

Geosci. Commun. Discuss., author comment AC5
<https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2021-36-AC5>, 2022
© Author(s) 2022. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

Reply on CC1

Clare E. Bond et al.

Author comment on "Learning outcomes, learning support, and cohort cohesion on a virtual field trip: an analysis of student and staff perceptions" by Clare E. Bond et al., Geosci. Commun. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2021-36-AC5>, 2022

General Comments

We thank the contributor for their positive comments. We are really pleased to hear that "Lessons learnt here will certainly inform future virtual field teaching."

We respond to the specific comments made:

- Key demographic data on students and staff are missing including the number of participants completing the questionnaire. If these data were collected, please consider including them.
- We will include this data.
- Ethics and consent - Please include relevant information (in accordance with GDPR) on the ethics assessments and the consent forms used for this study.
- We acquired University of Aberdeen ethical approval including GDPR for the study, we will provide details on this as required by Geoscience Communication.
- There are 11 learning outcomes (bullet points under question 3) in the questionnaire. Some of these outcomes are missing from Figure 2 and the discussion section. Why is that? Could you provide an explanation?
- We will add a sentence that explains why we have chosen to present the learning outcome questions we did.
- Statistical information - It's not clear to me if your results are statistically significant, especially when the number of participants is not reported (and the number of staff is low). Please explain what statistical tests you've performed including the corresponding values (in the text and in your figures, if possible).
- We will investigate the statistical tests suggested by RC1 and include this if appropriate.
- Can you include the questionnaire used for testing students' internet connection speeds in the supplemental information?

- yes we can include this.

- It is stated that "the answers of some participants might have been influenced by attendance in the initial week's session prior to questionnaire completion". Can you provide more information on this session and how it might have influenced participants' answers?

- this relates to when the participants submitted the 'prior' questionnaire. We will add this information to the manuscript.

- Was there a reason for the questionnaire being anonymized? This prevented the authors from matching pre- and post-assessment results for individual participants. One way to match an individual's pre- and post-assessment answers (while remaining anonymous) is to ask participants to use a code name (known only to them) on both surveys (e.g., see: <https://gc.copernicus.org/articles/4/281/2021/gc-4-281-2021.html>).

- yes, we could have done this, but set-up time was tight and we wanted to ensure anonymity.

- "Students were unsure as to the usefulness of a workbook in terms of "finding a quiet space to work" in advance of the course". This statement, as phrased here, was also unclear to me. Could it be that students didn't understand what they were being asked to rate? Perhaps this statement can be phrased differently?

- we will rephrase this sentence.

- Great figures, clear and effective!

- thank you – RC1 raised some concerns over how we presented the data. We think they are clear too, but understand their concerns. We will investigate if it is possible to create figures that are as clear, but that represent the original Likert choices better.