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**INCOMING PHD STUDENTS INTERVIEW ACLC MEMBERS**

For this brochure four PhD researchers who joined the ACLC in 2014 and 2015 [Marloes Oomen, Sune Gregersen, Hernán Labbé Grünberg, Imme Lammertink] had interviews with ACLC researchers who had reached a new stage in their careers. There is an interview with a researcher who has been with us for quite some time and who has recently become an associate professor, Judith Rispens, with a PhD researcher who after a long career as a lecturer started her PhD research project in 2015, Manon van der Laaken, with an ACLC post-doctoral fellow who came to the ACLC in 2015 on a Marie Curie Intra-European Fellowship, Marianna Bolognesi, and with an assistant professor who had been with us for 4 years when she received a permanent contract, Silke Hamann.
NEW NEW NEW "We found that pitch perception by amusics is impaired for speech stimuli and tonal analogs even at a distance of seven semitones. This substantiates the hypothesis that congenital amusia is not domain-specific but rather a general perceptual impairment." (Jasmin Pfeifer, Silke Hamann & Mats Exter, *Speech Prosody* 7, 2014)

Interview with
Judith Rispens by
Marloes Oomen

Judith Rispens is an associate professor and investigates language processing in participants with typical and disordered development. Marloes Oomen is currently doing PhD research on argument structure in German Sign Language.

*Can you briefly describe what your research is about?*

In general terms my research is about language acquisition and processing and more specifically about how individuals with an atypical language development acquire language. In my VIDI-project, we investigate whether implicit statistical learning – the ability to derive statistical regularities from the environment – contributes to language acquisition. Are the mechanisms underlying implicit language learning and statistical learning the same? PhD students Merel van Witteloostuijn and Imme Lammertink, also supervised by Paul Boersma, investigate this question for children with dyslexia and SLI. I myself investigate if implicit statistical learning is a predictor for literacy and language development in a longitudinal study with typically developing children between the ages of 6 and 7.5.

I am also interested in the interaction between certain language processes, such as that between morphosyntactic and phonological processes. For instance, the morphosyntactic marking of past tense in Dutch has a phonological component, because allomorph selection is determined by phonology. Thus, we hypothesize that children who have a phonological deficit also have problems with morphosyntactic processing. PhD-student Tiffany Boersma (with Anne Baker and Fred Weerman) investigates these kinds of processes in typically developing children and children with dyslexia. Hernán Labbé Grünberg (with Fred Weerman and Jan Don) also investigates morphosyntactic information processing, but his interest is in the morphosyntactic system of healthy participants.

*When did your interest in linguistics and language development start?*

I started my study in Dutch at the University of Groningen because I liked literature. I had also considered psychology, but my idea of that at the time was that you would have to become a clinical psychologist, which was not something I was interested in. Right in my first year of studying, I realized that I very much enjoyed the courses that centered on the brain, language, and disorders, so I dropped my literature course and continued with neurolinguistics as a major. After my bachelor’s, I wanted to learn more about language disorders, but in the Netherlands at the time you needed to do another 4-
year course in speech therapy for that. Instead, I chose to do a 2-year master’s at the University of Reading (UK) in order to become a qualified speech and language therapist.

**How did you end up at the UvA?**
I obtained my doctor’s degree at the University of Groningen. In my dissertation, I compared language behavior of older children with dyslexia and SLI. I continued as a post-doctoral fellow at an institute for children with severe learning difficulties. The research I did there was rather broad and focused for instance on the self-image of these children. It is there that I realized that I really missed the *language*, so when it was done, I applied for a VENI grant and went to the UvA. I wanted to come here because I was interested in working with Jan de Jong and Anne Baker because of their research on language cognition.

**So the VENI became a VIDI?**
After the VENI, I worked as an assistant professor for two years, until I got the VIDI grant.

