

# SOCIETY OF LINGUISTICS UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS



## Introduction

The Society of Linguistics Undergraduate Students (SLUGS) is a small but active group in the Department of Linguistics. We represent students taking courses offered by the Department of Linguistics, which include LIN, JAL, JLP, JFI, JLS, and JFL courses. SLUGS is known for its interesting and informative academic seminars and talks, as well as some pretty fantastic social events and parties. We also aim to make the views of undergraduates count in departmental policy and regulations.

Our website, [www.uoftslugs.com](http://www.uoftslugs.com), is full of helpful information for Linguistics students, including news and events, career information, links to useful sites, a message board, and some Linguistics humour to boot. We encourage all students to stop by our website and find out what's happening.

All students taking a course in Linguistics are automatically members of SLUGS, and we welcome all members to participate in SLUGS's regular meetings and yearly elections. Please visit our website, or contact us at [slugs@chass.utoronto.ca](mailto:slugs@chass.utoronto.ca) for more information or if you have any concerns about undergraduate Linguistics at U of T.

## SLUGS Executive

### LIN 100Y1Y Introduction to General Linguistics

Instructor(s): A. Kraehenmann

	Enr: 200							Mean
	Resp: 104 Retake: 51%							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	1	1	6	23	24	26	15	5.1
Explains	1	10	5	23	27	22	8	4.7
Communicates	7	3	7	28	29	12	9	4.5
Teaching	1	2	7	27	21	29	8	4.9
Workload	0	0	7	51	22	13	4	4.6
Difficulty	0	1	3	38	29	12	12	4.8
Learn Exp	9	4	10	44	14	12	4	4.1

Students felt that Kraehenmann was knowledgeable and interested in the material, but that the scope of the course was so broad, lectures often moved too quickly and left several students confused. Students would have preferred homework assignments to be reviewed after they had been returned. Also, tutorials and lectures often covered different topics that did not seem to relate. Overall, students felt that for an introductory course, too much focus was placed on students intending to continue in linguistics, and not on those with a general interest.

Instructor(s): A. Ali

	Enr: 135							Mean
	Resp: 54 Retake: 46%							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	2	2	16	28	40	12	0	4.4
Explains	1	1	9	13	45	21	5	4.9
Communicates	0	2	4	18	32	34	8	5.2

Teaching	0	2	4	24	34	26	12	5.1
Workload	0	0	1	52	30	5	9	4.7
Difficulty	1	0	3	40	32	9	11	4.8
Learn Exp	2	10	10	31	23	18	2	4.3

Ali was praised as a good orator who conveyed enthusiasm in the course material. Students also enjoyed his sense of humour. All of this being said, some students said that Ali was somewhat disorganized in lectures.

Regarding the course as a whole, students claimed that the tests were difficult. They also disliked that only a subset of the homework questions were actually graded.

Instructor(s): A. Kraehenmann

	Enr: 170							Mean
	Resp: 82 Retake: 56%							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	2	1	7	13	22	35	16	5.3
Explains	3	2	11	19	26	26	8	4.8
Communicates	2	3	8	22	24	26	11	4.9
Teaching	2	1	6	17	20	37	13	5.2
Workload	1	1	3	54	20	12	6	4.5
Difficulty	0	2	2	39	32	15	7	4.8
Learn Exp	4	1	10	40	24	10	7	4.4

Students found the instructor to be well-organized and easily approachable. Students found that she taught well but a few felt that she could have read less from the course handouts.

Instructor(s): A. Ali

	Enr: 99							Mean
	Resp: 59 Retake: 66%							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	1	0	9	20	36	25	7	4.9
Explains	0	1	5	15	30	35	11	5.3
Communicates	0	1	1	16	27	38	14	5.4
Teaching	0	1	1	23	25	34	12	5.3
Workload	0	1	10	49	33	3	1	4.3
Difficulty	0	5	8	43	31	6	5	4.4
Learn Exp	2	0	6	50	22	15	2	4.5

Some students praised Ali's enthusiasm for the course material. Others, however, commented that Ali seemed disorganized. Overall, however, he was a competent and helpful instructor.

