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Teaching philosophy statements are often declarations of beliefs interspersed with descriptions and metaphors. The disjuncture between the stated philosophy and actual teaching has been raised by numerous academics. This case study addresses the neglected area of grounding teaching philosophies in research on actual behaviour rather than beliefs, and provides a replicable framework for academics to create research-based teaching philosophy statements through a systematic investigation of actual teaching practice. A retrospective think-aloud protocol was used to recount a lesson. The transcript was analysed, and teacher actions were identified, extracted and justified following pre-determined protocols. References to theoretical and empirical studies supporting or contradicting the justification were checked in the research literature. To counteract the potential self-bias, colleagues’ views on the reasons selected were surveyed. The discrepancy between the teacher’s justification of actions and the peer perspective revealed hitherto hidden idiosyncrasies and values.

Introduction

Most teachers have a teaching philosophy (Fitzmaurice & Coughlan, 2007, p.40), which may or may not be formalized into a written document, called a teaching philosophy statement (TPS). TPSs are often requested by university administrators for a variety of purposes, particularly in the recruitment of new faculty and consideration of tenure (Benson & Buskist, 2005; Bruff, 2007; O’Neal, Meizlish & Kaplan, 2007; Kears & Sullivan, 2011; Meizlish & Kaplan, 2008; Schönwetter, Sokal, Friesen & Taylor, 2002; Seldin, 2010) and so can be considered a high-stakes document, affecting the career of academics. Although university administrators request TPSs, the format is rarely specified. There are various definitions and descriptions of TPSs, many of which share common themes of beliefs, descriptions and metaphors. Schönwetter et al. (2002, p.84) provide an oft-quoted definition of a teaching philosophy statement as “a systematic and critical rationale that focuses on the important components defining effective teaching and learning in a particular discipline and/or institutional context.”

Two common problems arise in many TPSs, namely: the disjunction between actual practice and stated teaching philosophy (Argyris, 1990; Argyris & Schön, 1974; Schön, 1983, 1995; Murray & Macdonald, 1997; Titus and Gremler, 2010), and the grounding of TPS in beliefs (Goodyear & Allchin, 1998, 2001; Fitzmaurice & Coughlan, 2007; Korn, 2011) rather than research-based results.

This study aims to address both by creating a research-based TPS through a systematic investigation of actual practice. The starting point for the TPS is research-led rather than belief-based.
A review of the literature revealed a substantial body of research on teaching philosophy statements (Chism, 1998; Coppolla, 2002; Ellis & Griffin, 2000; Fitzmaurice & Coughlan, 2007; Goodyear & Allchin, 2001; Montell, 2003; O’Neal, Meizlish & Kaplan, 2007; Schönwetter et al., 2002; Seldin, 1993, 2010).

Guidance on the creation of TPSs may be general (e.g. Chism 1998, Montell, 2003) or discipline specific (e.g. Austin, 2006 for science; Grundman, 2006 for mathematics). Guidance may be classified using the product-orientated and process-orientated dichotomy of approaches to writing. Process-orientated approaches include preparatory tasks such as card-sorting (Beatty, Leigh & Dean, 2012) or guided writing tasks, such as answering questions (Ellis and Griffin, 2000; Goodyear and Alchin, 1998; Schönwetter et al., 2002). Product-orientated approaches may advocate the inclusion of particular content, such as statement of beliefs on learning process (Bruning, 1994; Svinicki, 1991; Weinstein & Meyer, 1991) or descriptions of activities and metaphors (Grasha, 1996; Reinsmith, 1994). McCormack and Kennelly (2011) investigated the use of social models of reflection in order to construct TPSs and teaching portfolios through writing stories.

There is a myriad of information on creating TPSs; however, this is in stark contrast to the paucity of studies available on justifying teaching philosophies in the research literature. Only one recommendation for grounding teaching in research findings was discovered in a search of the published literature on TPSs. In the context of teacher education programs for pre-service teachers, Diana (2013) advocated the incorporation of current research into TPSs.

This study therefore contributes to the literature in three key ways. First, to the best knowledge of the author, this is the first documented study on the use of systematic introspection and peer review to create a TPS. Second, this paper attempts to fill the gap in the literature relating research to TPSs. Third, this study provides a useful and reusable framework for academics to create their own research-based TPS.

**Method**

An introspective analysis was chosen to investigate the actions and behaviors that are realized during teaching practice. Introspective analysis, however, leaves open the possibility of accusations of subjectivity and bias. To ameliorate this, a textual approach was selected. Given their ephemeral nature, analysis of thoughts and decisions is not replicable, whereas analysis of an artifact is replicable. The artifact, viz. the transcript, is a synchronic description of one lesson. Strict protocols were also harnessed to further tighten the framework and increase the academic rigour at the level of analysis and interpretation. Peer views were sought to validate the results.

