Supporting rich and meaningful interaction in language teaching for revitalization: Lessons from Macuiltianguis Zapotec

Katherine J. Riestenberg
Bryn Mawr College

Many language revitalization programs aimed at teaching Indigenous languages are small, informal efforts with limited time and resources. Even in communities that still have proficient speakers, students in revitalization programs often struggle to gain proficiency in the language. This paper offers an illustration of how one language revitalization program has tried to make teaching more effective by adapting communicative language teaching strategies to be more useful and appropriate for their particular context. Having gained empirical support in the field of second language acquisition (SLA), communicative language teaching emphasizes the importance of rich and meaningful interaction for language learning to take place. "Rich" refers to the availability of target-like input that is not oversimplified. "Meaningful" refers to the type of interaction that takes place in real-life situations that necessitate communication. However, existing research on these topics has largely ignored language revitalization contexts, where providing learners with rich and meaningful interaction can be particularly challenging. This paper presents strategies for promoting rich and meaningful interaction in instructed language revitalization settings, as demonstrated through teacher practices at a Zapotec revitalization program in San Pablo Macuiltianguis, Oaxaca, Mexico. The focus is on shifting from Spanish language use to Zapotec language use in specific, everyday social spaces, then supporting interaction within these spaces.

1. INTRODUCTION.[1] Language teaching has a growing role in language revitalization efforts around the world (Cope & Penfield 2011; Hermes 2007; Hinton 2011; Hornberger 2008a; Reyhner 1997). A global survey of Indigenous language revitalization efforts showed that language teaching was a major objective for a majority of programs that responded (Pérez Báez, Vogel, & Koller 2018; Pérez Báez, Vogel, & Patolo 2019). This suggests that in many communities experiencing language shift, immediately reestablishing language transmission in the home is not seen as a viable option,

and community members turn to teaching as an alternative. While some language revitalization efforts become well-funded, government-backed education initiatives (e.g., Benton 1986, 2015; Cowell 2012), many Indigenous language teaching programs are small, local efforts with little institutional support. A handful of community members may become concerned with the fact that children are not acquiring the language and simply decide to begin teaching the language themselves. In consideration of this reality, this article focuses on how teachers at a small, informal language revitalization program can employ strategies that maximize opportunities for language learning.

These language revitalization programs can face enormous challenges, even when a community still has proficient speakers. For one thing, Indigenous communities may not view schools as places of hope for their languages, as language loss has been perpetuated by boarding schools and exclusionary monolingual education around the world (Gantt 2016; Hornberger 2008a; White 2006). Even in cases where language teaching is seen as a positive path forward (e.g., De Korne 2017; Hermes 2007; Riestenberg & Sherris 2018), there is often an understanding that "schools alone are not enough to do the job" (Hornberger 2008b:1). As Hinton (2011) argued, Indigenous language learning is inextricably tied to one's identity as belonging to a minority culture, and learning an Indigenous language reflects a sociopolitical ideology about cultural autonomy and resistance to assimilation. This sociocultural reality sets teaching for Indigenous language revitalization apart from the foreign language teaching contexts that have received far more scholarly attention. The goals and needs of Indigenous language instruction can differ greatly from other language instruction settings, and most resources on effective language teaching are not created with revitalization in mind (Riestenberg, in press; Riestenberg & Sherris 2018; White 2006). Indigenous language educators may therefore find it difficult to achieve their instructional goals, and although the need is urgent, students in many revitalization programs struggle to gain proficiency in the language.

This paper offers an illustration of how one language revitalization program has tried to make teaching more effective by adapting communicative language teaching strategies so that they were more applicable, useful, and appropriate in an instructed language revitalization context. A major concern of this paper is how to maximize limited time, resources, and access to proficient speakers by promoting rich and meaningful interaction in language teaching. The terms "rich" and "meaningful interaction" come from literature on communicative language teaching as discussed further in Section 2. "Rich" refers to the availability of target-like language input (i.e., listening) that is not oversimplified. "Meaningful" refers to the type of interaction that takes place in real-life situations that necessitate communication (e.g., Brandl 2008:5). Instead of designing teaching around the grammar of the language, the instructor designs it around the things that students actually need or want to do in the language. The goal is highly participatory interactions in which speakers must achieve some communicative goal (Lave & Wenger 1991; Long 1996).

Within this paper, the concepts of rich input and meaningful interaction are reconsidered in light of the specific challenges of instructed Indigenous language revitalization, particularly when time and resources are limited. The next section sets up the problem of directly applying strategies from communicative language teaching to instructed Indigenous language revitalization. The second half of the paper suggests possible ways of adapting communicative teaching strategies to better meet these challenges, offering examples from the practices of instructors who teach Sierra Juárez Zapotec in the community of San Pablo Macuiltianguis, Oaxaca, Mexico, which is further

introduced in Section 3. The paper concludes with a consideration of the outcomes and remaining challenges involved in applying these strategies.

2. COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING FOR LANGUAGE REVITALIZATION. Communicative language teaching (CLT) is a meaning-based approach to language teaching that makes use of "real-life situations that necessitate communication" (Brandl 2008:5; see also Spada 2007). Based in an understanding that the primary function of language is social interaction, CLT aims to help learners develop 'communicative competence,' the characteristics of which are summarized by Lillis (2006:666) as follows (emphasis added):

- The ability to use a language well involves knowing (either explicitly or implicitly) how to use language appropriately in any given context.
- The ability to speak and understand language is not based solely on grammatical knowledge.
- What counts as appropriate language varies according to context and may involve a range of modes – for example, speaking, writing, singing, whistling, drumming.
- **Learning what counts as appropriate language occurs through a process of socialization** into particular ways of using language through participation in particular communities.