**Can you imagine yourself doing something completely different?**
Well, of course I’ve thought about this, because every time a project finishes you don’t know what the future will bring. I am a qualified speech therapist, so that’s always kind of my escape, but I am certainly under no illusion that I can just go and start doing that kind of work – I don’t have any experience.

It’s a difficult question, because I really like doing scientific research, teaching, and mentoring PhD students. When I was doing the postdoc and wasn’t enjoying it very much, I considered working at the criminal investigation department. At one point, the Dutch Criminal Investigation Department offered a shortened training track, but the program was three years and the logistics didn’t appeal to me. It’s essentially the same type of work – analyzing, solving puzzles, finding the crux of the problem – but you carry it out in a more natural environment, not stuck behind the computer. That’s what I like about my research as well. You go to schools, test children, see how they are struggling, and try to understand how it works. I find that much more satisfying than, for instance, analyzing a book. So the societal context and social relevance is important for me. It makes what I do more tangible, even if the results may only be noticed indirectly in practice.

**What kind of research would you still like to do?**
What I find really annoying, is that we usually work with really small participant samples. If we have 50 children, we consider that to be a lot because recruiting participants is difficult, especially when it comes to children with language development problems. Since we are working with such small numbers, it is difficult to generalize or to get a good view on the extent of individual variation. So I’d like to do tests with many more children, collect a lot of data. That would cost a lot of time and money, though. Something else is testing intervention methods. Margreet van Koert has started a postdoc in a project that we are carrying out in collaboration with the department of developmental psychology. In this project, we try to develop some kind of app that will help children with dyslexia or another language impairment to learn the orthography of English, which is notorious for its non-transparency. Investigating the effectiveness of intervention methods is extremely difficult, because you want to work with homogenous groups in order to determine that any effect you find can only be due to your manipulation. There are so many factors that might play a role, and you need to try to control as many of them as possible. I am glad we are doing this with Patrick Snellings, Jurgen Tijms and others of developmental psychology, because they
have a lot more knowledge on this than we do.

**Finally, what was your highlight of 2015?**
My biggest highlights already occurred in 2014, when I got both the VIDI and the NRO grant, which is for more applied education research. My highlight of 2015 is that both these projects started. I am very happy with my new PhD students who work on the VIDI-project. The intervention project also started in 2015. It is a tricky project methodologically, but I am very pleased about the collaboration. So, actually carrying out the ideas that you put on paper in a proposal, yes, that is the highlight of 2015.
NEW NEW NEW “while it is completely legitimate to focus second-language research and theory construction on the first few behavioral signs of acquisition of target structures (called emergence), there should also be room for research that looks at the entire developmental trajectory for a given set of related structures, from emergence to full mastery, to be examined in relevant target populations (differing in first language, differing in explicit knowledge), using several elicitation tasks, to be administered many times over the period that it takes to reach full mastery of all structures under investigation. Arguably, if such studies were to yield non-trivial findings, second language acquisition researchers should do their best to construct theories explaining these findings” (Jan Hulstijn, *Language proficiency in native and non-native speakers*, 2015)

Interview with Manon van der Laaken by Sune Gregersen

Manon van der Laaken is a lecturer at the Department of English Language and Culture and currently working on the PhD project The “Lastmeter” in out-patient cancer consultations: Help or hindrance to physician-patient communication. Sune Gregersen is a PhD student at the ACLC, working on the project De-auxiliarization in the Dutch and English modals: A comparative diachronic corpus investigation.

**What is your current position?**

I’ve actually got two positions, because my research is partly subsidized through the Verwelius Fonds and the Netherlands Cancer Institute (NKI). So I am a lecturer and PhD candidate at the Department of English Language and Culture/ACLC, and a PhD candidate at the NKI.

**What did you do before joining the ACLC?**

I have been a lecturer at the English department since 2003, teaching, among other things, Sociolinguistics and Critical Discourse Analysis. Before that I worked outside of academia for 10 years, first as a researcher and director for a television production company, and later as a communication expert for a consultancy agency. But I have a long history with the UvA – I got my degree in English Linguistics from the UvA in 1979, and I taught at the English department from 1977 to 1993.

