Aric Gaunt
CEP 900/930
<div align="center">RDP Reviewer Response Letter</div>

Reviewer 1

R1.3) <u>Clarify if motivation is to be assessed as the focus of the study seems to be exclusively on simplicity of knowledge</u>→ Motivation is not mentioned as a component of the study's framework or literature review. Though interesting, this study is not interested in examining the relationships among motivation and the concepts of interest. Simplicity of knowledge is indeed one of the key concepts involved in this study's interests. Additionally, concepts of knowledge acquisition on the internet and learning behaviors are outlined on page 4, paragraph 2 and page 5, paragraph 1.

R1.4-1) <u>Justify collecting data in a lab setting as this setting seems to prohibit the ability to represent the amount of hard-copy literature that is written about the subject</u>→ This comment brought up an important issue, and after considering it and other feedback, I have modified conditions of the study. Hard copy literature will no longer be a component of the study. Instead, all conditions will use a computer and internet as resources. I have extended the research design section within the method section to include explanation of the research setting (page 6, paragraph 1; page 8, paragraph 4).

R1.4-2<u>) Clarify what is to be accessible to both conditions</u>→ I have extended the research design section within the method section to include an explanation of what materials will be available at each stage of the study for each condition. Additionally, I have provided rationale for this access (page 8. paragraph 5).

R1.5) <u>Justify the target number of participants</u>→ I extended the method section to include explanation of the sample size- "Sample size was chosen as a small number of participants would afford an in depth analysis to recognize patterns and common strategies for searching for information across learners" (page 7, paragraph 1).

R 1.6-1<u>) Explain how think alouds will be enforced among all participants</u>→ I have specified that participants will be instructed to verbalize thoughts before beginning the study (page 8, paragraph 1).

R 1.6-2) <u>Question anticipated behavioral differences among conditions due to nature of essay question (computer related)</u> → After consideration of measures, we have decided to remove the essay portion of the study. Explanation of the choice of measures is discussed on page 5, paragraphs 2 & 5.

R 1.7-1) <u>If available, include codes for evaluating think alouds</u>→ At this time, we do not have the code book completed, as we anticipate post hoc classifications to emerge from data analysis of think alouds and retrospective reasoning.

R 1.7-2) <u>Clarify how differences in interests and prior knowledge on subject will be accounted for</u>→ We appreciated this concern, and decided that conducting a pilot study to gather a better

idea of the population's interest and prior knowledge would be the best way to control for these variables.

R 1.9) <u>Question if study should more heavily discuss implications in terms of educators as it is currently heavily learner focused</u>→ We acknowledge the importance for research to consider implications towards both learners and educators. Though this study was primarily focused on the learner's experience, implications of results towards educators is briefly discussed on page 11, paragraph 2.

Reviewer 2

R 2.1-1) <u>Question the order of interest statement and conceptual framework</u>→ After revisiting the order of presentation of the interest statement and conceptual framework, I decided against rearranging these sections. The interest statement is presented in the first paragraph as well as the last sentence of the introduction-this placement is intentional, as I feel it important to establish the research purpose before presenting the reader with the framework of this interest.

R 2.1-2) <u>Make research problem more explicit</u>→ The introduction has been expanded to further discuss what problems previous work suggest future research investigate (page 2, paragraph 2).

R 2.2) <u>Elaborate why understanding epistemological beliefs is important to teaching and learning</u>→ Please see the response to "R 1.9"

R 2.3-1) <u>Make research interest statement explicit</u>→ The proposal's interest is stated as the first sentence of the paper. Additionally, the purpose statement is stated as the research purpose on page 2, paragraph 1.

R 2.3-2<u>) Question about including logic model</u>→ I acknowledge and appreciate the suggestion to include a visual representation of this proposal's key components. I believe that the first paragraph of the proposal outlines and conveys the study's key components (internet, epistemic beliefs regarding simplicity of knowledge, and online learning behaviors) and their relationships to each other effectively. Concerning space, it was thought that omitting a visual model may not be appropriate for this proposal but may be useful for a more detailed write up.

R 2.4) <u>Question nature of experiment topic as biased subject</u>→ In order to eliminate data collection from individuals who may have an affinity of knowledge of the search task topic, the method section under participants (page 7, paragraph 2) states that biology and chemistry majors (related majors to the topic) will be excluded.

R 2.5) <u>Question influence of course credit as incentive</u>→ Through the limitations of using course credit and ultimately, a convenience sample (subject pool), this study aims to gather somewhat preliminary findings of the proposal's research interests using this mixed methodological approach and sees this proposal as a step towards constructing a more comprehensive understanding and framework for future studies that wish to employ and improve upon the methodologies used to investigate this topic. Additionally, resource constraints influence the sampling procedure (see Limitations for more detail).

R 2.6) Clarify more explicitly the experimental protocol→ I agree that the proposal was in need of increased clarity regarding the experimental protocol. The protocol has been outlined under *materials and measures* and a brief but explicit explanation of the steps are presented in chronological order on page 8, paragraph 1.

R 2.9) Elaborate on the affordances of knowing more about simplicity of knowledge→ I appreciate this comment and adjusted the final paragraph of the proposal (under *Summary and Significance of Study)* to better convey how I speculate better understanding this dimension of epistemic beliefs may influence interventions that prompt learner development to be better suited to approach problems in ill-structured domains.