CLT can thus be understood not as a specific pedagogical method but rather as any approach "that understands language to be inseparable from individual identity and social behavior" (Savignon 2018:5). While a number of different models of communicative competence for language pedagogy have been proposed (Bachman & Palmer 2010; Canale & Swain 1980; Canale 1983; Celce-Murcia, Dornyei & Thurrell 1995), all of these models share an emphasis on language use, meaning, and fluency alongside lessons on language structure, form, and accuracy. This stands in contrast to methods that focus on learning words and grammatical structures without necessarily placing them in the context of their communicative objectives, a legacy of the grammar-translation method that was widely used in Western schooling in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries but is not considered to be an effective method of developing oral language proficiency (Brandl 2008; Richards & Rodgers 2001).

Proponents of CLT argue that the development of oral proficiency can be accelerated through the increased interaction in the language that the approach offers, and this is backed by empirical research on second and foreign language instruction (Gass, Mackey & Pica 1998; Keck et al. 2006; Mackey 2007; McDonough & Mackey 2013; Pica, Kang & Sauro 2006; Seedhouse 1999). This may appeal to teachers in revitalization programs, as the need for learners to quickly gain speaking proficiency is often seen as urgent. However, offering opportunities for interaction in the language presents pedagogical challenges. In many language teaching settings, revitalization or otherwise, the instructor is the principle or only speaker of the language to whom students have regular access. For this reason, a substantial subset of CLT literature has focused on how technology can be used to support classroom practices (Chapelle 2007; Thomas & Reinders 2010). Use of technology, especially videos and audio of natural language use, can be extremely effective for CLT when this is a feasible option, but many language revitalization programs do not readily have access to classroom technology, or the time and resources to carry out video and audio recordings that are appropriate for

classroom use. On the other hand, if language revitalization is taking place in a scenario in which learners and proficient speakers are living together in a community, this can be seen as an advantage over other language learning contexts in which learners do not have such direct access to speakers of the target language.

CLT may be appealing in revitalization contexts for other reasons as well. Because CLT proceeds based not on language structure but on the communicative needs of learners, the approach can be used in settings that lack extensive language resources in the form of grammars and textbooks. By focusing on real-life situations, CLT moves away from rote, teacher-fronted practices and focuses instead on interactions among learners or between learners and teachers. This in turn lends itself to engaging with sociocultural practices while maintaining a focus on language learning. CLT's focus on language as it is authentically used among a community of speakers means that it is flexible enough for community members to realize it in the way they see fit.

Still, a major challenge in applying CLT in revitalization contexts is that there may not be any real-life social situations that truly require the learners to speak the target language (Riestenberg & Sherris 2018). This puts the focus on authentic or "real-life" language use that is the basis of CLT directly at odds with the realities of language revitalization. Because CLT aims to foster learners' ability to communicate outside of the language classroom, there must be an active speech community on which to base authentic and useful communicative tasks for the learners. Speakers must be using the language in at least some social domains, and these domains must be accessible to learners, at least in principle. This presents a dilemma in Indigenous language contexts if language loss has resulted in an overall decrease in language use across social domains and a social divide between older and younger generations. For revitalization to be successful, social practices for using the Indigenous language must be identified. This involves identifying potential changes to linguistic habits, such as everyday interactions, cultural practices, or routines that could be done in the Indigenous language instead of the colonizing language (Riestenberg, in press). Once these spaces of potential language use are identified, authentic communicative tasks of the type emphasized in CLT can emerge. This is not easy to do, however, and the responsibility to create these new spaces of language use often falls to language teachers with limited time and resources to devote to language instruction and who may themselves be learners of the language.

It is worth noting that CLT is not incompatible with other widely known approaches to language revitalization such as master-apprentice programs (Hinton 2001; Hinton, Vera & Steele 2002; Olawsky 2013), language nests (e.g., King 2001), and immersion schools (e.g., Bishop, Berryman & Richardson 2002; Greymorning 1997; Hermes 2007). While these approaches represent different ways to structure a revitalization program, CLT is better thought of as a set of pedagogical ideologies (e.g., a focus on social situations that necessitate communication) and strategies (e.g., promoting rich and meaningful interaction) that facilitate language learning. Any of these approaches can therefore incorporate CLT, or aspects of CLT, into lesson design. When these immersion-based approaches are not feasible due to lack of time or resources, CLT offers an alternative way to make the most out of limited instructional time. At the same time, it is important to acknowledge that the existing body of research on CLT has largely ignored language revitalization contexts, and, in any case, it is widely understood by language pedagogy experts that there is no "one-size-fits-all," single best method for language teaching. Instead, it is important to critically consider what strategies are applicable, useful, and appropriate in a particular setting.

This paper focuses on how teachers at a small language revitalization program adapted two particular strategies of CLT to fit their needs. The first strategy is to provide rich, authentic language input. The second strategy is to support frequent, meaningful interaction among learners or with other interlocutors. In the subsections that follow, I summarize how each of these strategies is presented in the CLT literature and the challenges for implementing these strategies in revitalization contexts, before turning in the subsequent section to ways the teachers adapted these strategies to better meet these challenges.

