The IGERT Program Evaluation:
A Questionnaire on the 2010 Winter Storm Workshop

By:
Corbin M. Campbell
Sharon A. La Voy
Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment
University of Maryland

Introduction

This report is the result of one assessment in a larger study designed to evaluate the IGERT program in language science at the University of Maryland. The evaluation seeks to determine the effectiveness of the program in terms of its goals and obtain information that offers insights into the components which appear most beneficial and those which need to be refined to enhance the program's impact.   The program evaluation is led by the Director of Assessment in Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment (IRPA) and her graduate assistant.

In winter of 2010, program evaluators conducted an online survey of Winter Storm workshop participants. The survey was designed to capture data on students' experiences with the Winter Storm workshop, the effectiveness of the overall Winter Storm workshop in meeting IGERT program goals, and the effectiveness of the individual workshop sessions to inform future Winter Storm workshops.

Methods

Program evaluators, in consultation with the IGERT administrators, formed the research team responsible for the questionnaire development, data collection, and analyses.   The questionnaire was vetted by program evaluators, IGERT administrators, and IGERT students to ensure that questions 1) were clear and understandable and 2) would assess important aspects of Winter Storms—covering all applicable topics. The survey was designed to run approximately 20 minutes. An introduction including information about the confidentiality of the survey and informed consent form were also a part of the questionnaire, as per IRB agreement.   See Appendix A for a final copy of the survey instrument.

Data Collection and Analysis

The online survey was available to participants immediately following the Winter Storm workshop, in late January 2010.   Winter Storm participants were invited to participate in the survey via email.   Two reminder emails were sent within a two week period.   Data were analyzed in SPSS and frequency reports were created and interpreted using aggregate data to keep confidentiality.

Participants

Thirty Winter Storm participants completed the online questionnaire.   Participant demographics follow:

		Count	Column Valid N %
What is your home department?	Computer Science	2	6.9%
	Hearing and Speech Sciences	1	3.4%
	Human Development	1	3.4%
	Linguistics	21	72.4%
	Psychology	2	6.9%
	Second Language Acquisition	2	6.9%
	Total	29	100.0%
What is your gender?	Female	17	56.7%
	Male	13	43.3%
	Total	30	100.0%
Race/ethnicity	More than 1 race	2	6.9%
	Asian, not Hispanic	7	24.1%
	White, not Hispanic	17	58.6%
	Hispanic	3	10.3%
	Total	29	100%
Class year	1st	7	23.3%
	2nd	8	26.7%
	3rd	7	23.3%
	4th	7	23.3%
	More than 5th	1	3.3%
	Total	30	100%
What is your IGERT Status	Already a participant, have funding	10	33.3%
	Already a participant, no NSF funding	7	23.3%
	No plans to apply to the program	8	26.7%
	Planning to become affiliated with the program	5	16.7
	Total	30	100%

Results

Results, presented below, are summaries of the data for each section of the Winter Storm workshop followed by a summary of the data on the overall workshop. Frequencies for each item and comments related to each section can be found in Appendix B.

I.   Morning Methods

Out of thirty respondents, most (22) said they participated in the morning methods sessions occasionally (3 never participated and 5 participated in every session). Of those who participated in morning methods, most (19) agreed/strongly agreed that they were helpful to their graduate studies.

a. Statistics/R Session

Twenty-five participants said they participated in the Statistics/R morning methods session.   It appears that respondents perceived the Statistics/R session to be a valuable part of the Winter Storm workshop, but that respondents might need more instruction to be able to use it in their studies.   Of those who participated in the session, sixteen said that they would like more time allocated to statistics/R in future workshops.   A majority of those who participated in the session agreed or strongly agreed that they are more knowledgeable about this method of research (18) and intend to use this method of research in their graduate studies (22) after participating in the session. About half said that they are capable of using this method after the session.

b. Infant Studies

Ten respondents said they participated in the Infant Studies session.   Opinions about this session varied. Six respondents said that in future workshops they would like the same amount of time devoted to Infant Studies, while three said they would like less time allocated.   Out of nine, six students agreed or strongly agreed that they are more knowledgeable about Infant Studies after the session, five intend to use it in their graduate studies, and six believe they are capable of doing so.

c. Eye tracking

Twelve respondents reported participating in the Eye Tracking sessions.   Of those who participated in the session, most (11) perceived that the correct amount of time was allocated to the session.   It appears that respondents thought that they learned about eye tracking from the session

(8 agreed/strongly agreed), but did not agree they intended to use it or could use it in their graduate studies (respectively, 5 and 3 agreed/strongly agreed).

d.   EEG

Thirteen respondents said they participated in the EEG session.   Overall, it appears that respondents perceived the EEG session to be valuable.   Of those who participated in the session, most perceived that the correct amount of time was allocated to the session (11).   Most agreed/strongly agreed that they were more knowledgeable about EEG as a result of the session (12) and they intend to use EEG in their graduate studies (8).   Just fewer than half of respondents (6) said that they were capable of using EEG after the session.

e.   MEG

Fourteen respondents reported participating in the MEG session.   Overall, it appears that respondents perceived the MEG session to be valuable, but that respondents might need more instruction to be able to use it in their studies.   Of those who participated in the session, just less than half of participants wanted more time devoted to MEG, the others wanted the same amount of time devoted.   Most agreed/strongly agreed that they were more knowledgeable about MEG as a result of the session (11) and they intend to use MEG in their graduate studies (8).   Yet, just over a third of respondents said that they were capable of using MEG after the session.

f.   Machine Learning with Weka

Fifteen respondents said they participated in the Machine Learning with Weka session. Overall, it appears that respondents perceived the Machine Learning with Weka session to be valuable, but that respondents might need more instruction to be able to use it in their studies.   Of those who participated in the session, most perceived that the correct amount of time was allocated to the session (12) and they were more knowledgeable about Machine Learning with Weka as a result of the session (14).   Yet, about a third agreed/strongly agreed that they intend to use Machine Learning with Weka in their graduate studies and they were capable of using Machine Learning with Weka after the session (5 and 6 respectively).

g.   Phonetic Analysis with Praat

Twelve respondents reported participating in the phonetics analysis with Praat session. Overall, it appears that respondents perceived the session to be valuable.   Of those who

participated in the session, most perceived that the correct amount of time was allocated to the session (9).   Most agreed/strongly agreed that they were more knowledgeable about phonetic analysis with Praat as a result of the session (10), they intend to use phonetics analysis with Praat in their graduate studies (8), and they were capable of using it after the session (8).

