An Interview with APPLE Lecture Speaker Professor Roy Lyster

Kaylee Fernandez, Michelle Stabler-Havener, & Carol Hoi Yee Lo

INTRODUCTION

On February 16, 2018, *Working Papers in Applied Linguistics and TESOL* (represented by Kaylee Fernandez, Michelle Stabler-Havener, and Carol HoiYee Lo) had the great pleasure of interviewing Dr. Roy Lyster, the invited speaker for the 2018 Applied Linguistics & Language Education (APPLE) Lecture Series hosted annually by the Applied Linguistics and TESOL Program at Teachers College, Columbia University. Dr. Lyster shared his research and advice he has for current and future researchers and educators in Applied Linguistics and TESOL.

Dr. Roy Lyster is Emeritus Professor of Second Language Education in the Department of Integrated Studies Education at McGill University in Montreal, Canada. His research examines content-based language teaching and the effects of instructional interventions designed to counterbalance form-focused and content-based approaches. His research interests also include professional development and collaboration among teachers for the purpose of integrated language learning and biliteracy development. He was co-recipient with colleague Leila Ranta of the 1998 Paul Pimsleur Award for Research in Foreign Language Education and was presented the Robert Roy Award by the Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers in 2017. He was co-president then president of the Canadian Association of Applied Linguistics from 2004 to 2008. He is author of a module called *Content-Based Language Teaching* published by Routledge in 2018, and two books: *Learning and Teaching Languages Through Content* published by Benjamins in 2007 and *Vers une approche intégrée en immersion* published by Les Éditions CEC in 2016.

THE INTERVIEW
Here is the link to the full interview.

Content-Based Language Teaching

1) In your paper titled "Content-Based Language Teaching: Convergent Concerns Across Divergent Contexts," you provided an overview of the diverse contexts in which content-based language teaching (CBLT) has been implemented. The research findings you cited drew attention to the decisive role of teachers in ensuring the success of CBLT, and you discussed how professional development might help teachers overcome challenges specific to the implementation of CBLT. What would you say are the biggest obstacles to implementing CBLT? **[Q1 Video]**

2) Much research has been dedicated to investigating the use of content-based language teaching in primary and secondary schools. Do you think content-based language teaching should also be implemented in adult language instruction? If so, what might this look like? **[Q2 Video]**

3) The Counterbalance Hypothesis that you proposed states that instructional activities and feedback that counter the communicative orientation of the lesson are more effective than those that are congruent with it. However, one of the aims of a communicatively-oriented classroom for adults is to allow students to engage in interactional practices that they will use in everyday life outside of the classroom—in a way, making classroom discourse more "conversational." How do we resolve this paradox? **[Q3 Video]**

4) What do you think are the most important takeaways language teachers should glean from empirical classroom research findings on CBLT? **[Q4 Video]**

Corrective Feedback

5) Much of your research addresses the topic of oral corrective feedback. What sparked your interest in this topic and what sustained your interest in it over the years? **[Q5 Video]**

6) Over the years, it seems like your perspective on how to provide beneficial feedback has changed. You appear to have shifted from recommending that teachers "consider the whole range of techniques... at their disposal" in your work with Leila Ranta (1997, p. 56) and suggesting that teachers offer a "balanced provision of both recasts and prompts" in your work with Hirohide Mori (2006, p. 296) to a different perspective in today's lecture, where you appear to advocate for contextualized practice over noticing of target forms. Can you tell us what led to this change? **[Q6 Video]**

7) A considerable body of your work has examined naturally-occurring classroom discourse as a way to understand corrective feedback, a research approach which has very high ecological validity. However, in Goo and Mackey (2013), "The Case Against the Case Against Recasts," it is suggested that internal validity must take priority, and SLA researchers need to carefully control variables in order to identify the effects of corrective feedback. This seems to be a longstanding methodological issue in instructed SLA research. What are some possible ways to satisfy both ecological and internal validity when designing research on corrective feedback? **[Q7 Video]**

8) The field of second language assessment also researches corrective feedback from the standpoint of classroom-based assessment, including instructor, peer-, and self-assessment. Do you have any recommendations on ways in which the field of second language acquisition and second language assessment could collaborate in order to more effectively further research in this area in both fields? **[Q8 Video]**

9) The findings of your paper titled "Oral Feedback in Classroom SLA: A Meta-Analysis" suggest that certain types of oral corrective feedback are more beneficial than others. What components of corrective feedback do you think contribute to their effectiveness or lack thereof? **[Q9 Video]**

10) You acknowledge that despite the positive results of empirical research, teachers face challenges to providing corrective feedback to students. To what challenges are you

referring? What are ways teachers can overcome these challenges? On a more basic level, do you have suggestions on how to teach novice instructors to provide oral corrective feedback to their students? **[Q10 Video]**

REFERENCES

Goo, J., & Mackey, A. (2013). The case against the case against recasts. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *35*(1), 127-165.

Lyster, R. (2007). *Learning and teaching languages through content: A counterbalanced approach* (Vol. 18). John Benjamins Publishing.

Lyster, R. (2016). *Vers une approche intégrée en immersion*. Les Éditions CEC.

Lyster, R., & Ballinger, S. (2011). Content-based language teaching: Convergent concerns across divergent contexts. *Language Teaching Research*, *15*(3), 279-288.

Lyster, R., & Mori, H. (2006). Interactional feedback and instructional counterbalance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *28*(2), 269-300.

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *19*(1), 37-66.

Lyster, R., & Saito, K. (2010). Oral feedback in classroom SLA: A meta-analysis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *32*(2), 265-302.