3. PROVIDING RICH, AUTHENTIC INPUT. Rich input is authentic, target-like input that is not oversimplified. According to Brandl (2008:12), the goal of rich input is to offer learners exposure to "a plethora of language patterns, chunks, and phrases in numerous contexts and situations." Long (2015:307) states that rich input should display "quality, quantity, variety, genuineness, and relevance." He argues that methods such as modeled dialogues, drills, and reading passages tend to offer input that is linguistically impoverished, resulting in limited or even unrealistic "data" for the learners who are processing the language. Instead of exposing learners to scripted interactions, the goal is to expose them to authentic, real-life discourse. Depending on the context, this input may come from the speech of the instructor, of other speakers of the language, or from classmates. It may be through face-to-face interactions, phone or video calls, or watching or listening to pre-recorded video or audio of people communicating in the language in a realistic context. For example, students may listen to someone describing how to weave a type of basket before being asked to complete the same task themselves.

One way to think about providing rich input is to consider both lexically and structurally rich input. In terms of lexically rich input, students need to be exposed not only to concrete, basic, isolated words (e.g., 'tree,' 'house,' 'jump') but also more abstract words (e.g., 'tired,' 'fun'), category labels (e.g., not just 'fork,' 'knife,' 'spoon' but also 'utensils'), grammaticalized words (e.g., the plural suffixes of 'cats,' 'bugs,' and 'foxes'), and collocations (e.g., 'get ready,' 'a large amount of,' 'a strong feeling'). In terms of structurally rich input, students need to be exposed to a variety of sentence structures. This may be quite different in different languages, but this could include things like using both questions and statements, using subordinate clauses, and using different types of agreement (e.g., 'You like to play baseball and she likes to play basketball.'). In a CLT approach, these lexically and structurally diverse forms emerge naturally through participation in real-life interactions that necessitate communication, rather than by teaching these forms directly. After an initial period of getting accustomed to these input floods, learners' implicit language learning mechanisms kick in, and learning takes place at a much more rapid pace than it would without rich input (Long 2015, 2016). This is one reason why "immersion" is widely understood to be effective for language learning.

It seems logical that we would want to offer students in instructed language revitalization contexts this type of immersive, rich language experience. However, providing learners with rich spoken input can be particularly difficult in language revitalization settings in which the number of proficient speakers is rapidly declining. Even when there are speakers, they may not be available to attend the classes. It may be particularly difficult to find existing authentic materials such as the "texts, photographs, video selections, and other language resources…not specially prepared for pedagogical purposes" suggested by Brandl (2008:13; see also Tschirner 2003), and programs may not have access to video or audio recordings, or the time and resources to carry this out.

Because many revitalization programs are led by teachers who are also learners, the input students receive is sometimes minimal, simple, and highly scripted. At the same time, the focus on "authentic" language input is attractive in revitalization settings because it is unnecessary to generate a large amount of teaching-specific materials. It can also help students make important sociocultural connections in the language, learning whole phrases and relationships among words instead of isolated words or calques from their other language. There are therefore significant benefits to providing rich, authentic input in an instructed revitalization setting if the stated challenges can be addressed.

4. SUPPORTING FREQUENT, MEANINGFUL INTERACTION. Interaction involves both input and learner production; learners cannot simply listen to input. Rather, they must be active conversational participants who interact and negotiate about the type of input they receive. A learner speaking to a teacher might ask for a clarification or check whether she has the right word. These kinds of negotiations for meaning take place naturally between speakers in everyday interactions to avoid conversational trouble and make oneself understood. It turns out that this type of interaction functions like a catalyst that promotes language acquisition. Several studies of instructed language learning have shown that a significant amount of learning takes place during interactions between the learners and teachers, other speakers, or other learners (Keck, Iberri-Shea, Tracy-Ventura, & Wa-Mbaleka, 2006; Mackey, 2007; McDonough & Mackey, 2013; Pica, Kang, & Sauro, 2006; Seedhouse, 1999).

In order for communicative interactions to be beneficial in this way, it is crucial that the interactions be meaningful. One way of thinking about providing opportunities for meaningful language use is through the use of tasks. Task-based language teaching (TBLT), a particular pedagogical approach within CLT, is grounded in the principle that language learning is most successful when learners engage in activities that are "worthwhile for their own sake" (Dewey, 1933:87 as cited in Norris 2009:579). This means going beyond language practice to achieve a nonlinguistic objective, such as getting to know one's classmates or learning to cook traditional food. In order to develop tasks, one first conducts a needs analysis (Long 2005; Serafini, Lake & Long 2015). This involves collecting information using qualitative research methods such as interviews, observations, or focus groups in order to identify the real-world tasks that learners need to be able to perform in the language and the discourse that is involved in completing them. Then instructional versions of these tasks, called pedagogic tasks, are developed for the classroom (Long 2015).

Another conceptualization of a task comes from Ellis (2009:223), who states that for a language-teaching activity to qualify as a "task," it should have the following characteristics:

- The primary focus should be on "meaning" (i.e., learners should be mainly concerned with processing the semantic and pragmatic meaning of utterances).
- There should be a "gap," a need to convey information, to express an opinion or to infer meaning.
- Learners should largely have to rely on their own resources (linguistic and non-linguistic) in order to complete the activity.
- There is a clearly defined outcome other than the use of language (i.e., the language serves as the means for achieving the outcome, not as an end in its own right).

