Abstract Essex meeting 26 November 2011

Tina Cambier-Langeveld

Abstract

Within the field of LADO, there are different approaches, and within each approach, there are differences in working method and level of expertise. Discussions on the reliability of different approaches (e.g. those referred to as the 'supervised native speaker' approach and the 'specialized linguist' approach) may have been blurred by the differences within each.

I must make clear from the outset that I will speak only for the method employed by the Dutch Immigration and Naturalisation Service, which falls under the heading of the 'supervised native speaker' approach. Note, however, that the testing, training and supervision of our analysts is such that they should be referred to as *expert* native speakers (ENS). The validity of our method is demonstrated in Cambier-Langeveld (2010), in which the results of the only validation research in the field of LADO to date are presented.

Second, I will go through a number of factors that characterise our casework. An understanding of the task at hand and the preselection of cases will make it easier to see how it is possible for us to draw relatively firm conclusions in the majority of cases.

In this paper, I will address the difficulties of defining the 'native speaker', being both myth and reality. Examples from actual practice will be used to show how we can work around these difficulties through case-specific evaluation. It will be noted that defining the required expertise of a 'specialized linguist' is equally problematic. Answering the question whether a specialized linguist has the required expertise to perform LADO should thus follow the same line of case-specific evaluation.

Reference

Cambier-Langeveld, T. (2010) The validity of language analysis in the Netherlands. In K. Zwaan, M. Verrips and P. Muysken (eds) *Language and Origin: the role of language in European asylum procedure: a linguistic and legal survey,* pp. 21-33. Nijmegen: Wolf Legal Publishers.