in WCDs to promote a form of learning-promoting verbal response from students.

Both international (e.g. Tabach et al., 2019) and Scandinavian (e.g. Myklebust et al., 2024) research – mostly in the subject mathematics – have examined various TMs teachers choose during WCDs, intentionally or unintentionally. For example, Tabach et al. (2019) found that teachers use different sequences of TMs (e.g. revoicing + explain/say more, or revoicing + press for reasoning).

Furthermore, Michaels O'Connor (2015) identified 'a set of recurring moves that seemed to take the conversation from recitation to reasoning' (p. 335). Using TMs, teachers can help individual students 'share their own thoughts', 'orient to and listen carefully to one another', 'deepen their reasoning', and 'engage with others' reasoning' (p. 338).

According to Myklebust et al. (2024), PSTs in Norway struggle with 'the third turn in the exchange, following up after a question and a response' (p. 1001). In line with Blikstad-Balas and Jenset (2024), Myklebust et al. (2024) recommend video-filming WCDs and analysing the use of TMs to ensure PSTs' professional reflection.

Indeed, TMs represent a powerful opportunity for providing learning with a meaningful context. Drawing on this concept of TMs as part of dialogic teaching, the present study examines how PSTs can use TMs to foster students' vocabulary learning during WCDs.

From our point of view, the two research areas – vocabulary learning--friendly output (linguistic approach) on the one hand (e.g. McKeown, 2019; Kwon, 2007), and TMs in EFL/ESL teaching (pedagogical approach) on the other hand (e.g. Hardman, 2020; Nystrand et al., 2003) – seem to exist separately.

The present study aimed to integrate these two strands of theories to contribute to a sharper research focus on possible links between dialogic classroom discussions and vocabulary learning in EFL/ESL.

Methods

Study design and procedures

This qualitative, small-scale case study examines PSTs' reflections on the use of TMs in WCDs in EFL/ESL. It was conducted as part of the research project *Rehearsing Teaching Professionally* (ReTPro), funded by the Norwegian Research Council.

It draws on four different engagement phases, both on campus and during practicum: (1) studying and modelling, (2) repetitive try-outs and simulations, (3) enactments in the classroom, and (4) analysis and reflections on the enactments (McDonald et al., 2013).

The PSTs carried out twelve WCDs that lasted about 20 minutes in phase three. They used pictures (e.g. leisure activities: pictures with animals doing weird things), and short video clips (e.g. sports, the Olympic Games), to trigger the WCDs.

In phase four, the PSTs were asked to analyse their WCDs by examining their own use of the following TMs (Chapin et al., 2009, p. 13; Hardman, 2020, p. 72):

Table 10.1

Talk moves (based on Chapin et al., 2009, p. 13; Hardman, 2020, p. 72)

Talk moves	Examples
1. EXPLAIN/SAY MORE	Can you say more, explain, give an example, expand,… ? What do you mean by that?
2. REVOICE	So, you're saying that… Is that what you are saying?
3. RESTATE/REPEAT	Could you please repeat in your own words?
4. PRESS FOR REASONING	Why does it make sense? What does it prove? What convinced you that it was the right answer?
5. CHALLENGE	How is this different from… ? If discussant B is right, what about discussant A? Can they both be right?
6. AGREE/DISAGREE	Are they right? Do you agree or disagree?… Why do you agree?… Who has a similar idea? Does it make sense?… Why?
7. ADD ON	Would anyone like to add on this? Do you want to add something? Who wants to respond to that?
8. Talk-enhancing WAIT TIME	Please take your time… We wait.

The PSTs' reflections on the use of TMs were video recorded in all four phases. According to Blikstad-Balas and Jenset (2024), authentic video clips can be used systematically to ensure PSTs' professional reflection. Interestingly, video recordings of WCDs can reveal so-called 'teachable moments'. Hyun and Marshal (2003) describe the concept as follows:

> Teachable moments are fortuitous opportunities provided by the students [i.e. learners] that are recognised, interpreted, evaluated and acted upon by the teacher [i.e. a knowledgeable other]. (p. 115)

Identifying such moments during WCDs is challenging but advantageous. Once PSTs have identified these opportunities, they can act upon students' ability to learn 'when the time is right' (Havighurst, 1952, p. 7).

Accordingly, Erickson (2011) emphasises that 'good teachers improvise as they talk to their students… They look for teachable moments and take opportunistic advantage of them' (p. 130).