Two students complained the lack of evening help labs, which was of great concern to night students. Some students also complained that assignments were only partially graded and that this hindered their preparation for the difficult tests.

### LIN 200H1F Introduction to Language

Instructor(s): M. Haji-Abdolhoseini

	Enr: 208							Mean
	Resp: 86 Retake: 58%							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	1	2	14	34	35	12	5.4
Explains	1	5	10	15	35	21	9	4.8
Communicates	3	2	4	22	29	22	14	5.0
Teaching	2	1	9	20	29	28	8	4.9
Workload	1	7	16	46	17	4	5	4.1
Difficulty	1	2	18	42	17	8	9	4.4
Learn Exp	0	4	6	48	22	12	4	4.5

A number commented that the test was too long and that the material was challenging. The instructor made good use of technology, but some students found that the instructor could have shown greater enthusiasm for the material. He was found to be helpful, available for individual consultation and through email. A large number of TESL students did not find the material helpful in terms of their studies.

**LIN 200H1S Introduction to Language**

Instructor(s): K. Phan

	Enr: 221							Mean
	Resp: 75							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	1	1	8	19	36	33	5.9
Explains	0	2	1	10	17	34	32	5.8
Communicates	0	0	1	9	12	42	33	6.0
Teaching	1	2	0	9	21	35	28	5.7
Workload	2	10	10	50	15	7	1	4.0
Difficulty	2	5	8	50	8	17	6	4.4
Learn Exp	2	4	4	36	24	20	10	4.8

Students praised Phan for being exceptionally well-organized and enthusiastic. Her explanations were helpful, as was the class website. Many students commented that the tests were too difficult, expected recollection of fine details, and were marked rigidly.

**LIN 201H1S Canadian English**

Instructor(s): J. Chambers

	Enr: 37							Mean
	Resp: 18							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	5	0	0	5	27	44	16	5.5
Explains	0	0	0	5	5	55	33	6.2
Communicates	0	0	0	11	0	33	55	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	11	11	50	27	5.9
Workload	0	0	27	61	5	5	0	3.9
Difficulty	0	0	22	55	16	0	5	4.1
Learn Exp	0	0	5	11	47	23	11	5.2

Chambers was noted as a very good and engaging lecturer who attentively attended to questions. Some students found the test was too narrow in focus, but they enjoyed working on the final paper.

**LIN 203H1F English Words**

Instructor(s): E. Dresher

	Enr: 202							Mean
	Resp: 44							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	4	11	25	29	29	5.7
Explains	2	0	2	6	34	29	25	5.6
Communicates	0	2	4	6	13	34	38	5.9
Teaching	0	2	0	4	15	52	25	5.9
Workload	4	2	16	47	23	0	4	4.0
Difficulty	0	9	16	46	18	4	4	4.1
Learn Exp	0	2	2	38	20	20	15	5.0

Students praised Dresher's enthusiasm for the course material and for the clarity of his explanations. Many students lauded the instructor's wit and use of humorous examples, which made lectures especially enjoyable. Students also commented that Dresher was very approachable and readily available for consultation. Some students commented that they would have benefitted from a clearer explanation of how to respond to homework questions.

Overall, students felt that this was a very good course.

**LING 203H1S English Words**

Instructor(s): E. Gold

	Enr: 219							Mean
	Resp: 121							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	1	13	31	35	17	5.5
Explains	0	0	4	9	27	39	18	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	8	26	36	28	5.8
Teaching	0	0	1	6	32	36	22	5.7
Workload	2	1	11	64	13	2	3	4.1
Difficulty	1	3	7	58	15	8	3	4.2
Learn Exp	2	1	6	29	27	23	10	4.9

Students found Gold very enthusiastic and many commented that lectures were very enjoyable. Students also found the instructor helpful

and approachable. A common comment was that the assignments were worth too little and the exam too much. Students suggested that the weight of these evaluations should have been redistributed.