For both Long and Ellis, it is not the task itself but rather the context surrounding the task that creates meaningfulness. Introducing yourself to your classmates is not meaningful if everyone already knows your name, or if no one really feels that it is important to learn your name. However, introducing yourself to your classmates is meaningful if others would truly like to learn your name. Brandl (2008:16) further argues that for a language interaction to be meaningful, it should be "relatable to existing knowledge that the learner already possesses." For instance, a lesson on terms used when playing basketball is not going to be successful if the learners aren't familiar with the sport. What all of these ways of understanding tasks have in common is their emphasis on meaning over decontextualized practice of words and grammar.

Promoting meaningful interaction is likely to be appealing to instructors working in language revitalization settings because of the opportunities it creates to engage with sociocultural practices while maintaining a focus on language. However, creating opportunities for meaningful interaction can be difficult if language shift has resulted in an overall decrease in language use across social domains and a social divide between older and younger generations. The authentic task idealized in TBLT requires significant community investment in the target language, because in Indigenous communities that have experienced language shift, there may be few tasks that learners truly need to do in the language (Riestenberg & Sherris 2018). This is particularly the case if everyone in the community is either bilingual or only speaks the colonizing language. Frequent, meaningful interaction is a major advantage of revitalization approaches such as Master-Apprentice (Hinton 2001), but this type of program is not practical in every community. What if there is only one committed teacher? Even if there are multiple proficient speakers participating in a program, are they able to commit to frequently (and patiently) interacting with the learners?

Still, the shift from grammar and vocabulary practice to a focus on language meaning can provide an enormous advantage in Indigenous language contexts, particularly if little linguistic analysis has been conducted. In addition, Riestenberg & Sherris (2018) argued that when learners in revitalization programs experience in meaningful, communicative use of the target language, this fosters their identities as knowers and users of the language and reinforces their relationship to the language as symbolic capital. This type of learning by doing also demonstrates to community members that students can actually use the language, which can foster positive beliefs about language revitalization (ibid 2018).

5. MACUILTIANGUIS ZAPOTEC REVITALIZATION PROJECT. The remainder of this paper offers examples of strategies for adapting CLT to meet the challenges of language revitalization settings described in previous sections. The examples come from a program aimed at teaching children the traditional Zapotec language of the community of San Pablo Macuiltianguis, Oaxaca, Mexico. Zapotec is the term used to designate a subfamily of "probably twenty-some" (Beam de Azcona, 2016:3) languages of the Otomanguean stock primarily spoken in the state of Oaxaca in southern Mexico, with many speakers also living in other regions of Mexico and the United States. Macuiltianguis Zapotec is the variety spoken in the small municipality of San Pablo Macuiltianguis, located in the mountainous Sierra Juárez region north of Oaxaca City. The 2010 Mexican census suggested a rapid decrease in the number of Indigenous language speakers in Macuiltianguis over the last two generations; 96% of people over age 45 reported that they spoke an Indigenous language but this was true for only 36% of people ages 5-14 (INEGI, 2010). During a year of fieldwork in the community (2015-

2016), I encountered no Zapotec-speaking children between the ages of 5 and 14, suggesting that there are perhaps even fewer speakers than the census indicates.

The Grupo Cultural Tagayu' (Macuiltianguis Cultural Group) was founded in 2008 by several community members with the broad goal of preserving and revitalizing the local language. The group established an alphabet for the language and have since produced several printed resources, including a Bingo game, a domino game, a booklet of songs and stories, a book on counting and measurement, a book on the community's history and traditional knowledge (Grupo Cultural Tagayu' 2017), and a workbook for learning the local practical orthography (Grupo Cultural Tagayu' 2018). In 2010, the group registered a learning center to teach Zapotec to children with the Center for the Study and Development of the Indigenous Languages of Oaxaca (CEDELIO), who provide training opportunities for Indigenous language activists. Between 2010 and 2015, the retired primary school teacher who voluntarily directs the revitalization group sporadically taught Zapotec classes to children in the community. In 2014, she attended a workshop on TBLT in multilingual contexts that I offered in Oaxaca through CEDELIO. We subsequently formed a collaboration to assess, create, adapt, and apply communicative and task-based strategies in the Zapotec classes, with the instructor's main goal being to promote authentic spoken interaction among the learners and between learners and speakers living in the community.

It is important to acknowledge that I write this paper as a non-Indigenous, outsider researcher and auxiliary to the language revitalization group. The reflections in this article are written and published with the permission of the community members involved and are based on work that took place between August 2015 and June 2016, during which time I was living in Macuiltianguis, working closely with the revitalization group on lesson plans and language materials, and conducting linguistic research. During this time, a fluctuating group of children (mostly ages 7-11) regularly attended a two-hour Zapotec class after school around three times per month. All learners were true beginners in terms of speaking, reading, and writing, but a few learners had higher-level listening comprehension abilities. Class lessons were centered on speaking tasks, though pedagogical tasks involving listening, reading, and writing skills were often used to support speaking task performance. Other members of the revitalization group occasionally co-taught classes with the main instructor. The examples presented in this article are based on lesson plans and video and audio recordings of class sessions and their accompanying transcripts. The latter were collected as part of a larger project to document the nature of the target language input learners receive and are archived at the Archive of the Indigenous Languages of Latin America (Riestenberg & Grupo Cultural Tagayu' 2019).

6. STRATEGIES FOR CLT IN REVITALIZATION SETTINGS. In Section 2, I described the various challenges involved in applying principles of CLT in instructed language revitalization settings. I suggested that providing learners with opportunities for rich, authentic input and frequent, meaningful interaction can be particularly difficult because 1) There may not currently be any real-life situations that truly require the learners to speak the target language; 2) There may be few highly proficient speakers, and/or language use may be restricted to a subset of social domains, and/or the language may be rarely used around younger community members; and 3) Access to technology may be limited and/or there may not be existing recordings of appropriate conversations or narratives in the language. In this section I suggest possible strategies for adapting

principles of CLT to better meet these challenges, offering examples from the practices of the instructors who teach Macuiltianguis Zapotec.