The method comprised four distinct phases, namely: (1) recounting and recording; (2) transcribing and extracting; (3) coding and classifying; and (4) peer debriefing. Phase 1 aims at creating a text to serve as a basis for analysis. Phase 2 focuses on identifying actions and reasons contained within the text. Phase 3 harnesses content analysis to classify the actions and reasons. References to the research literature
are also added in this phase. Finally, phase 4 triangulates the analysis to reduce subjective bias.

Phase 1: Recount and record

A 50-minute lesson was planned, prepared and delivered for a class of fifteen pre-intermediate and intermediate learners of English taking a non-credit course in conversational English. Immediately after delivering the lesson, the author recounted and audio-recorded the activities and occurrences in the class while referring to a teacher-created student handout (see Appendix 1) and a brief lesson plan (see Appendix 2). During the first-person recount, actions were described in chronological order. Explanations of the activities and justifications of micro-decisions were provided. A consistent format of stating the action followed by the reason for the action was adopted. This adapted think-aloud protocol (Ericsson & Simon, 1993), termed retrospective free recall protocol by Kuusela and Paul (2000) was selected to visualize, describe and explain the actions after the fact. This reflection-on-action (Schön, 1983) serves as the foundation for analysis.

Phase 2: Transcribe and extract

The recording of the think-aloud protocol was transcribed verbatim. The veracity of the transcript was confirmed by a third party to reduce the possibility of human error during transcription (Gilbert, 1993; Maclean, Meyer & Estable, 2004). Each dynamic verb, i.e. each verb indicating activity or process (Carter & McCarthy, 2006, p.902) was identified manually. A list of action statements was created by extracting each dynamic verb. The direct object was also extracted for transitive verbs, i.e. verbs that need a direct object to complete their meaning. Reasons were added to the list of action statements according to the following protocol:

Reason selection protocol
1. Use the reason stated in the transcript.
2. Add a reason post hoc if none stated in the transcript.
3. Select the most important reason.
4. Select a different reason for each action.

Phase 3: Code and classify

Each action statement was initially classified into one of three broad categories, namely: learners, learning or lesson content (language). Action statements in each of the three groups were then coded through template analysis (King, 2004) which may be viewed as occupying the middle ground between grounded theory (in which codes are not determined a priori) and content analysis (in which all codes are predetermined). Codes were grouped by similarity (proximate genus) and specific difference. Codes were merged, subsumed or re-classified during the process.

The aim was to create a concise TPS (Chism 1998; Montell 2003; Schönwetter et al 2002) which administrators, peers and students alike would all be able to refer to. With this in mind, a three-column table was chosen rather than using continuous prose. This tabular format may be read vertically to understand the gist or
horizontally to find specific details. It was envisaged that learners would read the columns vertically while peers and administrators would read horizontally as well. The rationale for this was that it would be easier for non-native English speakers to read a table since there would be fewer words.

Action statements were inserted in the first column. The reasons were input into the second column and the third column was reserved for references to the research literature. Literature searches were completed and references added to the research literature into the third column. References were added according to the following two-step protocol:

Reference selection protocol
1. Select the most important reference.
2. Select a different reference for each action.

Phase 4: Peer debrief

Given the possibility of falling into the “introspection illusion” (Pronin 2006, 2009; Pronin, Gilovich, & Ross, 2004; Pronin, Olivola, & Kennedy, 2008) and being aware of the concept of being “unaware of [one’s] unawareness” (Wilson & Yoav 2008), peer debriefing (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Houghton, Casey, Shaw & Murphy, 2013) was used. The tabular TPS was circulated to six peers with requests for written comments. The peer group had been teaching English as a foreign language for between three years and thirty years with the mean length of teaching being 16 years (See Table 1). Three colleagues shared the same educational background as the author while three colleagues shared the same cultural background. Two colleagues shared both the same educational and cultural backgrounds, while two other colleagues had both different educational and cultural backgrounds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colleague</th>
<th>Teaching experience (years)</th>
<th>Educational background</th>
<th>Cultural background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Different</td>
<td>Different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Different</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Different</td>
<td>Different</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: teaching experience and background of peers in relation to author

All six peers submitted comments and discussions were held on a one-to-one basis to clarify comments. The TPS was revised based on the comments received.