Drawing on Havighurst (1952), Hyun and Marshal (2003), and Erickson (2011), we defined teachable moments (see similar concepts in Kulild et al., 2025, and Myklebust & Tuset, 2025) as meaningful, critical decision-making moments during instruction that can further PSTs' professional development by providing them with an opportunity to reflect on both more successful (used), or less successful (lost), moments of students' vocabulary learning.

Participants

Informed consent was obtained from the participants. All information collected was treated confidentially (NSD 619149). The PSTs were recruited in person from a university in Western Norway that offers EFL/ESL courses for PSTs. The teacher training institution required all first-year students to undertake their practicum at elementary school (years 1–7), even though some of them were studying teacher education for grades 5–10.

The PSTs were in their first semester. Table 10.2 provides an overview of the participants.

Table 10.2

Profile of study participants

Participants	6 PSTs (4 females/2 males) with the pseudonyms Ava, Cass, Grace, Jade, Brad and Joe
Specification of PST's studies	4 students of 'GLU 5–10' (lower upper secondary school), 2 students of 'GLU 1–7' (elementary school)
Age	18–40 years
Teaching experience	None
Participants' L1	Norwegian (6)

Data collection methods

As shown below in Table 10.3, the study's data were derived from both oral (i.e. video/audio recordings) and written sources, more specifically from modelling sessions and rehearsing sessions on campus, enactments of WCDs at practicum schools, (video-stimulated) reflection dialogues, and term papers written by the six PSTs.

Table 10.3

Overview of the data sets

Data source	Rehearsing phase 1	Rehearsing phase 2	Rehearsing phase 3	Rehearsing phase 4
Video/audio recordings	5 modelling sessions (approx. 20 min each), 3 sessions using a picture and 2 sessions on talk moves	6 first rehearsing and 7 second rehearsing sessions	12 video-recorded enactments of whole--class discussions at practicum schools	8 video-stimulated reflection dialogues on Zoom
Documents	6 obligatory assignments, i.e. thesis statement/disposition, 1st draft of methods section			6 entire drafts of term paper and 6 final exam submissions of term papers
Relevance for RQs 1–2				RQ 1 + 2

We chose to use phase 4 data after enactment and rehearsals because they provided the reflective data answering both research questions. The data consisted of the video/audio recordings (i.e. 8 video-stimulated reflection dialogues), and the term papers (i.e. 6 final exam submissions).

In the reflection dialogues, the PSTs presented self-chosen snippets from the video recordings to reflect on how and why they over- or underused TMs, and whether they managed to use specific moments of dialogical WCDs to enhance vocabulary learning. In the term papers, the PSTs were asked to provide an in-depth analysis of their use of TMs, and to link their WCDs to dialogic teaching (e.g. Alexander, 2020).

Data analysis

For data analysis of the term papers and reflection dialogues, a qualitative codebook using NVivo 11 was developed. To do so, we used both content and thematic analyses (e.g. Braun & Clarke, 2019; Maxwell & Chmiel, 2013). Content analysis categorises data by 'similarity', whereas thematic analysis focuses more on connecting analyses or 'contiguity-based relations' (Maxwell & Chmiel, 2013, p. 3).

Rossman and Rallis (2017) suggest that content analysis can characterise categories as words or phrases describing some 'segment of your data that is relatively discrete (a variable, if you will)' (p. 240). In this study, content analysis consisted in quantifying the PSTs' talk move practices to answer research question 1. Indeed, Saldana (2016) asserts that such 'quantitizing may be better applied to content analytic studies' (p. 26).

Considering this, we decided to focus on thematic analysis when analysing the findings on research question 2. Thematic analysis 'involves the searching across a data set to find repeated patterns of meanings' (Braun & Clarke, 2022, p. 86). The present study used NVivo to colour (for typographic reasons in light and dark grey in Table 10.5) such emerged themes or repeated patterns of meanings (TMs used or lost) when the PSTs linked vocabulary-learning friendly TMs to used or lost moments of dialogic talk.

Rossman and Rallis (2017) suggest that themes 'state an argument regarding your interpretation' (p. 240). Thematic analysis is essential for developing new theories and interpreting findings. Indeed, in our analysis (cf. Figure 10.1), we were interested in linking the general distribution of TMs (pedagogical dimensions) to Swain's (2005) three functions of output and vocabulary learning (linguistic dimensions).

Findings

Using illustrative examples, this section presents the PSTs' reflections on use or non-use of TMs during dialogic WCDs intended to foster vocabulary learning. The first part elaborates on the PSTs' thoughts on the distribution of TMs (RQ 1). The second part describes the PSTs' reflections on teachable moments of vocabulary learning that were used or lost during the WCDs (RQ 2).