The examples from Macuiltianguis may not apply to every language revitalization context, and I do not claim that all of these practices are generalizable across settings. The examples I give are most practical when there are at least of handful of speakers in the community where learning is taking place. Although the strategies presented are most likely to be of interest to programs that have limited time and resources, some strategies may also be worthwhile in Master-Apprentice programs or in full-time immersion programs. Overall, my goal is to share with a wider audience the ways that this revitalization group has addressed some of the pedagogical challenges they faced, in hopes of sparking others to explore these ideas as they may apply in their own specific contexts.

6.1 STRATEGY 1: ESTABLISHING SPACES THAT NECESSITATE COMMUNICATION IN THE LANGUAGE. One of the major strengths of CLT is its emphasis on real-world language use. However, when the target language is rarely or no longer used in in natural communication, it is not clear how CLT can be implemented (Riestenberg & Sherris 2018). The experiences of the Macuiltianguis revitalization program suggest that it is necessary to reestablish or forge open social spaces that necessitate communication in the target language (Riestenberg, in press). Many people involved in language revitalization have acknowledged the need develop a wider range of functional social uses for threatened languages (e.g., Hornberger 2008a), including early work on reversing language shift (Fishman 1991), so I do not claim to be the first to raise this issue. Nor do I wish to suggest that this is easy or straightforward. My goal is only to point out the connection between the need to establish social spaces of language use and the practices advocated in CLT.

In Macuiltianguis, spaces for Zapotec language use were forged open by focusing on encouraging students to speak Zapotec in situations in which they were already interacting with Zapotec speakers but doing so in Spanish. This approach emerged from interviews and meetings with students, their parents, members of the revitalization group, community leaders, and members of the wider community which revealed an overwhelming desire for children to speak Zapotec in routine interactions in public spaces in the community. Therefore our initial focus was on everyday tasks such as greeting others on the street, making small talk, and making purchases at a local store. When learning to make purchases in Zapotec, students first practiced the task in the classroom by imagining the store setting. The instructor brought items that could be purchased at a local general store into the classroom (a bag of black beans, a bag of rice, tortillas, an empty carton of milk, an empty water bottle, and so on). First, two speakers would model the task for the students, imagining that one person was the shopkeeper and the other was there to make a purchase. As a comprehension check, students had to answer questions about the interactions they observed. The instructors highlighted key phrases for the students and asked them to repeat these phrases. Then task practice switched from dyads of two native speakers to dyads of one student with one native speaker.

Eventually, students were taken to local stores where the shopkeepers were Zapotec speakers to try making purchases in Zapotec. The instructors asked parents ahead of time to send students with some change and instructions about which item(s) to buy. The shopkeepers were asked ahead of time to only speak Zapotec to the students when they came in the store. The Zapotec instructors asked the shopkeepers to keep speaking

Zapotec to the students in the class whenever they came into their store. I did not conduct any specific follow up observations to check how often this happened, as the scope of my research was limited to the classroom setting. However, I later observed a shopkeeper who had participated in the task speaking Zapotec to students who came into the shop on a handful of occasions.

Another example of a new space for Zapotec use was during students' basketball games. Basketball has been an important sport in this region since the mid 20th century. Communities host all-ages basketball tournaments several times a year. Before an important tournament, the Zapotec instructor brought materials to the classroom for making signs in Zapotec that people in the crowd could hold when cheering on the basketball players. They said things like *¡Tsitsiteba!* (Strength!) and *¡Guakaba!* (You can do it!). During the tournament, when the Zapotec students and instructors were in the crowd watching other age groups from Macuiltianguis play, they recited these phrases in Zapotec as chants to cheer on the players.

Both of these examples illustrate use of Zapotec in a social space that had previously been Spanish-only. While the impetus for this change started in the classroom at the direction of the Zapotec instructors, both examples show ways that the use of Zapotec extended beyond the classroom. Another benefit of these activities as they were implemented by the Zapotec instructors is that they required very little preparation ahead of time. They did not require worksheets, audio recordings, or preparation of scripted dialogues. Some materials were required, but these were things that could be easily found in the community. The main requirement was willingness on the part of a handful of speakers in the community to interact with the children in Zapotec.

6.2 STRATEGY 2: PLANNING MEANINGFUL, FACE-TO-FACE INTERACTION. One advantage for CLT in some language revitalization programs, as compared with most foreign language programs, is that students may have regular access to multiple speakers of the language who live in the same community where the learning is taking place. This is the case in Macuiltianguis. It is a small, walkable village, and many older members of the community speak Zapotec. The instructors decided to take advantage of this by planning opportunities for students to interact face-to-face with a variety of speakers. This included visits to speakers' homes in the community, visiting speakers at their place of work (as in the shop example given in the previous section), or asking speakers to visit the Zapotec classroom. For example, a community member who played and coached basketball in the 1970s (when Macuiltianguis was establishing itself as a serious contender!) came by the classroom to talk to the students about how basketball has changed in the community over time. In another instance, students visited a speaker's home and she described the different traditional tools and items in her house and what they were used for. One class session even led students on a sort of scavenger hunt around the community, visiting with different speakers along the way.

