How to juggle a job and a PhD project?
Dear colleagues,

We wish you a creative 2018.

Paul Boersma, Marten Hidma, Marijke Vuyk

PhD researchers trying to balance work-work commitments

For the 2016 brochure four junior ACLC PhD researchers did interviews with colleagues who are constantly trying to find the right work-work balance.

Kiki Renardel de Lavalette did an interview with Eveline Boers-Visker, who is a lecturer and does PhD research on sign language acquisition. Sybren Spit met Hanneke Pot, a lector and a PhD researcher studying vocabulary acquisition with the help of Total Physical Response [TPR]. Andreas Finsen got together with Klaske van Sluis to talk about her work as a speech therapist and her PhD research with laryngectomy patients. The fourth interview, by Natalia Rivera Vera, is with Rosalinde Stadt, a teacher of French and a PhD researcher studying the influence of L1 Dutch and L2 English on L3.

Interview with Eveline Boers-Visker
by Kiki Renardel de Lavalette

Eveline Boers-Visker is a lecturer at the Utrecht University of Applied Sciences, and she is doing PhD research on sign language acquisition in L2-learners of Sign Language of the Netherlands (NGT).

Kiki Renardel de Lavalette is currently working on the PhD project “Resistance to Metaphor in Government and Politics”.

What are your current positions?
I am a PhD student at Utrecht University of Applied Sciences (UUAP). UUAP has granted me a voucher, so I get funded to do research for three days a week. A PhD candidate is always linked to a university, and normally UUAP PhD candidates are supervised by a professor from Utrecht University. However, the University of Amsterdam, in contrast to the UU, has a sign language linguistics
department, so that is why I do my research here at the UvA. UUAP is also the place where I work as a sign language teacher one day a week.

Can you describe what your PhD research is about?
My research is about sign language pedagogy. So it is about how to teach sign language to people that can hear, non-signers, who want to become professionals in the sign language community. They can, for example, become sign language interpreters or sign language teachers. Those students can start without any knowledge of sign language.
So, my job is to teach sign language to adults that want to become professionals in sign language, and my research is about how to do that: what is the most effective way to teach sign language?

Why did you decide to do a PhD besides your regular job?
They offered it to me. I started university in 1996 in Nijmegen, and I remember telling a friend back then that I wanted to be a PhD researcher, but I did not even really know what that was. It was just something you could do. So probably it was already in me. But after one year of university, I decided to go to the University of Applied Sciences because it focuses more on the practical skills needed in a professional job. After I had done the four-year bachelor programme, I became a teacher. I was actually recruited by the university where I was a student.

When I started as a teacher in 2000, there wasn’t a possibility to do a PhD at the UUAP. They made this possible five or six years ago, and my boss asked me whether I was interested in doing a PhD. My first reaction was: “Why? Why should I?” But after I had thought about it some more, I realized it was a very nice opportunity for professional development.

Do your job and PhD research benefit from each other?
Yes, they do, because they are in the same field. I think the advantage of doing PhD research in the way that I do it, is that I can use the things I learn from my research in my teaching. As a researcher you have to sell your research to the world as it were, me too of course, but because I am already in the field it is easy to recognize the value of the research that I am doing. My PhD project is making me a better teacher, because my linguistic knowledge has expanded. And being a teacher in sign language myself helps me in doing research about teaching sign language.

How do you combine having a job with doing a PhD?
The combination of work, study, and children is not easy. When you are a regular PhD student, you get four days a week to do research and already have to invest your own time as well. I only have three days a week to do research, so I do not have enough time. It is an advantage that I have seventeen years of experience as a sign language teacher, because sometimes it enables me to do or understand things more quickly. Teaching is a demanding job as well. I track my time with a time tracking app (toggl.com). I have all my tasks labelled and when I start a task, I press the ‘on’ button. When I finish, I press the ‘off’ button. This way I keep track of the hours I work. Every week, I spend four extra hours on my job as a teacher. That means that I work the normal eight hours, and four
hours extra which makes twelve. So yes, it is a demanding job, and it is important to learn to set your boundaries.

**What is the most challenging thing about writing a PhD thesis in combination with a job?**

Time management, and also that a lot of PhD students are younger than I am. They are in a different phase of their lives; they do not have children, they do not have the responsibility for a family, and I do. All my colleagues here at the University of Amsterdam are very understanding and supportive, but sometimes I just think: Oh, I cannot go to the “vrijdagmiddagborrel” (Friday drinks) because I have to go home to take care of my children. Sometimes that can be difficult. But now it sounds like doing a PhD is very difficult, but it is also great fun.

