DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 292 329 FL 017 246

AUTHOR Hankamer, Jorge
TITLE THE USCS Linguistics Major. Linguistics in the Undergraduate Curriculum, Appendix 4-O.
INSTITUTION Linguistic Society of America, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY National Endowment for the Humanities (NFAH), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Dec 87
GRANT EH-20558-85
NOTE 14p.; In: Langendoen, D. Terence, Ed., Linguistics in the Undergraduate Curriculum: Final Report; see FL 017 227.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Bachelors Degrees; *College Curriculum; Course Content; Course Descriptions; *Degree Requirements; Graduate Study; Higher Education; *Linguistics; *Majors (Students); Program Descriptions; *Program Design; Public Schools; Undergraduate Study; Universities
IDENTIFIERS *University of California Santa Cruz

ABSTRACT

The undergraduate linguistics program at the University of California at Santa Cruz is described, the courses and course sequences are outlined, and the place of the major in the general curriculum is discussed. The program has been actively developed since 1980, when it was in danger of being discontinued, and now offers rigorous instruction in linguistic theory to a rapidly growing enrollment. The program goal is to teach undergraduates to engage in investigation and analysis of linguistic structures, based on the four principles of focus, professionalism, rigor, and fun. It offers 8 lower division and 27 upper division courses, and the major is built around three basic course sequences focusing on syntax, semantics, and phonology. Special program features include opportunities for students to assist in teaching courses, a research seminar, and publication of student papers. A closely interrelated graduate program has been initiated. The university as a whole has benefitted from the strengthening of the linguistics program, and the program has benefitted from a supportive administration and a high quality student body. (MSE)

LINGUISTICS IN THE UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM

APPENDIX 4-O

The UCSC Linguistics Major

by

Jorge Hankamer
University of California, Santa Cruz

The Linguistics in the Undergraduate Curriculum Project was funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities, Grant #EH-20558-85, D. Terence Langendoen, Principal Investigator.

Linguistic Society of America
1325 18th Street, N.W., Suite 211
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 835-1714

December 1987

PREFACE

The Linguistics in the Undergraduate Curriculum (LUC) project is an effort by the Linguistic Society of America (LSA) to study the state of undergraduate instruction in linguistics in the United States and Canada and to suggest directions for its future development. It was supported by a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities during the period 1 January 1985-31 December 1987. The project was carried out under the direction of D. Terence Langendoen, Principal Investigator, and Secretary-Treasurer of the LSA. Mary Niebuhr, Executive Assistant at the LSA office in Washington, DC, was responsible for the day-to-day administration of the project with the assistance of Nicole VandenHeuvel and Dana McDaniel.

Project oversight was provided by a Steering Committee that was appointed by the LSA Executive Committee in 1985. Its members were: Judith Aissen (University of California, Santa Cruz), Paul Angelis (Southern Illinois University), Victoria Fromkin (University of California, Los Angeles), Frank Heny, Robert Jeffers (Rutgers University), D. Terence Langendoen (Graduate Center of the City University of New York), Manjari Ohala (San Jose State University), Ellen Prince (University of Pennsylvania), and Arnold Zwicky (The Ohio State University and Stanford University). The Steering Committee, in turn, received help from a Consultant Panel, whose members were: Ed Battistella (University of Alabama, Birmingham), Byron Bender (University of Hawaii, Manoa), Garland Bills (University of New Mexico), Daniel Brink (Arizona State University), Ronald Butters (Duke University), Charles Cairns (Queens College of CUNY), Jean Casagrande (University of Florida), Nancy Dorian (Bryn Mawr College), Sheila Embleton (York University), Francine Frank (State University of New York, Albany), Robert Freidin (Princeton University), Jean Berko-Gleason (Boston University), Wayne Harbert (Cornell University), Alice Harris (Vanderbilt University), Jeffrey Heath, Michael Henderson (University of Kansas), Larry Hutchinson (University of Minnesota, Minneapolis), Ray Jackendoff (Brandeis University), Robert Johnson (Gallaudet College), Braj Kachru (University of Illinois, Urbana), Charles Kreidler (Georgetown University), William Ladusaw (University of California, Santa Cruz), Ilse Lehiste (The Ohio State University), David Lightfoot (University of Maryland), Donna Jo Napoli (Swarthmore College), Ronald Macaulay (Pitzer College), Geoffrey Pullum (University of California, Santa Cruz), Victor Raskin (Purdue University), Sanford Schane (University of California, San Diego), Carlota Smith (University of Texas, Austin), Roger Shuy (Georgetown University), and Jessica Wirth (University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee).