Of course, one challenge for the instructors was how to make sure these interactions were meaningful for the students. For one lesson, members of the community showed students how to make *pan de muerto*, a sweet bread baked for Day of the Dead in Mexico. The speakers demonstrated and explained the process to the students, but the lesson also incorporated ways for students to interact with the speakers using Zapotec by looking for ways to insert communicative "gaps" into the activities (Ellis 2009). Students needed to ask for ingredients from speakers or from each other, they needed to ask how much of each ingredient was required, and when they finished a step, they

had to ask a speaker what to do next. These simple key phrases were practiced ahead of time, with instructors first modeling language that could be used.

Another way instructors made such interactions more meaningful was by incorporating practice using key phrases for negotiating comprehension or requesting clarification. These included phrases such as "Can you say that again?" "How do you say ___?" "What does ____ mean?" and "I don't understand." These kinds of phrases were not included in any existing language documentation, and it was not immediately obvious which phrases would be most helpful, so the instructors first had to observe their own patterns of meaning negotiation with other speakers and analyze the language that was used to be able to teach these phrases to students for their own use.

Organizing home and classroom visits in this way reflects the value of face-to-face interaction advocated in language revitalization methods such as Master-Apprentice (Hinton 2001). However, when this type of high-commitment model is not feasible, this approach makes use of the same principle while spreading the commitment out among different speakers. The small amount of time students spend with speakers is maximized by ensuring opportunities for meaningful interaction through creating communicative gaps (Ellis 2009), modeling the language needed to address those gaps, and then asking the students to use the target language to close the gap.

6.3 STRATEGY 3: PRACTICING ELABORATING SPOKEN INPUT OF SELF AND OTHERS. Language teachers sometimes worry about exposing students to the large quantities of varied input advocated in a CLT approach. Learners in revitalization programs are often beginners, and this kind of immersive, input flooding approach can be overwhelming, especially if there are few cognates or little typological similarity between the target language and the other language(s) the learner knows. In order to make the input easier for learners to process and understand, proponents of CLT suggest elaborating input rather than simplifying it. Elaboration of input involves adding redundancy and highlighting regularity. Redundancy can be added by through things like repetition, gesturing, and paraphrase. Regularity can be highlighted through parallelism (e.g., 'We get tired when…,' 'We get hungry when…,' 'We get annoyed when…') or through retention of optional words and morphemes (e.g., 'Do you want to go to the store with me?' rather than 'Want to go to the store with me?'). Explicitly drawing learners' attention to grammatical and semantic features by raising your voice, writing on the board, or using gestures may also be considered a type of input elaboration. Various empirical studies have demonstrated that students at a variety of levels are able to comprehend elaborated input just as well as simplified input (see Long 2015:248-258 for an overview).

Most of the CLT literature focuses on elaborating written texts, but this may not be very useful for language revitalization programs whose principle goal is to get the learners speaking the language. Therefore it may be useful for instructors to focus on becoming skilled elaborators of the spoken input they produce in the classroom, as well as ways to elaborate the language offered by other speakers. Elaboration mostly occurs orally in the Macuiltianguis Zapotec classes. Instructors often repeated and paraphrased their own language or the language of other speakers, and they often recasted or expanded upon the utterances of the learners. The transcription in Table 1 shows how the Zapotec instructor elaborated a spoken riddle to aid learners' comprehension (Riestenberg & Sherris 2018).

TABLE 1: Elaborated spoken input in the Zapotec classroom (Riestenberg & Sherris 2018)

1	Instructor:	Nu' ruinna na, ruttina na. Nu' ruinna na, rut-tina na.	<u>He who makes it, sells it. He who makes it sells it.</u>	*repetition*
2	Instructor:	Nu' ro'ona na, labí ruki-na'na na, labí rukina'na na	<u>He who buys it, doesn't use it, doesn't use it.</u>	*repetition, parallelism*
3	Instructor:	*Es mucho* nana *pero es que* na *"él" y* na *de las cosas que estoy...*	<u>(Spanish) It's a lot of *nana* because there's *na* "he" and *na* the things that I'm…</u>	*explicitly draws learners' attention to the fact that* na *is used as both a subject pronoun* "he" *and an object pronoun* "it"
4	Instructor:	Nu' ruin…NA…NA, ruttina na, ruttina na, ruttina, ruttina.	<u>HE who makes IT, sells it, he sells it, he sells, he sells.</u>	*use of pauses and louder voice to make pronouns salient; repetition*
5	Instructor:	Inte ruttiya etaxtila, lu ruttilu iyya, lu ruttilu la'go	<u>I sell bread, you sell tools, you sell food</u>	*paraphrase, use of verb* sell *in different hypothetical contexts*
6	Instructor:	Student 1, nancho'a rut-tiye lha'go, nancho'a rut-tiye ettatosa lani bela', nancho'a ruttiye etaxtila	<u>Student 1, your mom sells food, (to another student) your mom sells tacos, (to a third student) your mom sells bread</u>	*paraphrase, use of verb* sell *in different real life contexts*
7	Student 2:	*El que hace tortillas*	<u>(Spanish) He who makes tortillas</u>	

This example shows the Zapotec instructor's willingness and ability to elaborate spoken input in the classroom, using strategies such as repetition, paraphrasing, drawing learners' attention to grammatical features, and occasionally translating to the L1. This example suggests that without text elaboration, students did not understand the riddle. It also illustrates that for this Zapotec instructor, spoken elaboration became natural in the Zapotec class. By focusing on elaborated rather than simplified input, the learners received exposure to richer and more varied language.

