

Chapter 1

Deep Apprenticeship Is Reflective, Adaptive, and Self-Determined

Because of exam-oriented education, students have become rootless. (Liu, 2010)

This chapter scaffolds understanding about a series of premises that are crucial for a good grasp of the breadth and scope of the Deep Approach project.

When I started teaching, the reference model for teacher planning was to use well-defined objectives. Nowadays with outcomes-based standards, the situation has not changed much: the teacher is in a position to direct and control learning through a prespecified curriculum and a textbook. Curricula are usually imposed by the foreign language department, the program coordinator, or the head teaching assistant.

In the early 1970s, I read Robert Mager's book on "Preparing Instructional Objectives" and was baffled that he could claim that, once outcomes are clear and the sequence of instructional goals is on paper, not much is left to do as a teacher. This present book can be considered a response to Mager. It shows how much is left to do if you target responsive practice. Planning travel on the basis of a roadmap and moving forward adaptively may be as important as knowing the goal. I illustrated this point in a short story that I presented in China at a workshop on the Deep Approach at the beginning of the Year of the Rabbit¹.

¹ The Chinese version, 什么是深度反思性学习? is here: <http://www.deepproapproach.com/chinesestory.html>.

Why Having Clear Goals Derived from Backward Planning Is a Myth

Once upon a time, there was a rabbit, who, after saving eight gold coins, was preparing to seek his fortune in the world. Before leaving, he sought the advice of a wise, old rabbit, who told him this: “Don’t listen to advice; think for yourself, and think deeply.”

Our rabbit, baffled by the old rabbit’s advice, leapt from field to field, deep in thought. He stopped for the night at the top of a hillock where he could admire his surroundings. In the morning, as soon as he opened his eyes, he saw he was not alone. A weasel was staring at him.

“Good morning, rabbit! Where are you off to?”

“I’m thinking of how I can go and seek my fortune.”

“You are a lucky rabbit. I will guide you on your journey. You need a clear starting point, a goal, and a method.”

The weasel instructed him to make a backward map that began at his destination. The lesson lasted several days. When she felt he was ready, the weasel cried, “Perfect! You owe me three gold coins.”

The rabbit found himself alone, disheartened at being poorer, but now he knew how to set a goal based on a starting point composed of clear outcomes, which made him very proud of himself. He started on his first goal: that by the end of the day, he should be able to reach the hill about five miles off in the distance without spending another coin.

Poor rabbit! A group of children from the village pestered him so much that he had to avoid the village, which took him in the opposite direction of the hill! During his escape, he lost one gold coin. After a pensive journey where he thought deeply about the unexpected, he finally approached the hill, but he was stopped by a river that would most certainly keep him from his destination on the far-off hill. He sighed sadly, heartbroken, and camped for the night. As he opened his eyes in the morning, he saw he was not alone. A beaver was staring at him.

“Hello, rabbit! Where are you off to?”

“I’m thinking of how to seek my fortune.”

“You are a lucky rabbit because I’m going to teach you how to walk. You can’t get anywhere if you don’t know how to walk. You can move to the left, you can move to the right, you can navigate by sight or by sound. But you must first breakdown your journey into pieces and handle them one at a time.”

The rabbit pondered on this for a while and recognized in the words of the beaver the advice of the weasel, but the beaver’s advice seemed more brilliant. He groaned hesitantly, “But how much will this cost, my friend?”

The beaver was so persuasive that the rabbit devoured his lessons. He learned how to divide the journey into individual steps in order to get a feel for it. His schooling lasted several days. When he felt the rabbit was ready, the beaver announced, “You have finished your lessons. You owe me three gold coins.”

The rabbit found himself alone, disheartened at being poorer by three gold coins, but he now knew how to breakdown an outcome into parts and find the solution to each individual problem. The beaver had given him charts, rubrics, testing forms and every instrument imaginable. The rabbit decided to cross the meadow, towards a ribbon of smoke that rose in the distance. He started off, applying what he had learned, taking extra care not to spend another coin.

Poor rabbit! He knew everything about backward planning, but he stopped after each leap, not knowing how to proceed with the next step or tool to use, or how to compare the earlier leaps with the later ones. Nothing was as he expected. Each blade of grass, each stream terrified him. Another gold coin disappeared when he lost his footing, the rabbit being too absorbed in his charts. And he lost hours milling over each step of the way, weeping the whole time. Nothing of his journey was predictable, so he found himself reduced to improvisation.