0. Introduction

This paper is a descendant of a paper titled "The UCSC Undergraduate Program in Linguistics", which was presented at the Princeton Conference on Linguistics in the Undergraduate Curriculum, Princeton University, March 6-8, 1987. The revisions are fairly radical. The Princeton paper contained two sections which have been omitted entirely from this paper, one on the development of the UCSC Linguistics program and one on the development of undergraduate Linguistics programs in general. The Princeton paper was largely about how the program in Linguistics at UCSC was developed. This paper focusses on the nature of the UCSC Linguistics major.

The UCSC undergraduate program in linguistics has drawn attention for two reasons. One has to do with the nature of the program itself: while a relatively small program (four faculty, increasing to seven) at a small institution (8,000 students) offering a rigorous program in linguistic theory with almost no frills, it has been able to attract respectable numbers of students and has gained a reputation for quality both at UCSC and elsewhere. The second has to do with its history. The program was near extinction in 1980, and five years later was healthy and growing, adding new faculty and preparing to launch a graduate program.

The purpose of this paper is to describe the undergraduate major in Linguistics which is at the heart of the UCSC program, explain the pedagogical philosophy of the program, and discuss what it has to offer to students in the program and the university as a whole.

1. Background and History

1.0 UCSC

UCSC is one of the smaller campuses of the University of California, with a faculty of about 400 and a student body of 8,000 undergraduate students and 600 graduate students. The academic calendar is based on the quarter system, with three ten-week quarters making up the academic year. Most courses are one-quarter courses. All courses are five units, the standard load for a student being three courses per quarter. The standard teaching load for faculty in our division is five courses per year.

Academic requirements of all students are the completion of an approved major and satisfaction of general education requirements, which involves taking a prescribed balance of lower division courses across disciplines. A total of 36 courses is required for graduation.

Departments set the requirements for their majors, but all programs require a comprehensive examination or senior thesis.

Linguistics at UCSC is in the division of Humanities. The program currently has seven faculty, about forty-five undergraduate majors, and three graduate students.

1.1 History of the Program

There has been a program in Linguistics at UCSC since the founding of the campus. Bill Shipley is a charter member of the UCSC faculty, coming to UCSC from Berkeley in 1968. During the early seventies, the program was small but fairly vigorous, and had a couple of junior faculty of some national prominence. They were lost, however, and toward the end of the decade the program was weakened and threatened with disestablishment. The UCSC Chancellor in fact announced a decision to close the program.

Despite its small size and apparent vulnerability, the program turned out to possess one vital resource: the Linguistics majors, though few, were a force to be reckoned with. They liked

linguistics a lot, and they stormed into the offices of deans and pounded on desks, tracked administrators and influential faculty members down in coffee shops, wrote angry letters, and generally made pests of themselves. The miracle is that it worked. The administrators changed their minds.

The chancellor then announced that if the program was not to be trashed, it would have to be supported. He allocated one new hard-money FTE to the program, to bring the total to four. The chancellor's reasoning was that to have a chance of succeeding, a program needed a minimum of four FTE in order to have the critical mass to cover essential teaching in the discipline and provide enough intellectual stimulation and cross-fertilization to produce useful research.

In 1979-80 a search was conducted to fill the new hard FTE. The result of this search was that I was hired to come in as chair in 1980-81. At this point the program had four faculty FTE, seventeen undergraduate majors, and a curriculum that was weak in central areas and didn't serve very many students beyond the majors.

There was steady growth during the next five years, with an increase in majors to about forty, an increase in faculty to six FTE, and a corresponding enrichment and stabilization of the curriculum.

In 1980-81 and 1981-82 Geoff Pullum and Judith Aissen were added to the faculty.

During the three academic years 1980-83, the curriculum was modified to provide more lower-division service courses, extended to include courses in computer literacy and programming, and professionalized at the top end so that students preparing for graduate school received instruction in current theoretical frameworks in syntax and semantics. A major in Language Studies was initiated, which involved a significant linguistics component and caused a surge in enrollments in Linguistics courses.