7. OUTCOMES AND REMAINING CHALLENGES. The primary goal of applying CLT in the Zapotec program was to increase spoken interaction in the classroom. Both students and teachers reported that students speak much more in class than they

did before, and this is corroborated by the class videos. A number of community members who have worked with the program have commented that they were surprised how much children spoke when in a classroom setting. In this sense, the practices outlined in this paper offer potential ways for programs with limited time and resources to use their limited time and resources efficiently.

A more ambitious goal in Macuiltianguis, as for most language revitalization programs, is to create a new generation of Zapotec speakers. It is less clear how well the community is poised to achieve this goal. The program faces various challenges. Students tend to stop going to the classes when they reach middle school and their regular academic demands become greater, and there has not been enough community interest to find a way to teach Zapotec through the regular school system. Class hours are limited to just a few hours a month, and no language teaching method can create fluent speakers with so few hours of class time.

Acknowledging these challenges helps to reiterate the fact that the academic fields that in principle could have much to offer language revitalization efforts, those concerned with second language teaching and learning, have not traditionally concerned themselves with the teaching of endangered Indigenous languages. If these fields are to be relevant for the challenges of language revitalization, the approaches used must be critically examined and remain open to adjustment. Perhaps future implementations of CLT in instructed language revitalization contexts can make creating new community spaces for language use the central aspect of the program, equally as important as instructional design. In Indigenous language teaching, reclaiming the value of Indigenous knowledge may be just as important as learners' acquisition of new knowledge, and CLT may offer strategies that are useful for this valorization process (Riestenberg & Sherris 2018). Analysis of these issues within the community can be incorporated into lesson planning. While language teachers may have little control over how wider social factors do or do not align with Indigenous language use, they may be able to support students' opportunities to gain proficiency in the language, and a CLT approach may be exploited to further these efforts.

REFERENCES

Bachman, Lyle F. & Adrian S. Palmer. 2010. *Language assessment in practice : developing language assessments and justifying their use in the real world*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Beam de Azcona, Rosemary. G. 2016. Zapotecan languages. *Oxford Research Encyclopedias, Linguistics*. Oxford University Press. doi:10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.013.73.

Benton, Richard A. 1986. Schools as agents for language revival in Ireland and New Zealand. In Bernard Spolsky (Ed.), *Language and education in multilingual settings*, 53–76. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Benton, Richard A. 2015. Perfecting the partnership: Revitalising the Māori language in New Zealand education and society 1987–2014. *Language, Culture and Curriculum* 28(2). 99–112. doi:10.1080/07908318.2015.1025001.

Bishop, Russell, Mere Berryman & Cath Richardson. 2002. Te Toi Huarewa: Effective teaching and learning in total immersion Maori language educational settings. *Canadian Journal of Native Education* 26(1). 46–61.

Brandl, Klaus. 2008. *Communicative language teaching in action: Putting principles to work*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Canale, Michael. 1983. From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. *Language and Communication* 1(1). 1–27.

Canale, Michael & Merrill Swain. 1980. Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics* 1(1). 1-47. doi:10.1093/applin/I.1.1.

Celce-Murcia, Marianne, Zoltán Dornyei & Sarah Thurrell. 1995. Communicative competence: A pedagogically motivated model with content specifications. *Issues in Applied Linguistics* 6(2). 5-35.

Chapelle, Carol A. Technology and second language acquisition. 2007. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 27, 98-114. doi:10.1017/S0267190508070050.

Cope, Lida & Susan D. Penfield. 2011. 'Applied linguist needed': Cross-disciplinary networking for revitalization and education in endangered language contexts. Introduction to special issue. *Language and Education* 25(4). 267–271.

Cowell, Andrew. 2012. The Hawaiian model of language revitalization: Problems of extension to mainland native America. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 218. 167–193. doi:10.1515/ijsl-2012-0063.

De Korne, Haley. 2017. The multilingual realities of language reclamation: Working with language contact, diversity, and change in endangered language education. In Wesley Y. Leonard and Haley De Korne (eds.), *Language Documentation and Description* 14. 111-135.

Ellis, Rod. 2009. Task-based language teaching: Sorting out the misunderstandings. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 19(3). 221–246.

Fishman, Joshua. 1991. *Reversing language shift: Theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Gantt, Amy M. 2016. Native language revitalization: Keeping the languages alive and thriving. In Mark B. Spencer (ed.), *Native Leadership Past, Present, and Future: Proceedings of the Eleventh Native American Symposium*, 13–19. Durant, OK: Southeastern Oklahoma State University.

Gass, Susan M., Alison Mackey & Teresa Pica. 1998. The role of input and interaction in Second Language Acquisition: Introduction to the Special Issue. *The Modern Language Journal* 82(3). 299–307.

Greymorning, Steve. 1997. Going beyond words: The Arapaho Immersion Program. In Jon Reyhner (ed.), *Teaching Indigenous languages*, 22–30. Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona University.

Grupo Cultural Tagayu'. 2017. *Ta' gukua, la'nabani, ta' yuuriu ke' yesi Tagayu', Lola'a (History, lifestyle, and traditional knowledge of the community of Macuiltianguis, Oaxaca)*. Mexico City: Talleres de Impresos & Publicidad.

Grupo Cultural Tagayu'. 2018. *Gudiariu, gulhariu, ineriu xtisa' Tagayu', Lola'a (Read, write, and speak the Zapotec language of Macuiltianguis, Oaxaca)*. Ciudad de México: Talleres de Impresos & Publicidad.

