

## How Geoscientists Think and Learn

PAGES 265-266

Decades ago, pioneering petroleum geologist Wallace Pratt pointed out that oil is first found in the human mind. His insight remains true today: Across geoscience specialties, the human mind is arguably the geoscientist's most important tool. It is the mind that converts colors and textures of dirt, or blotches on a satellite image, or wiggles on a seismogram, into explanatory narratives about the formation and migration of oil, the rise and fall of mountain ranges, the opening and closing of oceans. Improved understanding of how humans think and learn about the Earth can help geoscientists and geoscience educators do their jobs better, and can highlight the strengths that geoscience expertise brings to interdisciplinary problem solving.

To shed light on the nature of geoscience thinking and learning requires collaboration among those who study geosciences and those who study thinking and learning. Such a collaborative group, comprising geoscientists, geoscience educators, a philosopher of science, an anthropologist, a developmental psychologist, and a cognitive psychologist, has synthesized what is known and articulated what is most in need of further research in four areas: thinking about time on geological timescales, understanding the Earth as a complex system, learning in the field, and spatial thinking as applied to geosciences (Figure 1). Documentation of references, sources, and methods used in this study can be found in the online supplement to this *Eos* issue ([http://www.agu.org/eos\\_elec/](http://www.agu.org/eos_elec/))

Taken together, this work shows that while geoscientists use a broad range of tools to study a diversity of problems, they share a distinctive set of approaches and perspectives that are particularly well suited to studying something as big, old, and complicated as the Earth system.

By K. A. KASTENS, C. A. MANDUCA, C. CERVATO, R. FRODEMAN, C. GOODWIN, L. S. LIBEN, D. W. MOGK, T. C. SPANGLER, N. A. STILLINGS, AND S. TITUS

### *Thinking About Time*

Two key features of geoscientists' temporal thinking distinguish them from the general population: They take a long view of time, and they expect low-frequency, high-impact events. Geoscientists have internalized the vastness of the age of the Earth and the relative brevity of human history. They can envision Earth in states drastically different from the planet they have personally experienced: an Earth without humans, an Earth without life, a hothouse Earth, a snowball Earth. In the long view of time, exceedingly slow processes such as erosion or evolution can effect huge changes, such as the removal of a mountain or the establishment of new species. Infrequent but powerful processes, such as floods, volcanic eruptions, landslides, and asteroid impacts, are routine rather than aberrant when considered across the whole of Earth's history.

This perspective is unusual: Short time frames, of the order of days to years, drive most decisions in business, politics, and news cycles. If widely adopted, geoscientists' long view of time could provide a crucial counterweight and support decision making with a time horizon of decades to centuries. A society in which a long view of time is pervasive could plan more effectively for infrequent events such as hurricanes or earthquakes and might take more seriously the prospect that tiny but cumulative forcings leveraged over long intervals of time can cause profound changes to the planet.

However, having a long view of time should not be viewed as merely a practical tool for decision makers; philosophically, it is a fundamental aspect of humanity's self-image. Just as Nicolaus Copernicus's sixteenth-century discovery of the heliocentric solar system altered perceptions of humanity's place in the spatial dimensions of the cosmos, so did James Hutton's eighteenth-century discovery of deep time alter the perception of humans' place within Earth history. However, the fact that humanity's planet does not lie at the center of the universe is more widely understood and accepted in Western civilization than is the

fact that human history spans only a tiny fraction of geologic time.

Substantial impediments stand in the way of society achieving a broad understanding of geologic time. Geologic time involves scales and events far removed from human experience; thus, envisioning the cumulative impact of slow processes or infrequent events over geological timescales is not intuitive. Scientists' timekeeping tools rely on exponential numbers, ratios, and proportional reasoning, all of which present well-documented difficulties for many students. Finally, some religious teachings oppose the idea of an old Earth.

Most educational research concerning geological time has focused on how accurately students understand and can recall aspects of the scientists' model of Earth history, and on what interventions can improve these metrics. One promising technique is to have students use imagery and narrative to establish the sequence of events before attaching numerical ages. Thinking about the events of Earth history as a sequence allows students to tap into their experience-based temporal reasoning, for example, their understanding that earlier events can have influenced or caused later events, but not vice versa. Teachers at all levels, including those in higher education, can capitalize on these techniques to improve students' grasp of geologic time.

As valuable as this research is, it leaves untested the assertion that taking a long view of time leads to more farseeing and environmentally responsible decision making. Testing this claim will require combining expertise in geoscience education, environmental education, conceptual change, and human decision making.