Distribution of talk moves

The general findings pertaining to the content analysis of the various TMs in research question 1 revealed that the PSTs distinguished between basic TMs 'explain/say more', often referred to as what-questions (What do you see? What do we call this?), and more advanced TMs such as 'challenge' and 'press for reasoning', or why-questions (Why does the elephant wear sunglasses?). This tendency was confirmed by the PST Ava: 'My initial approach would involve initiating a discussion with the question "What can you see?" as a trigger.'

Interestingly, the PSTs did not distinguish clearly between initial and follow-up use of the TM 'explain/say more' in their reflections. Based on the reflection dialogues, it seemed that few 'explain/say more' TMs were used as second moves. This was, however, disconfirmed by the video-recorded enact-

ment of the WCDs at the practicum schools, which showed that 'explain/say more' TMs were used to prompt elaboration, as opposed to the initiation of an IRE (Initiation–Response–Evaluation) exchange.

The PSTs used all TMs in their classroom discussions. Based on the content analysis of the video-stimulated reflection dialogues, we elaborated the following overview of the PSTs' self-reported TM practices during practicum.

Table 10.4

PSTs' self-reported use of talk moves

	Ava	Cass	Grace	Jade	Brad	Joe
Explain/ say more						
Revoice						
Restate/ repeat						
Press for reasoning						
Challenge						
Agree/ disagree						
Add on						
Talk-enhancing wait time						

Note. The PSTs' self-perceived estimates were derived from the video-stimulated reflection dialogues after the whole-class discussions. For example, high or low use of a talk move is respectively symbolised with the colours black or light grey, while medium grey is used for a medium use, indicating that the PSTs considered the use satisfactory and reasonable.

Table 10.4 shows three interesting tendencies, which did not involve any statistical inference. First, the PSTs reported a high use of 'say more/explain', and medium to high use of 'talk-enhancing wait time' in the reflective dialogues. Second, the PSTs made little use of the TMs 'challenge' and 'restate/repeat'. Third, the TMs 'revoice', 'press for reasoning', 'agree', and 'add on' showed medium use, even though all PSTs had rehearsed all TMs during classroom simulations on campus. The following illustrative sentences from some reflection dialogues explain these tendencies in more detail.

Concerning the predominant use of the TM 'explain/say more', the PST Brad elaborated in the following manner on a natural order of TMs:

> *Naturally, a discussion will usually start with seeking explanations before moving on to challenge the students and seek different points of view…*

This natural order of TMs may explain the high reported use of the TM 'explain/say more'. In contrast, the TM 'challenge/press for reasoning' was used less frequently. The PST Ava was one of few participants to use it. She noticed that 'the students got very engaged when I asked them… to justify. They laughed and wanted to share what they were thinking.'

The PST explained the frequent use of the TM 'wait time' with the explicit focus on this TM during phase 1 (modelling), phase 2 (on-campus rehearsals), and phase 3 (enactment at the practicum schools). Thus, rehearsals of this TM seemed to be successful because the TM was also used during practicum.

The PSTs emphasised that all TMs were rehearsed on campus, but that the enactment at the practicum schools was challenging in the case of more advanced TM.

The following section will examine the WCDs in relation to the question of how the PSTs used TMs to create possibilities for vocabulary learning.

Used or lost moments of vocabulary learning?

This section elaborates on the general findings pertaining to research question 2, that is, the thematic analysis of the essential moments (used or lost) describing vocabulary learning-friendly WCDs that were rehearsed on campus and enacted in the practicum schools.

Based on the video-stimulated reflection dialogues and the term papers, the following overview provides illustrative snippets from examples of teachable moments which the PSTs mentioned as used or lost moments to enrich the students' vocabulary during the WCDs.

Table 10.5

Overview of a selected amount of PSTs' moments used or lost to instigate possible vocabulary learning

PST	Possible vocabulary learning	Vocabulary-learning friendly talk moves in used moments (coded in light grey)	Vocabulary-learning friendly talk moves in lost moments (coded in dark grey)
Joe	Engine failure	(…) a student said, 'the car is smoking.' Here the student probably did not know the word 'engine failure' (…) The student 'noticed the gap' when struggling to find some other words to describe what he saw. I then asked to the entire class what this is called. Another student answered 'motor stop'. EXPLAIN/SAY MORE	Here I could have gone more in depth and asked the second student why he thought that, or if he knew another word for it, but I just corrected it to 'engine failure'. PRESS FOR REASONING
Cass	Different Halloween words like: bat, skeleton, pumpkin and mummy	(…) a student answered 'a mummy is something with bandage around him'. Afterwards I asked him 'what kind of bandage?' This was a good opportunity to start a conversation with the student. EXPLAIN/SAY MORE	