II.   Lunch Sessions with Faculty

Out of thirty respondents, seventeen said they participated in the lunch sessions with faculty every session that was offered and twelve said they attended occasionally (only 1 never participated).   In planning future Winter Storm workshops, most (23) would like the same amount of time allocated to lunch sessions with faculty.   Overall, it appears that respondents thought that the session was valuable: most agreed/strongly agreed that the session was useful for their graduate studies (24), they know who to contact to get involved on campus (20), and are more knowledgeable about the opportunities on campus (20).   Yet, about a third of respondents intend to get involved in the activities that were discussed during the sessions.

III.   Afternoon Research Lecture Sessions on Monday and Tuesday Afternoon

Out of thirty respondents, sixteen said they participated in the afternoon sessions every session that was offered and seven said they attended occasionally (4 never participated). In planning future Winter Storm workshops, most (17) would like the same amount of time allocated to afternoon research sessions and seven would like less time allocated.   Respondents expressed mixed opinions about the session's value.   Most agreed/strongly agreed that they are more knowledgeable about how to incorporate language diversity issues into their research (17) and intend to do so (21).   Yet, less than half agreed/strongly agreed that they gained the skills necessary to incorporate language diversity issues into their research (12) and found the session useful for their graduate studies (13).

IV.   Research Groups[1]

Out of thirty respondents, eleven said they did not participate in any research group. Others participated in one of the following research groups: action-perception loops (2), language disorders (2), reflexives (2), sounds (4), theory of mind and language acquisition (5), or one of the two groups that were not listed in the response options.   In terms of participation, just less than

---

[1] Note that not all the research groups were listed in the options, which may have affected results.

half (7) said that all group members contributed to the discussions, but a majority (10) said that they, themselves, participated frequently in every meeting.   Most (12) said that the faculty role was about right, but three said it was too small.   Nine believed that an appropriate amount of time was allocated to the research groups (3 said too much and 3 said too little).

Respondents were also asked about the group process.   Of the fifteen who responded about their participation in a research group, nine said that group members came from a variety of disciplines.   A majority agreed/strongly agreed that they felt comfortable participating in meetings (11) and most said they had enough background to understand the discussions that took place (13).   Almost all said that the group dynamic was positive, with one dissenter who strongly disagreed.

A majority expressed positive outcomes of the research groups, including:

- 13 gained a better understanding of other perspectives on the topic.
- 12 are more knowledgeable about how to conduct collaborative/interdisciplinary research.
- 12 intend to get involved in collaborative/interdisciplinary research.
- 10 intend to continue their involvement in this research area after Winter Storm.
- 9 gained the abilities necessary to conduct collaborative/interdisciplinary research.
- 9 found it helpful for their graduate studies.
- 8 said that [new] research plans were formulated during the sessions.

V.   Session with IGERT from Penn and Johns Hopkins

Out of thirty, nineteen students reported participating in the session with IGERT from Penn and Johns Hopkins.   Overall, respondents seemed to find less value in this session.   Only three agreed/strongly agreed that they were more knowledgeable about other IGERT programs after the session.   Six felt connected with a larger network of interdisciplinary researchers and nine said the session was helpful to their graduate studies.

VI.   Socializing Activities

Out of thirty respondents, twenty-one reported participating at least once in socializing activities.   Of those who participated, fifteen agreed/strongly agreed that they felt more connected to other IGERT participants after the sessions and fourteen expressed that an appropriate amount

of time was allocated to socializing.

VII.   Overall Impressions of Winter Storm

When reflecting on the overall Winter Storm experience, twenty-four out of thirty respondents said that their view of the workshop was positive or very positive.   Ten said that the workshop contributed "a lot" and thirteen said it contributed "some" to their overall IGERT experience.   Additionally, most participants expressed positive outcomes:

- 22 said they have a better understanding of the challenges of interdisciplinary research.
- 22 said they have a better understanding of what other departments work on.
- 15 anticipate forming new research collaborations.

Appendix A: Questionnaire Items

Winter Storm 2010 Evaluation

SD-SA = Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree, Strongly Agree

About You
1. What is your home department?
    a. Linguistics
    b. Psychology
    c. Biology
    d. Computer Science
    e. Second Language Acquisition
    f. Hearing and Speech Sciences
    g. Philosophy
    h. Other (Please specify)
2. What is your gender? (male female)
3. Are you Hispanic/Latino? (Y/N)
4. What is your race? Select one or more:
    a. American Indian or Alaska Native
    b. Black/African-American
    c. Asian
    d. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
    e. White
5. Are you faculty or a student and what year? (Faculty, 1st year student, 2nd year student, 3rd year student, 4th year student, 5th year student, More than 5th year student)
6. IGERT Status (Already a participant, have NSF funding; Already a participant, no NSF funding; Planning to become affiliated with the program; No plans to apply to the program)

Morning Methods Sessions
1. Did you participate in the morning methods sessions? (No, yes- once, yes- occasionally, yes- every session that was offered)   ** those who respond NO Skip to section on Lunch Sessions***

For each session attended (Statistics/R, Infant methods, Eye tracking, EEG, MEG, Weka, Praat):
2. In planning future Winter Storm workshops, I would have liked: (more time allocated to this topic; the same amount of time allocated to this topic; less time allocated to this topic)
3. After participating in this session: (SD-SA)
    a. "I am more knowledgeable about _(software)____"
    b. "I intend to use the _(software)___ in my graduate studies."
    c. "I am capable of using _(software)___ in my graduate studies."

4. Overall, I found the morning methods sessions to be helpful to my graduate studies. (SD-SA)
5. Please comment on the morning methods sessions (what was most helpful/least helpful/other comments): (open ended)

Lunch Sessions with Faculty
1. Did you participate in the Lunch Sessions with Faculty? (No, yes- once, yes- occasionally, yes- every session that was offered)   ** those who respond NO Skip to section on Research Lecture Sessions***
2. After participating in the lunch sessions with faculty: (SD-SA)
   a. "I am more knowledgeable about opportunities available on campus."
   b. "I intend to get involved in the opportunities available on campus that were discussed during the lunch sessions."
   c. "I know who to contact/where to go in order to get involved with opportunities on campus."
3. In planning future Winter Storm workshops, I would have liked: (more time allocated to sessions with faculty; the same amount of time allocated to sessions with faculty; less time allocated to sessions with faculty)
4. Overall, I found the lunch sessions with faculty to be helpful in my graduate studies. (SD-SA)
5. Please comment on the lunch sessions with faculty (what was most helpful/least helpful/other comments): (open ended)

