



EGUsphere, referee comment RC2
<https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2022-320-RC2>, 2022
© Author(s) 2022. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

Comment on egusphere-2022-320

Anonymous Referee #2

Referee comment on "Handwritten letters and photo albums linking geoscientists with school classes" by Mathew Stiller-Reeve et al., EGU sphere,
<https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2022-320-RC2>, 2022

General Comments

This article reports an interesting work done by the authors in the field of geoscience education and is based on the educational approach through hand-written letters and photo albums. Moreover, the article highlights an important aspect of the science communication focusing on a more personal and engaging interaction between science communicators and audience. Today, the communication process is conditioned by digital technologies and this article faces and discuss the possible contribution of an analogical and slower communication.

Although the topic is relevant to the journal, the manuscript needs revision to improve the overall scientific level. In addition to the description the authors must indicate what is positive and what needs to be improved. For example, the activity you describe is a time-consuming activity, but not expensive.

See specific and technical comments.

Specific Comments

The article is generally well written but in some part it has repetitive phrases even not necessary for the reader's understanding. You may synthesize concepts that are too conversational, with some repetitions and non-essential information that make the reading

difficult, especially in the introduction. Moreover, some phrases seem to be too emphatic for a scientific publication.

Considering you the 4 classes at different schools across Europe you should explain if the interaction between researchers and students was always in English. Did they write letters and comments in English? This is something that possibly may interact with their thoughts and the writing in a different language.

Generally, to make easier the reading, put quotes and citations at the end of the sentence and do not use brackets if not strictly necessary.

Regards the Evaluation and Cognitive assessments, you have very few data both respect to the total number and to the available sample. This needs to be discussed.

Moreover, the first question contains more than one question and the evaluation process is not linear so you must take it into account analyzing the answers.

In the concluding remarks you must discuss and emphasize that you analyzes are based on little data and that perhaps by gaining more experience and adding more data your conclusions will become more robust.

Finally a question: Have you observed gender-related aspects?

For example, did the class only interact with male scientists? Did girls and boys ask different questions? this is important for example when you write that some students have stated that they see the research profession as a real possibility.

Technical corrections

46 remove

Maybe only we ... foundly ...

50 remove

Our project was certainly not the first to use hand-written letters and photography to connect science with a younger audience.

51 add

For our project we

55 it would be interesting for discussion to understand why they consider it detrimental.

57 remove the sentence in brackets

66 make a single sentence: remove the sentence in brackets and On this expedition they

77 replace a project called with the project

84 replace

was (46 active students total) with - 46 active students - was

86 replace

which Pedrozo-Acunˆa et al. (2019) noted as beneficial to inspire "next generation geoscientists"

with

noted as beneficial to inspire "next generation geoscientists" by Pedrozo-Acunˆa et al.

(2019)

101 remove

that we present

119 remove

then it was time to put pen to paper

120-121 remove

These questions could be anything from general questions about why the scientists became scientists, to what exactly they will be doing on their research expedition.

129 remove (albeit very interesting)

130 remove see

132 remove They started to put together their responses.

136 replace

Once the letters were sent in the post, it was time for the next exciting part of the project, where the scientist would balance scientific research and photo journalism.

with

In the next step of the project the scientist balanced the communication process with scientific research and photo journalism.

140 remove brackets

145 remove

With equipment in hand, the scientists were ready to go to sea

152 replace

They captured both the scientific and the personal aspects. They captured the excitement and the mundane. They captured the research instruments and the sports equipment.

with

They captured both the scientific and the personal aspects, research instruments and excitement, sports equipment and the mundane.

157 replace

Once the scientists returned to shore, they were meant to post their albums to the classes. However, due to one of the scientist's travel plans, all the albums were delivered personally to the schools involved.

with

Once the scientists returned to shore all the albums were delivered to the schools involved.

164 replace

Initially, these link-ups were meant to be the first time the scientists and students met face-to-face. This was not the case since a couple of the classes had already linked-up with the scientists during the expedition itself. However, for one of the schools, this was the first face-to-face interaction. Here it is worth noting something (albeit anecdotally) important.

with

For one of the schools, this was the first face-to-face interaction.

171 explain:

R.O.V images

181 remove

take a close look at

185 remove

With the communication for the AKMA Polaroid project over, it was time to evaluate the

process to see if the use of these “traditional” ways of communication impacted the students taking part.

194 replace

Since the number of evaluations were likely to be rather low (we estimated 10-20 of the 46 pupils who had initially sent questions to the scientists),

with

Since we estimated the number of evaluations to be rather low,

200 since the question contains more than one question, the process of analyzing the answers is not linear and you must take it into account when analyzing the answers

207 only about 37% ? of students, please discuss this.

215 add the acronym BERA

220 Since the survey was voluntary, we received considerably less answers than the total number who took part.

Does that mean that they were obliged before? I suggest to remove the sentence

221 remove brackets

230 less than half of the initial sample of students discuss this and the meaning of analyzing so scarcely data.

234 remove can

235 replace

The neutral and negative comments (of which 3 of 17 students came with) spoke to ways we could improve the project, but also to wider issues around communication and education

with

3 of the 17 comments were neutral and negative and indicate how we could improve the project, but also how widening issues around communication and education.

238 replace

One of the other students

with

One student

250 remove brackets

258 remove brackets

263 remove

This speaks nicely to how we opened this article with our memories of how personal photography and letters used to feel.

270 remove

We have to remember that

288 replace

In total, 6 of 15 students (only 15 of the students answered the second question) mentioned aspects of the AKMA project itself.

with

Only 15 students answered the second question, 6 of which mentioned aspects of the AKMA project itself.

311 replace

Over half of the students (10 of the 16 who answered this question) stated that they had realized new things about scientists

with

16 students answered this question, 10 of which stated that they had realized new things about scientists.

323 replace

Finally, some of the students (3 of 16)

with

Finally, 3 out of 16 students

350 add that this could make up for the fact that our analysis has little data

370 Not mentioned in the text

Fig. 3 the images are not seen well

- Does the paper address relevant scientific questions within the scope of GC? yes
- Does the paper present novel concepts, ideas, tools, or data? yes
- Are the scientific methods and assumptions valid and clearly outlined? yes
- Are the results sufficient to support the interpretations and conclusions? Not entirely
- Do the authors give proper credit to related work and clearly indicate their own new/original contribution? no
- Does the title clearly reflect the contents of the paper? yes
- Does the abstract provide a concise and complete summary? yes
- Is the overall presentation well structured and clear? yes
- Is the language fluent and precise? yes
- Are the number and quality of references appropriate? yes