PST	Possible vocabulary learning	Vocabulary-learning friendly talk moves in used moments (coded in light grey)	Vocabulary-learning friendly talk moves in lost moments (coded in dark grey)
Cass	Tombstone		'What is a tombstone in Norwegian?' Almost no students were able to figure it out on the first try. Student A answered tombstone is Frankenstein. Here the student became aware that he does not know the word… Frankenstein was a very interesting answer. Here I could ask him 'why are you thinking about Frankenstein?' PRESS FOR REASONING
Cass	Hens	(…) I ask them 'do you have any animals at home?'. Then a student says 'I have 8 goats, and ten…'. I asked 'ten…?', waiting for his answer. The student meant to say hens and became aware that he is missing that word in his vocabulary. EXPLAIN/SAY MORE, WAIT TIME	
Cass	Witch		When the students answered me witch is 'heks' in Norwegian, I could have asked them 'Would anyone like to add on this?' or 'can you describe a witch in your own words?'. If I had asked these questions the students could talk more in complete sentences and gain insight into which words they knew and which words they did not know. ADD ON
Ava	False friend: 'light pear' in Norwegian vs. light bulb in English		(…) a student raised her hand and told me in Norwegian that she could see a lightbulb. I asked if she knew what it was in English, but she did not know. We had to find this out (here I used wait time), so I asked the rest of the group, and a boy raised his hand and said, 'light pear'. (…) I could have used this moment as an opportunity to facilitate a metalinguistic discussion and make the student reflect over why he thought 'light pear' was the correct answer. CHALLENGE

PST	Possible vocabulary learning	Vocabulary-learning friendly talk moves in used moments (coded in light grey)	Vocabulary-learning friendly talk moves in lost moments (coded in dark grey)
Brad	Sports: relay in English, 'stafett' in Norwegian	A student used the [Norwegian] word 'stafett' [pronounced with the diphthong /ei/ in English]. I revoiced the word, and told him that it was a nice try to pronounce the word in English but that the English word is 'relay'. I asked him then whether he likes watching ski relays on TV. REVOICE, EXPLAIN/SAY MORE	
Grace	Cheerful		I ask the students if they did see any feeling in the You Tube clip… . One of the students said he could see 'cheerful'. I replied with 'very good'. I should have asked the student if he could give an example, or I could have asked why it made sense that it was cheerful he saw. EXPLAIN/SAY MORE, CHALLENGE
Grace	Proud	A golden moment was at minute 14 in the clip. I said 'A student said that the parents probably felt very proud, did any of the rest of you also see that?' The students said yes, and then I continued asking 'how did you see that, why did that make sense?' PRESS FOR REASONING	
Jade	Please		In 5:32 press for reasoning could have allowed a deeper explanation to why using kind words… is important, and by that enlighten the importance of acknowledging each other. PRESS FOR REASONING

Note. The extracts are the PSTs' direct quotations from the term papers or reflection dialogues.

As shown in Table 10.5, the PSTs created several teachable moments during the WCDs. Some of them were used (in light grey in Table 10.5), or not used (in dark grey), to enhance possible vocabulary learning. All above-mentioned excerpts represented teachable moments of vocabulary-learning-friendly WCDs. They were used or not used due to various personal (e.g. lack of

planning, self-reliance, knowledge about talk moves), or contextual factors (e.g. format of chosen trigger, classroom management, unknown proficiency levels of the students), which could not be analysed due to the research scope and limited word count of the present article.

To sum up, most moments used were instigated by the predominant TM 'explain/say more', except for some instances of 'revoice', 'wait time', and 'press for reasoning' (in light grey in Table 10.5). In contrast, the PSTs' reflections on moments lost seemed to mention predominantly 'press for reasoning', 'add on', and 'challenging' as unused TMs (in dark grey in Table 10.5).

Discussion

The following discussion section will first examine pedagogical dimensions of findings in light of theories on dialogic teaching and TMs and then elaborate on linguistic dimensions in terms of vocabulary learning, showcasing that certain TMs can be linked to different functions of output.

The last section will integrate these two strands of theories to contribute to a sharper research focus on possible links between dialogic classroom discussions and vocabulary learning.

Pedagogical dimensions: Dialogic discussions and the reported use of talk moves

In the term papers and the video-stimulated reflection dialogues, the PSTs distinguished between more advanced TMs, such as 'press for reasoning', and basic TMs (e.g. 'explain/say more', 'revoice'). Even though the video-recorded enactment showed that approximately half of the 'explain/say more' moves were used in a follow-up move, the PSTs stated that basic TMs were often used to initiate a discussion. This is in line with Myklebust et al.'s (2024) study

stating that PSTs in Norway struggle with 'the third turn in the exchange, following up after a question and a response' (p. 1001).