**LIN 228H1F Phonetics**

Instructor(s): S. Mackenzie

	Enr: 109							Mean
	Resp: 67							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	6	7	29	38	12	6	4.6
Explains	0	1	12	23	27	27	7	4.9
Communicates	1	1	3	12	38	36	6	5.2
Teaching	1	1	4	16	37	30	7	5.1
Workload	1	4	16	61	10	3	1	3.9
Difficulty	1	1	7	67	13	4	3	4.2
Learn Exp	1	1	3	43	37	9	1	4.5

Many students commented that Mackenzie was an approachable and engaging lecturer. Many felt that the required tutorials were useful. Conversely, others felt that the instructor did not communicate well with the TAs, as they seemed to have different approaches to the material.

While students did enjoy the lectures, some commented that classes ended early when the material could have been covered more slowly and thoroughly.

**LIN 229H1S Sound Patterns in Language**

Instructor(s): A. Kraehenmann

	Enr: 65							Mean
	Resp: 43							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	4	16	26	35	14	2	4.5
Explains	0	0	19	30	30	14	4	4.5
Communicates	0	0	11	30	33	19	4	4.7
Teaching	0	4	11	28	30	16	7	4.6
Workload	0	0	4	59	26	9	0	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	4	33	26	28	7	5.0
Learn Exp	3	6	17	55	13	0	3	3.8

Students felt the textbook was useless. Some students commented that the instructor was nice and helpful when asked for more assistance.

**LIN 231H1S Morphological Patterns in Language**

Instructor(s): A. Johns

	Enr: 67							Mean
	Resp: 27							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	11	18	11	44	14	0	4.3
Explains	0	7	22	29	29	11	0	4.1
Communicates	0	7	7	11	33	37	3	5.0
Teaching	0	0	14	29	33	14	7	4.7
Workload	0	0	7	70	14	3	3	4.3
Difficulty	0	0	3	62	18	11	3	4.5
Learn Exp	0	5	20	65	10	0	0	3.8

Some students praised John's enthusiasm, availability for consultation, and use of examples from her own research on Inuktitut. The textbook was also useful. The above being said, many students had serious complaints about this course. Many complained that there appeared to be very poor communication between the instructor and the TA, which became problematic when assignments were graded. Students further complained that the expectations for assignments were unclear, and that little feedback was given. Many students commented that practice exercises (and answer keys) would have been beneficial.

**LIN 232H1F Syntactic Patterns in Language**

Instructor(s): M. Barrie

	Enr: 77							Mean
	Resp: 47							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	2	4	15	32	32	13	5.3
Explains	2	4	4	15	28	31	13	5.1
Communicates	0	2	2	8	29	27	29	5.7

## 126 LINGUISTICS

Teaching	2	0	2	13	28	30	23	5.5
Workload	0	0	2	11	21	27	27	5.6
Difficulty	0	0	0	10	10	21	57	6.3
Learn Exp	4	4	6	36	20	22	4	4.5

Many commented that Barrie was very organized and professional, and that he went out of his way to be available for extra help. Students felt that the course was too difficult and that the workload was excessive. The most repeated comment was that too much material was covered in each lecture, and that the lectures were always rushed. Barrie's notes were outstanding in their thoroughness, although they were difficult to follow in parts. Many students felt that the notes replaced the textbook and found the textbook useless.