At this point (during 1983-84), the program underwent an external review. The review committee, consisting of Guy Carden as chair, Charles Fillmore, and Barbara Hall Partee, found the program sound and pronounced it one of the best undergraduate linguistics programs in the country. The committee also recommended expansion of the faculty and the initiation of a graduate program.

The UCSC administration responded by immediately allocating one new hard FTE to Linguistics, followed shortly by a soft FTE which has continued on a one-to-three year basis to the present time.

The two new faculty positions (filled by Bill Ladusaw and Aditi Lahiri) allowed the development of the semantic and phonological components of the curriculum to a state of acceptable coverage, and at the same time allowed us to schedule multiple offerings of large-enrollment lower-division courses. This resulted in a net increase in enrollments.

Enrollment growth is charted below, alongside faculty FTE (including full-time visiting positions, but disregarding leaves and part-time visiting faculty, which roughly cancel each other):

year	faculty	majors	enrollments
80-81	4	17	294
81-82	4	20	487
82-83	4	25	736
83-84	4	30	754
84-85	6	35	1122
85-86	6	40	1239

Over a five-year period, enrollments quadrupled while majors doubled and faculty increased by half.

On the basis of the healthy enrollment picture, the external review committee's recommendation, and the rising visibility of the program due to the acquisition of new faculty, the administration was willing to support our proposal to establish a Ph.D. program (in fact, the dean of our division asked us to do it). This entailed further faculty expansion, beginning with the allocation of a sixth hard FTE (filled in 1986-87 by Sandra Chung). The new graduate program was approved and launched in fall 1986 with an initial graduate class of three. In connection with the development of the graduate program, we will make three new hard appointments in the next three years. By 1990 the faculty size will be nine permanent faculty and one visiting position, the graduate student body will number fifteen to twenty, and there will be fifty to sixty undergraduate majors.

2. Program Description

2.0

This section presents a description of the Linguistics major at UCSC. I first discuss the focus and pedagogical philosophy of the program, then present a sketch of the curriculum and a detailed description of the core courses. Finally I discuss some special features of the program and its integration with the new graduate program.

2.1 Focus and Philosophy

The focus of the UCSC program is theoretical and descriptive linguistics. This encompasses semantic, syntactic, morphological, and phonological theory, and includes a commitment to natural language description and analysis, typology, and historical linguistics. Psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, ethnolinguistics, computational linguistics, and applied linguistics may be pursued to varying degrees because of special interests of individual faculty or by taking advantage of offerings in other departments.

Doing Linguistics

The goal of our program is to teach undergraduate Linguistics majors to "do linguistics", i.e. to engage in the activities of investigation and analysis of linguistic structures which constitute the craft of linguistics as currently practiced. If our program is successful, it should provide each student with an understanding of the methods and results of linguistic investigation, an ability to read and critically evaluate current work in at least one major area, and the ability to conduct and write about investigations in linguistic description and theory.

In trying to teach undergraduates to do linguistics, we adhere to the following four principles as guides for the design of the core curriculum:

(1) Focus

> An undergraduate linguistics program should be focussed. It should have specific areas of strength, and the major curriculum should be coherently designed to take advantage of them. Especially in the case of a small program, depth should be established first, breadth later.

(2) Professionalism

> An undergraduate linguistics program should be professional. All students in the

major should master the central and fundamental concepts and techniques of the discipline. Advanced students should have the opportunity to approach the frontiers of knowledge, and should be trained in the methods of investigation currently being used to advance those frontiers.

(3) Rigor

An undergraduate program in linguistics should be rigorous. It should demand commitment, intelligence, and work from the students. There is no point in encouraging stupid or lazy students to do linguistics, there's not enough money in it for that.

(4) Fun

An undergraduate program in linguistics should be fun. Actually, all learning should be fun. People learn best when there's some fun in it, and we are blessed with a discipline which people come to mainly for fun, so we might as well capitalize on it.

None of the above should need to be said specifically about linguistics; all university academic programs should have these features. We are just saying that linguistics should not be different from other respectable academic programs.

The design and development of the UCSC undergraduate program in linguistics is based on these four principles. They have guided faculty development, curriculum design, the nature of individual courses, and the general atmosphere in which the study of linguistics is pursued at UCSC.