Afternoon Research Lecture Sessions (*that took place on Monday and Tuesday afternoon*)
1. Did you participate in the Afternoon Research Lecture sessions? (No, yes- once, yes- occasionally, yes- every session that was offered)   ** those who respond NO Skip to section on Research Groups***
2. After participating in the afternoon research lecture sessions: (SD-SA)
   a. "I am more knowledgeable about how to incorporate language diversity issues into my research."
   b. "I intend to incorporate language diversity issues into my research."
   c. "I gained the abilities necessary incorporate language diversity issues into my research."
3. In planning future Winter Storm workshops, I would have liked: (more time allocated to research lecture sessions; the same amount of time allocated to research lecture sessions; less time allocated to research lecture sessions)
4. Overall, I found the afternoon research lecture sessions to be helpful to my graduate studies. (SD-SA)
5. Please comment on the afternoon research lecture sessions (what was most helpful/least helpful/other comments): (open ended)

Afternoon Research Group Sessions
1. Which research group did you participate in? (None, Reflexives, Theory of Mind and Language Acquisition, Action-Perception Loops, Sounds, Language Disorders, …)   ** those who respond NONE Skip to section on Sessions with Outside IGERT Groups***

2. Were members of your group from a variety of disciplinary backgrounds/perspectives (at least three)? (Y/N/I don't know)
3. Were any research plans formulated? (Y/N/I don't know)
4. "I had adequate background to understand the discussions that took place in my research group." (SD-SA)
5. "I felt comfortable participating in my research group." (SD-SA)
6. "The dynamic in my group was positive." (SD-SA)
7. "All the members of the group contributed to the discussions." (SD-SA)
8. "The faculty role in the discussions was:" (too large, about right, too small).
9. After participating in the research group sessions. (SD-SA)
   a. "I gained a better understanding of other perspectives on the topic."
   b. "I intend to continue my involvement in this research area after Winter Storm."
   c. How often did you participate in your group's discussions? (Not at all, occasionally-but not in every meeting, at least once in each meeting, frequently in every meeting)
10. After participating in the afternoon research group sessions: (SD-SA)
    a. "I am more knowledgeable about how to conduct collaborative/interdisciplinary research."
    b. "I intend to get involved in collaborative/interdisciplinary research."
    c. "I gained the abilities necessary to conduct collaborative/interdisciplinary research."
11. In planning future Winter Storm workshops, I would have liked: (more time allocated to research group sessions; the same amount of time allocated to research group sessions; less time allocated to research group sessions)
12. Overall, I found the research group sessions to be helpful to my graduate studies. (SD-SA)
13. Please comment on the research group sessions (what was most helpful/least helpful/other comments): (open ended)

Session with IGERT from Penn and Johns Hopkins
   1. Did you participate in the session with IGERT from Penn and Johns Hopkins? (No/Yes)   ** those who respond NO Skip to Socializing Time***
   2. After participating in the session with IGERT from Penn and Johns Hopkins: (SD-SA)
      a. "I am more knowledgeable about other IGERT programs."
      b. "I feel connected to a larger network of interdisciplinary language researchers."
   3. Overall, I found the session with IGERT from Penn and Johns Hopkins to be helpful to my graduate studies. (SD-SA)

Socializing/community building time
   1. Did you participate in socializing activities? (No, yes- once, yes- occasionally, yes- every session that was offered)   ** those who respond NO Skip to section on Overall***
   2. After participating in the socializing activities: (SD-SA)
      a. "I feel more connected to other IGERT participants."
   3. In planning future Winter Storm workshops, I would have liked: (more time allocated to socializing; the same amount of time allocated to socializing; less time allocated to socializing)

4. Please comment on the socializing activities(what was most helpful/least helpful/other comments): (open ended)

Overall
1. After Winter Storm, (SD-SA)
    a. "I have a better understanding of the challenges of interdisciplinary research."
    b. "I have a better understanding of what other departments work on."
    c. "My general attitude about the Winter Storm workshop is" (Very Negative, Negative, Neutral, Positive, Very Positive"
2. After Winter Storm, do you anticipate forming new research collaborations with people you met? (Y/N/I don't know).
    a. If yes, please describe (open ended)
    b. If no, why not? (open ended)
3. For students who participate in IGERT, how much does Winter Storm contribute to your overall IGERT experience? (None, A little, Some, A lot)
4. Please comment on the overall Winter Storm workshop experience (what was most helpful/least helpful/other comments): (open ended)
5. What are three things that you learned about Interdisciplinary Language research from attending Winter Storm? (open ended)

Appendix B: Frequencies and Comments

Morning Methods

		Count	Column Valid N %
Overall, I found the morning methods sessions to be helpful to my graduate studies.	Strongly Disagree	0	.0%
	Disagree	1	3.7%
	Neutral	7	25.9%
	Agree	9	33.3%
	Strongly Agree	10	37.0%
	Total	27	100.0%

Please comment on the morning methods sessions

- I found the ggplot2 tutorial extremely helpful.

- I found the weka, eye-tracking and praat sessions more useful because these are tools that we learn very little about during our typical graduate training.   I would have liked to have more time dedicated to learning about these tools.   On the other hand, while the sessions on MEG and EEG were well lead, these tools are ones that we are all fairly familiar with.   For these types of sessions I would have rather seen very specific goals, like advanced EEG/MEG analysis.   An understanding of Stats and R is a really critical practical skill.   While there are very good stats courses offered during the regular semester, these offer little practical advice for implementing a statistical analysis using the tools that are used by our peers.   I would have liked to see this part of the Winterstorm morning methods session be longer.   Maybe it would be constructive to collect real data from the types of experiments that are done in the language sciences and work in small teams to carry out analyses.   For example, someone could lead the session on analyzing eye-tracking, EEG, MEG, self-paced reading, and discrimination data using R.

- I think it was nice to have a variety of methods covered, but I feel like perhaps if we chose just 2 or 3 and focused more on those that we would be able to gain more. While I think that the way the morning methods were run this year really helped people to get a general idea of "what is out there", it would be nice to go more in depth on some of these.

- In general, I find that if there is not enough time to dive deep, DON'T TRY! It is fine to get a general overview of a topic to allow one to be better equipped to do their own follow-up. Trying to go deep in a short time only confuses things instead of really helping. Conversely, for those topics where time permits...it is great that we can delve into them a little more.

- more time for introduction to basic concepts in stats. theoretical introduction way too advanced.   R session was good but too short. at least week-long course necessary to make it possible to use R in own research (for me at least).

- Since there was so little time allocated to each topic, most of the sessions did not go beyond the level of knowledge that I already have. The R, Praat, and Weka sessions were exceptions. Hands-on software workshops seem to lend themselves well to the amount of time we have available. Hardware, on the other hand, requires a lot more time to get a handle on, for practical purposes.

- Some were very relevant, others not so much. That is probably the case for everyone. I dont think this setting is good for learning hardware, but with large groups it seems like it is the only option. One thing that doesn't come across in this survey is that teaching the morning methods (i taught one) was useful, learning to explain what we do is valuable, and now we hav resources to teach with in the future.