Findings

Action statements

Transcription of the twenty-minute audio recording of the think-aloud protocol resulted in a text of slightly over 3500 words. The relevant dynamic verbs and
associated grammatical objects were identified manually. Items that were repeated or not generalizable to my teaching were deleted. Four items concerning needs analysis and five items regarding assessment were also added post hoc to provide a more complete picture of my teaching philosophy. The final list consisted of 121 items.

Both the transcription and the identification of dynamic verbs were straightforward. The choice of wording for the statements and categorizing of the statements, however, was naturally subjective. Some statements became subsumed within other broader statements. It was at this stage that choices had to be made about the primary audience of the TPS.

As with any written text, the audience and purpose need to be identified in order to target the message accurately. The audience of TPSs is varied, and includes prospective and current students, peers and university administrators. The purpose of a TPS needs careful consideration as one TPS may not be the most appropriate for the differing audiences of students, peers or administrators (Boyer, 1990; Chism, 1998).

TPSs may be used for developmental, accountability and promotional purposes, namely to persuade students to join or participate in classes taught by that member of faculty. The TPSs disseminated on the Internet may be for promotional purposes, intended to persuade prospective students to enroll in a particular course, the TPS submitted as part of a job application may be for accountability purposes while those submitted to the training coordinator could be for developmental purposes.

Students may use TPSs to gain insight into their teacher and better understand the expectations demanded of them. Academics often maintain homepages at the behest of university administrators (Hess, 2002; Hyland, 2011). Prospective students may read the homepages and TPSs and use their contents as a basis for course selection. TPS may therefore function as a way of promoting enrolment. In cases when enrolment numbers are considered in contract renewal, this could be a teacher’s primary motivation.

The primary audience for this version was selected as university administrators. Each of the action statements was allocated one row in the tabular TPS as shown in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Literature reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Get students talking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate grammar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Extract from Teaching Philosophy Statement

Subsections

These action statements were categorized into three distinct sections, namely: learners, language or learning. These three categories are commonly used in TPSs of teachers of English as a foreign or second language. However, to avoid the fallacy
of *ad populum*, viz. appeal to popularity, the format selected was not chosen simply because of its frequency. The easiest-to-understand TPSs appeared to the author to be those organised by views on content (language), learners and learning. Table 3 shows the breakdown of each section in terms of the number of subsections and action statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Preamble</th>
<th>Learners</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Learning</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of subsections</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of action statements</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3: Breakdown of subsections and statements in TPS*

Some of the 121 action statements were combined, subsumed or reclassified either more specifically or more broadly. The final list consists of 87 action statements, divided into 3 broad categories, and 20 subsections (See Table 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learners</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify and analyze needs</td>
<td>Raise language consciousness</td>
<td>Maximize interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create positive learning environment</td>
<td>Select frequently-used language</td>
<td>Raise self-esteem and confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat learners differently according to learning styles, motivations, etc.</td>
<td>Show cultural differences and similarities</td>
<td>Facilitate independent learning and promote life-long learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set expectations</td>
<td>Use authentic contextualized language</td>
<td>Assess and act on results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inject humour</td>
<td>Focus on communication</td>
<td>Encourage critical thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus on language</td>
<td>Integrate technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scaffold learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Experiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop writers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4: Names of each subsection*

**Reasons and references**

Each of the 87 statements was allocated a different reason as shown in Table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Literature reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Get students talking</td>
<td>Group dynamics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listen</td>
<td>Interactive approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate grammar</td>
<td>Communicative approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5: Extract from Teaching Philosophy Statement*

When selecting reasons for each action, it was necessary to take into account the specific cohort of learners in the class, the culture and the institutional context. Many actions appeared to be guided by theory which came from research literature or pre-service and in-service teacher training. However, there were also a number of actions that were based on my own experience and intuition. My actions appeared to be “guided by theory, but informed by practice” (Poduska & Kurki, 2014). Selecting reasons for actions is a complex, ill-defined process which raised various problems.
Although reasons were allocated to all the action statements, this process was bound by the standard operating protocol, which at times resulted in causal oversimplification and neglect of common cause. The selection of an appropriate reason was frequently problematic as the relationship between action and reason was not necessarily one-to-one. Some actions had multiple reasons while some reasons had multiple actions. The causality of classroom actions was far more complex than initially envisaged. Causes for any one action could be sufficient or necessary, distal or proximal, rival or contributory. The four-step protocol to systematize the selection of reasons simplified the TPS, resulting in a more reader-friendly document. However, the downside of this simplification was that when examining the TPS discretely rather than holistically, a single line of actions, reasons and references may provide a skewed view of the TPS.