2.2 Curriculum and Requirements

A brief sketch of the curriculum:

Lower Division

Introduction to Linguistics	(50)
Languages of the World	(60)
Modern English Grammar	(55) (3x)
Language, Society, and Culture	(40)
Nature and Language of Computers	(150)
Phonetics	(40) (3x)
Syntax 1	(40) (3x)
Semantics 1	(25)

Upper Division

Phonology 1	(20)
Phonology 2	(10)
Phonology 3	(5)
Morphology	(20)
Syntax 2	(25)
Syntax 3	(15)
Semantics 2	(10)
Semantics 3	(5)
Government and Binding Theory	(10) (1/2)

Generalized Phrase Structure Grammar	(15) (1/2)
Relational Approaches to Grammar	(5) (1/2)
Lexical-Functional Grammar	(10) (1/2)
Topics in Syntax and Semantics	(5)
Topics in Phonology and Morphology	(5)
Field Methods (two quarter course)	(5) (1/2)
Indo-European	(30)
Language Change	(20)
Sociolinguistics	(20) (1/2)
Psycholinguistics	(20) (1/2)
Natural Language Processing	(15)
Topics in Computational Linguistics	(15)
Structure of Spanish	(15)
Structure of French	(15)
Structure of Japanese	(15) (1/2)
History of Linguistics	(15) (1/2)
Mathematical Foundations of Linguistics	(15) (1/2)
Research Seminar	(5)

For each course, the number of students typically enrolled is given in parentheses. Courses offered more or less than once yearly are noted (3x, 1/2).

The lower division courses divide into two categories: general education (Introduction to Linguistics, Languages of the World, Modern English Grammar, Language Society and Culture, Language of Computers) and disciplinary introductions (Phonetics, Syntax 1, Semantics 1). The general education courses are designed primarily for non-majors; they have no prerequisites and do not serve as prerequisites for any upper division courses. They all satisfy campus breadth requirements. The disciplinary introductions also have no prerequisites, but they are prerequisites to the upper-division sequences and are required of Linguistics majors.

Linguistics majors are required to take Phonetics, Phonology 1 and 2, Syntax 1 and 2, Semantics 1 and 2, and a course in historical linguistics. They are required to take five further upper-division electives, chosen from courses offered in Linguistics and selected courses offered in other departments (Psycholinguistics, Language Development, Language Acquisition, Human Information Processing, Programming Language Syntax and Semantics, Philosophy of Language).

The only other requirement is submission of a senior thesis or project, or successful completion of a comprehensive examination. The comprehensive examination is offered once yearly, in the spring, and consists of a five-day take-home set of problems in phonology, syntax, and a special field. Senior theses and projects must be proposed a year in advance of expected graduation, approved by the department faculty, and accepted by an examining committee.

2.3 Discussion of the Major Curriculum

The undergraduate major curriculum is built around three fundamental sequences: Phonetics, Phonology 1, Phonology 2, Phonology 3; Syntax 1, Syntax 2, Syntax 3; and Semantics 1, Semantics 2, Semantics 3. We are in the process of adding a two-quarter sequence in morphology. The nature and content of these sequences is discussed below.

Majors are required to take all but the last level in each of these sequences, plus at least one course in historical linguistics and five further electives. We have considered requiring that one of the electives be an advanced course in one of the central areas, but since almost all majors do this anyway, it seems unnecessary to require it.

One point where our curriculum differs from that of most undergraduate programs is that the introduction to linguistics course is not required of majors, nor is it a prerequisite for any advanced course. The reasoning behind this is that the usual introduction to linguistics achieves so little in any particular area that most of it has to be done over in the real course on the subject anyway; and the absence of the prerequisite in other courses makes the entry courses to the three central sequences all recruitment points for the major. We have found that little is sacrificed by this move: Syntax 1, Semantics 1, and Phonetics function quite well without an introduction to linguistics behind them. On the other hand, our ability to draw prospective majors to the program and to raise enrollments in general is considerably enhanced.

Core Sequences

The prerequisite structure in the core sequences is simple. In each sequence, each course after the first presupposes the preceding course in that sequence. In addition, for n greater than 1, Semantics n presupposes Syntax n-1.

The Syntax Sequence

The syntax sequence is the backbone of our program. It is in these courses, especially Syntax 1 and 2, where the learn-by-doing method is most fully developed.