- The best ones seemed to be the goal-driven ones where actual software was involved -- R, Weka, Praat. The other methods sections weren't as hands-on, and I was already familiar with the basics of these methods from IGERT-related coursework.

- the expectations/objectives for the morning sessions were not clear to me in advance. i believe it'd be helpful if we set the objectives (and the topics to be covered) in advance.

- The morning methods sessions that included hands-on sections (such as MEG and R) were particularly useful for getting accustomed to the software.   I think statistics, being something that all departments and researchers share, should have more sessions devoted to it, at a more advanced level. Equally, I'd like to have more time devoted to learn how to use   R.

- Very useful to get to know the overview of every methods.   All sessions were very well presented. Pratt could have been more slow-paced.

Statistics/R

		Count	Column Valid N %
Did you participate in the Statistics/R session?	No	1	3.8%
	Yes	25	96.2%
	Total	26	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
In planning future Winter Storm workshops, I would have liked:	More time allocated to Statistics/R.	16	64.0%
	The same amount of time allocated to Statistics/R.	9	36.0%
	Total	25	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
After participating in this session:/I am more knowledgeable about this method of research.	Strongly Disagree	1	4.0%
	Disagree	0	.0%
	Neutral	6	24.0%
	Agree	10	40.0%
	Strongly Agree	8	32.0%
	Total	25	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
After participating in this session:/I intend to use this method of research in my graduate studies.	Strongly Disagree	0	.0%
	Disagree	2	8.0%
	Neutral	1	4.0%
	Agree	7	28.0%
	Strongly Agree	15	60.0%
	Total	25	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
After participating in this session:/I am capable of using this method of research in my graduate studies.	Strongly Disagree	0	.0%
	Disagree	7	28.0%
	Neutral	6	24.0%
	Agree	6	24.0%
	Strongly Agree	6	24.0%
	Total	25	100.0%

Infant Studies

		Count	Column Valid N %
Did you participate in the infant studies section?	No	15	60.0%
	Yes	10	40.0%
	Total	25	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
In planning future Winter Storm workshops, I would have liked:	Less time allocated to infant studies.	3	30.0%
	More time allocated to infant studies.	1	10.0%
	The same amount of time allocated to infant studies.	6	60.0%
	Total	10	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
After participating in this session:/I am more knowledgeable about this method of research.	Strongly Disagree	1	11.1%
	Disagree	1	11.1%
	Neutral	1	11.1%
	Agree	4	44.4%
	Strongly Agree	2	22.2%
	Total	9	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
After participating in this session:/I intend to use this method of research in my graduate studies.	Strongly Disagree	0	.0%
	Disagree	1	11.1%
	Neutral	3	33.3%
	Agree	3	33.3%
	Strongly Agree	2	22.2%
	Total	9	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
After participating in this session:/I am capable of using this method of research in my graduate studies.	Strongly Disagree	0	.0%
	Disagree	1	11.1%
	Neutral	2	22.2%
	Agree	5	55.6%
	Strongly Agree	1	11.1%
	Total	9	100.0%

Eye Tracking

		Count	Column Valid N %
Did you participate in the eye tracking session?	No	14	53.8%
	Yes	12	46.2%
	Total	26	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
In planning future Winter Storm workshops, I would have liked:	More time allocated to eye tracking.	1	8.3%
	The same amount of time allocated to eye tracking.	11	91.7%
	Total	12	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
After participating in this session:/I am more knowledgeable about this method of research.	Strongly Disagree	1	8.3%
	Disagree	0	.0%
	Neutral	3	25.0%
	Agree	6	50.0%
	Strongly Agree	2	16.7%
	Total	12	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
After participating in this session:/I intend to use this method of research in my graduate studies.	Strongly Disagree	1	8.3%
	Disagree	3	25.0%
	Neutral	3	25.0%
	Agree	3	25.0%
	Strongly Agree	2	16.7%
	Total	12	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
After participating in this session:/I am capable of using this method of research in my graduate studies.	Strongly Disagree	1	8.3%
	Disagree	4	33.3%
	Neutral	4	33.3%
	Agree	3	25.0%
	Strongly Agree	0	.0%
	Total	12	100.0%

EEG

		Count	Column Valid N %
Did you participate in the EEG methods session?	No	14	51.9%
	Yes	13	48.1%
	Total	27	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
In planning future Winter Storm workshops, I would have liked:	More time allocated to EEG.	2	15.4%
	The same amount of time allocated to EEG.	11	84.6%
	Total	13	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
After participating in this session:/I am more knowledgeable about this method of research.	Strongly Disagree	0	.0%
	Disagree	0	.0%
	Neutral	1	7.7%
	Agree	7	53.8%
	Strongly Agree	5	38.5%
	Total	13	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
After participating in this session:/I intend to use this method of research in my graduate studies.	Strongly Disagree	0	.0%
	Disagree	3	23.1%
	Neutral	2	15.4%
	Agree	1	7.7%
	Strongly Agree	7	53.8%
	Total	13	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
After participating in this session, I am capable of using this method of research in my graduate studies.	Strongly Disagree	0	.0%
	Disagree	3	23.1%
	Neutral	4	30.8%
	Agree	1	7.7%
	Strongly Agree	5	38.5%
	Total	13	100.0%

MEG

		Count	Column Valid N %
Did you participate in the MEG methods section?	No	12	46.2%
	Yes	14	53.8%
	Total	26	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
In planning future Winter Storm workshops, I would have liked:	More time allocated to MEG.	6	42.9%
	The same amount of time allocated to MEG.	8	57.1%
	Total	14	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
After participating in this session:/I am more knowledgeable about this method of research.	Strongly Disagree	0	.0%
	Disagree	1	7.1%
	Neutral	2	14.3%
	Agree	6	42.9%
	Strongly Agree	5	35.7%
	Total	14	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
After participating in this session:/I intend to use this method of research in my graduate studies.	Strongly Disagree	0	.0%
	Disagree	3	21.4%
	Neutral	3	21.4%
	Agree	1	7.1%
	Strongly Agree	7	50.0%
	Total	14	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
After participating in this session:/I am capable of using this method of research in my graduate studies.	Strongly Disagree	1	7.1%
	Disagree	3	21.4%
	Neutral	5	35.7%
	Agree	3	21.4%
	Strongly Agree	2	14.3%
	Total	14	100.0%

