



HaBiNet1, the First HaBiNet Colloquium

PANELS

Overall format:

Minute 0-5: getting settled & introduction by chair

Minute 6-20: 5-minute statements from each panelist, strictly timed

Minute 21-45: open discussion

Minute 46-53: 1.5 minute remarks from each panelist

Minute 54-59: closing statement by discussant

Thursday May 24, 2018, 14:15 - 15:15 hrs

Panel 1: Demographic, social, and cultural variability in the study of bilinguals.

How do we deal with variation in nonlinguistic factors, such as poverty, poor health, limited education and/or literacy, and other sources of vulnerability? For example, how do we report SES differences: What standards, and (how) does it matter? How do we compare different cultural contexts?

Position statements from 4 panelists:

Sharon Armon-Lotem, Hilde De Smedt, James Simpson, Adam Winsler

Chair: Lourdes Ortega, Closing statement: Annick De Houwer

Thursday May 24, 2018, 16:00 - 17:00 hrs

Panel 2: Do we need monolinguals to explain language (un)learning and use in bilinguals?

Often findings from monolingual child language acquisition are used as a basis for explaining patterns of acquisition in young bilinguals. Often monolingual language use is held up as a standard for adult second language acquisition. In studies of language attrition, decisions about whether attrition is happening or not are often made based on comparisons with monolinguals. Is this the only or best way to go?

Position statements from 4 panelists:

Sible Andringa, Kees de Bot, Anna Ghimenton, Kara Morgan-Short

Chair: Annick De Houwer, Closing statement: Lourdes Ortega

Friday May 25, 2018, 09:00 - 10:00 hrs

Panel 3: Pitfalls of and opportunities for transdisciplinary research into bilingualism.

How can we improve inter- and transdisciplinary connections between scholars working on bilingualism and who are coming from very different research traditions, using very different methodologies, from often opposed theoretical positions?

Position statements from 4 panelists:

Kellie Gonçalves, Rob Hartsuiker, Ken Paap, Bente Ailin Svendsen

Chair: Annick De Houwer, Closing statement: Lourdes Ortega

Friday May 25, 2018, 11:45 - 12:45 hrs

Panel 4: Terminology in the study of bilinguals and bilingualism.

How useful is it to create new names for groups of people depending on how they communicate? Do we need terms like heritage speakers, new speakers, child bilinguals, bimodals, bilectals, early bilinguals, late bilinguals, second language learners, English language learners, 1.5 generation...? How do we agree on consistent use of terms like societal language, home language, majority language, elective bilingualism, multi- vs. bilingualism, and so on? And what do translanguaging, code-switching, code-mixing, nonce borrowing, mixing really mean? How do we avoid terminological chaos? How do we keep clarity in all this? Is there any way forward in this?

Position statements from 4 panelists:

Suzanne Aalberse, David Birdsong, Simona Montanari, Nikolay Slavkov

Chair: Annick De Houwer, **Closing statement:** Lourdes Ortega

Friday May 25, 2018, 14:15 - 15:15 hrs

Panel 5: Ethical considerations in doing research on bilinguals and in communicating results to the general public.

Certain methodological decisions in how we do our research can lead to results that contribute to a deficit view of bilingualism (an example is asking only a single parent about how children communicate; parents who speak mainly a single language with their children may not know much about how their child communicates in the other language; if then one finds large lags in comparison with monolingual children this may be due to the way one asked). Should we and can we, as a field, set up ethical guidelines relating to research methods so that we avoid such cases? And what with communicating our results to the general public? We may give interviews and not have much control over how our words are represented in the media, but in cases where we are, and in cases where we control public communication ourselves, what would be the best strategies to keep in mind, to avoid under- and overstating research results? Our research is by definition complex and often what we find is nuanced. How we do translate that into "soundbites" that are ethically acceptable.

Position statements from 4 panelists:

Philipp Angermeyer, Marianne Gullberg, Roy Lyster, Simone Pfenninger

Chair: Lourdes Ortega, **Closing statement:** Annick De Houwer