Suddenly, he remembered the wise old rabbit. He realized the weasel and beaver were wrong. No longer bound by one theory or another, he felt free! He frolicked as he pleased, deciding spontaneously what followed each leap. He reacted in the moment. He understood that a weasel or a beaver couldn’t teach a rabbit how to move as a rabbit,

and he was angry to have paid dearly for his lessons. His past came back to him. In comparing the attitude of the wise old rabbits he knew, he saw the common link. Flexible, old rabbits laid the pathway by adapting to the circumstances, without useless instruments.

As night fell without a hitch, he approached a large fire. A man sitting there stared at the rabbit hungrily.

“Hello, rabbit! Where are you off to?”

“I’m reacting to my surroundings, so I can seek my fortune.”

“You are a lucky rabbit. I’ll let you in on a secret: you’ve reached the end of your voyage. If you break the spell, you will be master of time and space. Jump into the fire, it’s the only way to seek your fortune.”

The rabbit, wiser than before, sat to reflect deeply on this for himself, also thinking of the old rabbits, who were terrified of men. “All advice is an illusion, only take what is useful.”

From his experiences and deep thoughts, our friend the rabbit had developed his own strategies. He understood that there was no knowledge for everyone. He declined the invitation and went on his way, certain to find his fortune.

The moral of this story: If one doesn’t think profoundly, having goals doesn’t help. Backward planning before experience itself is delusive.

In the story, the wise old rabbit represents the Deep Approach—a way for students to self-guide their learning. The beaver is an earlier model of structured planning—it costs a lot but... The weasel presents the backward planning of more recent pedagogy... similarly costly and time-consuming and... The man in the story who tells the rabbit to jump in the fire could be interpreted as the extreme version of teaching for the test that many teachers face today. The way that best fits the young rabbit’s path is forward planning on the go, focusing on content input and output as a process, not a pre-specified, restrictive goal.

Note that, in this book, I use the words “input” and “output” in a way that matches the definitions provided by Curriculum Theory because of its focus on organizing open apprenticeship activities. From a Curriculum

perspective, instructional units can be planned as conceptual entries through forward planning (input focus in planning) or as measurable outcomes through backward planning (focusing on outputs in planning). In contrast to this definition, SLA researchers differentiate the “structured input activities” of processing instruction (Cardieno, 1995; VanPatten, 2004) considered since Krashen (1985), Gass (1997) and Carroll (2001) as being superior to instruction that was traditionally based on language production (or output) through drilling practices. However, there are other ways of making good use of output than drills. For example, open expression may reinforce self-evaluation and increase proficiency.

Swain (1985) proposed the output hypothesis suggesting that L2 production could affect acquisition, which was supported by Skehan (1998), Ellis (2003) and Toth (2006), among others. The idea was that production “pushed” learners from the “semantic processing” that comprehending input entails to the “syntactic processing” required to encode meanings (Swain, *ibid*, p. 249). The idea that production (output) helps acquisition is now well accepted (Swain, 2000): it (1) pushes learners to note the gap between what they want and can say; (2) provides opportunities to express oneself, test and encode meanings and get feedback; (3) routinizes encoding procedures; (4) allows learners to develop their own voice; and (5) generates reflective meta talk with increased awareness about the language. This book proposes an approach in which scaffolded production in open projects chosen by the learners becomes the key to language acquisition. Within this perspective, learning by doing in the production mode redefines acquisition in terms of apprenticeship.

Principles We Can Take from This Story

THERE ARE NO WORTHY OUTCOMES WITHOUT DEEP THOUGHT. Learners often feel that they are taught by theories that ignore contextual difficulties. For example, standardized models are often created off-practice, and can lead to neglecting adaptive qualities, necessary for working with others in co-created contexts. Such a theoretical ideal is partly unsustainable in the reality of the classroom. At the very least, it deserves to be complemented.

PEDAGOGY IS A LANGUAGE OF PRACTICE. In order to understand language learning in practice, a body of research should study the thoughts of students when they plan their learning, and as they work to realize their projects. Self-directed, project-based learning is under-researched. The results of this research paradigm would lead to a vision of a new way of teaching for proficiency, directly inspired by the reflections and practices of students' spontaneous actions and genuine projects.