### *Understanding the Earth as a Complex and Complicated System*

Geoscientists understand that the Earth is a system characterized by feedbacks between processes and among component parts. Geoscientists respect that such feedbacks are important and difficult to understand completely and can lead to strong effects in unanticipated places. Earth systems are "complex" in the technical sense: exhibiting nonlinear interactions, multiple stable states, fractal and chaotic behavior, self-organized criticality, and non-Gaussian distributions of outputs. Earth systems are

also “complicated” in the ordinary sense of the word. Multiple mechanical, chemical, biological, and anthropogenic processes may be active and interacting at the same time and place. For example, one widely used representation of the water cycle for K-12 students includes 16 component concepts with multiple linkages among them. Although geoscientists are not the only scientists who work with complicated, complex systems, their ability and propensity to apply a systems approach to understanding the Earth is an important expertise that they bring to the table of interdisciplinary collaboration.

For understanding the Earth as a complex system, the concept of feedback loops is key. Negative (stabilizing) feedbacks keep the Earth system sufficiently stable that complex forms of life, including humans, can exist. Positive (reinforcing) feedbacks underlie many environmental problems, including loss of biodiversity, global climate change, and degradation of agricultural soils. In education, feedback loops function as a “threshold concept,” a concept difficult to learn but transformative once mastered. Because feedback loops underpin a stable Earth system, fostering a working knowledge of this concept throughout the decision-making populace could increase civilization’s capacity to cope with 21st-century challenges. In spite of its importance, the feedback loop concept is arguably the most under-researched topic in the entire domain of geoscience thinking and learning.

There are some success stories in the systems approach to teaching and learning about the Earth. Evidence is strong that middle-school students can reason qualitatively about interconnections between the hydrosphere, atmosphere, geosphere, cryosphere, and biosphere, and that undergraduates can create and manipulate quantitative computer models of those interactions. What is needed now is to develop learning progressions that build purposefully from primary through secondary education into college, leveraging students’ increasing maturity and incorporating their growing knowledge of chemistry, math, physics, biology, and social sciences.

*Learning in the Field*

A hallmark of the geosciences is that theoretical advances are usually grounded in direct observations of the Earth, oceans, atmosphere, or planets. While it is not accurate to describe the geosciences as merely observational sciences, observations play a central role in geoscientists’ formulation and testing of new ideas and theories.

In reflecting on their own learning trajectories, many geoscientists report that fieldwork was a central, formative experience, whether at geology field camp, on a research vessel, or during an atmospheric science field experiment. Geoscientists and geoscience educators have claimed, often




Fig. 1. Selected insights from the four themes identified with how geoscientists think and learn. (a) Like the heliocentric view of the solar system (left), the discovery of the brevity of human history within the vastness of geologic time (right) altered humanity’s understanding of its place in the cosmos. (b) In understanding the Earth as a system, feedback loops are a “threshold concept.” Even when the student understands a situation experientially (left), casting it into the symbolic language of flows, reservoirs, and feedbacks (right) remains exceptionally difficult. (c) Learning in the field offers many opportunities for students to experience making “first inscriptions.” Using senses and sensors, students transform the raw material of nature (left) into human artifacts: tractable, transportable symbols on paper (right). (d) Spatial thinking is common in geosciences and presents a stumbling block for students who have come up through an education system that did not develop, assess, or reward spatial skills. The illustrated exercise requires “visual penetrative ability,” which varies widely from student to student. Image credits are located in the supplement to this Eos issue ([http://www.agu.org/eos\\_elec](http://www.agu.org/eos_elec)).

passionately, that field-based learning helps students develop a feel for Earth processes and a sense of scale, and strengthens their ability to integrate fragmentary information, to reason spatially and temporally, and to critique the quality of observational data. But quantitative evidence and convincing mechanisms for these strong claims have been sparse. Two lines of reasoning may shed light on why field experiences are so fundamental.

First, field experiences provide a concentrated opportunity to develop what anthropologists call “professional vision,”

the ability to see features that are important to professional practice. Like a criminal investigator at a crime scene, a geoscientist in the field sees differently than a novice at the same scene. Professional vision can be developed through guided apprenticeship, as an expert watches and corrects a novice’s iterative efforts to segment the observed world into meaningful categories (e.g., cloud types or rock units) and to identify features of interest (e.g., rip tides or faults) amid visual complexity. Such mentorship extends beyond the development of observational skill and

includes guidance on the use of observational data to test hypotheses. The interplay between observation and testing of ideas is a central feature of a geoscientist's reasoning, and field experiences may play a critical role in developing this habit of mind.