**Speaking about fun, what do you enjoy most about doing a PhD?**

There is a lot I enjoy about doing a PhD. The thing that makes it difficult is time management, and the thing that makes it fun is also time management. You are very autonomous. I can decide myself how to plan my tasks. As a teacher, others decide on my schedule. Also, the way I set up my study is decided by me. So you can be very creative in this job, and I really enjoy that. I have been a teacher for seventeen years, and after a while it becomes a bit of a routine. It is just the thing you do. Now I am in a new situation, a new environment, and I am learning so much. I am not only learning about the topic I am studying, but also about myself. And the University of Amsterdam is a really nice place to work. Everybody is so eager to learn, it is a very stimulating environment to work in.

**And what do you like most about your job?**

What I like most about my job is developing teaching material - the creative part - and the contact with students. I think it is very important to connect to your students, so they feel safe and free to ask questions. I have the impression that that is something that I am capable of.

**Do you want to continue doing research after finishing your PhD, or would you like to go back to only teaching?**

Both. I have understood that it is very hard to find a job in academia, and that the jobs that are there are often short term contracts. So I do not want to go into academia, because of this very insecure position you will have. But I would really like to continue doing research. As from last year UUAP has also been offering post-doc positions. It is a similar construction as with the PhD positions. That is what I want to do, those are my plans for the future.
Interview with Hanneke Pot
by Sybren Spit

Hanneke Pot is a lector at Inholland University of Applied Sciences. Sybren Spit started his PhD project at the ACLC in November 2016, after finishing his BA in Dutch language and culture and his RMA in Linguistics. He investigates the role of meta-linguistic awareness in early language acquisition.

I meet Hanneke in Rotterdam, where she works as a lector of the Dutch language at the teacher training department of Inholland University of Applied Sciences. When she started, she mainly taught future teachers how to teach their pupils reading and writing. Nowadays her activities also encompass teaching academic writing and professional literacy.

How did you end up here?
I started out as a teacher myself in the 80s. I first worked at a Jenaplan school in Rotterdam for two years. Afterwards, I ended up at a school in Hoogvliet between Shell’s refineries, with up to 90% children with Dutch as a second language. There, I learned what it means when a child does not speak Dutch: education crashes.

How can we prevent such educational crashes?
Back in the days, language educators took children out of the class. These children made progress, so presumably these educators did something. However, the teachers themselves had no clue about what happened outside the classroom. When budget cuts caused these educators to stop their classes, teachers did not know how to react. Some thought the children’s natural language instinct would enable them to pick up Dutch automatically. If that did not happen, they were just not smart enough. As a result, children with a disadvantage in kindergarten, still had it in first grade. For most of them this gap never closed. These children did not gain enough advantage from their school education, which made me frustrated. Learning a language does happen spontaneously, but not fast enough for them to overcome their disadvantage.

What should these teachers do to help children learn Dutch?
You should invest your energy as early as possible, when disadvantages are big but not unbridgeable. A way to educate people in a target language is Total Physical Response (TPR), a receptive approach from the 60s. Children do not repeat or name anything, but listen and receive small tasks. For example:

Embodying the circus.
‘This is a cup, give the teacher the cup.’ The teacher can immediately infer whether a child understands or makes progress. This approach was used in child education, but did not fit in with modern developmentally directed education from the 90s, in which children must learn Dutch naturally and in their own pace.

You cannot use TPR to learn Dutch in Developmental Education?
The teacher-student interaction in TPR consists of series of ‘commands’. This can quickly become boring without a meaningful context. In my own research, I adjust TPR to an overall theme in class: the circus. This way, the children feel the TPR activities are meaningful, and that they as students belong in the TPR group as well as in the whole class. It provokes a positive, instead of a negative, spiral.

How did you carry this out?
I conducted an experiment, connected to the circus theme, in which children learn 70 words in the classroom. Children with a language delay probably hardly learn anything, as they are exposed to a speech avalanche, and research shows isolated words are learnt more quickly. Therefore, we took certain children out of the classroom three times a week. These children received extra education in three different ways. One group got live TPR. They performed tricks, like jumping on a table, manipulated props to set up a circus, had to pay for a ticket and so on. Another group received TPR on an iPad. They, for example, had to move a clown towards the circus. A third control group performed regular activities from the program.