REFLEXIVE LEARNING ADAPTS ITSELF TO STUDENT PROJECTS. Reflexive apprenticeship represents a dynamic process: students reflect in the moment and make decisions for projects that play a mediating role in the apprenticeship of the language. Deep pedagogy places reflection in the foreground.

DEEP TEACHING REQUIRES FLEXIBLE PLANNING. Learning is much more complicated than assimilating easily digestible content, taxonomically organized according to a Cartesian ideal that breaks difficulties into smaller chunks. Students can conceive plans for their own that are flexible. Learning is a negotiated process that gives a sense to the resources in organizing them in educational projects relatable for the students, allowing for the instructional material's integration.

DEEP LEARNING IS REFLECTIVE AND DOES NOT REQUIRE A NORMATIVE FRAMEWORK. Contrary to models, which impose normative frameworks, complete with fixed outcomes, reflective pedagogy does not respond to a focus on prescriptive rigor. It includes the capacity for the student to adapt the academic goals in reference to a moving context applied to projects, drawing on a repertory of knowledge, which allows the anticipation of problems and assuring a personal progression. Deep, reflective teaching is an open form of scaffolding and feedback centered on the process of learning. The goal is autonomous, creative reflection and action while developing proficiency.

As an example illustrating this last principle, here are the reflections of Jingjing, a World Language teacher who received a copy of the aforementioned rabbit story, which had been translated into Chinese for the "Rabbit Year":

After his experiences with the weasel and the beaver, the little rabbit finally understands that “all advice is an illusion, only take what is useful” and finds his fortune. This story reminded me of similar ideas in Chinese philosophy. Chinese philosophy presents several education principles. The first principle is “inexpressible”. One teacher was once asked: “What is the first principle?” He answered: “If I were to tell you, it would become the second principle.” That means if a principle can be told in the process of teaching, it cannot be the useful knowledge to learn. In the fable, the old rabbit told the little rabbit not to listen to advice and think for himself, this act can be interpreted as an understanding of inexpressible education.

Then, the method of cultivation is also non-cultivation. In some aspects of Chinese philosophy, to do things without deliberate effort seems to be the best way to achieve goals, and the adequate confidence in oneself is equally important. So actually, learning does not impose a normative purpose, and sometimes, the teachers should wait for the students to learn reflexively, like the old rabbit did. The old rabbit did not tell the little rabbit any details about the journey and didn’t tell him what should be done step by step as the weasel and the beaver did. But the little rabbit carried the first advice with him on his journey. The old rabbit teacher used the non-cultivation to some extent and successfully let the little rabbit find the most suitable way for himself.

This example illustrates the importance of and the unforeseeable turns in the Deep Approach process and its inexpressibility. Chinese philosophical thought supports the non-normalizing aspect of the Deep Approach, as would do recent philosophical explorations, such as Jacques Rancières’ (1991) study of the need for students to find their own learning path.

Obviously, the attempt at describing the indescribable is a complex endeavor. In Eastern philosophy, one way of approaching such depth is inspired from what depth is not. Here is a little survey to grasp the Deep Approach by what it is NOT. Note which points strike you as important.

1. Directive teaching and controlled learning do NOT lead to language proficiency.
2. Backward planning is NOT the easy way to language fluency.
3. The emphasis on oral communication has been at the cost of depth in language learning.
4. The place of grammar is neither clear nor balanced in current language teaching methods.
5. Language tasks rarely target sociocultural situations in their context.
6. Language courses rarely provide exposure to the regional and social varieties of the target language.
7. Deep culture and cross-cultural pragmatics are minor topics in language classrooms.
8. The way we teach cultures in a language classroom context is commonly not respectful of their varieties and complexity.
9. New technologies are rarely used in the language classroom to make students self-sufficient in their learning.
10. The teacher rarely works as a facilitator and the students almost never build their curriculum and their progression themselves.
11. Language programs do not adapt to students' determination.
12. Situations in which students freely build up on their projects represent a very minor part of what most foreign language departments propose.
13. Most languages courses are based upon extrinsically motivated activities.
14. Depth is more important than coverage in most languages courses.
15. Evaluation is rarely helpful and empowering in language classrooms.
16. Literature is not well integrated in language courses.

