## CASLA 2014 highlights

New PhD candidates
Two PhD candidates, both supervised by **Folkert Kuiken** started in 2014:
External Phd: **Hanneke Pot**, *Total Physical Response in vocabulary teaching to young beginning L2 learners in primary education.*
Joint PhD with University of Zurich: **Patrick Schetters**, *Accuracy in the written production of proficient learners of Dutch as a second language with L1 German.*

Grants awarded
**Folkert Kuiken** obtained the following two grants:
1.Stichting Lezen en Schrijven, De kwaliteit van Taalmeter 1F en Taalmeter 2F. €21.707.
2.NWO-NRO, Programmaraad Praktijkgericht Onderzoek (PPO) voor Kortlopend onderwijsonderzoek: Gedifferentieerd LeesOnderwijs VO (GLOVO), €79.660.

Valorisation
**Sible Andringa** presented at the *Conferentie voor lerarenopleiders* about listening in a second language, Arnhem, April 4, 2014
**Folkert Kuiken participated** in a Rondetafelgesprek Nieuwkomersonderwijs. Ministerie van SZW. Den Haag, 3 June 2014. The topic of this round table was *Bouwstenen voor kwalitatief goed nieuwkomersonderwijs.*

Guest editing
**Folkert Kuiken and Ineke Vedder** were guest editors of a special issue of *Language Testing* (Vol. 31/3, July 2014) on Assessing oral and written L2 performance: Raters' decisions, rating procedures and rating scales..
**Folkert Kuiken** and Marije Michel were guest editors of a special issue of the *European Journal of Applied Linguistics* (Vol. 2/1, April 2014) on Language at preschool in Europe: Early years professionals in the spotlight.

Collocoquium organization
**Sible Andringa** and Patrick Rebuschat (Lancaster University) organized a colloquium on *Implicit learning and second language acquisition* at the EuroSLA 2014 conference in York, September 5, 2014
**Folkert Kuiken and Ineke Vedder** organized a colloquium of the Research Network CoSeLL (Complexity in Second Language Learning) at the AILA 2014 Conference, Brisbane, 13 August 2014. The title of the colloquium was *Linguistic complexity and second language learning*.
**Alla Peeters-Podgaevskaja**, together with J. Stelleman and J. Kalsbeek, organized a two-day international conference "Slavic days" at the UvA, in November 2014.
**Ineke Vedder** and E. Santoro organized the following colloquium: Pragmatica e interculturalità in italiano lingua seconda. AIPI XXI, 'Est-ovest/Nord-Sud. Frontiere, passaggi, incontri culturali'. August 28-29, 2014.

Invited talks
**Jan Hulstijn** gave an invited plenary presentation about his BLC Theory at the Joint meeting of the Estonian Society of Applied Linguistics and IAIMTE Educational Linguistics SIG-

meeting. University of Tallinn, Estonia, on 25 April 2014.

**Folkert Kuiken** gave two invited talks on *Multilingualism and language policy in the Netherlands* and *The complexity of written performance in Dutch L2* at Palacký University in Olomouc (Czech Republic), October 20-21, 2014.

**Ineke Vedder** gave two invited talks:

*Language tasks as a pedagogic tool for second language learning*. Sevilla Universidad de Sevilla, Sevilla (Spain), 18 November 2014.

*Tasks as tools for eliciting oral and written language*. Universitat Jaume I, Castellòn de la Plana (Spain), 20 November 2014.


Quotes from papers published in 2014

"The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR, Council of Europe, 2001) currently functions as an instrument for educational policy and practice. The view of language proficiency on which it rests and the six proficiency levels it defines lack empirical support from language-use data. Several issues need to be investigated collaboratively by researchers working in the fields of first and second language acquisition, corpus linguistics and language assessment. These issues are concerned with (i) the CEFR's failure to consistently distinguish between levels of language proficiency (static aspect) and language development (dynamic aspect), (ii) with the CEFR's confounding of levels of language proficiency and intellectual abilities, and (iii) the potential problem of mismatches between second-language learners' communicative and linguistic competences. Furthermore, in a more theoretical approach, this paper proposes (iv) to investigate which CEFR proficiency levels are attainable by native speakers and (v) to empirically delineate the lexical, morpho-syntactic and pragmatic knowledge shared by all native speakers (called Basic Language Cognition)." (p. 3)

"It is high time that researchers of SLA, researchers of language assessment, and corpus linguists paid attention to each other's work and engaged in collaborative research, testing the linguistic, psycholinguistic, and sociolinguistic assumptions on which the CEFR rests."(p. 17)

> Quotes from **Hulstijn, J. H.** (2014). The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: A challenge for applied linguistics. *ITL International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 165/1, 3-18. DOI 10.1075/itl.165.1.01hul


"In a recent methodological treatment, DeKeyser ( 2013 ) acknowledged that NS [native speaker] variation has not been considered much in CPH [Critical Period Hypothesis] research. He recommended the use of a homogeneous NS sample: "When there is substantial variation among native speakers, then the native and nonnative ranges of variation are almost bound to overlap substantially, whether for the same reasons or not, yielding trivially predictable results" (p. 58). He also recommended that the L1 and the L2 be distant languages so that one could compare them on more central (rather than peripheral) structural features of the target language. DeKeyser's recommendations are well worth noting but also raise questions. The NS sample should be homogeneous, but which NSs should be selected? Should they be highly educated and highly experienced language users? When is overlap between NS and NNS performance trivial, and when is it meaningful? Which languages are sufficiently different, and which structures are sufficiently central? Ultimately, these questions cannot be answered on strictly empirical grounds. We still lack a sufficiently comprehensive theory of what it means to master a language as a NS. Without that, we cannot decide on what aspects of the language NNSs should be tested, and we cannot know which

NSs should be selected as the norm group. When it comes to selecting the NS norm group, we have seen that the NS samples used in CPH research have been quite small, whereas the NNS samples are often quite large. It should be the other way around. Long ( 1990 ) has claimed that it may be enough to identify just one NNS who is nativelike in every respect to falsify the CPH. If that is true, then we do not need large NNS samples. What we really need is a sizeable and well-described NS norm group.