Second, field experiences provide practice in transforming the raw material of nature into the words, signs, and symbols that geoscientists use to capture and communicate their observations. Ethnographers studying scientists refer to the "cascade of inscriptions" that scientists make, where the term "inscription" encompasses text, diagrams, graphs, tables, maps, equations, etc. The first inscription in the "cascade" transforms an aspect of nature into a human-made artifact; for example, the slope of a rock layer is transformed into a dip and strike symbol on a map, or the chill of the ocean is transformed into a number in degrees Celsius. The same or different scientists then transform the initial inscription into subsequent inscriptions (for example, a geological map or a temperature/salinity graph), and so on toward ever more abstract, transportable, generalized, and integrative inscriptions.

Although all of the steps in the cascade play important roles in science, the first inscription differs in kind because it results from a transformation of information directly from nature rather than from another human artifact. Moreover, the first inscription sets the quality of all of the subsequent inscriptions. By making first inscriptions in the field, using their own senses and simple tools, students can experience the interactions among that which is observed, the actions and thoughts of the human observer, the recorded observations (inscriptions) that the scientist brings home from the field area, and the eventual interpretation that emerges after multiple generations of more integrative inscriptions. Geoscience educators can help students make these connections by fostering discussion about pathways from observation to interpretation, and by designing activities that require students to test their interpretation against observations of the Earth.

### *Spatial Thinking*

Geoscientists use spatial thinking extensively whenever they acquire, represent,

manipulate, or reason about objects, processes, or phenomena in space. Exemplars of the power of spatial thinking include Alfred Wegener's interpretation in 1915 of the gross patterns of continental geology as a product of continental drift, and Inge Lehmann's interpretation, published in 1936, that the global distribution of earthquake *P* and *S* waves is indicative of a two-layer solid/liquid core. Geoscientists deploy a wide array of specialized spatial representations, using them not only to convey data that are inherently spatial (e.g., maps and cross sections) but also to elucidate relationships between nonspatial variables (e.g., phase diagrams of mineral composition).

Many students struggle with spatial tasks. Several factors contribute to these difficulties: Spatial skills are unevenly distributed among individuals. The formal education system tends not to develop, assess, or reward spatial skills. And instructors who are strong spatial thinkers themselves tend to be unaware of the degree to which some students are spatially challenged. However, recent studies show that performance on abstract and applied spatial tasks can be enhanced through instruction and practice. Moreover, completing a spatially intensive geoscience course can strengthen performance on nongeospecific spatial tasks.

One active line of geoscience/cognitive science collaborative research has sought to identify and strengthen the cognitive processes and concepts that underpin spatially demanding elements of the geoscience curriculum. For example, map reading builds on mastery of projective spatial concepts. Envisioning three-dimensional geological structures inside a solid mass of rock builds on visual penetrative ability. The frontier in this line of inquiry lies in understanding how people make meaning from spatial information, constructing inferences about causal Earth processes from observations of shape, size, orientation, configuration, or trajectory.

### *A Community of Practice*

Reflecting on the nature of geoscience thinking and learning reveals that geoscientists are not merely individuals who know a lot about the oceans, atmosphere, or solid Earth. Geoscientists make up a "community of practice," who have been shaped by, and now embody, a distinctive suite of

experiences, approaches, perspectives, and values. These include taking a long view of time, using temporal and spatial reasoning to formulate hypotheses and answer questions, interpreting observations in terms of a system of intertwined processes rather than a single independent variable, and building cascades of inscriptions that begin with the raw materials of nature and tap into powerful visualization techniques.

None of these attributes, taken individually, is unique to geoscientists. Nor does every individual geoscientist have every one of these experiences, ascribe to every perspective, and utilize every approach. But taken collectively, this combination of attributes has proven valuable for answering questions and solving problems concerning the Earth and its environment.

### *Acknowledgments*

In assembling this synthesis, we have drawn on conversations with dozens of colleagues and the writings of hundreds, as documented in the online supplement to this *Eos* issue ([http://www.agu.org/eos\\_elec/](http://www.agu.org/eos_elec/)). This work was funded by the U.S. National Science Foundation through the synthesis track of the Research and Evaluation on Education in Science and Engineering program, grants DRL07-22268 (Kastens) and DRL07-22388 (Manduca). This is Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory contribution 7285.