**Can you tell us something about your research?**

My research focusses on the communication between doctor and patient in follow-up cancer consultations. These consultations take place in the period after the last treatment, but before the patient has been “officially” declared cancer-free, or the appearance of a new malignancy. There is a concern that patients may not always be able to voice all their worries and problems at such consultations, something which has even been brought up in the Dutch parliament. My thesis investigates whether a communication tool called the “Lastmeter” (the “Distress Thermometer”) can help remedy this. The Lastmeter was developed to measure the degree of distress by asking the patient a number of questions about their physical and emotional well-being, and the tool has already been implemented in some Dutch hospitals.

There has been quite a lot of quantitative research into this tool, but the results seem to be contradictory – studies claim the Lastmeter works, in that patients’ worries
are discussed more frequently, but on the other hand the Lastmeter does not seem to positively influence the patients’ well-being, disease management or health outcomes. So it was decided to conduct a qualitative, discourse analytical study, to see whether that can help show what exactly is going on. To be able to see whether the Lastmeter actually improves doctor–patient communication, I first need to set a baseline, so I am now analysing a number of video-recorded follow-up consultations in order to see what an “ordinary” consultation looks like, and how doctor and patient together construct these consultations.

**What is the most surprising thing to come out of your research so far?**
The most surprising thing so far is that in these follow-up cancer consultations, you see both doctors and patients orienting towards well-being or wellness, not just distress and complications. You would perhaps expect this kind of consultation to be quite somber and have a serious tone, but the focus is generally on looking forward, and there are moments in all the consultations that are geared towards the positive, towards hope, towards “so far so good”. At the moment I am looking at what different types of wellness doctors and patients orient towards and how they construct this wellness together. The next step will then be to analyze how they talk about distress and to see if the Lastmeter helps in this.

**What was your number one highlight of 2015?**
Getting the PhD project. That was quite an unusual thing, because the project was already under way. Elin Derks had written the proposal and conducted the first part of the project: she got all the approvals, videoed more than 60 consultations, arranged for their transcription, and had already begun to analyze the data. Then she realized that she didn’t want an academic career, and decided to give up the project. So there was this wonderful project going begging. Her supervisors then asked me whether I was interested, and I was. So then I wrote an adaptation of the project, and that was approved by the ACLC and my supervisors in July 2015. I have written the first article together with Elin, so that she gets academic recognition for the work she has done.

**How about yourself, what would you be doing if you weren’t working in academia?**
Actually, things could have turned out quite differently: I had 10 years of singing lessons and did one year of conservatory, so – if I had kept that up – I might have ended up in the choir of the opera, or as a music teacher. In the end, though, my passion for language and linguistics won over my passion for opera, but I still sing in a choir in my free time and enjoy it a lot.

**What is the most challenging thing about writing a PhD thesis?**
Balancing my teaching with my research. Both these tasks demand your full attention and can always use more work. I try to block fixed days for teaching and for research, so that I don’t get lost in one “job” while I should be spending time on the other. But somehow that is not always as easy to manage as one would like.

**Is there anything in particular that you would still like to achieve in your research and at the ACLC?**
Yes – I would like to complete my thesis within the set time. There is still a discussion going on about how useful the Lastmeter is, and I think it is very important that hospitals and doctors can make informed decisions about what tools to use, and how to handle these follow-up consultations in general. So I am really looking forward to seeing what my results will show, and how they can be used to improve doctor–patient communication.
What are your plans for the academic year 2016-2017?
Write! The first article based on the research, by Elin Derks and myself, is now ready for submission, and I have started on the next one. I am also going to present at a number of conferences. So it’s going to be a busy year, but hopefully also one with a lot of interesting results.
NEW NEW NEW “A three-way distinction between root affixes (root-attaching, stress-sensitive, categorically flexible), ‘first heads’ (root-attaching, stress-sensitive, categorically fixed), and head-affixes (word-attaching, stress-neutral, categorically fixed) seems to make the right predictions for the properties of Dutch word formation.” (Ava Creemers, Jan Don & Paula Fenger, NELS 45, 2015)