Machine Learning with Weka

		Count	Column Valid N %
Did you participate in the Machine Learning with Weka session?	No	9	37.5%
	Yes	15	62.5%
	Total	24	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
In planning future Winter Storm workshops, I would have liked:	More time allocated to Weka.	3	20.0%
	The same amount of time allocated to Weka.	12	80.0%
	Total	15	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
After participating in this session:/I am more knowledgeable about this method of research.	Strongly Disagree	0	.0%
	Disagree	0	.0%
	Neutral	1	6.7%
	Agree	6	40.0%
	Strongly Agree	8	53.3%
	Total	15	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
After participating in this session:/I intend to use this method of research in my graduate studies.	Strongly Disagree	1	6.7%
	Disagree	2	13.3%
	Neutral	7	46.7%
	Agree	2	13.3%
	Strongly Agree	3	20.0%
	Total	15	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
After participating in this session:/I am capable of using this method of research in my graduate studies.	Strongly Disagree	0	.0%
	Disagree	4	26.7%
	Neutral	5	33.3%
	Agree	3	20.0%
	Strongly Agree	3	20.0%
	Total	15	100.0%

Phonetic Analysis with Pratt

		Count	Column Valid N %
Did you participate in the phonetic analysis with Praat session?	No	14	53.8%
	Yes	12	46.2%
	Total	26	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
In planning future Winter Storm workshops, I would have liked:	More time allocated to Praat.	3	25.0%
	The same amount of time allocated to Praat.	9	75.0%
	Total	12	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
After participating in this session:/I am more knowledgeable about this method of research.	Strongly Disagree	0	.0%
	Disagree	0	.0%
	Neutral	2	16.7%
	Agree	3	25.0%
	Strongly Agree	7	58.3%
	Total	12	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
After participating in this session:/I intend to use this method of research in my graduate studies.	Strongly Disagree	0	.0%
	Disagree	1	8.3%
	Neutral	3	25.0%
	Agree	2	16.7%
	Strongly Agree	6	50.0%
	Total	12	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
After participating in this session:/I am capable of using this method of research in my graduate studies.	Strongly Disagree	0	.0%
	Disagree	1	8.3%
	Neutral	3	25.0%
	Agree	4	33.3%
	Strongly Agree	4	33.3%
	Total	12	100.0%

Lunch Sessions with Faculty

		Count	Column Valid N %
Did you participate in the Lunch Sessions with Faculty?	Yes; every session that was offered.	17	56.7%
	Yes; occasionally.	12	40.0%
	Yes; once.	1	3.3%
	Total	30	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
After participating in the lunch sessions with faculty:/I am more knowledgeable about opportunities available on campus.	Strongly Disagree	2	6.7%
	Disagree	2	6.7%
	Neutral	6	20.0%
	Agree	14	46.7%
	Strongly Agree	6	20.0%
	Total	30	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
After participating in the lunch sessions with faculty:/I intend to get involved in the opportunities available on campus that were discussed during the lunch sessions.	Strongly Disagree	1	3.3%
	Disagree	3	10.0%
	Neutral	15	50.0%
	Agree	6	20.0%
	Strongly Agree	5	16.7%
	Total	30	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
After participating in the lunch sessions with faculty:/I know who to contact/where to go in order to get involved with opportunities on campus.	Strongly Disagree	1	3.3%
	Disagree	2	6.7%
	Neutral	7	23.3%
	Agree	15	50.0%
	Strongly Agree	5	16.7%
	Total	30	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
In planning future Winter Storm workshops, I would have liked:	Less time allocated to sessions with faculty.	2	6.7%
	More time allocated to sessions with faculty.	5	16.7%
	The same amount of time allocated to sessions with faculty.	23	76.7%
	Total	30	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
Overall, I found the lunch sessions with faculty to be helpful in my graduate studies.	Strongly Disagree	0	.0%
	Disagree	3	10.0%
	Neutral	3	10.0%
	Agree	17	56.7%
	Strongly Agree	7	23.3%
	Total	30	100.0%

Please comment on the lunch sessions with faculty (what was most helpful/least helpful/other comments)

- All the talks were interesting and informative. It would have been better if we could fill all the slots.

- I really thought the session with John Sprouse with tips about how to survive the job market was very enlightening and helpful. I would love to see more practical topics like this (I believe someone suggested things like how to write a grant, etc.).

- It was useful to see what people were up to, not all of it seemed incredibly relevant to the IGERT and it was not clear how/if getting involved in the research would come out of hearing the talks. the session with jon sprouse on professionsal stuff was very useful,w e could use more practical info like that.

- Most helpful: that we managed to get faculty from different areas. It would be nice to have more of these - there are still many other faculty that Im sure people would like to hear from.

- The amount of time allocated to the lunch talks was perfect.   The only thing I may like to see is for the presenters to become more integrated with the Winter Storm (i.e., possibly participate in the research groups).

- The Jon Sprouse discussion was excellent. I learned a lot from what he had to say.

- The lunch session that I found most helpful was the one lead by Jon Sprouse about job searches, applications, applying for grants, dealing with reviews and setting up a lab.   This is information that we don't get in normal classes, but which is never the less very important for our professional development.

- The session on entering the job market and what to do when you get a job with Jon Sprouse was fantastic, enormously informative and useful. In general, I found the faculty talks very interesting, it was wonderful to see in more depth how people that work in the cognitive sciences approach the problems unique to their areas, whether related to language directly or less directly. This is a great forum for such presentations/discussions, since the faculty are quite aware of who their audience is, and tailor their presentation accordingly.

- The talks were great, really enjoyed hearing about various topics outside of language research

- Tom Carlson's talk was easily the weakest, as it had no relevance whatsoever to the goals of the IGERT. I got nothing out of it.

Afternoon Research Lecture Sessions on Monday and Tuesday Afternoon

		Count	Column Valid N %
Did you participate in the afternoon research sessions?	No.	4	13.3%
	Yes; every session that was offered.	16	53.3%
	Yes; occasionally.	7	23.3%
	Yes; once.	3	10.0%
	Total	30	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
After participating in the afternoon research sessions (that took place on Monday and Tuesday afternoon):/I am more knowledgeable about how to incorporate language diversity issues into my research.	Strongly Disagree	2	7.7%
	Disagree	4	15.4%
	Neutral	3	11.5%
	Agree	11	42.3%
	Strongly Agree	6	23.1%
	Total	26	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
After participating in the afternoon research sessions (that took place on Monday and Tuesday afternoon):/I intend to incorporate language diversity issues into my research.	Strongly Disagree	0	.0%
	Disagree	1	3.8%
	Neutral	4	15.4%
	Agree	9	34.6%
	Strongly Agree	12	46.2%
	Total	26	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
After participating in the	Strongly Disagree	0	.0%

afternoon research sessions (that took place on Monday and Tuesday afternoon):/I gained the abilities necessary to incorporate language diversity issues into my research.	Disagree	3	11.5%
	Neutral	11	42.3%
	Agree	9	34.6%
	Strongly Agree	3	11.5%
	Total	26	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
In planning future Winter Storm workshops, I would have liked:	Less time allocated to research lecture sessions.	7	26.9%
	More time allocated to research lecture sessions.	2	7.7%
	The same amount of time allocated to research lecture sessions.	17	65.4%
	Total	26	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
Overall, I found the afternoon research lecture sessions to be helpful to my graduate studies.	Strongly Disagree	2	7.7%
	Disagree	3	11.5%
	Neutral	8	30.8%
	Agree	7	26.9%
	Strongly Agree	6	23.1%
	Total	26	100.0%