### *Author Information*

Kim A. Kastens, Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory and Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences, Columbia University, Palisades, N. Y.; E-mail: [kastens@ldeo.columbia.edu](mailto:kastens@ldeo.columbia.edu); Cathryn A. Manduca, Science Education Resource Center, Carleton College, Northfield, Minn.; Cinzia Cervato, Department of Geological and Atmospheric Sciences, Iowa State University, Ames; Robert Frodeman, Department of Philosophy and Religion Studies, University of North Texas, Denton; Charles Goodwin, Department of Applied Linguistics, University of California, Los Angeles; Lynn S. Liben, Department of Psychology, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park; David W. Mogk, Department of Earth Sciences, Montana State University, Bozeman; Timothy C. Spangler, University Corporation for Atmospheric Research, Boulder, Colo.; Neil A. Stillings, School of Cognitive Science, Hampshire College, Amherst, Mass.; and Sarah Titus, Department of Geology, Carleton College



---

## Supplementary material to “How Geoscientists Think and Learn”

*Published 4 August 2009*

*Kim A. Kastens*, Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory and Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences, Columbia University, Palisades, New York

*Cathryn A. Manduca*, Science Education Resource Center, Carleton College, Northfield, Minnesota

*Cinzia Cervato*, Department of Geological and Atmospheric Sciences, Iowa State University, Ames

*Robert Frodeman*, Department of Philosophy and Religion Studies, University of North Texas, Denton

*Charles Goodwin*, Department of Applied Linguistics, University of California, Los Angeles

*Lynn S. Liben*, Department of Psychology, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park

*David W. Mogk*, Department of Earth Sciences, Montana State University, Bozeman

*Timothy C. Spangler*, University Corporation for Atmospheric Research, Boulder, Colorado

*Neil A. Stillings*, School of Cognitive Science, Hampshire College, Amherst, Massachusetts

*Sarah Titus*, Department of Geology, Carleton College

### **Citation:**

Kastens, K. A., C. A. Manduca, C. Cervato, R. Frodeman, C. Goodwin, L. S. Liben, D. W. Mogk, T. C. Spangler, N. A. Stillings, and S. Titus (2009), How geoscientists think and learn, *Eos Trans. AGU*, 90(31), 265–266. [Full Article (pdf)]

---

### **Notes on Sources**

The work of the Synthesis of Research on Thinking & Learning in the Geosciences Project has been carried out through an extensive literature review, a virtual Journal Club, a web-based system for sharing manuscript drafts and internal reviews, a week-long writing retreat at Black Rock Forest in Cornwall, NY, and one-to-one collaboration between two-person writing teams each comprising one geoscientist and one cognitive/social scientist. In this online supplement, we document the main human, print and web resources that provided direct input to the *EOS* article. The individuals cited below participated in structured discussions with the

Synthesis group as either members of the virtual Journal Club or as Discussants at the writing retreat. A far larger group of colleagues have informed our thinking through informal discussions.

One of the products of the Synthesis project is an online annotated database of print and on-line resources relevant to the Synthesis themes of geological time, spatial thinking, systems thinking and learning in the field. The database and other information about the project can be accessed at [http://serc.carleton.edu/research\\_on\\_learning/synthesis/](http://serc.carleton.edu/research_on_learning/synthesis/) (click “Browse Synthesis Resources.”) Papers cited below are sources for specific ideas or findings in the EOS article. However, our thinking was informed by the larger group of resources in the database, especially our prioritization of what insights to showcase in this overview article.

## Introduction

- **“Oil is found...”**: p. 2236, in Pratt, W., 1952, Towards a philosophy of oil finding: *Bulletin of the American Association of Petroleum Geologists*, 36(12), p. 2231–2236.

## Thinking about Time

Jeff Dodick, Stephanie Pfirman, Tim Shipley and Michael Tabor contributed to the Synthesis group discussions of geological time and temporal thinking.