Once each action had been allocated a different reason, references in support of the reasons were sourced in the applied linguistics and education literature. However, given the parameter of avoiding repetition for some items and the number of decisions involved in the selection, this became challenging.

The initial idea of one reason and one reference per action was to ensure that the most important reason and reference were selected. The advantage to the rule was that the TPS remained reader friendly and did not become too overwhelming. Nevertheless, as with the selection of reasons, there were a number of dilemmas in the selection of references.

The complexity of the selection of references was underestimated at the outset. This oversight resulted in a reference selection protocol that did not provide sufficient guidance. The retrospective decision matrix shown in Table 6 illustrates the multitude of choices that needed consideration in the selection of a reference for each action statement. The choices are presented as dichotomies for simplicity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice 1</th>
<th>Choice 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generalisability</td>
<td>For my current classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For most classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validity</td>
<td>Strong standpoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contentious standpoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional context</td>
<td>Related to university teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutionally independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global context</td>
<td>Japan-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Globally valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language dependency</td>
<td>Japanese focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-orientation</td>
<td>Original reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recent reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher-orientation</td>
<td>Well-known researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not well-known researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>The research that influenced me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More valid research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Decision matrix

In order to create a TPS that reflects the depth and breadth of the research influences, I opted to select references from each of the categories, since the influences on my teaching were not one-dimensional. With hindsight, these dilemmas could have been solved by introducing another parameter, such as selecting the most recent reference.

In the end, each of the 87 statements was allocated a different reason as shown in Table 7.
Peer comments

The comments received varied greatly in terms of quality and quantity; yet there were two notable results. First, the agreement on my actions and reasons was generally high. Second, disagreement with my reasons centered around three main areas, namely experimenting, using technology and efficiency. The reasons allocated for particular actions were firmly justified in the literature, but the comments of my peers indicated that my true reasons for the actions were different. Relevant comments received are classified in Table 8 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Literature reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Get students talking</td>
<td>Group dynamics</td>
<td>Dörnyei &amp; Malderez, 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listen</td>
<td>Interactive approach</td>
<td>Brown, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate grammar</td>
<td>Communicative approach</td>
<td>Burns, 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Extract from Teaching Philosophy Statement

The feedback from my peers was accurate. I enjoy experimenting, I maximize the use of technology to inspire students to harness its power to learn languages and I try to be efficient by drawing on my managerial background. It appears that although I created a research-based TPS, the underlying reasons for some actions were not actually research-based. I had succumbed to the introspection illusion. In the words of Gilbert (2006, p.12), “the human brain knows many tricks that allow it to consider evidence, weigh facts and still reach precisely the conclusion it favors”. My own personal predilections were more central to my behaviour than expected.

The peer debrief was the most illuminating stage and showed how easy it was for researcher bias to affect results. The hidden motivator for my actions appeared to be a set of personal values or principles. Values may affect both personal and professional domains; these values may be unwavering or may fluctuate. The effect of these values can explain the discrepancies between the justification of my actions and the comments I received from my colleagues.

To understand my teaching philosophy more fully, these values need to be identified. After reviewing the literature on values in education (e.g. Carr, 2011), I began the process of uncovering my values. Brainstorming, selecting, classifying and rewording was harnessed to identify the underlying values or primary drivers of my teaching.
behaviour. The values are expressed using abstract nouns in conjunction with slogans to reduce lexical ambiguity (see Table 9).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Slogan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>&quot;zero distortion between words and action&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiration</td>
<td>&quot;spurring students into action&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>&quot;trying out novel ideas, always experimenting&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>&quot;mixing management, education and language learning research&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Values and associated slogans

Conclusion

In conclusion, I was able to create a tabular TPS that linked actions in the classroom with a justification of each action that was, in turn, linked to the research literature. This TPS can be viewed as a living document (Alexander, Chabot, Cox, DeVoss, Gerber, Perryman-Clark, Platt, Sackey & Wendt, 2011), which describes teaching synchronically. Adopting a more pedagogic perspective, Ratnapradipa and Abrams (2012) portray the TPS as a roadmap through which educators can identify pedagogical strengths and weaknesses (p.39).

My research-based teaching philosophy statement draws upon a wide range of references within the interlinked fields of education and applied linguistics. Yet, the reasons attributed to the actions provided only a partial picture of my teaching, since it became obvious during the peer debrief that personal predilections were at play. Despite my desire to prove that all my actions as a teacher were led by research, it did not turn out to be the case. I was unable to escape from the fact that “teaching is a value-laden activity” (Goodyear & Allchin, 2001). Although I could justify my choices using the literature, the underlying reasons for the choice of some activities and actions were not research based. It seems more likely that the guiding force of some of my decisions were a set of values rather than research-based knowledge. This was in-line with many of the teaching philosophies I had read, the difference being the starting point: I aimed to create a research-based teaching philosophy, while the ones I read started from the vantage point of a set of beliefs.