### LIN 256H1F Sociolinguistics

Instructor(s): S. Tagliamonte

Enr: 72	Resp: 52							Retake: 72%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	1	23	35	31	7	5.2
Explains	0	1	3	19	31	27	15	5.3
Communicates	0	0	0	6	12	40	40	6.2
Teaching	0	1	1	17	33	29	15	5.3
Workload	2	2	8	72	14	2	0	4.0
Difficulty	1	1	6	78	13	0	0	4.0
Learn Exp	0	4	2	46	21	19	6	4.7

The course was repetitious, with lecture material being taken from the textbook. A few students said they appreciated the material being posted on the course website. Tests were based on memorization and regurgitation of material from the readings. A few students found the instructor unapproachable and unwilling to take time to help them. They disliked the usual reply of being told to read the readings again. Most enjoyed the material in and of itself, and several comment that they appreciated how the instructor drew upon evidence and examples from present-day Toronto.

### LIN 305H1F Quantitative Methods in Linguistics

Instructor(s): R. Smyth

Enr: 12	Resp: 9							Retake: 55%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	11	0	11	11	22	22	22	4.9
Explains	11	0	11	22	0	44	11	4.8
Communicates	11	0	0	11	11	44	22	5.3
Teaching	11	0	11	0	22	33	22	5.1
Workload	0	0	11	33	33	22	0	4.7
Difficulty	0	0	0	44	33	11	11	4.9
Learn Exp	0	14	0	14	28	42	0	4.9

Many students commented that Smyth was enthusiastic about the material and was readily available for consultation. Many felt that the value of the reading was low and wished that the instructor had used a different textbook. A few students commented that the instructor's lectures were poorly organized and that his examples were unhelpful.

### LIN 306H1S Language Diversity and Language Universals

Instructor(s): D. Massam

Enr: 17	Resp: 12							Retake: 81%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	16	41	25	16	5.4
Explains	0	0	0	8	8	50	33	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	0	16	25	58	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	0	16	41	41	6.2
Workload	0	0	9	54	27	0	9	4.5
Difficulty	0	0	8	50	33	8	0	4.4
Learn Exp	0	0	10	30	30	20	10	4.9

Students found the course well-structured and many commented on how much they enjoyed it. There was much praise for the instructor, with comments about how pleasant she was, how she was always ready to

help, and about how much knowledge and enthusiasm she showed.

### LIN 322H1S Phonological Theory

Instructor(s): K. Rice

Enr: 21	Resp: 17							Retake: 94%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	23	23	52	6.3
Explains	0	0	0	0	17	41	41	6.2
Communicates	0	0	0	0	5	11	82	6.8
Teaching	0	0	0	0	5	29	64	6.6
Workload	0	0	0	41	52	5	0	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	0	41	47	11	0	4.7
Learn Exp	0	0	0	7	30	53	7	5.6

Students gave resounding praise of Rice and the course itself. While the course was demanding, Rice's enthusiasm and energy drew the class into the material. Rice was further lauded for ensuring that assignments were returned quickly so that students had useful feedback on their progress. Rice was also available to her students for consultation and extra help. Several students commented that Rice was one of the best instructors they'd had at the University.

### LIN 323H1F Accoustic Phonetics

Instructor(s): M. Chasin

Enr: 39	Resp: 34							Retake: 75%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	11	14	47	26	5.9
Explains	0	0	0	17	23	41	19	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	0	5	38	55	6.5
Teaching	0	0	0	2	20	38	38	6.1
Workload	0	2	14	70	8	2	0	3.9
Difficulty	0	0	2	73	14	8	0	4.3
Learn Exp	0	0	0	41	20	12	25	5.2

Most students enjoyed the instructor's lectures and thought his enthusiasm was a great asset to the experience. Chasin was very open to questions and worked to make concepts easily understandable. Students appreciated the Powerpoint presentations being made available on the web. Many commented on how much they enjoyed the field trip and on how helpful they felt it was.

