

*Studies in the Linguistic Sciences*

Volume 28, Number 2 (Fall, 1998)

**STRENGTHENING THE TIES THAT EXIST:  
REEXPLORING CHARTED TERRITORY**

William D. Davies  
*University of Iowa*  
william-davies@uiowa.edu

Determining new ways to expand the reach of linguistics and the most appropriate ways to position linguistics in a changing intellectual landscape are particularly important in the face of diminishing budgets and increased business-oriented planning at American universities. However, at the same time, it is important to ensure that linguistics programs have made the most of opportunities that currently exist. The point of this paper is to encourage administrators of linguistics programs to reexplore some of these areas with an eye toward strengthening some of the more traditional cross-disciplinary ties.

I have no handout. I have no overheads. I have no laser pointer or powerpoint presentation. I come to you today as a cranky old linguist. The topic of this symposium 'Territories and Boundaries' evokes a call for us to be forward thinking, considering new possibilities for collaboration in research and teaching as we approach a new millennium — wanting to build that bridge, and so on. And of course in these times of relatively tight budgets at academic institutions, cross-disciplinary programs and research are encouraged as a way of maximizing the impact of scarce resources. Thus, the more new connections we can make to other disciplines the more secure we can feel in continued funding, and perhaps even the possibility of a new tenure-track line now and then. Also as we must produce new graduates to help ensure our survival, so must we hope that those we are educating will someday all have fulfilling jobs with acceptable salaries. So it behooves us to look forward, think imaginatively, and consider new possibilities. But I am largely going to leave that for others to speculate on in their contributions to this symposium. As I said, I come to you today as a cranky old linguist. As such I will mainly look backward and share with you a little of what I am feeling cranky about, because I want to urge us to also consider the possibility of strengthening ties that already exist, ties that are many times underdeveloped and underutilized.

Linguistics has long had the opportunity to cross disciplinary lines. This is something amply recognized by institutions: linguistics programs without departmental standing have been housed in a variety of departments, and scholars and teachers who identify themselves as linguists are members of even more departments. In fact, a search of linguistics department websites and catalogues from around the country reveals that the majority feature a section under faculty enti-

tled 'Linguists in Other Departments'. A cursory glance that the past few decades of the Linguistic Society of America's Directory of Programs in Linguistics shows that this has long been the case in this field. This is something that until recently was not found in most other disciplines that have achieved departmental status and still is found in relatively few. So, as we all already know, linguistics is a discipline rife with opportunities for crossing boundaries. I think, however, that as a discipline we have been more reluctant to embrace some of these opportunities than perhaps we should have been.

One of the things that must be kept in mind is the tension that exists between establishing linguistics as an independent discipline — a discipline with an identifiable identity of its own — and the need to support cross-disciplinary initiatives. Many scholars have expended not a little effort over the past 30-40 years trying to do the former. However, with each new administration that comes into place at our institutions, many of us find ourselves in the position of once again trying to explain what it is linguists do and why we do it (but hopefully not why anyone should care). So, in some regards we have not been as successful as we might have wished in establishing this identity. Naturally, this varies from institution to institution. But while we think about crossing boundaries in the sense of interdisciplinary efforts and so on, it is absolutely essential that we retain the autonomy of the field and foster the notion that we are the experts on language and that is what we bring to cross-disciplinary efforts.

At any rate, there are a number of areas where I think linguists could have made more of a presence felt, but for me chief among them is in the area of language teaching. Now this might strike some as odd. After all, in some ways it might seem that language teaching and acquisition is a realm in which linguists have had quite a presence. And surely the past 15 years or so has seen an explosion in the second language acquisition field with a number of linguistically sophisticated approaches to SLA cropping up, a spate of new conferences, a seemingly revitalized American Association for Applied Linguistics, and the emergence of a number of new second language acquisition and teaching programs around the country. In fact, another contributor to this symposium may give a somewhat different perspective on all this. The problem, as I see it, however, is that the antipathy or at least the mutual disrespect that grew between the fields of theoretical linguistics and language teaching in the 1960's and blossomed in the 1970's remains — albeit somewhat more covertly at times.