Please comment on the afternoon research lecture sessions (what was most helpful/least helpful/other comments)
• as a teacher of these lectures, i think i am already incorporating the linguistic diversity into my work. I found it sueful to prepare the material and i enjoye it but i am not sure how much anyone else really took away from it, especially people without some foundation in linguistics (really necessary for studying languages...).
• Given that I have a linguistics background, I found these sessions some what tedious.   I imagine that these may have been extremely useful to others without a background in linguistics.
• I felt like the research groups could have been helped with just an outline of possible directions or goals to set- I felt that at least in my group, we all agreed the topic was interesting but weren't sure what to do with it. Setting a few simple possible goals might also make the meet-up at the end (where the groups present what they worked on) a bit more uniform or structured.
• I really benefit from the research groups and our group plans to continue to meet throughout the semester.   It would be helpful though to ideally have a faculty member in each of the groups. This year my group did not have a faculty member and it seems like at times we could have used some guidance. My group was the ERP and Language Group.
• I think its good to keep allocating time to these sessions...but there needs to be a way to make them more productive. As it stood...I found them to be not helpful
• The research groups were great because they allowed for direct interaction with others outside the department.
• The typology lesson was too advanced for some non-linguists.
• This didn't seem to end up relating to the research groups very much, at least not the group I was in. I also didn't feel like I learned how to apply this notion of "language diversity" to anything. There were a lot of good examples of diversity (most of which I was aware of), but I didn't get a good sense of how knowledge of diversity should inform one's research plans.   The best part of it was when we were encouraged to divide into small groups and discuss our research with the others, because it's sometimes surprising what other people are working on.

Research Groups

		Count	Column Valid N %
Which research group did you participate in?	Action-Perception loops	2	7.7%
	Language Disorders	2	7.7%
	None	11	42.3%
	Reflexives	2	7.7%
	Sounds	4	15.4%
	Theory of Mind and Language Acquisition	5	19.2%
	Total	26	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
Were any research plans formulated?	I don't know.	3	21.4%
	No.	3	21.4%
	Yes.	8	57.1%
	Total	14	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
While participating in the research group, I had adequate background to understand the discussions that took place.	Strongly Disagree	0	.0%
	Disagree	0	.0%
	Neutral	2	13.3%
	Agree	4	26.7%
	Strongly Agree	9	60.0%
	Total	15	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
Were the members of your group from a variety of disciplinary backgrounds/perspectives (at least three)?	I don't know.	2	13.3%
	No.	4	26.7%
	Yes.	9	60.0%
	Total	15	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
While participating in the research group, I felt comfortable participating.	Strongly Disagree	1	6.7%
	Disagree	1	6.7%
	Neutral	2	13.3%
	Agree	1	6.7%
	Strongly Agree	10	66.7%
	Total	15	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
While participating in the research group, the dynamic in my group was positive.	Strongly Disagree	1	6.7%
	Disagree	0	.0%
	Neutral	0	.0%
	Agree	4	26.7%
	Strongly Agree	10	66.7%
	Total	15	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
While participating in the research group:/All the members of the group contributed to the discussions.	Strongly Disagree	1	6.7%
	Disagree	5	33.3%
	Neutral	2	13.3%
	Agree	1	6.7%
	Strongly Agree	6	40.0%
	Total	15	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
The faculty role in the discussions was:	About right	12	80.0%
	Too small	3	20.0%
	Total	15	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
After participating in the research group sessions:/I gained a better understanding of other perspectives on the topic.	Strongly Disagree	0	.0%
	Disagree	0	.0%
	Neutral	2	13.3%
	Agree	6	40.0%
	Strongly Agree	7	46.7%
	Total	15	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
After participating in the research group sessions:/I intend to continue my involvement in this research area after Winter Storm.	Strongly Disagree	0	.0%
	Disagree	2	13.3%
	Neutral	3	20.0%
	Agree	2	13.3%
	Strongly Agree	8	53.3%
	Total	15	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
After participating in the research group sessions:/I am more knowledgeable about how to conduct collaborative/interdisciplinary research.	Strongly Disagree	1	7.1%
	Disagree	0	.0%
	Neutral	1	7.1%
	Agree	7	50.0%
	Strongly Agree	5	35.7%
	Total	14	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
After participating in the research group sessions:/I intend to get involved in collaborative/interdisciplinary research.	Strongly Disagree	1	6.7%
	Disagree	0	.0%
	Neutral	2	13.3%
	Agree	6	40.0%
	Strongly Agree	6	40.0%
	Total	15	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
After participating in the research group sessions:/I gained the abilities necessary to conduct collaborative/interdisciplinary research.	Strongly Disagree	1	6.7%
	Disagree	0	.0%
	Neutral	5	33.3%
	Agree	5	33.3%
	Strongly Agree	4	26.7%
	Total	15	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
How often did you participate in your group's discussions?	At least once in each meeting.	1	6.7%
	Frequently in every meeting.	10	66.7%
	Not at all	1	6.7%
	Occasionally; but not in every meeting.	3	20.0%
	Total	15	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
In planning future Winter Storm workshops, I would have liked:	Less time allocated to research group sessions.	3	20.0%
	More time allocated to research group sessions.	3	20.0%
	The same amount of time allocated to research group sessions.	9	60.0%
	Total	15	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
Overall, I found the research group sessions to be helpful to my graduate studies.	Strongly Disagree	1	6.7%
	Disagree	1	6.7%
	Neutral	4	26.7%
	Agree	3	20.0%
	Strongly Agree	6	40.0%
	Total	15	100.0%

Please comment on the research group sessions (what was most helpful/least helpful/other comments)
• First, i wasn't in this group, i was in the parsing in L1 and L2 group but there was no button for that.   There was no faculty involvement which was a little diappointing.   I am not sure out group really got anywhere, but i thought the discussions we generally good,   it is a big topic.
• I couldn't find my group in the first question. I was in the Memory and Language ERP group.
• It might be nice to have a bit more focus and direction with the research group. Appointing group leaders who already have projects in mind would be a good idea, so that the whole session is not devoted to searching for common ground on the topic. Part of the problem with my group in particular is that a few members could not attend every meeting, so that meetings were spent rehashing previous sessions.
• The Sounds group actually sat down and analyzed data using a variety of approaches, which was extremely useful. Watching and evaluation the methods that other students use for exploratory data analysis was enlightening and has helped me update my own data analysis skills.