More advanced TMs were often subsequent to basic TMs. Interestingly, the PSTs coined the term 'natural order of talk moves' to explain this phenomenon. They seemed to understand that finding a good balance between basic and more advanced TMs is of particular importance. This aligns with previous research (e.g. Tabach et al., 2019) that uncovered different sequential patterns of TMs used by teachers in the subject mathematics (e.g. revoicing + explain/say more, or revoicing + press for reasoning).

Use of the TM talk-enhancing wait time entails delaying both the allocation of turn and provision of feedback. Teacher follow-up or feedback has been shown to be an integral part of the communicative context of the classroom (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975, p. 51; Cullen, 2002, p. 118). The teacher is expected to provide feedback. Merely withholding it slightly longer than what is natural in the situation may be perceived as a break with expectations of normality, and as potentially detrimental to class management.

In contrast to research showing that the TM 'challenge' is a difficult move for teachers to get used to (e.g. Michaels & O'Connor, 2015, p. 337), it is surprising that wait-time was frequently used in the present study. In the context of L2 instruction, waiting time can be a talking tool with a potential downside. While giving learners the opportunity to pre-plan their output has been linked to increased accuracy, it may cause them to withdraw to the safety of familiar, yet unchallenging, linguistic choices (Batstone, 2002, p. 10).

The present study shows that all TMs had to be adapted to the specific classroom situations. Indeed, the PST often had to make spontaneous decisions and improvise (e.g. Erickson, 2011). In other words, the rehearsing of TMs on campus before practicum helped to gain insight into the various TMs, specifically the reported use of more advanced TMs (e.g. press for reasoning, challenging). However, in the end, the enactment at the practicum schools was highly contingent on personal or contextual factors.

All TMs presented in the present study are in line with what Michaels and O'Connor (2015) qualified as 'a set of recurring moves that seemed to take the conversation from recitation to reasoning' (p. 335).

However, in relation to Michaels and O'Connor's (2015) four goals of TMs, only the goals of 'helping individual students share their own thoughts', and 'orient to and listen carefully to one another' (p. 338) could be seen in the

high or medium reported use of basic TMs such as 'explain/say more', 'revoice', and 'talk-enhancing wait time'.

Given the reported underuse of advanced TMs such as 'press for reasoning', 'challenge', 'agree/disagree', and 'add on', the present study suggests that Michaels and O'Connor's (2015) goals of 'helping deepen their reasoning', and 'engage with others' reasoning' (p. 338) were met unsatisfactorily, and made the WCDs thus less dialogical.

Linguistic dimensions: Can language theories help us understand teachable moments of vocabulary learning?

Swain (1995) emphasises the role of output in L2 learning and distinguishes between the noticing and metalinguistic function of output, in addition to the hypothesis-testing function.

Our data show interesting examples of Swain's three functions of output. For example, in Joe's classroom discussion, a student said 'the car is smoking' to describe a car that had broken down. The PST asked the same student to describe the situation. The student struggled finding the right word (first function: noticing the gap), and another student suggested the word 'motor stop' (second function: hypothesis testing). The PST corrected the student as he thought that 'engine failure' is the correct word in English.

The third function of output, that is, the metalinguistic function of output, could also be seen in the data but often related to moments lost. For example, a student raised her hand and told the PST Ava in Norwegian that she could see a 'lyspære' (in English: lightbulb) on the picture at the screen. Ava asked if she knew what it was in English, but she did not know. The PST asked the rest of the group, and a boy raised his hand and said 'light pear', translating each of the constituents of the Norwegian compound noun 'lyspære' into English. The PST qualified this situation a moment lost because she only corrected 'light pear' into 'light bulb' without talking about amusing interferences (i.e. false friends) between English and Norwegian.

Examining relevant didactic questions for L2 instruction within Swain's conceptual framework, this study suggests that PSTs can easily initiate hypothesis

testing – that is, the learners' testing out of new words such as 'motor stop' in the example above – by increasing the total amount of output (e.g. via WCDs).

However, the metalinguistic function – learners' explicit use of 'language to reflect on language' (Swain, 1995, p. 132) or 'negotiation about form' (Swain, 1995, p. 132) – appears to be contingent upon the noticing function being engaged, and to be logically and temporally preceded by it.

Thus, to shift from a focus on meaning and communicative purpose (first and second functions of output) to conscious attention to form (third function of output), the PSTs must first help learners notice a 'gap'; that is, they must help learners become aware of a concrete instance of the general discrepancy between their interlanguage and L2.