What did your experiment show?
We tested the children before, directly after and a few weeks after the experiment with a productive and a receptive vocabulary task. However, we did not find any differences between the three groups! It is surprising the results of the regular program should not differ from very intensive TPR training. Possibly, children do learn the words in the classroom after all, notwithstanding the ‘avalanche of speech’. However, it could also mean that in a small group, without the noise of a classroom, children can learn these words. Teachers adjust their teaching to the mean. In the classroom, they automatically teach above the level of second language learners. Outside the classroom, they adjust their teaching to these children. Possibly, this helps these learners.

Children learn in all three conditions. Isn’t that a nice result in itself?
Of course! However, education authorities want to know whether they should fund these extra activities outside the classroom. In the current design, we do not know where the words are learned. If the words were to be learned in the classroom after all, there would be no need for extra activities outside of the room. That would require further investigation. Nevertheless, they learn words with an iPad, which can save expensive extra teacher time outside of the classroom. Teachers can put children to work in the classroom with a headset. Despite the surprising results, the ‘success’ of the iPad is an interesting result of the experiment, both for theory and practice.

How long did this project take you?
It took me two years to collect the data. I am now in the fourth and last year of my PhD project and I am writing my dissertation. I got two days a week for four years for writing, which is not enough, so I have to be very efficient, especially as I am unfamiliar with certain academic conventions, with regard to writing and statistics. I am thus very grateful for the help and feedback of my (co-)promotors, busy as they are themselves. It takes a lot of my spare time and I hope I will make it in time.
These are the disadvantages. Are there also benefits? Practical maybe?
I know how to approach teachers, what is possible at schools and what is not. I could also ensure the experiment was as valid and reliable as possible, despite the educational situation. Furthermore, the publisher of the program was so friendly to develop the iPad application and hand me the addresses of the schools using the program. Nevertheless, I had a hard time recruiting participants. It is difficult to reach the people that matter: they are teaching. You can only reach them before 8.30 and after 15.30. I have been on the phone full time for 6 weeks for each experiment. Schools had to fit the experiment in a time slot. The participating teachers had to work with a small group outside the classrooms three times a week. You need a lot of people and time. It took a lot of perseverance to gather enough children for a sound statistical analysis.

Did you perhaps have any advantages, where you could draw from your own experience?
The TPR activities should be varied, otherwise they would get boring. I know what young children like and could connect the tasks to their world: “climb the table, walk on the rope”. The children were very excited. Furthermore, people assume TPR is about verbs (climbing, walking), but children also handle objects. You need those. I asked some of my own students here to craft clowns and other things. We put those in boxes, to hand to the teachers for the training. You need to imagine how to carry it out practically and be able to instruct people to carry out the experiment, be it the construction of materials or the performance of activities in the experimental or control groups.

Did you also learn things at the UvA you can take to Inholland?
Folkert and Rob, my (co-)promoters, showed me what valid and reliable research looks like and how to write this down. I became familiar with the whole project. I myself am supervising master students in their research and I can see where things might go wrong, but they also like that I am doing research myself. It is a successful combination.

What was your highlight as a researcher?
I was very proud and excited when the teachers went home with the material sets after the training, fully instructed to start the experiment. I succeeded to pull off a logistically very complicated experiment, not once but twice. With all the teachers and the research assistants involved the planning was enormous. I needed to solve smaller or greater problems all the time to ensure my data collection would prevail and the data would be reliable and valid. I also take pride in my own progress in for example statistics and I enjoyed carrying out the pilot of the intervention myself. I still like working with children. Furthermore, I enjoy the research into theory very much.

Can you find the time to read?
When the workload is heavy, reading articles might lose out?
There is a lot of pressure, but the research needs to be well substantiated. I am now working on it retroactively, which is not ideal.

You started this research only three years ago. It sounds as if you wanted to investigate this way before?
I had already piloted some of it with some teachers at primary schools. However, it should of course be controlled better, which became this project. You could feel it coming as it were, as it nicely combines everything I did before. In Hoogvliet I experienced that teachers can make the difference. That is what keeps me going. Otherwise, you cannot find the energy to combine these jobs. I know why I am doing it and that gives me the energy to get it done.
Interview with Klaske van Sluis

by Andreas Finsen

Klaske van Sluis is a PhD candidate/speech language pathologist at Antoni van Leeuwenhoek. Andreas Finsen is a PhD candidate in the research groups ‘Argumentation and Rhetoric’ and ‘Metaphor Lab Amsterdam’. His research analyzes the argumentative functions of scientific metaphors, as well as the resistance elicited by such metaphors.