Session with IGERT from Penn and Johns Hopkins

		Count	Column Valid N %
Did you participate in the session with IGERT from Penn and Johns Hopkins?	No.	11	36.7%
	Yes	19	63.3%
	Total	30	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
After participating in the session with IGERT from Penn and Johns Hopkins:/I am more knowledgeable about other IGERT programs.	Strongly Disagree	5	26.3%
	Disagree	5	26.3%
	Neutral	6	31.6%
	Agree	2	10.5%
	Strongly Agree	1	5.3%
	Total	19	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
After participating in the session with IGERT from Penn and Johns Hopkins:/I feel connected to a larger network of interdisciplinary language researchers.	Strongly Disagree	4	21.1%
	Disagree	0	.0%
	Neutral	9	47.4%
	Agree	3	15.8%
	Strongly Agree	3	15.8%
	Total	19	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
After participating in the session with IGERT from Penn and Johns Hopkins:/Overall, I found the session with IGERT from Penn and Johns Hopkins to be helpful to my graduate studies.	Strongly Disagree	0	.0%
	Disagree	3	15.8%
	Neutral	7	36.8%
	Agree	6	31.6%
	Strongly Agree	3	15.8%
	Total	19	100.0%

Socializing Activities

		Count	Column Valid N %
Did you participate in socializing activities?	No.	9	30.0%
	Yes; every session that was offered.	5	16.7%
	Yes; occasionally.	7	23.3%
	Yes; once.	9	30.0%
	Total	30	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
After participating in the socializing activities I feel more connected to other IGERT participants.	Strongly Disagree	1	4.8%
	Disagree	1	4.8%
	Neutral	4	19.0%
	Agree	12	57.1%
	Strongly Agree	3	14.3%
	Total	21	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
In planning future Winter Storm workshops, I would have liked:	Less time allocated to socializing.	1	4.8%
	More time allocated to socializing.	6	28.6%
	The same amount of time allocated to socializing.	14	66.7%
	Total	21	100.0%

Please comment on the socializing activities(what was most helpful/least helpful/other comments):
• find a way for non-linguists to integrate better, will be tough but maybe some other activity, e.g. ice skating
• for the most part, only linguistics people showed up so it wasn't all that different than usual.
• I don't like people. Socializing was a bad idea.
• I felt that perhaps it would have been good if there were one or two lunches (or dinners) that were devoted especially to mingling with the other students. It was too easy, when we were having lunch before the faculty talks, to just sit with your regular group or alone, eat, and then listen to the presentation. Something like an activity could be planned, so that there is a deliberate shaking up of the usual groups.
• I think encouraging people a little more strongly to attend these would be helpful. As it was...there were only a couple of people...a truly lost opportunity. We need a way of getting all the people together talking about the work that we're all doing but at the same time just getting to know each other a little better. Maybe something like bowling, arcade..something fun!!!

Overall Impressions of Winter Storm

		Count	Column Valid N %
Overall:After Winter Storm, I have a better understanding of the challenges of interdisciplinary research.	Strongly Disagree	0	.0%
	Disagree	0	.0%
	Neutral	8	26.7%
	Agree	13	43.3%
	Strongly Agree	9	30.0%
	Total	30	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
Overall:After Winter Storm, I have a better understanding of what other departments work on.	Strongly Disagree	1	3.3%
	Disagree	2	6.7%
	Neutral	5	16.7%
	Agree	13	43.3%
	Strongly Agree	9	30.0%
	Total	30	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
Overall:My general attitude about the Winter Storm workshop is:	Neutral.	5	17.2%
	Positive.	15	51.7%
	Very positive.	9	31.0%
	Total	29	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
Overall:After Winter Storm, do you anticipate forming new research collaborations with people you meet?	I don't know	10	33.3%
	No	5	16.7%
	Yes	15	50.0%
	Total	30	100.0%

		Count	Column Valid N %
Overall:How much does Winter Storm contribute to your overall IGERT experience?	A little	4	14.3%
	A lot	10	35.7%
	None	1	3.6%
	Some	13	46.4%
	Total	28	100.0%

If yes (anticipate forming new research collaborations), please describe; if no, explain why not.

- I am already heavily involved in interdisciplinary research of sufficient breadth that it should last me until my dissertation is complete.

- I am pretty established in what i'm up to and don't anticipate having the time or energy to devote to completely new projects.

- I was involved in the Memory and ERPs group (it isn't listed in this questionaire) and it was composed by linguist and a person from the HESP Department. Our meetings were very interesting, we came up with several ideas for experiments, and we intend to keep meeting to discuss them.

- I was part of the memory and language research group.   Our group has plans of continuing to meet and possibly to carry out a language related study using   techniques common to the memory literature.

- I will definitely continue to work with the others from my research group.

- I would like to, but I am currently working on so many projects that it's hard to envisage taking on another one. Some of my current projects already are interdisciplinary.

- Let's collaborate! You know.

- My research group plans to continue meeting and hopefully develop a research project together. Also my research group from last year's Winter Storm, still plans to continue meeting.

- Relative clause research may develop out of my research group (Learnability in SLA).

- Research group was extremely productive, will continue to communicate with others involved in other labs.

- the experiment that we developed from our research group.

- The Ferrets and Phonemes group intends to meet with researchers not present at Winter Storm to continue our research plans.

- The members of my research group will be continuing our collaboration.

- There was another research group which is not listed in this questionnarie. I joined the second language/bilingualism group. While we have a series of meetings during the Winter Storm, we formed a very plausible research project which I'd like to develop it with other members.

- While my research interests are interdisciplinary, there seem to be very few students in the relevant disciplines who are interested in the same questions. Or, if there are more, they don't participate in IGERT. So, while I have made connections with faculty through IGERT activities, I have yet to find any student collaborators outside my department.

Overall: Please comment on the overall Winter Storm workshop experience (what was most helpful/least helpful/other comments)

- The variety of morning sessions was good. Even though I didn't participate in all of them because I already knew a lot about the methodology or it wasn't relevant to my research, it is good that there was something for everyone. I would have liked to see more faculty at these sessions. It sends the message that.   I think the typology afternoon session was a bit forced. It didn't fit into the rest of Winter Storm in that the message was "this is important; you must know this" and not "this is something you might find useful". The session asked the question "Why is cross-linguistic research important?" and not the more appropriate, less presumptuous question: "Is cross-linguistic research important?"   * I found it very disappointing that some of the IGERT co-PIs didn't show up to any of the activities. This sends the message that WS isn't an important IGERT activity. If IGERT students are required to attend, IGERT co-PIs should likewise be required.