What, how and why should students learn? Is it better for them to learn rules by rote or to express their creativity? Is the post hoc focus on form(s) the final say on what should be enacted in a classroom context? Should they be storing information in their memory or be encouraged to find answers for themselves? The current context of education does not allow much freedom for reflective activity that respects the natural flow of

learning. These approaches may be complementary, and it becomes a matter of affirming their respective merits. This directly concerns the management of instructional content. Planning is, in large measure, responsible for the way in which our students' lives are organized. A highly structured plan risks developing automatism, whereas a project with more complexity may trigger something like an awakening. All these questions require a closer study and serious reflection. What are the underlying values that are being targeted?

While in the United States it is legitimate to believe that the emphasis on the 5 Cs standards (Communication, Comparisons, Connections, Cultures, and Community) within their presentational, interpretive and interpersonal aspects constitutes an advancement over previous methods in the promotion of foreign language learning—an emphasis that is now shared across K-12 grade levels as well as college instruction, the European Reference Framework for Foreign Languages has developed in the community of language instructors a sense that the communicative functions of the language are not sufficient and must be put into situated action. Indeed, it indicates that linguistic communication competences must be re-thought within broader competences whose contexts and conditions may vary to mobilize strategies adapted to the tasks that need to be accomplished (CECR, 2001, p. 15). Richer (2009) posits that this new, post-communicative framework based upon action theory must be understood more as a rupture from the past, rather than a simple, soft and cosmetic move away from the usual communicative jargon. It offers a perspective that is eclectic and post-methodological because its focus is the take-over by the learners of their teaching, whatever means can concur to develop the needed, situated proficiency in its context. More than an “actional” turn, this framework represents a turn towards self-direction and the acknowledgement that the language instructor cannot do much if the learner is not actively part of the decision-making process.

Thus from the somewhat simplistic perspective of communicational competences emerges a new panorama of what needs to be done for the complex action/project competence, a process which presents the major challenge and paradox of having to be explored and perfected in large part *without the teacher*. The whole turn challenges one basic premise

that was taken for granted by generations of language instructors: that language classes should be planned by the teacher (and by extension with the close guidance, supervision, curriculum and agreement of the foreign language department). To understand how revolutionary the move is and why it deserves the denomination of post-method, let us consider a minute what instructional planning is. Indeed the linking of research on language learning in action and field practice, especially for teachers in training, is vital.

The Limits of Instructional Planning

Instructional planning has so far been at the core of the life of language teachers. It is highly influenced by textbooks, and therefore, represents market forces over individual empowerment. Textbooks, as well as teacher planning, present anticipation of instructional events, an organization of content that precedes interaction. In this sense, planning is an evolutionary fiction that projects itself beforehand onto unpredictable future interactions of instructional life. Thus, planning is a conceptual simplification of reality. Its models marry diverse theories to produce a concrete, practical action.

At the moment of instructional action, planning has, to a great extent, a transformational face because it must respond to immediate situations whose referents are past experience and prior knowledge. To be sure, this knowledge may appear hybrid and any work on planning courts the danger of applying different epistemological frames onto an action that a learner will explain using terms from a cross section of theories. Curriculum planning, then, has its own way of knowing, is an epistemology of synthesis with the risk of artifice. Its legitimacy resides in convergence and the pragmatic fusion of ideas. It would be a mistake to fault planning for slighting the roses when it blends them with the marigolds and dahlias; the florist creates art out of the harmony of confrontation. Accessed by metaphor, pedagogical relations transcend the realm of behaviors; they can be guided only by an approximate estimation, a project. Planning lies on this side of the meaning constructed from experience; it is a way to make sense of things. It conscientiously fuses these many theories, which apprentices (students)

amalgamate at will to understand and to deepen their understanding. The quintessence of planning resides in the common denominator; and some risks are associated with reductive meanings. Concepts, with use, become divorced from their pragmatic contexts and become trite. Abstractions become objects of discourse. This *thingification* makes them meaningless.

Research on language learning in action should hereafter be linked to field practices. The investigations into the categories and constructs used by language students to organize learning experience ran counter to the predominant normative trend. Nonetheless, the number of studies in this area of research has increased steadily. Enthusiasm for the description of actual practices is explained in part by the recurring problems encountered by master program designers and innovators who attempt to prescribe changes without coming to grips with the importance of teachers' and students' knowledge, beliefs, values and interests in the instructional process. Innumerable practical problems arise from the deliberate ignorance of working mental models, and of the rationales of situated practice (Lave & Wenger, 1990). Other practical problems are related to teachers' training: experienced teachers advise education students to leave theory aside when they are in the field, i.e. the classroom; and in higher education, teacher training is practically nonexistent. The approach that I propose may remedy this situation, which can be attributed to partial irrelevance of training models and their frequent lack of connection with practice, unless intensive practicums are organized in close connection with methods courses.