What are your current positions?
I am an external PhD student at the ACLC and I have a job as a speech language pathologist. My job as well as my PhD research takes place at the Antoni van Leeuwenhoek Ziekenhuis. I do my PhD research on a 0.66 contract and my job on a 0.33 contract. On Tuesday mornings, Thursday afternoons and Friday mornings, I am a speech language pathologist, and the rest of the time I am a PhD student. There’s some overlap every now and then, though, since it’s all in the same building.

What is your PhD research about?
My research focuses on people who have a total laryngectomy, a type of surgery patients may need if they have throat cancer in an advanced stage. The larynx is removed and a stoma in the neck is created, and they breathe through a hole in the neck. These patients need to be able to speak again after losing their vocal cords, so they get a voice prosthesis. The question I am trying to ask in my research is whether and how we can predict before surgery how a patient’s voice will sound after they have had their voice prosthesis. We know that some patients have difficulties learning to speak again whereas others regain their speaking ability fairly easily. In order to identify the relevant factors in this process of regaining speech, I am creating a prospective database with voice recordings of patients from before and after surgery. We think factors such as age, co-morbidity, previous radiotherapy, and various surgical factors have an influence, but we need a structured data collection in order to gain more precise knowledge. That’s basically what my research is about.

Why did you decide to do a PhD in combination with your regular job?
I did my internship and master’s thesis here at Antoni van Leeuwenhoek so I had already done research here. And then I began as a speech therapist here, which I really liked. I really like the contact with the patients, but I also knew I wanted to do research in addition to that. I wanted to dive more deeply into the subject and to know more about the background science. And the benefits
were also part of it. You know, travelling to conferences and so on. We are actually collaborating with four hospitals in Sydney, so I just spent two weeks over there. In this way I get to be part of a larger research environment which I also really appreciate.

**Do your job and PhD research benefit from each other?**

Yes, definitely. On the one hand, I know what goes on in the latest research and what types of solutions may be implemented, which I can draw upon in my work as a speech therapist. On the other hand, my practical experience with the patients means I am familiar with their concerns and the things that bother them. Maybe sometimes I am almost too practical-minded because I tend to care most about the patients’ subjective perspective on their voice and their quality of life. That is really beneficial, but perhaps I sometimes slightly neglect some of the acoustic modeling and other methods for coming up with more objective measurements of what a “normal” post-surgery voice is.

**What is the most challenging about writing a PhD thesis in combination with a job?**

Since they take place in the same place, it is very important that I draw clear boundaries between the two roles. Sometimes it is difficult for me to really focus on my research work. Last summer I actually had a burnout shortly after I had begun my PhD research. I tried to do everything and fulfill all my roles at once and wound up having a break-down. So I stopped with my research for 6 months and my job for about 2-3 months. Then I slowly began again and got a lot better at drawing boundaries. So when at work as a speech therapist, I do not plan my research, and when I am supposed to do my research, I do not help out my colleagues with job-related things. And they know and respect that.

**What do you enjoy most about doing your PhD?**

I really love the work environment. There are another 10 PhD students in the department and we do all kinds of things together. For instance, we are going to Belgium next week for a weekend of cycling. We also have a lot of ‘borrels’, which is not so bad either. Like I said, I also get to travel a lot. I have been to a conference in San Fransisco, and there is the research taking place in Sydney. So I feel really lucky and blessed.

**What do you enjoy most about your job?**

My colleagues are really nice and that matters a lot to me. And I really enjoy helping my patients. It is so rewarding. I help them with things that make a very big difference in their lives. Besides learning to speak again, they also need to learn how to swallow again. If I can help someone to be able to speak with other people again and to drink a cup of coffee, then I have really made a difference. People also assume it must be hard to work in a cancer hospital. Do not get me wrong, it can be, but I also get to see how powerful people can get when they survive cancer and are determined to get back to their normal lives. The contact with the patients is what matters most to me.