Therefore, a relevant didactic question appears to be how to increase the noticing function, and metalinguistic reflection.

The following section looks into possible answers to this interesting question.

Pedagogical and linguistic dimensions: The importance of fostering vocabulary learning-friendly and dialogic classroom discussions

All of Hardman's (2020, p. 72) standard TMs, which were rehearsed several times on campus, lend themselves to the facilitation of all three of Swain's functions.

In this respect, there is no inherent difference between high-order and basic TMs in terms of the potential for vocabulary learning. This could also explain the preference for using basic, low-order TMs among the PSTs in this study.

The rationale behind the PSTs' use of TMs amounted, in most cases, to stimulation of the maximum quantity of output. This was done by promoting vocabulary learning through a strategy aiming for 'pushed output' (Nation & Newton, 2009, p. 115), that is, by making the learners produce language about topics unfamiliar to them, and thus to engage the noticing function regarding vocabulary lacunae.

The purpose was, in other words, to generate output in a certain thematic area in the hope that this would make the learners notice a gap in their lexical knowledge, which, in turn, would lead to metalinguistic reflection and conscious reflection on hypotheses with regard to appropriate word choice.

Such a strategy is discernible in the PST Cass's reflection on a moment used through her employment of the basic TM explain/say more:

> *In a moment I ask them 'do you have any animals at home?' Then a student says I have 8 goats, and ten… The student meant to say hens and became aware that he is missing that word in his vocabulary.*

However, as teachers will know from experience, learners will often fail to notice the 'gap' – 'what they do not know, or know only partially' (Swain, 1995, p. 126) – by themselves without external cues. Even when they do become aware of the discrepancy between their interlanguage and the target language, learners do not necessarily engage in metalinguistic reflection.

In such cases, advanced high-order TMs, such as press for reasoning, may be used as a focused strategy to stimulate the engagement of both functions, as suggested by the reflections of the PST Joe on a teachable moment lost:

> *Here I could have gone more in depth and asked the student why he thought that, or if he knew another word for it, but I just corrected it to 'engine failure'.*

The PSTs' reflections on teachable moments show that TMs can be used in two different ways: (1) reported use of low-order TMs generally to stimulate the total amount of output (often in regard to a specific lexical field), and (2) more targeted reported use of high-order TMs in order to stimulate the noticing function and metalinguistic reflection on a specific instance of L2-inadequate vocabulary use.

In Joe's case, the lost opportunity for using an advanced high-order TM to stimulate Swain's noticing and metalinguistic function was preceded by a successful use of the low-order TM explain/say more. Indeed, in some instances, the participants used low-order TMs to generate output, and followed up with high-order moves in order to focus on a part of the output. This could be described as a planned and integrated approach.

Figure 10.1 shows the distributions of TMs in relation to Swain's (2005) three functions of output in the classroom discussions at the practicum schools.

Figure 10.1

Talk moves (e.g. Hardman, 2020) and Swain's (2005) output hypothesis

Functions of output (Swain, 2005) / **Talk moves (Hardman, 2020)**	**First function** ***Noticing the Gap***	**Second function** ***Testing***	**Third function** ***Metalinguistics***
1. EXPLAIN/SAY MORE			
2. REVOICE			
3. RESTATE/REPEAT			
4. PRESS FOR REASONING			
5. CHALLENGE			
6. AGREE/DISAGREE			
7. ADD ON			
8. Talk-enhancing WAIT TIME			

High occurrence Low occurrence Zero occurrence

As illustrated in Figure 10.1, three tendencies could be seen. First, a high occurrence of 'talk enhancing wait time' related to all three functions of output. Second, a high occurrence of low-order TMs, such as 'explain/say more' and 'revoice', was used to make the students notice that they did not know a word (first function of output). Third, few high-order TMs, such as 'press for reasoning', 'challenge', 'agree/disagree', and 'add on', were used to make students test out new words (second function), and talk about language to describe linguistic phenomena (third function).

The present study suggests two different recommendations. First, rehearsing classroom discussions in teacher education should focus more clearly on explicit hypothesis testing and metalinguistic talk to facilitate vocabulary learning. Second, if we believe Swain's (1995, p. 132) claim that all output is implicit hypothesis testing (i.e. all output is a form of testing out words, or an attempt to reproduce a structure in L2), it is possible to connect the various functions of Swain to the high-order/low-order TM distinction presented in this study.