The distrust surfaces in a number of ways. A somewhat subtle but noticeable piece of evidence is the fact that the AAAL switched from holding its annual meeting in conjunction with the LSA winter meeting to holding the meeting during a week adjacent to the annual TESOL convention, either in the same city or a nearby locale. However, one fairly obvious and public place one can find the distrust played out is the SLART-L list on the internet. For those who are unfamiliar with it, this is an internet list devoted to discussion of issues in second language acquisition research and teaching. There have been flare-ups here from time to time over the past five years or so. The flare-up generally comes about as the result of someone with some formal theoretical linguistic training who by accident

or design happens to inhabit the world of language teaching as well as the world of theoretical second language acquisition (two worlds which are all too often disparate domains). This hopefully well-intentioned person will ask for a bit more evidence for some position than an interlocutor cares to give (or perhaps is able to give), and then it's off to the races with the usual flaming, name calling, and re-primination. One exchange a while back started innocuously enough. A relative newcomer posted a request for information on the literature regarding first language attrition — the effect of learning a second language on one's first language. One public response was that such a query had no place on the list because there was no direct relevance to language teaching and that's what this list should be all about. A UG type shot back about the possible interest to the question of parameter setting and the UG SLA theory, and the fact that some folks really need to understand what theory is all about and why it is important. So, the war of words began, with all the usual navel contemplation that happens when there's an upset on a not-too-closely moderated list. And what has this got to do with this symposium? I firmly believe that more linguists with serious interests in mainline, mainstream theoretical linguistics need to take a greater interest and role in the education of those who will teach second and foreign languages.

As one looks at the new programs that have sprouted up around the country in response to a perceived need (and more than likely a little niche building), one is immediately impressed by the number of linguists who on paper are involved. The problem is that in many instances the long list of linguists (and for that matter anthropologists, psychologists, and so on) who appear as affiliated faculty is likely largely a public relations effort to convince administrators to fund this interdisciplinary effort and to convince prospective students of the valuable opportunities if one attends them. These are not really idle speculations. My suspicions are fueled by reports I have received from a couple of recent graduates of the Iowa linguistics program who have entered such programs to pursue advanced degrees, and from my experience with a number of graduates of these programs whom I have interviewed in the past five to six years in trying to fill positions in second language acquisition in the Iowa Department of Linguistics.

Having experience as an ESL teacher, and as a current administrator of ESL programs and someone actively involved in the training of ESL teachers, I am thoroughly convinced of the importance of language teachers' learning how to analyze language, the importance of bringing the rigors of thinking about language from the perspective of linguistic theory. This is as true from the perspective of phonetics and phonology as from that of morphology and syntax. Bringing to bear rigorous analysis brings students an important understanding about how language is structured, and the possibility of including a typological perspective permits prospective language teachers to experience the ways in which languages are similar and how they differ. While this may not translate into a classroom activity on Tuesday (and hopefully it will not), it can greatly inform the approach a teacher can take to an unexpected question from a student. During a practicum observation this past summer, I watched a fledgling teacher fully engage two students in a bit of linguistic problem solving when one of the students

posed a question about appropriate adverb placement. After the class I discussed the point with the teacher-in-training and asked why he had handled the situation as he had. He reported that he simply approached the question as he might have one of his syntactic analysis problems and cajoled the students to do a little analysis with him. And my fledgling teacher was right on the money (and he taught two classes each semester this year in our ESL credit program despite his undergraduate status).

So of equal importance to the specific linguistic knowledge gained, the intellectual rigor that is the hallmark of 'serious' linguistic study and analysis can inform the general approach that teachers take to their classroom situations and teaching methodologies and to their dealings with students and administrators. Of equal importance, the intellectual rigor informs the kind of classroom-based or other research graduates of these programs are equipped to undertake. It also helps determine the kind of research these graduates will be able to read and profit from. It is this aspect of things that often goes lacking in some of our training programs. It is this aspect of things that linguists can and must contribute to these programs.

This has been a guiding principle in our TESL training program at Iowa, where students pursuing a Master's take a core linguistics curriculum that includes phonetics, two semesters of phonology, two semesters of syntax, and a linguistic typology course in addition to specialized courses to prepare them to teach English as a second language. Now, this may be more than some feel they can afford to include in their programs or perhaps are able to include. However, our students have responded extremely positively, much as the practicum student I just described, infusing methods of problem solving and analytical thinking to guide their ESL student's learning in a structured, coherent way. Our students have a wonderful track record of getting good jobs and retaining them. And in the past 10 years I have received a wide variety of offers from our graduates to provide testimonials for the effectiveness of the program. The latter is, of course, quite gratifying, but it stems from their awareness that some students whose primary focus is second language teaching fail at first to appreciate the relevance of some of their linguistic study to what they plan to do in the classroom. Needless to say, these types of considerations guide our hiring practice in our intensive English program as well and we have been quite pleased with the results.