The quest was for a research-based teaching philosophy, but the final TPS is a truer representation of what guides my behaviour as an academic and a teacher: a value-led research-based philosophy.

This study contributes to the research literature in three ways. It is the first reported study of the use of systematic analysis of introspection to create a TPS. It starts to address the neglected area of grounding teaching philosophies in research. Third, this study provides a framework for other teachers to use to create their own research-based TPS. This paper also echoes calls for grounding actions and behaviours in the research literature (Diana, 2013) rather than simply acting on prescriptive advice in pedagogic literature to describe beliefs and actions.

This study adopted a think-aloud procedure to reflect on the class taught and create the initial transcript for analysis. However, there are numerous alternative starting
points, such as analysing video-recordings of lessons. The subjectivity in the selection of references leaves open the possibility of accusations of cherry picking; the addition of more specific criteria to further systematize the decision-making process could address this shortcoming.
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Appendix 1: Student handout

Describing food

Activity 1 Vocabulary  
Tick the types of food you like eating:

☐ sweet  ☐ sour  ☐ bitter  ☐ salty  ☐ spicy
☐ bland  ☐ rich  ☐ oily  ☐ greasy  ☐ healthy
☐ crunchy  ☐ chewy  ☐ sticky  ☐ crispy  ☐ smelly
☐ delicious  ☐ tasty  ☐ disgusting  ☐ cheap  ☐ expensive

Activity 2 Drill  
Describe these foods using ‘... is...’ or ‘... are...’

sugar  coffee  fish sauce  chilli peppers  rice soup
lemons  KFC  fried bacon  Thai food  durian
nuts  melted cheese  tom yum gung  green curry

Activity 3 Common questions  
Ask and answer these questions.

What kind of food do you like? I like Thai food
Which Thai food do you like the most? I love green curry
What does it taste like? It’s spicy and a little sweet
What’s it made from? The main ingredients are .... &....

Activity 4 QAR  
We use the format Question, Answer and Response to make conversations flow smoothly. There are four common responses to open questions, namely: sound, copy, comment and follow-up question. Practice these dialogues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>What kind of food do you like?</th>
<th>What’s your favourite dish?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answer</td>
<td>I like Thai food</td>
<td>I love Mama noodles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response: sound</td>
<td>Oh,</td>
<td>Oh,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response: copy</td>
<td>Thai food</td>
<td>Mama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response: comment</td>
<td>Me too</td>
<td>They’re spicy and delicious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response: follow-up Q</td>
<td>What’s your favourite dish?</td>
<td>How often do you have them?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Activity 5 Student talk  
In pairs or threes, discuss your tastes in food. Ensure that you sound interested in your friend’s answers by using all four types of response every time.

Activity 6 Teacher talk  
Ask your teacher about his or her taste in food. Find out which foods he or she is familiar with. Introduce some special dishes to him or her.

Useful phrases to describe food:

XXX noodles  XXX curry  XXX soup
XXX sauce  XXX rice  XXX paste
XXX, a Thai fish  XXX, a Chinese vegetable  XXX, a tropical fruit
Appendix 2: Bullet point plan (expanded for clarity)

Activity 1 Use line drawings to elicit adjectives

Activity 2 Use pictures as prompts for sentences like
Sugar is sweet
Coffee is bitter
Fish sauce is salty
Teacher points, students say.
Students work in pairs to say all sentences.

Activity 3 Use dialogue build. Practice each question and answer in turn.
Then practice full dialogue with whole class.
Then practice in pairs.

Activity 4 Practice responses one by one.
Practice in groups with each person saying only one response.
e.g. in groups of 4 students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student 1 Question</th>
<th>What kind of food do you like?</th>
<th>What’s your favourite dish?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student 2 Answer</td>
<td>I like Thai food</td>
<td>I love instant noodles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 3 Response: sound</td>
<td>Oh,</td>
<td>Oh,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 4 Response: copy</td>
<td>Thai food</td>
<td>Instant noodles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 1 Response: comment</td>
<td>Me too</td>
<td>They’re spicy and delicious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 2 Response: follow-up</td>
<td>What’s your favourite dish?</td>
<td>How often do you have them?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Activity 5 Collect examples of common errors to provide feedback to whole class

Activity 6 Use opportunity to get students to recall new vocabulary