To increase the total amount of hypotheses in L2, it is enough to increase the total amount of output (i.e. WCDs). The more cumulative the output is, the

greater the chance of learning, and low-order TMs can be used to stimulate output. Thus, the low occurrence of high-order TMs in the hypothesis-testing function presented in Figure 10.1 can qualify as a meaningful choice made by the PSTs. However, the other two functions (i.e. the noticing the gap and metalinguistic functions) do not necessarily follow from increased output and may require the use of high-order TMs. Consequently, teacher education needs to focus more on high-order TMs to support the noticing the gap and the metalinguistic functions of output.

Limitations and strengths

Concerning research question one, one of the authors served as a second rater and rescored the different TM types mentioned in the video-stimulated reflection dialogues. The inter-rater reliability score was a 1.0 Cohen's kappa for 'explain/say more', 1.0 for 'revoice', .739 for 'restate/repeat', 1.0 for 'press for reasoning', 1.0 for 'challenge', 1.0 for 'agree/disagree', 1.0 for 'add on', and .739 Cohen's kappa for 'talk-enhancing wait time' (0.41–0.60 *moderate*, 0.61–0.80 *substantial*, 0.81–0.99 *near perfect*, and 1.0 *perfect* agreement between the two raters). Moreover, an assistant researcher was asked to peer-check the validity of the codes related to research question two.

To confirm the findings, the term papers and video-stimulated reflection dialogues were triangulated with the video recordings showing the enactment at the practicum schools.

Only six PSTs underwent scrutiny. Thus, the study does not provide an exhaustive picture of Norwegian teacher education.

Conclusion

The present study makes the following points: Using WCDs during rehearsals on campus and in practicum schools, with a particular focus on TMs, can

be an efficient method for facilitating vocabulary learning because it can enable PSTs to

- develop the ability to facilitate the noticing the gap, hypothesis testing, and metalinguistic functions of output,
- reflect on a good balance between low order and high order TMs in relation to Swain's (1995) three functions of output and thus develop critical thinking.

The study aimed to integrate more closely two strands of theories in EFL/ESL, namely principles of dialogic teaching and TMs on the one hand (pedagogical approach), and vocabulary learning-friendly output (linguistic approach) on the other hand.

The present study contributes to a sharper research focus on possible links between dialogic classroom discussions and vocabulary learning.

Eventually, the study emphasises the importance of video-recorded rehearsing and analysing WCDs as a method to strengthen teaching quality in terms of dialogic teaching and vocabulary learning in EFL/ESL teacher education.

References

Alexander, R. (2020). *A dialogic teaching companion*. Routledge.

Batstone, R. (2002). Contexts of engagement: A discourse perspective on 'intake' and 'pushed output'. *System*, *30*(1), 1–14.

Blikstad-Balas, M. & Jenset, S. I. (2024). *Using video to foster teacher development. Improving professional practice through adaptation and reflection*. Routledge.

Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2019). Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise & Health*, *11*(4), 589–597. https://doi.org/10.1080/2159676X.2019.1628806

Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2022). *Thematic analysis: A practical guide*. Sage.

Cabot, M. (2018). Personal English learning ecologies and meaningful input with digital and non-digital artefacts. *Nordic Journal of Digital Literacy*, *13*(2), 94–112.

Chapin, S. H., O'Connor, C. & Anderson, N. C. (2009). *Classroom discussions. Using math talk to help students learn*. Math Solutions.

Corder, S. P. (1981). *Error analysis and interlanguage*. Oxford University Press.

Cullen, R. (2002). Supportive teacher talk: The importance of the F-move. *ELT Journal*, *56*(2), 117–127.

Dahl, K. E. (2022). It's time to disagree: Young people's self-efficacy for political disagreement in Norway. *Democracy & Education*, *30*(1), 1–9.

De Wilde, V., Brysbaert, M. & Eyckmans, J. (2021). Young learners' L2 English after the onset of instruction: Longitudinal development of L2 proficiency and the role of individual differences. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, *24*(3), 439–453.

Drew, I., Oostdam, R. & Van Toorenburg, H. (2007). Teachers' experiences and perceptions of primary EFL in Norway and the Netherlands: A comparative study. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, *30*(3), 319–341.

Erickson, F. (2011). Taking advantage of structure to improvise in instruction: Examples from elementary school. In K. R. Sawyer (Ed.), *Structure and improvisation in creative teaching* (pp. 113–132). Cambridge.

Hardman, J. (2020). Developing the repertoire of teacher and student talk in whole-class primary English teaching: Lessons from England. *The Australian Journal of Language and Literacy*, *43*(1), 68–82.

Havighurst, R. J. (1952). *Human development and education*. Longmans.