Syntax 1

Syntax 1 is a lower-division course without prerequisites. Its population is approximately one-third linguistics majors, one-third language studies majors, and one-third others. Syntax 1 is offered three times a year (one offering every quarter) and draws about forty students each time.

Syntax 1, officially titled "Introduction to Transformational Grammar", is really an introduction to linguistic investigation. The subject matter is English syntax. There is no text, no reading, and no lecture. At the first class, the students are told what a generative grammar is and introduced to the notion of grammaticality. They are given some set of simple sentences and told to go home and write a grammar to generate them. At the next class competing grammars are assessed and questions of overgeneration and undergeneration are brought up. The idea of choosing one solution over another based on arguments is introduced. After that the process is repeated in something like the following sequence: (a) facts are presented, in the form of grammatical and ungrammatical sentences or readings of sentences, which are not accounted for by the grammar and/or theory of grammar most recently adopted by the class; (b) the assignment is to revise the grammar and/or the theory of grammar to account for the given facts; (c) the discussion in the following class concentrates on proposals and arguments, and leads to a new agreement about the grammar and the theory of grammar; (d) new facts are presented.

An assignment is given at the end of every class, and is due at the next class. The papers are read, commented on, and returned at the following class. In addition there are two rather demanding take-home examinations, each lasting about a week. Students are free to work together, as long as they write up their solutions independently.

This regimen generates a surprising amount of written work. Students in syntax 1 turn in an average of approximately 100 hand-written or double-spaced typed pages during the course. Some students turn in far more.

By the end of the course, they know a good deal about the syntax of English. They have developed the standard apparatus of transformational grammar, and the beginnings of a theory of grammar. And they have invented, criticised, discussed, accepted, and rejected hundreds of arguments.

Syntax 1 is intense, and far from easy. The students, however, appear to find it rewarding. They

realize that they are learning the fundamentals of a discipline, and they like the challenge of figuring things out for themselves. It also turns out to be fun. A significant percentage of conversions from other majors to Linguistics take place as a direct result of this course.

Syntax 2

While a majority of Syntax 1 students are non-majors, 90% of Syntax 2 students are majors in Linguistics. This course is offered once a year, and is taken by about 25 students. Syntax 2 establishes the foundations of standard theory and continues the exploration of English grammar begun in Syntax 1. Students in this course hand in regular homework assignments at each class period plus two take-home examinations, and write at least two squibs. Average number of pages handed in per student during the quarter is about 150. There is little or no reading.

The pattern of work follows closely the pattern established in Syntax 1. The course is driven by the homework assignments, which require the students to propose revisions to an existing grammar of English and theory of grammar; the proposed revisions are subjected to scrutiny in class discussion, and arguments for and against particular solutions are brought forth and evaluated. Most of the work involves pursuing lines of investigation and theoretical proposals developed by the students themselves.

Syntax 3

Syntax 3 is taken almost exclusively by linguistics majors. It has been run as a "topics" course, taking up whatever the instructor wanted to do, usually in consultation with the students. Topics addressed have included anaphora, GPSG, a survey of modern theoretical frameworks, and others. The work for this course usually involves substantial reading, some problems, and squibs and term papers. The average number of pages written for this course is probably only about 50.

The sequence of learning is important. Note that the sequence is (1) doing syntax; (2) writing; (3) reading. Not the other way around.

At certain points in this sequence it becomes appropriate to insert lectures on the history of linguistics, to introduce alternative proposals from the literature, to present arguments of historical or current interest. This is done very sparingly at the beginning, and more and more toward the end of the sequence. Thus the sequence provides a history of the field as well as training in its fundamentals.

The Semantics Sequence

The other sequences have a similar design. Semantics 1 is a course which introduces the fundamental tools and concepts needed to investigate meaning relations in natural language; Semantics 2 develops an understanding of central issues in natural language semantics and the ability to investigate and write about semantic problems; and Semantics 3 takes on an advanced topic in semantic theory (usually including a thorough introduction to model-theoretic semantics) and involves learning to read the literature.

Semantics 1 is taken by a mix of students, about half of which are Linguistics majors. Semantics 2 draws mostly Linguistics majors, but also a few computer science majors. Semantics 3 is almost all Linguistics majors.

The Phonology Sequence

Phonetics is a course in articulatory phonetics and phonetic representation. It is required of majors in Linguistics and majors in Language Studies, who make up almost the whole population in the course.