- Favorites: Stats/R, weka, Jon Sprouse   Least useful: typology lectures

- First of all...the survey should reflect the actual sessions. My research group was not listed so I had to select None and did not get a chance to comment on what I felt was one of the more important parts of the program. This is important...if we want feedback we need to give people a chance to provide it accurately.   Overall, Winter Storm was good. Again, we need to have realistic expectations of the different sessions and try to get the most out of them without trying to squeeze impossible content out of a short time.   Definitely need better ways of engaging people for each topic so they are not just sitting there listening. Also, the socializing needs a revamp.

- I enjoyed the extra time between sessions compared to last year, as it gave a good chance to socialize.

- I liked mixing with the Earth and Ocean Sciences stuff.

- I think having interdisciplinary research groups around a specific research problem (instead of a general issue) was extremely helpful and productive. The job talk by Jon Sprouse was also very enlightening and useful.   As I said before, statistics is a big part of being a reseracher (no matter in what discipline). I feel we would benefit from having more advanced, hands-on sessions with that theme.

- I would have to say the most helpful components were the faculty lunch talks and the research groups. The morning methods, were interesting it just felt like too much to cover in two weeks.

- It can be a bit grueling. At times it felt like we were floundering around, especially in the research groups where there wasn't a pre-established research question or ongoing project.

- It is nice to see what different departments do and the lunch talks are particularly helpful.

- It was a good experience overall. I would have liked, however, a better introduction to exactly what Winter Storm IS (background, participants, goals, etc.)

- Methodology session was helpful.   I wish we had different topic other than "typology/language diversity" as research group. I understand the motivation, but it was too "linguistic."

- Most of morning sessions (methodology) were great.

- Need more time dedicated to statistics (one full week)

- Overall, I felt that WS 2010 was successful.   I would have liked to see more hardware-research integration, rather than short, abbreviated hardware sessions followed by more in-depth research sessions.   I also would have liked to have more faculty members involved in both sessions, especially those from other disciplines.

- Right now the main limitation of WS and other IGERT activities is the lack of participation by students in other departments (i.e., not linguistics). We don't need a special program to discuss interdisciplinary research amongst ourselves--we do that already. We put a lot of effort into making WS an interdisciplinary activity, but there's only so much we can do when outside participation is so limited. To make WS better, it will be more important to diversify IGERT participation than to tweak the details of the event itself.

- The morning methods section and the lunch lectures were the most helpful.

- There was a lot of organizing for very little payoff. I got some practice teaching/explaining and have some slides and other things developed for futue teaching, but I don't think i learned all that much, except that things are very disorganized and really the organization fell at the last minute on just a few people. Like last year, it was an exhausting experience right before the start o the semester.   If i didn't have to, I wouldn't participate in Winter Storm again unless it was significantly different.   There were citations of many people participating but really, many people did very small things and few people did everything else.

Overall: What are three things that you learned about interdisciplinary language research from attending Winter Storm?

- 1 - learning how to talk to people within different traditions about the issues that matter to both parties is challenging, but can be done.   2 - people in different traditions can offer unique insight into problems outside their area of expertise. 3 - trying to see things from others' perspective (both when the perspective is similar to one's own, or very different) is a useful skill that one should employ as often as possible when conducting one's own research

- 1. It is hard to get people talking to each other no matter how hard you try! 2. Expectations for research quantity and publications are very different across various disciplines. 3. It takes time to develop cross-disciplinary links...but once they are there they can be an incredibly rewarding part of the graduate program and also personally enriching.

- 1. It's challenging.   2. It requires a great amount of open-mindedness and creative thinking. 3. We certainly have the immediate network needed to foster more interdisciplinary language research.

- 1. Obviously, it's very useful to collaborate with researchers in other discipline to appoarch the same question in this field.- Many people in other disciplines would be open to work together.   2. Methodolgical variety gives us much more opportunites to investigate language research.   3. Even beyond langauge related issue, many of universal knowledge on human cognition contribute to understand how language works in human mind.

- 1. Through my research group, I discovered a very promising new line of research in cross-linguistic study of language disorders.   2. I learned about some new software tools (though that hardly counts as "interdisciplinary").

- 1. Very difficult to work with people from other discipline because of lack of shared knowledge. We sometimes overlook how much we know about our own specific field, and tend to assume everyone else should know some basic things. But in order to work with other people we should put the idea in a very simple language for general public. 2. There are too many different methodologies we probably should learn as a language scientist. No one can master all of them, so it's getting more and more important to collaborate. 3. I feel like I have little to contribute to the IGERT, which makes me sad.

- 1. We need to find a way to get more people interested in language. 2. We need more accessible vocabulary to talk about linguistic phenomena. 3. It's harder than it looks.

- 1) there is usually more than one way/methodology for addressing the same question. 2) using language variation in different languages can be a very interesting way to addressing many of the questions that we deal with in our labs. 3) it is helpful to learn about how other people do work in their own fields and try to apply that to how we are used to working in our own departments.

- 1) What perspectives are taken from other departments, such as SLA and HESP 2) A more rich background on different methods for studying language 3) That diversity is one of the key phenomena to explain when studying language as a cognitive system.

- I can't remember.

- I learned that interdisciplinary research can be challenging.   It is key to establish contacts with the right people, but that the payoff can be great.

- I learned that it is not the case that all fields come to the table with the same ability to contribute to our understanding of the language faculty. The IGERT program makes the assumption that other fields have well-defined "perspectives" on language. This may be an incorrect assumption. Winter Storm is linguistics-centric because linguistics has the best defined framework for studying language. WS failed to make it clear what substantive contributions other fields can make. What's more, linguistics at Maryland is itself a thoroughly interdisciplinary field (notice how every morning session was led by at least one member of the linguistics department). It is not clear what including, say, psychologists into the mix does other than adding a (smart) brain onto the problem (but for that matter, you could include physicists and mathematicians to the same effect).

- 1. It is useful to look at language research from more than one perspective. 2. It is possible to do cross departmental work within the university. 3. Having a meeting that specifically brings together different departments is a good opportunity to make connections with people that might not be possible otherwise.

- There is a lot of organizing for very little results. People really need some baseline linguistic background to take part in research about language and that doesn't seem to be happening. people in the linguistics department seem to be naturally doing things interdisciplinarily, I'm not sure what the IGERT is really adding.

- While many disciplines are discussing the same issues, they might have very different perspectives on the issues. Bringing together different fields can give a sense of the broader picture. Also, different people have different skills, so collaboration may allow you to take a project in a direction that you wouldn't be able to take it otherwise.