Interview with Marianna Bolognesi by Hernán Labbé Grünberg

Marianna Bolognesi is an Italian post-doc researcher working on visual metaphors at the Metaphor Lab, as part of a two-year Marie Curie European fellowship. She obtained her BA degree in foreign languages at the University of Pisa (Italy) and her MA degree in applied and computational linguistics at the University of Pavia (Italy). She then went on to become a PhD student based both in Torino (Italy) and London (UK).

Hernán Labbé Grünberg is currently doing PhD research on automatic, unconscious processing of Dutch Morphosyntax by L2 speakers of Dutch.

Can you briefly describe your research?
I compare how metaphors are expressed in two modalities: language and images. My work can be framed within a long tradition that studies how metaphors work in language, and argues that metaphors are matters of thought, rather than simple figures of speech. Today we know most metaphors are used unconsciously, and utterances like “I see what you mean” are not perceived to be metaphoric anymore, but indeed they are: the statement means to understand, not really to see. This is just an example of the many idiomatic expressions that are built on deeper conceptual metaphors. In this case: knowing is seeing. We know a lot on how metaphors work when they are expressed in language, but we don’t know much about how they work when expressed in images (like advertisements, political campaigns, art, etc.). Nor we know how the two modalities compare to each other, and whether visual and linguistic metaphoric expressions point to the same underlying conceptual metaphors. In my project I tackle precisely this topic, by analyzing different types of visual metaphors, how they work, how they can be grounded in human cognition, and how they differ from or resemble the use of metaphors in language.

Why (visual) metaphors?
As I had anticipated before, a great deal of researchers and metaphor scholars suggest that metaphors are not just a form of poetic use of language, but rather a basic cognitive mechanism: We think through metaphors. Specifically, metaphors would be the mechanism through which we are able to understand abstract concepts that do not have a concrete reference in the real world. For example, we conceptualize the abstract concept of love as a journey, and by analogy we transfer attributes of journeys to the concept of love. Namely, it is a trip shared with another person, it can have a final destination, obstacles to overcome, etc. But are the same attributes transferred when we use metaphors to communicate in the visual modality? Or, instead, do different modalities exploit different streams of knowledge to convey a metaphorical comparison between two concepts? And how do abstract concepts emerge from images, which by definition need to represent concrete entities? These are the
questions that sparked my interest in this research.

**How did you end up in this line of research?**

During my PhD I used distributional semantics to model the lexicon of native and foreign language speakers. When comparing the semantic spaces between the two groups, I realized that the bulk of differences between the two lexicons coincided with different metaphoric uses of certain motion verbs. I was already interested in Embodied Cognition and alternatives to symbolic computations to describe cognition, so after stumbling upon metaphors in my PhD project, I decided to dive into this line of research.

**What do you expect to achieve with your project on visual metaphors?**

I expect to build a solid framework for the study of metaphors in modalities other than language (namely, in images). Specifically, I would like to tackle one of the big questions in cognitive science: How do we ground abstract concepts?

I am also aware that despite the importance of metaphors, they are probably not the only cognitive mechanism we use to deal with abstract concepts. Some scholars in London, for example, have suggested emotional cognition plays an important role in abstract concepts. This is why towards the end of my project, in November, I am organizing a high profile international symposium on abstract concepts. Eight top professors from around the world are coming to this event to present and discuss their views on abstract concepts. The keynotes are experts in Cognitive science, Neuroscience, Computer science, and Linguistics. The symposium will generate a fruitful discussion on how we ground abstract concepts. My plan is to turn the papers and contributions of this symposium into an edited collection that will lay the ground for further research on this area.