Phonology 1 teaches how to do phonology, concentrating on segmental representations and rules;

Phonology 2 introduces nonlinear approaches and develops writing through problem sets, squibs, and term papers; Phonology 3 is an advanced topics course in phonological and morphological theory, involving extensive reading in current literature as well as writing. The phonology sequence makes greater use of reading than the other two, with the reading of recent articles a major feature both of Phonology 2 and Phonology 3.

Phonology 1, 2, and 3 are taken almost exclusively by Linguistics majors, though occasionally Language Studies majors turn up in Phonology 1.

Important features of the core curriculum

These core sequence courses are focussed, professional, rigorous, and fun. The students work very hard, and they love it. At the lower levels they are fascinated by the challenge of learning to do linguistic investigation; in the intermediate levels they experience growing control and power, while they are lured on by the thrill of discovery; at the advanced levels the best of them are drawn into an engagement with current issues and developments, and weaker ones at least see something of the achievements of the discipline. No very weak students are around anymore.

Two features of our pedagogical philosophy, especially as applied to the teaching of syntax, engendered extensive discussion when this paper was presented at the Princeton conference. These were the no-textbook approach (more accurately, the fact that we explicitly discourage reading during the first quarter and make little use of it during the second quarter), and the particular emphasis on learning by doing, to the extent that we never tell students in those early courses anything about results in the field until after the students have discovered them for themselves.

The reason for the ban on reading is that it is the simplest, cleanest way to get across to students that they are learning a craft. It is a complex, difficult, intellectual craft, but it is a craft. It is not the case, as one might think, that all they get out of these courses is empty methodology. They finish Syntax 2 with a very firm understanding of the major results of syntactic research through the sixties and seventies, and know a good bit of the history of that research. Not only do they know the major results but they know what evidence the results are founded on, and quite a lot about the arguments that were put forth for and against various hypotheses. When confronted with a new proposal they know how to evaluate it. When they begin reading things, which they do toward the end of this sequence, they know how to read critically and are not inclined to accept anything that is not adequately supported by evidence.

We have nothing against reading per se. Learning to read the literature in the field is an important part of becoming a linguist, and one might view our first two quarters of syntax as training camp for getting ready to read. In individual cases, as it becomes clear that a student has reached the point where a particular article or book would make sense (as, for example, when a student's squib or homework paper replicates some discovery or argument, or where something in the literature would illuminate a question the student has raised), we direct them to appropriate reading. Especially in the second quarter, student papers are often handed back with a copy of a paper or a journal reference attached, without further comment. The principle is not that students should not read, but that they should not read too soon. I would not want a student to read about a result that the student could just as well discover.

The second issue, closely related to the first, concerned a worry that students in our first two quarters of syntax are not introduced to "current" issues and theories. They hear nothing of government and binding, there is little or no discussion of innateness and learnability, and only toward the end do they begin to get glimpses of universal grammar and parameterization, in connection with the study of island constraints.

There were people at the Princeton conference who thought that this was too slow. The issues

and results of current theory must be introduced very early in the first course, they said. I did not understand the reasons for this impatience.

Beyond the core

The core sequences provide a foundation for further study in the central areas, and for work in several other subdisciplines.

The most popular advanced field among our students is syntax. Current frameworks of the eighties (GB, GPSG, RG, APG, LFG) are introduced in advanced courses which have syntax 2 as a prerequisite. Some students focus on phonology or semantics in advanced work. Our course offerings are less in these areas, but sufficient to bring students to the point of being able to begin original research projects. Students may pursue such projects as individual studies courses or in the research seminar.

Other aspects of linguistics available for advanced study include advanced phonetics, language change, typology, morphology, the structure of several particular languages (French, Spanish, Japanese), computational linguistics, and field methods.

Students interested in psycholinguistics may take courses in language acquisition and development, human information processing, and psychological approaches to linguistics from the Psychology department. We have a number of double majors in Linguistics and Psychology.

Students specialize in computational linguistics either by doing a double major in Linguistics and Computer Science or by majoring in one field and doing a minor in the other.