- **Deep time is important for broader population**: Zen, E.-a., What is deep time and why should anyone care?, *Journal of Geoscience Education*, 49 (1), 5–9, 2001.
- **The original report of Hutton’s discovery** of deep time is available online at Hutton, J., THEORY of the EARTH; or an INVESTIGATION of the Laws observable in the Composition, Dissolution, and Restoration of Land upon the Globe. *Transactions of the Royal Society of Edinburgh*, 1, 1788 (<http://www.uwmc.uwc.edu/geography/hutton/hutton.htm>). A popular account is: Repcheck, J., *The Man who found Time: James Hutton and the Discovery of the Earth’s Antiquity*, 247 pp., Perseus Publishing, Cambridge, MA, 2003.
- **Educational research on students’ recall of geologic time** and interventions to improve same: Ault, C.R., Jr., Time in geological explanations as perceived by elementary-school students, *Journal of Geological Education*, 30, 304–309, 1982. Trend, R.D., Deep time framework: A preliminary study of U. K. primary teachers’ conceptions of geological time and perceptions of geoscience, *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 38, 191–221, 2001. Libarkin, J.C., J.P. Kurdziel, and S.W. Anderson, College student conceptions of geological time and the disconnect between ordering and scale, *Journal of Geoscience Education*, 55, 402–412, 2007. Dodick, J., and N. Orion, Measuring student understanding of geological time, *Science Education*, 87, 708–731, 2003.
- **Interventions using imagery and narrative**: Dodick, J., and N. Orion, Building an understanding of geological time: A cognitive synthesis of the “macro” and “micro” scales of time, in *Earth and Mind: How Geologists Think and Learn about the Earth*, edited by C.A. Manduca and D.W. Mogk, pp. 77–93, Geological Society of America Special Paper 413, Denver, 2006.

## Understanding the Earth as a Complex System

Patrick Louchouart, Stephanie Pfirman, Michael Piburn and James Slotta contributed to the Synthesis group discussions of complex systems and systems thinking.

- **Manifestations of “complexity” in earth systems**: Turcotte, D.L., Modeling Geocomplexity: “A New Kind of Science”, in *Earth & Mind: How Geologists Think and Learn about the Complex Earth*, edited by C. Manduca and D. Mogk, Geological Society of America, 2006.

- **Water cycle for K-12:** <http://ga.water.usgs.gov/edu/watercycle.html>
- **Definition of “threshold concept”:** Meyer, J., and R. Land, Threshold concepts and troublesome knowledge: Linkages to ways of thinking and practicing with the discipline, in *Occasional Report of the Enhancing Teaching-Learning Environments in Undergraduate Courses Project*, University of Edinburgh, School of Education, Edinburgh, 2003.
- **Interconnections among spheres:** Barstow, D., and E. Geary, *Blueprint for Change: Report from the National Conference on the Revolution in Earth and Space Science Education*, TERC, Cambridge, MA, 2002.
- **Undergraduate systems modeling:** Bice, D.M., STELLA modeling as a tool for understanding the dynamics of earth systems, in *Earth and Mind: How Geologists Think and Learn about the Earth: Geological Society of America Special Paper 413*, edited by C.A. Manduca and D.W. Mogk, pp. 171–185, Geological Society of America, Denver, 2006.
- **Learning progressions for systems thinking:** Rivet, A., Systems Thinking, in Fortus, D., Hug, B., Krajcik, J., Kuhn, L., McNeill, K., Reiser, B., Rivet, A., Rogat, A., Schwartz, C. & Shwatz, Y., *Sequencing and Supporting Complex Scientific Inquiry Practices in Instructional Materials for Middle School Students*, Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, San Francisco, April 2006.

## Field-based learning

Eric Riggs, Tim Shipley and Michael Tabor contributed to the Synthesis group discussions of field-based learning.

- **Professional vision, definition and examples:** Goodwin, C., Professional Vision, *American Anthropologist*, 96, 606–633, 1994. Koschmann, T., C. LaBaron, C. Goodwin, and P. Feltovich, The mystery of the missing referent: objects, procedures and the problem of the instruction follower, *Proceedings of the 2006 20th anniversary conference on Computer supported cooperative work*, 373–382, 2006.
- **Terms “inscription” and “cascade of inscriptions”:** Latour, B., *Science in Action: How to follow scientists and engineers through society*, Open University Press, Milton, Keynes, England, 1987.
- **Subsequent inscriptions gain in universality, etc.:** Latour, B., Circulating reference: Sampling the soil in the Amazon Forest, in *Pandora’s Hope: Essays on the Reality of Science Studies*, pp. 24–79, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 1999.
- **Students’ inscriptions in field-based learning:** Roth, W.-M., Where is the context in contextual word problems?: Mathematical practices and products in Grade 8 students' answers to story problems, *Cognition & Instruction*, 14, 487–527, 1996.

## Spatial Thinking

Ben Jee, Yael Kali, Michael Piburn, Stephen Reynolds, Tim Shipley, and Michael Tabor contributed to Synthesis group discussions of spatial thinking in Geosciences.