Hermes, Mary. 2007. Moving toward the language: Reflections on teaching in an Indigenous-immersion school. *Journal of American Indian Education* 46(3). 54–72.

Hinton, Leanne, Matt Vera & Nancy Steele. 2002. *How to keep your language alive: A commonsense approach to one-on-one language learning*. Berkeley, CA: Heyday Books.

Hinton, Leanne. 2001. The master-apprentice language learning program. In Leanne Hinton & Kenneth Hale (eds.), *The Green Book of language revitalization in practice*, 217–226. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Hinton, Leanne. 2011. Language revitalization and language pedagogy: New teaching and learning strategies. *Language and Education* 25(4). 307–318.

Hornberger, Nancy H. (Ed.). 2008a. *Can schools save indigenous languages? Policy and practice on four continents*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hornberger, Nancy H. 2008b. Introduction. In Nancy H. Hornberger (ed.), *Can schools save indigenous languages? Policy and practice on four continents*, 1–12. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Keck, Casey, Gina Iberri-Shea, Nicole Tracy-Ventura & Safary Wa-Mbaleka. 2006. Investigating the empirical link between task-based interaction and acquisition. In John M Norris & Lourdes Ortega (eds.), *Synthesizing research on language learning and teaching*, 91–131. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

King, Jeanette. 2001. Te Kōhanga Reo: Māori language revitalization. In Leanne Hinton & Kenneth Hale (Eds.), *The Green Book of language revitalization in practice*, 119–128. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Lave, Jean & Etienne Wenger. 1991. *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Lillis, Theresa M. 2006. Communicative competence. In Keith Brown (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics*, 666-673. Oxford: Elsevier.

Long, Michael H. 1996. The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In William C. Ritchie and Tej K. Bhatia (eds.), *Handbook of Second Language Acquisition (Vol. 2)*, 413-468. New York: Academic Press.

Long, Michael H. 2005. *Second language needs analysis*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Long, Michael H. 2015. *Second language acquisition and task-based language teaching*. Somerset, NJ: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Long, Michael H. 2016. In defense of tasks and TBLT: Nonissues and real issues. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 36. 5–33.

Mackey, Alison. 2007. *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition: A collection of empirical studies*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

McDonough, Kim & Alison Mackey. 2013. *Second language interaction in diverse educational contexts*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Norris, John M. 2009. Task-based teaching and testing. In Michael H Long & Catherine J. Doughty (eds.), *The handbook of language teaching*, 578–594. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Olawsky, Knut J. 2013. The Master-Apprentice language learning program down under: Experience and adaptation in an Australian context. *Language Documentation & Conservation* 7. 41-63.

Pérez Báez, Gabriela, Rachel Vogel & Eve Okura Koller. 2018. Comparative analysis in language revitalization practices: Addressing the challenge. In Kenneth L. Rehg & Lyle Campbell (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Endangered Languages*, 466–489. Oxford University Press.

Pérez Báez, Gabriela, Rachel Vogel and Uia Patolo. 2019. Global Survey of Revitalization Efforts: A mixed methods approach to understanding language revitalization practices. *Language Documentation & Conservation* 13: 446–513.

Pica, Teresa, Hyun-sook Kang & Shannon Sauro. 2006. Information gap tasks: Their multiple roles and contributions to interaction research methodology. *Studies in*

Second Language Acquisition 28. 301–338.

Reyhner, Jon (ed.). 1997. *Teaching indigenous languages: Selected papers from the Symposium on Stabilizing Indigenous Languages*. Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona University.

Richards, Jack C. & Theodore S. Rodgers. 2001. *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Riestenberg, Katherine J. in press. Meaningful interaction and affordances for langauge learning at a Zapotec revitalisation program. *The Language Learning Journal.*

Riestenberg, Katherine J. and Grupo Cultural Tagayu'. 2019. Teaching Macuiltianguis Zapotec Collection of Kate Riestenberg and Grupo Cultural Tagayu'. The Archive of the Indigenous Languages of Latin America, ailla.utexas.org. Access: restricted. PID ailla: 260404.

Riestenberg, Katherine J. & Ari Sherris. 2018. Task-based teaching of Indigenous languages: Investment and methodological principles in Macuiltianguis Zapotec and Salish Qlipse revitalization. *Canadian Modern Language Review* 74(3). 434–459.

Savignon, Sandra J. 2018. Communicative competence. In John I. Liontas (ed.), *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching*, 1–7. John Wiley and Sons.

Seedhouse, Paul. 1999. Task-based interaction. *ELT Journal* 53(3). 149–156.

Serafini, Ellen J., Julie B. Lake & Michael H Long. 2015. Needs analysis for specialized learner populations: Essential methodological improvements. *English for Specific Purposes* 40. 11–26.

Spada, Nina. 2007. Communicative language teaching: Current status and future prospects. In Jim Cummins & Chris Davison (eds.), *International Handbook of English Language Teaching*, 271–288. New York: Springer.

Thomas, Michael and Hayo Reinders (Eds.). 2010. *Task-based language learning and teaching with technology*. London: Continuum.

Tschirner, Erwin. 2003. Language acquisition in the classroom: The role of digital video. *Computer Assisted Language Learning* 14(3–4). 305–319.

White, Frederick. 2006. Rethinking Native American language revitalization. *The American Indian Quarterly* 30(1). 91–109. doi:10.1353/aiq.2006.0013.

Katherine J. Riestenberg
kriestenbe@brynmawr.edu