Quite a few of our majors are interested in some aspect of applied linguistics. We provide no courses in applied linguistics, but we encourage students with applied interests to seek relevant practical experience, which may be structured as a senior project satisfying the graduation requirement. Students have taught in bilingual classrooms, worked with hearing-impaired children, taught English as a second language, designed second-language learning experiments, written computer-aided instruction software, and done translations. Many of our graduates go on to do graduate work in applied linguistics or education programs. Some go directly into language teaching and related fields. A good background in the core areas seems to be good preparation for that.

Special Features

Advanced undergraduate students have opportunities to assist in courses as readers, tutors, section leaders, etc. (essentially, to function as TAs). Particularly able undergraduate students may propose to teach a lower division course, under the supervision of a faculty mentor. Courses offered in this way have included an introduction to linguistics, a course in language pathology, and a course in the phonology and morphology of Russian.

A yearly research seminar offered in the fall quarter provides a framework in which students pursue individual research projects, culminating in a paper and a conference presentation. This work can be continued and developed into a senior thesis for submission in the spring.

Student papers written in advanced courses are sometimes edited (by student volunteer editors), reproduced, and published as undergraduate working papers. This has been done in recent years with syntax squibs, phonology papers, and papers from the field methods course.

2.4 Relation to the Graduate Program

Beginning in fall quarter 1986, a new Ph.D. program in Linguistics was initiated at UCSC. It will

be a small program, reaching not more than twenty students at steady state, focussing on theoretical linguistics. The graduate program will be closely interrelated with the undergraduate major program.

Students admitted to the graduate program will have varying degrees of preparation in the core areas. In the unmarked case a new graduate student will enter each of the core sequences at an intermediate level (phonology 2, syntax 2, semantics 2) and complete the sequence the first year. The intermediate and advanced level core courses will thus be mixed undergraduates and graduate students. This will also be true of the more advanced topics and theoretical frameworks courses, the field methods course, and the research seminar.

Several new courses introduced in conjunction with the graduate program will also offer enrichment to the program of advanced undergraduates: a history of the discipline, a course in mathematical foundations of linguistics, a course in linguistic argumentation and analysis, and a course in advanced phonetics. The addition of new faculty and increased visiting faculty generated by the graduate program will provide further enrichment and variety for advanced undergraduate students.

The presence of graduate students in itself should prove beneficial to the undergraduate majors. More able, intelligent students means better classes; advanced courses need not be so small; and it will not hurt to have more role models working at a level not too far advanced.

No course will be inaccessible to undergraduates. At UCSC there will be no seam between the undergraduate major and the graduate program.

3. Conclusion

The previous sections have described the history and the content of the UCSC Linguistics major. Here I will briefly discuss the place of the major in the general curriculum and what it offers to the students and the university.

Students majoring in linguistics at UCSC get a thorough, rigorous introduction to a discipline. Those who desire to are well prepared to pursue further study at the graduate level, either in theoretical linguistics or an applied field. All graduands have behind them an intellectual accomplishment of some value, and have developed the intellectual flexibity and independence that is the most important product of a liberal education. They are well exercised in thinking hard, and in writing clearly and persuasively.

The University benefits in several ways from the presence of a strong Linguistics program. At UCSC Linguistics attracts excellent students, many of whom (especially transfer students) come to the campus specifically to study Linguistics. The presence of a rigorous and technically satisfying program within the Humanities draws able students into the division, contributing to its strength and intellectual vigor. Neighboring disciplines (Psychology, Computer Science, Language Studies) are enhanced by interaction with Linguistics at faculty, graduate, and undergraduate levels.

Linguistics provides a number of services to the general education curriculum, including courses in computer literacy, English grammar, Phonetics (taken by large numbers of language students), Syntax 1 (taken by lots of non-majors just for the intellectual experience), Semantics 1 (taken by many non-majors for its natural-language approach to logic), and more.

Linguistics at many universities suffers from the minority status of Linguistics as a discipline. Many faculty colleagues at the same institution will not even have heard of linguistics, and most of those who have heard of it will not understand what it is, and will not see why a university should have a department for that. We have overcome this disadvantage at UCSC by establishing

the Linguistics major as a rigorous program of recognized quality and by providing extensive and visible service to the university at large.

Many factors have contributed to the success of the UCSC Linguistics program. We have been fortunate in having a friendly administration, a supply of excellent students, many opportunities to provide useful and not very onerous service, and some luck. But it is clear that the one essential factor all along has been the quality of the Linguistics major.