**Can you share a recent finding from your research?**

Metaphors can be conceptualized as a relation between two concepts, as in \( X \) is \( Y \). This, roughly speaking, causes attributes of \( X \) to be mapped onto \( Y \). Many scholars argue that the mappings shall be somehow already present in the latent semantics of both, \( X \) and \( Y \). For example, if I say my friend is a fox, fox-like attributes are transferred to my concept of friend (e.g. cunningness), but this feature shall be somehow already part of both, friend and fox. So, friend and fox have an inner latent semantic similarity, which is the shared feature cunningness. I have recently discovered that the type of similarity that can explain a metaphorical comparison changes, depending on the modality in which the metaphor is expressed. In the specific case of visual communication, the similarity between \( X \) and \( Y \) is typically based on perceptual features or contextual entities, which typically co-occur with both the metaphor terms. On the other hand, for metaphors expressed in language, \( X \) and \( Y \) share similar syntactic patterns, which are not shared by concepts aligned in visual metaphors. So even though metaphors are a general-purpose cognitive mechanism, the transfer of attributes turns out to be modality-dependent.

**How has your experience been working on the ACLC as a post-doc?**

I like being embedded in the ACLC because of the wide variety of people working on so many different topics. An important challenge has been to learn to communicate with the wide variety of researchers at this institute. The fields of study are so numerous that it has really been an interesting challenge to make myself understood by my fellow researchers, and to understand them when we talk about our work. Thanks to this variety I received very useful comments, coming from peers in different disciplines.
Why Amsterdam?
One of the requirements of the Marie Curie fellowship I received was to work on a quality, highly ranked institution known for its excellence in research. Moreover, the institution had to excel at the specific field of study I was applying to, which is the grounding of metaphors. That is why I set up to work with the Metaphor Lab here in Amsterdam. It is a unique lab in the research world, and I thought “Well, I want to work in an environment where there are experts on metaphors”. I am now glad to be working in Amsterdam!
Interview Silke Hamann by Imme Lammertink

Silke is an assistant professor in phonology and investigates the role that phonological knowledge plays in the process of speech perception, especially in the adaptation of loanwords, in sound change, and for congenital amusics. Imme Lammertink is doing a PhD project on the contribution of procedural learning to grammar and literacy acquisition in children with Specific Language Impairment.

Can you briefly describe what your research is about?

My research is mostly about the phonetics–phonology interface. I try to unravel how we map acoustic auditory information onto abstract phonological categories and how these categories activate lexical meaning; especially how this mapping can change from generation to generation. By means of experiments, by formalizing models and by running simulations, I hope to get a clearer view of how speakers acquire the knowledge of the sounds in their language, and how this can differ from the acquisition of previous speakers.

When I ask Silke whether her studies are always with adults, Silke confesses that she did study with infants once, but that these types of experiments are not her favorite.

It was difficult to get enough data and I found it tricky to draw any conclusions from the data as half of the children had a preference for novel sounds whereas the other half of the children showed a preference for the familiar sounds. Older kids are much easier to work with.

Following up this question I ask Silke how she feels about working with language-impaired populations?

Actually I would be very interested testing whether exactly the same phonological restrictions are used for comprehension of spoken as well as written language (something I predict from my formal modeling). It would be great to test this hypothesis with participants with dyslexia.

How did you decide to become a researcher?

In general I am very curious. Whenever I hear something new I start thinking about what this tells us about how humans work, and how our brains work. But to be honest, I became a researcher more by accident. Towards the end of my studies in general linguistics and the English language, I knew that I liked literature, linguistics, and writing and solving logical puzzles a lot. I had no idea, however, what to do afterwards. At some point, one of our teachers advertised a PhD position. First I thought “that’s not for me”. But when I talked to the teacher for another reason, she finished our conversation saying: “by the way, that PhD position, aren’t you interested?” And somehow I decided to give it a try 😊.

And you have never regretted it?

No, not at all.