### LIN 331H1F Syntactic Theory

Instructor(s): D. Massam

Enr: 27	Resp: 19							Retake: 72%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	5	5	21	62	5	5.6
Explains	0	0	0	10	21	47	21	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	0	5	36	57	6.5
Teaching	0	0	0	5	5	47	42	6.3
Workload	0	0	11	38	22	22	5	4.7
Difficulty	0	0	5	42	31	10	10	4.8
Learn Exp	0	0	12	25	50	12	0	4.6

Many commented that Massam was a very good instructor who presented the material well, and who was also accessible to students. Students commented that the course material was very challenging and the assignments were difficult. Many students, however, appreciated being exposed to more theoretically oriented material.

### LING 356H1F Language Variation

Instructor(s): S. Tagliamonte

Enr: 9	Resp: 6							Retake: 50%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	50	33	16	0	4.7
Explains	0	0	20	20	60	0	0	4.4
Communicates	0	0	0	0	33	33	33	6.0
Teaching	0	0	0	16	50	33	0	5.2
Workload	0	0	0	0	0	16	83	6.8
Difficulty	0	0	0	16	16	50	16	5.7

Learn Exp 0 0 25 0 75 0 0 4.5

Students felt very discouraged throughout this course. They felt that the workload was extreme. The reading material was not very helpful and the instructor offered little direction.

**LIN 362H1F Historical Linguistics**

Instructor(s): E. Gold

	Enr: 26							Mean
	Resp: 15 Retake: 86%							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	0	26	53	20	5.9
Explains	0	0	0	20	13	46	20	5.7
Communicates	0	0	0	13	6	53	26	5.9
Teaching	0	0	0	6	40	33	20	5.7
Workload	0	6	0	86	6	0	0	3.9
Difficulty	0	6	0	66	20	6	0	4.2
Learn Exp	0	0	0	25	58	8	8	5.0

Students found the instructor to be approachable, well-organized and delightful.

**LIN 372H1S Introduction to Cognitive Linguistics**

Instructor(s): P. Reich

	Enr: 38							Mean
	Resp: 23 Retake: 69%							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	9	33	42	14	0	4.6
Explains	0	0	0	34	34	26	4	5.0
Communicates	0	0	0	0	26	39	34	6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	18	36	31	13	5.4
Workload	0	0	13	52	21	13	0	4.3
Difficulty	0	4	4	30	39	13	8	4.8
Learn Exp	0	0	10	25	35	15	15	5.0

Many students commented that they enjoyed this course. Reich presented material that was very different from that taught in other linguistics courses and this was a refreshing change.

Many commented that the midterm tests was very difficult and that its content and emphasis were surprising and unexpected.

**LIN 423H1S Phonetic Analysis**

Instructor(s): L. Colantoni

	Enr: 15							Mean
	Resp: 14 Retake: 100%							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	0	4	57	35	6.3
Explains	0	0	0	0	14	57	28	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	0	21	35	42	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	0	7	35	57	6.5
Workload	0	0	7	61	7	15	7	4.5
Difficulty	0	0	15	46	23	7	7	4.5
Learn Exp	0	0	0	25	25	25	25	5.5

Colantoni was praised as a very effective instructor whose enthusiasm for the material was inspiring. Students commented that Colantoni was well-organized, and also that she was always available to help students with their work outside class hours. A few students commented that they would have enjoyed covering a wide breadth of subject matter. Overall, a very good course with an excellent instructor.

**LIN 458H1F Revitalizing Languages**

Instructor(s): K. Rice

	Enr: 28							Mean
	Resp: 22 Retake: 95%							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	4	33	33	28	5.9
Explains	0	0	4	0	23	33	38	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	0	9	19	71	6.6
Teaching	0	0	5	0	15	25	55	6.2
Workload	0	0	10	60	20	0	10	4.4
Difficulty	4	0	9	66	9	4	4	4.1
Learn Exp	5	0	0	16	22	22	33	5.5

Students had very good things to say about this course and its instructor. They found the lectures enjoyable and the subject material very interesting. Students commented that the instructor was very enthusiastic and approachable. In particular, they liked that Rice catered to their individual interests.