When I waited for you in the reception here in Antoni van Leeuwenhoek, I actually also wondered if it was not sometimes hard to work with cancer patients. Yes, it can be. It can be very emotional sometimes. And I think you need to be very caring and committed to the patients, but I also think you need to know how to stay professional. You have to be able to strike a balance between being empathic and keeping a professional distance, because that is how you best help the patients.
New facts in 2016

Heritage speakers of Spanish in the Netherlands have problems with Spanish mood, especially with the subjunctive. Interestingly, unlike Spanish heritage speakers in the US, these speakers behaved more similarly to monolinguals in judgment than in an oral production. We suggest that this result may be accounted for by differential societal circumstances between both heritage speaker populations. Since Hispanic communities in the Netherlands are small and dispersed, heritage speakers of Spanish in the Netherlands may lack the experience of speaking their heritage language on a regular basis that would help them in an oral production task. Furthermore, the multilingual nature of the Dutch educational system may give rise to a higher metalinguistic awareness from which the heritage speakers would benefit in a more explicit judgment task. This finding confirms the heterogeneity of heritage speakers as a population and emphasizes the importance of taking societal circumstances into consideration.


Children acquire *eerste* ‘first’ first, then regular ordinals like *tweede* ‘second’ and *vierde* ‘fourth’ simultaneously. It takes more time for children to acquire irregular *derde* ‘third’ and perform reliably on regular higher ordinals. We suggest that the poor performance on *derde* is evidence that children derive ordinals via a morphological rule (informally: cardinal + –de = ordinal) rather than store them lexically.


After comparing grammatical non-manual markers (NMMs) in sign languages with tone in spoken languages, I tentatively claim that spreading of different types of NMMs targets prosodic domains of varying size: the prosodic word for lexical NMMs, the phonological phrase for morphological NMMs, and the intonational phrase for syntactic NMMs. In addition, I suggest that eye blinks function like boundary tones.

Interview with Rosalinde Stadt

by Natalia Rivera Vera

Rosalinde Stadt is a fourth-year PhD student of Linguistics at the ACLC. She is also a secondary school teacher of French. In her research project she investigates the influence of L1 Dutch and L2 English on L3 French and L3 German by comparing an English immersion vs. a formal instruction program of education.

Natalia Rivera Vera is a second-year PhD researcher, who is investigating the role of information structure and syntax on the comprehension of passive sentences in Dutch in neurotypical adults, typically developing children and children with autism.

Can you tell us what you did before starting your PhD?
I studied French at the UvA, and in my last year I went to live in Paris for one year. I only had to finish my thesis, so I wrote my thesis there about the role of women in the books of a French writer, Michel Houellebecq, so it was not a linguistics thesis, although I liked both linguistics and literature. Since I had some time left, I applied for a job and worked there as a computational linguist. I was part of a team that worked on the development of “Bots”, which are Virtual Assistants. We put different types of language information of Dutch into a computer in order to make conversations work between someone typing a question and a virtual assistant. There is where my love for linguistics started.

How did you end up here? Did you do a master after that?
When I came back in Holland, I did a one-year master’s programme to become a French teacher. After being a teacher for some months, I missed the job as a linguist, so I went back working as a computational linguist at a company named Q-go. We basically did the same thing as in Virtuoz, the French company. I did that for six months and I went back and forth all the time. I liked it a lot, but I did not like sitting at the computer for 40 hours a week. Then, I went back to teaching again, because I missed the freedom of being a teacher and the atmosphere of schools. I think there is a lot of energy in schools and I really like that. I missed the students, and the
working environment, which I think is very dynamic. I like being a teacher, although I was not really good at it in the beginning. This was in 2010, and after a while, I started to miss linguistics. So, this position came up: a PhD for teachers, financed by NWO. I applied, and after several rounds I got the job. So, I could do both, be a teacher and work in linguistics.

Can you tell us something about you and how you started with your project? I am a French teacher and I work in an immersion school, where students learn English by using it. This means that their methods are in English and their teachers speak English. However, this is only for 50-60% of the subjects, and the rest is in Dutch. This includes the teaching of French, which is also in Dutch. This made me wonder how students learn foreign languages and how they use background languages in this process. For example, they use sentences like “demander une question”, but in French you say “poser une question”. The first sentence means ‘Ask a question’, so it could be argued that English is having an influence here. I saw these kinds of phenomena and started thinking of my research project. I read some articles on third language acquisition, which interested me a lot because in traditional foreign language acquisition research it is assumed that the mother tongue is the most important in foreign language learning. And you can see that in the school context because all the methods are based on the mother tongue. So, in the Netherlands all the methods are in Dutch, which means that students learn French, German, and Spanish through their mother tongue, through Dutch.