All of this is relevant to an initiative at Iowa recently approved by the Graduate Council and the faculty of the Graduate School to begin an interdisciplinary PhD program in foreign language acquisition research and education (FLARE). As is true of a number of institutions, a sizable number of language teaching and linguistics faculty have been hired in the language departments on campus. The FLARE initiative is an attempt to bring these faculty together in a structured way and to meet the challenge of internationalizing the campus. The Linguistics Department has taken an active role on the FLARE steering committee and in the development of the core curriculum, which contains a healthy dose of core linguistics and also affords a rigorous linguistics track. Mainstream, mainline linguistics is represented here as well as more specialized SLA types of

courses. This will ensure the active participation of many members of the linguistics faculty as well as engendering the possibility of more cross-disciplinary research among students and faculty.

So, this is one area where I would suggest that we can reexplore opportunities available to linguists to cross the boundaries of the narrowly circumscribed domains that we sometimes set for ourselves. Linguistics can and should make a strong positive contribution to these programs.

Another area that should most likely come as no surprise, but is one currently under exploration at Iowa, is translation studies. In September 1998 a workshop conducted by the American Translation Association was held at the University of Iowa. This workshop brought together people from language departments, writing programs, information science, communication studies, and linguistics, in addition to translators to consider the topic 'Programs in Translator Education'. The group explored various possible curricular models for graduate programs in translation and information about these various models will be available in a book being produced by the ATA entitled *Programs in Translation Studies: ATA Guidelines*, with publication tentatively scheduled for the fall of 1999.

One of the models, and that heavily favored by the head of the Iowa Translation Laboratory and head of the ATA, includes linguistics in a foundational role. This is largely due to one of the issues that arose in the workshop: while many students come to translation programs with excellent language skills (obviously such skills are a prerequisite for admission), they come with little knowledge of language and languages; that is, many apparently have little knowledge about the richness of morphological and syntactic systems available to human language. This, then, creates difficulties in their education as translators and their abilities in translation.

According to the guidelines to be formulated, the most critical areas are morphology, syntax, and discourse analysis. The reasoning here is that while lexical retrieval clearly plays an important role in the translation process (and therefore information science contributes to the collaborative effort), it is important for translators to recognize the syntactic devices a particular language may have at its disposal that can most effectively be used to translate a passage from a non-cognate language. Solid grounding in syntactic analysis and discourse analysis will provide translators with the theoretical foundation necessary to accomplish this. It strikes me again that a typological approach to morphology and syntax could be particularly effective here. It remains to be seen precisely what morphology, syntax, typology, and/or discourse analysis courses might be the best suited in such a program, but it is clear from the ATA guidelines and my discussions with these translators that there is an pivotal role for linguists to play in these programs that they have apparently up to now not been playing. As the head of the Iowa Translation Lab put it to me 'It's vital that translators have a firm theoretical grounding, not only to apply to their translation work but also so that they can go back to theory from time to time to refresh themselves.'

Another traditional link for linguistics is with departments of speech pathology. Given our particular circumstances, there is a fairly active link between Linguistics and the Department of Speech Pathology and Audiology at Iowa. At the curricular level, Speech Pathology students at one time took their phonetics class in the Linguistics Department and current graduate and undergraduate Speech Pathology majors take our upper level introduction to linguistics course as preparation for psycholinguistic courses and developmental courses. We have a fairly large number of cross-listed courses which students take advantage of. At the graduate level, our MA in Linguistics requires a focus area of 4 courses in addition to the core curriculum, intended to get students more deeply involved in a subdiscipline. Other than the TESL focus, which usually engages roughly half of our Master's students, the psycholinguistics focus is quite popular with students, most of these courses coming from Speech Pathology offerings in speech perception, learning, memory and cognition, and others. At Iowa, the kind of cross-fertilization that we share with Speech Pathology yields a large number of undergraduate double majors and graduates of each department seeking opportunities to do graduate work in programs in the opposite discipline. Some of our graduate students have also had opportunities to work in Speech Pathology labs.