Another issue is the novice teacher's inherited mindset. Teachers are meant to teach. A teacher must be interrupted in some way to leave room for student self-determination and decision-making. Teachers make huge efforts to adapt their syllabus in a way that will fit the comfort level of their class. However, such attempts are limited as long as the student is not part of the planning process. In the classroom, the written program is transformed into an active one and the interpretation of the curriculum is crucial in choosing what to teach. This interpretation is a part of the genesis of a learning plan. But how can a teacher interpret content from the perspective of twenty or so students? It must be close to the students' mental models for them to be able to grasp it. Any training that does not

take into account the practical problems related to the adaptive transfer, by each learner, of abstract contents into action is doomed for failing to use the full resources of the learner. Therefore we first need to address how to stimulate engagement and language development in the classroom through strategies we learned from motivation research and SLA research that point to the inadequacy of the present approach.

In principle, education is an applied science. Problems are generated the moment theory loses touch with the learners. For this reason, instructional models should draw closer to field practice. Mixed studies, conjugating ethnomethodological analyses, experiential approaches, teacher professional stories, action research, case studies and experimentations should pave the way for the conception of methodologies that reflect more closely the wisdom of practice. This work pursues this intent inasmuch as it is the product of video study groups (Tochon, 1999), participatory action research (Tochon & Ökten, 2010) and ethnomethodological research on the experience of seasoned teachers. Its models were verified by exploratory practice (Allwright, 2003), by virtue of the connection between theory and its field integration. They correspond to the latest developments in world language education and Second Language Acquisition, but more importantly, they work in practice.

Survey of the Book's Chapters

In this book, a rather rigorous description is undertaken—this being characteristic of any attempt at verisimilitude and trustworthiness, if not generalization—of what is happening in expert language instruction (Tsui, 2003). Instructional planning in practice equates to describing the un verbalized, implicit dimension of teaching.

Chapter 1 was an introduction to the nuances required for transdisciplinary action and value creation in instructional design. That said, planning has its limits, as shown in the second chapter.

Chapter 2: “A compelling chapter” expressed a teacher. “Absolutely vital to forming an understanding of the theoretical bases of the Deep Approach.” A number of curriculum researchers and theorists proposed to define instructional outcomes in a way that would make

assessments comparable. However models born from Cartesian logic are often inadequate relative to language-situated competence, they do not account for all its complexity. The deep learning process, defined as apprenticeship, gives rise to a variety of outcomes that cannot be anticipated. Therefore, evaluation is open and focuses on creative work.

Chapter 3 addresses the critical roles of text to language learning and its correlate, project-based learning, clearly key features of the Deep Approach. Because they directly challenge deeply embedded orally-based conversational learning practice, they are introduced directly and without equivocation. I indicate how and why text and the writing process should be the primary focus of deep language learning. Writing is used as a form of expression that leaves a trace where analysis and reflection are used as tools to encourage further improvement. Writing precedes oral exchange. Oral exchange must be considered the by-product of reading and writing in the language, as reading and writing are the seats of knowing.

Chapter 4: As Kurt Lewin emphasized, there is nothing more practical than a good theory. A number of researchers have designed educational classifications integrating the cognitive, the socio-affective, and the psychomotor aspects of learning. Their levels have some important points in common: the first level is usually related to the mastery of disciplinary content and is confined to the short term; the second level concerns thinking strategies and instrumental skills that can be transferred from one subject area to another; and the third level pertains to the long term, representing transdisciplinary competences in concrete situations. The articulation of the discipline/interdiscipline/transdiscipline levels supports transversal approaches, i.e. a better relation between the subject areas and a social application of contents.

Chapter 5: An inquiry conducted with some thirty teachers suggests that, contrary to the principles established by most planning models, seasoned practitioners do not sequence their lessons linearly but by integrating task domains. This integration allows the simultaneous attainment of a variety of outcomes, not just one. The characteristics of the Deep Approach and its core principles are highlighted.