Does this mean that the methods that are used are based on the assumption that your mother tongue is the one that influences more? Yes, exactly. The methods in the Netherlands are in Dutch. Additionally, in traditional second language acquisition there is no distinction between the L1, the L2 and the L3, because it is always mother tongue vs. second language. So, after reading some articles about the topic, I came up with this question of how the L1, in this case Dutch, and the L2 English influence the L3. At first I only looked into L3 French, but now I am also looking at L3 German.

Since German is closer to Dutch, could you see any differences? Yes, and that is very interesting. I first tested the L2 Status Factor hypothesis, which claims that the L2 is more important than the L1, and I found some evidence supporting this hypothesis. I found, for example, that immersion Dutch students receive more L2 input in their daily context, and use English more than regular VWO students. It is interesting to find out whether it is the L2 or maybe also the L3 that decides which background language the L3 learner wants to use. So that is why I compare two L3s, German and French in native speakers of Dutch. I study the same constructions, in the same school context, and the same year. For this study, I looked at third-year students, and they significantly use English more in French than in German. So, in this case, when learning German, the L1 Dutch comes into play a lot more than when learning French. And we think now that this is because the L1 gets more active since it is typologically related to the L3, whereas in the language pair L1 Dutch L2 English and L3 French, the three languages are more or less different.

Do you apply this when you teach? I think it is a difficult question because when you want to put it into practice, I would not necessarily say that the modern foreign languages should be taught from English instead of Dutch. It can be confusing for the students. But I think it would be good to see the students as a multilingual instead of a monolingual learner. So, to do more with the fact that L2 English plays an important role in
students’ lives, I think it would be a very good thing in modern foreign language acquisition to see the relations between languages.

**Was there a highlight in this past academic year?**
One highlight is that I was invited to speak about my research at a workshop in Stockholm by one of the greatest researchers in third language acquisition, Camilla Bardel. There are three important L3 models, of which she introduced one, the L2 Status Factor. Another thing which is not really a highlight but that I really like is the third (and now already fourth!) year of the PhD. In the third year, things are falling into place. It is not that I know exactly what to write down in the upcoming months, but I have the feeling that somehow I have it more or less in my head.

**Why the ACLC?**
Two reasons. The first is a practical one, and it has to do with the fact that I studied French at the UvA and I knew Petra Sleeman, who introduced me to the ACLC. The second is that I found out that the ACLC is one of the major linguistics departments, and that it is well-known. Wherever I go, when I tell that I am a PhD-student of Aafke Hulk’s, everyone reacts enthusiastically and knows her. I think there are a lot of ambitious people working here and I must admit that I am sometimes a bit impressed by the colleagues.

Finally: what would you be doing if you were not doing a PhD.
I would work in a secondary school as a teacher. I really like to teach, but I would only do it as a part time job, though. I used to teach five days a week, and I managed, but it is important to keep being enthusiastic about teaching. I would also like to keep on doing other things, maybe in academia as a researcher or teacher.

---


2 An interesting discussion on the current status and challenges of education in modern foreign languages is given by Rosalinde Stadt in her article “Met Franse communicatieles blijf je hakkelen op de camping” (published in NRC.nl, link: http://alturl.com/yso9r).
ACLC-doctorates in 2016