Hyun, E. & Marshall, J. D. (2003). Teachable-moment-oriented curriculum practice in early childhood education. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 35*(1), 111–127.

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

Kulild, M., Cabot, M. A. & Iversen, T. (2025). Meaningful use of talk moves: Preservice teachers' self-reflections on individual student-teacher conversations. In M. A. Cabot, S. M. Høisæter, & V. Vangsnes (Eds.), *Rehearsing for teaching: Theoretical and empirical approaches to a practice-based teacher education* (pp. 285–309). Fagbokforlaget.

Kwon, S. H. (2007). The roles of output on L2 vocabulary acquisition: Noticing, retrieval and retention. *English Teaching*, *62*(4), 279–310.

Lee, G. (2009). Speaking up: Six Korean students' oral participation in class discussions in US graduate seminars. *English for Specific Purposes, 28*(3), 142–156.

Maxwell, J. & Chmiel, M. (2013). Generalization in and from qualitative analysis. In U. Flick (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative data analysis* (pp. 541–553). SAGE Publications.

McDonald, M., Kazemi, E. & Kavanagh, S. S. (2013). Core practices and pedagogies of teacher education: A call for a common language and collective activity. *Journal of Teacher Education, 64*(5), 378–386.

McKeown, M. G. (2019). Effective vocabulary instruction fosters knowing words, using words, and understanding how words work. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools, 50*(4), 466–476.

Michaels, S. & O'Connor, C. (2015). Conceptualizing talk moves as tools: Professional development approaches for academically productive discussion. In L. Resnick, C. S. C. Asterhan, & S. N. Clarke (Eds.), *Socializing intelligence through talk and dialogue* (333–347). American Educational Research Association.

Min, H. T. (2008). EFL vocabulary acquisition and retention: Reading plus vocabulary enhancement activities and narrow reading. *Language Learning*, *58*(1), 73–115.

Myklebust, H. & Guadie, M. A. (2024). Following up: Questions and talk moves in preservice teachers' mathematics classroom conversations. *European Journal of Educational Research, 13*(3), 1001–1018.

Myklebust, H. & Tuset, G. (2025). Developing preservice teachers' noticing and pedagogical reasoning in video-based reflection conversations. In M. A. Cabot, S. M. Høisæter, & V. Vangsnes (Eds.), Rehearsing for teaching: Theoretical and empirical approaches to a practice-based teacher education (pp. 231–255). Fagbokforlaget.

Nation, I. S. P. & Newton, J. (2009). *Teaching ESL/EFL listening and speaking*. Routledge.

Nation, P. (2007). The four strands. *International Journal of Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching, 1*(1), 2–13.

Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training (NDET). (2019). *Læreplan i engelsk* [English Curriculum]. https://www.udir.no/lk20/ENG01-04?lang=eng

Nystrand, M., Wu, L. L., Gamoran, A., Zeiser, S. & Long, D. A. (2003). Questions in time: Investigating the structure and dynamics of unfolding classroom discourse. *Discourse Processes*, *35*(2), 135–198.

Rossman, G. B. & Rallis, S. F. (2017). *An introduction to qualitative research: Learning in the field*. SAGE Publications.

Saldaña, J. (2016). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. SAGE Publications.

Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *IRAL-International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, *10*(1–4), 209–232. https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.1972.10.1-4.209

Sinclair, J. & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils*. Oxford University Press.

Sparks, R. L. & Ganschow, L. (2007). Is the foreign language classroom anxiety scale measuring anxiety or language skills? *Foreign Language Annals, 40*, 260–287. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2007.tb03201.x

Sundqvist, P. (2009). *Extramural English matters: Out-of-school English and its impact on Swedish ninth graders' oral proficiency and vocabulary* [Doctoral thesis, Karlstad University]. Karlstad University Press.

Sundqvist, P. (2024). Extramural English as an individual difference variable in L2 research: Methodology matters. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190524000072

Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principle and practice in applied linguistics* (pp. 125–144). Oxford University Press.

Swain, M. (2005). The output hypothesis: Theory and research. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 471–483). Routledge.

Swain, M. (2006). Languaging, agency and collaboration in advanced second language learning. In H. Byrnes (Ed.), *Advanced language learning: The contributions of Halliday and Vygotsky* (pp. 95–108). Continuum.

Tabach, M., Hershkowitz, R., Azmon, S. & Dreyfus, T. (2020). Following the traces of teachers' talk-moves in their students' verbal and written responses. *International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education*, *18*(3), 509–528.

Wang, L. (2020). Application of affective filter hypothesis in junior English vocabulary teaching. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *11*(6), 983–987.