Chapter 6: “An important chapter for the teacher so that she can develop the global perspective needed for facilitating and guiding the

student on the various levels.” In the Deep Approach, the learners are in charge of their own learning; they are, in large part, in charge of the curriculum decisions, such as planning educative projects, choosing themes, films, and texts, as well as grammar complements they need for their projects. The teacher becomes an advisor or counselor and facilitator and provides extensive feedback. Thus, what articulates teaching and learning is intensive viewing and its conversational feedback, extensive reading, and extensive writing workshops for individual and group projects. A series of examples are proposed.

Chapter 7: Self-determination and the awareness of one’s own way of knowing and learning is the cornerstone for the possibility of deep apprenticeship. When students are allowed to plan their own productions, they organize their knowledge autonomously and develop their reflectiveness. In an educative production, the students are brought to evaluate themselves. The path to self-evaluation is acquired gradually, by experience. Studying the directives develops a working methodology as well as reflexive aptitudes. In the final learning phase, evaluative metacognition becomes a fundamental competence.

Chapter 8: The deep process can’t be reified. In the internationalization of the mind, value creation is of utmost importance. This positioning first suggests that it is no longer possible nowadays to think disciplinary without re-connecting content to the issues that we live as a world, a society, not only as inhabitants but as members and partners of planet Earth. Language is the conduit for connecting humanity across states, and peace building across cultures. Therefore language study should not be constructed for the exclusive purpose of proficiency: it can foster the wisdom, courage and compassion of cosmopolitanism for peace. This “Deep Turn” in language education goes with Ikeda’s (2010a) suggestion of changing the standards model toward 6Cs standards with the overarching C of Cosmopolitanism.

Chapter 9: The Deep Turn Toward Wisdom and Autonomy supports the argument that World Language Education should be but one aspect of a whole strategy to reverse the destructive trends our societies have pursued over the last century. Humans are confronted with a choice within a collapsing environment, violent competition for limited

resources, financial crisis, mass murders and industrial pollution. This situation, along with systemic corruption and censorship of the medias, legitimates pedagogy of social awakening. We need politics with a conscience, business with a conscience, communities with a conscience, and Education with a conscience. This is the missing transdisciplinary element in Education. It is nice to describe what “language students should know and be able to do” (ACTFL, 2006, p.13), but it is not enough. Language is not *one*. A sense of mission is required. Language learning should not simply target proficiency: it should foster intercultural wisdom, an awareness of differences, empathy, and target cosmopolitanism for peace. Teachers need to become activists, promoting social hol-acts. Language is the conduit for connectedness. Thus language studies should educate through and beyond the language. Colonial representations of superior Self and inferior Other involving race, gender, ethnicity, class, and language, are constantly re/constructed in curricula, policies and practices related to foreign languages. The Deep Approach may become an empowering micro-policy: critical multiculturalism, aesthetic, political, and cosmopolitan philosophies inform its intercultural positioning.

Conclusion: The proposal in this book is to opt for a shared, creative rebalancing of our Education world toward student self-determined curricula. The Deep Approach uses projects in a very special way, with broad and thorough, self-determined action, yet quite detailed regarding tasks domains for process evaluation. Teachers need more freedom of action, curriculum flexibility, a vast resource of knowledge, and self-training, reflecting on the role of identity, agency, cooperation and shared autonomy in language learning. Pedagogy for autonomy and value creation is not a simple aim, however. It requires a change of mindset. When order is emphasized in classroom interaction, conformity models are produced that do not support much creativity. In this respect, we need to reimagine different ways of organizing practices, and the Deep Approach is such a proposal.

Make no mistake: The age of methods has passed, but of course, the teachers remain (Reagan & Osborn, 2002). The rigor of the arguments posed in this work should not overshadow the fact that a methodology blends with the teacher’s knowledge. Any application is an individual,

unique, non-reproducible experience. Thus, a planning synthesis is an arduous, controversial task that too often skirts the context and the student-teacher relationship. The aim of this work is not to oversimplify the realities of learning but to lead the reader to reflect upon them in a way that helps reconceptualize one's practice.

Many language instructors are used to teaching in a way that involves decontextualized exercises, which have proven ineffective for Second Language Acquisition. Empty slot exercises, vocabulary and morphologic manipulation, and an overemphasis on formal aspects of the language are most often developed at the cost of meaning, communication, and depth. They make learners passive, as the teacher makes the curriculum decisions. Therefore, the first step to a deeper approach is for teachers NOT to teach. Teaching as usual must be interrupted. Then what are the teachers doing? This book is a response to this question.

