

Solid Earth Discuss., author comment AC3
<https://doi.org/10.5194/se-2021-107-AC3>, 2021
© Author(s) 2021. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

Reply on RC2

Steven Whitmeyer et al.

Author comment on "The Mid Atlantic Appalachian Orogen Traverse: a comparison of virtual and on-location field-based capstone experiences" by Steven Whitmeyer et al., Solid Earth Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/se-2021-107-AC3>, 2021

We appreciate the comments from reviewer #2 regarding the organization of the early sections of the manuscript, but also note the reviewer's comment that "It does read clearly." In our revision we will re-evaluate the early sections to make sure they address the main focus of the manuscript and make edits to improve their clarity and flow. The reviewer also notes the disparity of section 3.3 with respect to other parts of the manuscript and that it lacks relevant references to existing literature. As noted in our reply to reviewer #1, we will substantially rewrite this section to improve clarity and flow with respect to the rest of the manuscript, and include references to other relevant research on stratigraphic analyses and field-focused instruction. Similarly, we will revise the section on "Initial experiences with leading field trips virtually via the Zoom interface" (starting at line 247), in order to ground the presentation of our experiences with virtual instruction with relevant existing research. The reviewer's suggestions about cognitive psychology and its relevance to "people's reasoning within real versus virtual environments" are appreciated, but addressing this is beyond the scope of this manuscript, as we didn't have a cognitive psychologist participating in this project.

The section on community access is important to this manuscript by providing the broader context and relevance of this work to the field education community. However, we agree with the reviewer that this section of the manuscript seems a bit out of place, and we will reorganize this part of the manuscript to improve the logical flow within the revised manuscript. In addition, we will enhance the methods section to address the questions of the reviewer (e.g. demographics, span of years encompassed by survey respondents, etc.) Finally, we will address the comments about the preferred learning styles and clarify that our instructional approaches were tailored towards enhancing student interactions with geological features in the field in the context of theoretical concepts.