In 2015, you published (or co-authored) 5 papers. Which of these five should everyone from the ACLC read?

Looking at my publications of 2015, I realize it is a very mixed bag. I wrote two papers together with my PhD student Jasmin Pfeifer about Amusia. That’s very interesting. But if you are more interested in what I talked about earlier (the phonetics–phonology interface and how to formalize it), then read my paper with Laura Downing in Journal of Linguistics1. If you’re

1 Hamann, Silke & Laura J. Downing (2015). 

"NT revisited again: An approach to
interested in an easy read about a funny project on sound change, then it’s definitely worth to look at the paper that I wrote with Alma de Jonge (former research master student)\(^2\). In this project we tried to answer the question how Dutch speakers realize a written \(<g>\) in nonnative words like mango and spaghetti. We developed a new task (the menu task) to investigate this question and found interesting differences in the realization of \(<g>\) between younger and older speakers of Dutch, and also very unexpected word-specific differences.

**Recently, you received support from the UvA FGw Aspasia Fund and you were nominated for the UvA onderwijsprijs.**

**What is your key to success?**

I was very happy with both, but I find it difficult to formulate my key to success. The funny thing is that I had never imagined that I would enjoy teaching. If, as a teenager, someone had told me that I would become a teacher, I would have said: no way. But now, I really enjoy it (as long as it’s not too much!). I hadn’t realized how much you learn from explaining and by asking simple questions.

---


\(^{3}\) The UvA FGw Aspasia Fund aims to support women in their career development within the Faculty of Humanities at the UvA and to expand their opportunities to conduct research.
ACLC-doctorates in 2014, 2015

2014

Promotor: prof. dr. Anne Baker; co-promotor dr. Roland Pfau

Promotor: prof. dr. Anne Baker; co-promotor dr. Roland Pfau

Promotor: prof. dr. Paul Boersma; co-promotores dr. Paola Escudero and dr. S. Hamann


Hadil Karawani, 17 June 2014, *The real, the fake, and the fake fake: In counterfactual conditionals, crosslinguistically.*

2015


Promotor: prof. dr. Kees Hengeveld; copromotor: prof. dr. Enoch Aboh

Karin Wanrooij, 23 April 2015, *Distributional learning of vowel categories in infants and adults.*

Promotor: prof. dr. Anne Baker; co-promotor: dr. Jan de Jong

Natalia Aralova, 4 September 2015, *Vowel harmony in two Even dialects: production and perception.*

Roosmaryn Pilgram, 8 September 2015, *A doctor’s argument by authority.*
Promotor: prof. dr. F.H. van Eemeren; co-promotor: dr. H.L.M. Meuffels

Jing Lin, 4 December 2015, *Acquiring Negative Polarity Items.*
Promotor: prof. dr. F.P. Weerman; co-promotor: prof. dr. H.H. Zeijlstra

Promotor: prof. dr. F.H. van Eemeren; co-promotor: dr. A.F. Snoeck Henkemans

Ingeborg van der Geest, 16 December 2015, *Argumentatie voor een keuze: Een pragma-dialectische analyse van gemotiveerde keuzes in overheidsbesluiten over m.e.r.-plichtige projecten.*
Promotor: prof. dr. F.H. van Eemeren; co-promotor: dr. H.J. Plug
Research groups and co-ordinators in 2014-2015
The ACLC is organised in following 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>Jan Hulstijn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Slavic Verbal Aspect (and Related Issues)</td>
<td>René Genis, Janneke Kalsbeek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosslinguistic Semantics</td>
<td>Maria Aloni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Discourse Grammar</td>
<td>Hella Olbertz, Kees Hengeveld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar &amp; Cognition</td>
<td>Fred Weerman, Judith Rispens</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>Language Description &amp; Typology</td>
<td>Eva van Lier, Jenny Audring</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>
<tr>
<td>Unlearnable and Learnable Languages</td>
<td>Jan Don, Sterre Leufkens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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