In addition to curricular matters, there are research opportunities as well. Work on Specific Language Impairment has benefitted greatly from interaction with linguistics faculty. More recently, our TESL students and professional staff in our ESL programs have begun to cooperate with members of the clinical faculty in exploring ways to apply some of the clinical techniques used to work with patients with severe speech impediments in teaching pronunciation. While this is still largely in the exploratory stage, it has been found that some of these clinical techniques can be used effectively in helping the ESL student overcome some particularly troubling pronunciation difficulties. This area may hold some promise for interdisciplinary research for students and our professional staff, and more importantly provide an important resource to the classroom that will ultimately benefit ESL students.

There are, of course, other linkages at Iowa and other opportunities, largely in language departments and neuroscience, but we'll be hearing about some possibilities in these areas from other participants in this symposium. So I will not delve into those.

It can be somewhat difficult to make these links, and the kinds of links one wishes to make will depend on the local situation — the particular resources available and the predilections of the faculty. One program which has recently become very active in establishing links with traditionally allied disciplines is the Linguistics Program at the University of South Carolina, currently being headed up by my sometime collaborator in syntactic research Stan Dubinsky. Stan and the South Carolina faculty have recently undertaken a vigorous program in setting up cooperative endeavors with graduate programs in the French Department, the experimental psychology division of the Psychology Department, the English Department; and there are a number of other combinations currently being negotiated. Now, since South Carolina has the structure of being an interdepartmental

discipline, and thus draws its core faculty from nine different departments and has consulting faculty in yet more, this is a fairly natural kind of development. However, it also strikes me that the kind of courses of study being proposed at South Carolina provide some excellent examples of how we can reexplore some of the natural and currently existing ties.

One of these new programs, a joint venture with French, provides either opportunities for a French MA with concentration in French linguistics, or a PhD in linguistics with a minor specialization in French literature. The programs make good curricular use of existing courses with the aim of producing students well-trained in linguistic theory, French linguistics, and French literature. The stated goal of the PhD is to develop potential faculty members for French or foreign language departments. In addition to being forward thinking from the standpoint of training students with marketable skills in a shrinking job market, such cooperation brings with it new funding opportunities for MA and doctoral level students. According to the USC website, other areas currently under development include anthropological linguistics, English composition and rhetoric, philosophy, speech pathology, and other language departments.

An issue that must be kept in mind when thinking along the lines of interdisciplinary curricula is, of course, the impact of setting up such links on our core curriculum and the impact of interdisciplinary curricula on our identity as a field. To what degree does any particular link require modification of existing courses or creation of new courses? What is the impact of admitting or inviting non-linguistics students into linguistics courses, especially if one has a fairly small program? While these must be concerns and must be considered carefully, I would maintain that it is frequently unnecessary to make that many modifications. Again, I would advocate infusion of full-bore linguistics into other disciplines. One area where we have had a bit of experience with that at Iowa is ESL teacher certification. In the mid-1980's, I was one of the few people on the Iowa campus doing any research or teaching in the area of second language acquisition, so I essentially taught the second language acquisition theory course that was available on campus. While this course always included one or two non-linguistics students in each class (usually someone from education or Asian Languages and Literature or one of the other language departments), the class was always relatively small—about 10-13 graduate students or advanced undergraduate majors. The year that the School of Education started ESL certification, there were 30 students enrolled on the first day of class, and more were asking to add. This was quite a shock to the system to say the least. My first inclination was to try to change the course content and the way I delivered it to fit this new clientele. But I resisted that temptation, if only because I still had my linguistics students (albeit as a minority now) to be concerned about. In the end, I was glad to have resisted that temptation. For the most part, the students did fine, and the majority reported appreciating the rigor of the course. Brian Joseph and Greg Ward have described ways in which we can get linguistics into everyone's course of study through the design of classes that reach out to students who usually do not take a linguistics course, classes that explore some of the edges of linguistics. By exposing more students

to linguistics, we might feel a little less compelled to tailor our course offerings to particular groups when they show up in our regular courses.

But all that aside, as we approach the issue of crossing boundaries and the nature of the role linguists can take in interdisciplinary efforts, I would hope that we take care not to lose the autonomy we've developed as a discipline, certainly far from a necessary move. However, more importantly, in addition to looking for new and untested alliances, I would urge us to re-explore some of the territory that's already been charted but underutilized or underappreciated—we may find some fertile old ground in which to establish some strong new roots.