Mirjam Trapman, 13 January 2016,
Reading and writing development of low achieving-adolescents. The roles of linguistic knowledge, fluency, and metacognitive knowledge.
Promotor: Prof. dr. Jan Hulstijn; co-promotor: Dr. Amos van Gelderen.
Brendan Costello, 29 January 2016,
Language and Modality: Effects of the Use of Space in the Agreement System of Lengua de Signos Espaňola (Spanish Sign Language).
Promotor: Prof. dr. Anne Baker; co-promotores: Dr. Roland Pfau and Dr. Alazne Landa Arevalillo.
Margreet van Koert, 5 February 2016,
Binding and quantification in monolingual and bilingual language acquisition.
Promotores: Prof. dr. Aafke Hulk and Prof. dr. Fred Weerman; co-promotor: Dr. Olaf Koeneman.
Konrad Rybka, 26 February 2016,
The linguistic encoding of landscape in Lokono.
Promotor: Prof. dr. Kees Hengeveld; co-promotores: Prof. dr. Enoch Aboh and Dr. Eithne Carlin.
Sophie ter Schure, 7 April 2016,
The Relevance of Visual Information on Learning Sounds in Infancy.
Promotor: Prof. dr. Paul Boersma; co-promotor: Dr. Caroline Junge.
Femmy Admiraal, 3 June 2016,
A grammar of space in Baure: A study on the linguistic encoding of spacial reference.
Promotor: Prof. dr. Kees Hengeveld; co-promotor: Dr. Swintha Daniëlsen.
Merel Boers, 15 June 2016,
Promotores: Prof. dr. Frans van Eemeren and Prof. dr. Frits Boterman; co-promotor: Dr. Bart Garssen.
André Juthe, 28 June 2016,
Promotor: Prof. dr. Frans van Eemeren; co-promotor: Dr. Bart Garssen.
Eugen Popa, 7 September 2016,
Thought Experiments in Academic Communication. A pragma-dialectical method of reconstructing the argumentative use of imaginary scenarios in academic disputes.
Promotor: Prof. dr. Frans van Eemeren; co-promotor: Dr. Jean Wagemans.
Ahmed Omar, 21 September 2016,
Promotor: Prof. dr. Frans van Eemeren; co-promotor: Dr. Franciska Snoeck Henkemans.
Smadar Cohen, 27 September 2016,
Person markers in Spoken Spontaneous Israeli Hebrew.
Promotor: Prof. dr. Kees Hengeveld.
Katherine Bolaños Quiñones, 12 October 2016,
A Grammar of Kakau.
Promotor: Prof. dr. Kees Hengeveld; co-promotores: Prof. dr. Patience Epps and Dr. Frank Seifart.
Jacky Visser, 18 November 2016,
A Dialogue Game for Critical Discussion. Groundwork in the formalisation and computerisation of the pragma-dialectical model of argumentation.
Promotor: Prof. dr. Frans van Eemeren; co-promotores: Dr. Franciska Snoeck Henkemans and Dr. Bart Verheij.
Bibi Janssen, 24 November 2016,
The acquisition of gender and case in Polish and Russian. A study of monolingual and bilingual children.
Promotor: Prof. dr. Anne Baker; co-promotores: Prof. dr. Wim Honselaar and Dr. Alla Peeters-Podgaevskaja.
Pierre Winkler, 24 November 2016,  
*Missionary Pragmalinguistics. Father Diego Luis de Sanvitores’ gramma (1668) within the tradition of Philippine grammars.*  
Promotor: Prof. dr. Olga Fischer; co-promotor: Dr. Otto Zwartjes.

Matthias Passer, 15 December 2016,  
*Typology and Diachrony of Nominal Classification.*  
Promotores: Prof. dr. Kees Hengeveld and Prof. dr. Hedde Zeijlstra.

## Research groups and co-ordinators in 2016

The ACLC is organised in research groups. In the period that this brochure covers, ACLC research was carried out in the following groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research group</th>
<th>Coordinator[s]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adventures in Multimodality (AIM): Narrating and arguing by images, words &amp; sounds</td>
<td>Charles Forceville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amusia and Language</td>
<td>Silke Hamann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argumentation and Rhetoric</td>
<td>Francisca Snoeck Henkemans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bidirectional Phonology and Phonetics</td>
<td>Paul Boersma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Approaches to Second Language Acquisition</td>
<td>Sible Andringa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Slavic Verbal Aspect (and Related Issues)</td>
<td>René Genis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosslinguistic Semantics</td>
<td>Maria Aloni, Lotte Hogeweg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Discourse Grammar</td>
<td>Kees Hengeveld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar &amp; Cognition</td>
<td>Judith Rispens, Jan Don</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iconicity</td>
<td>Olga Fischer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Discourse</td>
<td>Anne Bannink, Jet van Dam van Isselt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic and Cultural Aspects of Translation</td>
<td>Eric Metz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphor Lab Amsterdam</td>
<td>Gerard Steen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oncology-Related Communication Disorders</td>
<td>Michiel van den Brekel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revitalizing Older Linguistic Documentation (ROLD)</td>
<td>Otto Zwartjes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Language Grammar and Typology (SiLaGaT)</td>
<td>Roland Pfau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking about Learners</td>
<td>Enoch Aboh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>