



EGUsphere, referee comment RC2
<https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2022-967-RC2>, 2022
© Author(s) 2022. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

Comment on egusphere-2022-967

Anonymous Referee #2

Referee comment on "How you teach changes who you reach: understanding the effect of teaching modality on student engagement, content interest, and learning in undergraduate hydrology" by Christine Georgakakos and James Knighton, EGU sphere, <https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2022-967-RC2>, 2022

This manuscript deals with the important issue of how we best teach hydrology and particularly hydrological modelling. While the presented study certainly might have its value, I am afraid I could not really see this in the presented manuscript. There are no clearly formulated research questions and I found it hard to understand what actually had been done and why. So, after reading the text a few times, I feel more confused. Below are a few of the questions that I struggled with:

The results might be heavily influenced by the temporal sequence of the different ways of teaching. Is the study design with one course with a mixture of teaching approaches really suitable to study the differences of the different teaching approaches?

Were the authors also the teachers? From the text this seems so but I could not see this clearly stated.

The number of participants is low, does this allow drawing conclusions? We all know how variable student populations are and how much the general 'mood' can vary from year to year (often based on a few students who 'set the tone')

What was the return rate of the questionnaires? How many accepted the link to the grades?

The (very good) grades are of course highly influenced by the choice of questions and grading, the numbers alone do not say much

How many questions were there in the questionnaire? Only the five shown in figure 3? I am no expert, but I would assume there are better ways to design questionnaires to get more detailed information.

Overall, there is a need for clarification. However, as far as I understood the manuscript, I am also not convinced that the study has been properly designed.