- **Definition of spatial thinking** is after Liben, L., L.J. Myers, and K.A. Kastens, Locating oneself on a map in relation to person qualities and map characteristics, in *Spatial 2008*, edited by C. Freska, N.S. Newcombe, P. Gärdenfors, and S. Wöfl, Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg, Germany, 2008.
- **Geoscientists use spatial thinking extensively:** Kastens, K. A. & T. Ishikawa, Spatial Thinking in the Geosciences and Cognitive Sciences, in *Earth and Mind: How Geoscientists Think and Learn about the Complex Earth*, edited by C. Manduca and D. Mogk, pp. 53–76, Geological Society of America Special Paper 413, 2006. Downs, R.M., and L.S. Liben, Getting a bearing on maps: The role of projective spatial

- concepts in map understanding by children, *Children’s Env. Quart.*, 7 (1), 15–25, 1990. Downs, R.M., and L.S. Liben, The development of expertise in geography: A cognitive-developmental approach to geographic education, *Annals of the Assoc. of Amer. Geogr.*, 8 (2), 304–327, 1991. Kali, Y., and N. Orion, Spatial abilities of high-school students in the perception of geologic structures, *Jour. of Research in Science Teaching*, 33, 369–391, 1996.
- **Classic geoscience examples of spatial thinking:** Lehman, I., Seismology in the days of old, *EOS, Transactions of the American Geophysical Union*, 68 (3), 33–35, 1987. Wegener, A.L., *The Origin of Continents and Oceans, Translation of the third German edition by J. Biram*, 246 pp., Dover, New York, 1929/1966.
  - **Phase diagrams for mineral composition:** good examples are at: [http://serc.carleton.edu/research\\_education/equilibria/ternary\\_diagrams.html](http://serc.carleton.edu/research_education/equilibria/ternary_diagrams.html)
  - **Spatial skills differ among individuals:** National Research Council, Individual differences in spatial thinking: The effects of age, development and sex, in *Learning to Think Spatially*. (National Academies Press, Washington, D.C., 2006), pp. 266–280.
  - **Formal education lack of attention to spatial:** National Research Council 2006, *op. cit.*
  - **Instructors unaware of spatial challenge:** Liben, L., Education for Spatial Thinking, in *Handbook of child psychology, sixth edition, volume four: Child psychology in practice*, edited by K.A. Renninger, and I.E. Sigel, pp. 197–247, Wiley, Hoboken, NJ, 2006.
  - **Spatial skills can be improved:** Sorby, S.A., and B.J. Baartmans, The development and assessment of a course for enhancing the 3-D spatial visualization skills of first year engineering students, *Journal of Engineering Education*, 89, 301–308, 2000. Piburn, M., S. J. Reynolds, C. McAuliffe, D.E. Leedy, J.P. Birk, and J.K. Johnson, The role of visualization in learning from computer-based images, *International Journal of Science Education*, 27, 513–527, 2005.
  - **Collaborations between geoscientists and cognitive scientists:** National Research Council, *Learning to Think Spatially*, 313 pp., National Academies Press, Washington, D.C., 2006. Downs, R.M., L.S. Liben, and D.G. Daggs, On education and geographers: The role of cognitive development theory in geographic education, *Annal. Ass’n Amer. Geogr.*, 78, 680–700, 1988. Liben, L., and R.M. Downs, Geography for Young Children: Maps as Tools for Learning Environments, in *Psychological Perspectives on Early Childhood Education*, edited by S.L. Golbeck, pp. 220–252, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, NJ, 2001. Piburn, et al, *op. cit.* Kastens & Ishikawa, *op. cit.*

## Community of Practice

Richard Duschl provided insights on including mastery of scientists’ professional practices as an important learning goal for science education.

- Concept of “community of practice”: Lave, J., Situating learning in communities of practice, in *Perspectives on Socially Shared Cognition*, edited by L. Resnick, J.M. Levine, and S.D. Teasley, pp. 63–84, American Psychological Association, Washington, DC, 1991.

## Figure Credits

Illustration by Linda Pistolesi, Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory.

(b) left: Photo credit: Hagemann, Judy. cheasapeakebaybeginning.jpg. January 2007. Downloaded 20 Jul 2009 from <http://pics.tech4learning.com>. Reuse permitted for educational use.

(c) left: Photo credit: Kim Kastens

(d) after Titus, S., and Horsman, E., in press, Characterizing and improving spatial visualization skills, Journal of Geoscience Education. Used with permission.

---

*AGU is a worldwide scientific community that advances, through unselfish cooperation in research, the understanding of Earth and space for the benefit of humanity.*



© 2009 American Geophysical Union