

These concept maps may also be considered knowledge maps, node-link diagrams in which all links represent relationships belonging to a fixed set of relationship types (O'Donnell et. al, 2002). Knowledge maps can be considered a specific type of concept map (Schroeder et. al, 2018). Knowledge maps can be distinguished from their close cousins knowledge graphs by their information visualization primary use case: The primary use case of knowledge graphs lies in data storage (Rhem, 2019). The LTB concept maps visualize relationships existing among a large number of concepts in the geo-information science and earth observation domains (Lemmens et. al, 2018). Each node represents one unique concept. Nodes are connected with directed links, each representing one of several relationship types.

These concept maps' current representation of conceptual relationship semantics may be considered poor. A student using the concept maps to learn may have difficulty discriminating different relationships belonging to individual concept-relationship-concept triples: All relationship types are represented with the same link symbology, and, in many locations in the maps, links cross each others' paths. Additionally, the map does not clearly communicate information about conceptual relationship superstructures, to which multiple node-link-node triples may belong. For example, several node-link-node triples in the EO4GEO BoK concept map are relevant to the broad topics of cartography and geovisualization. However, the map's current design doesn't lucidly communicate the close semantic relationships shared among these node-link-node triples. The design improvement work taking place during the thesis research will focus on remedying these representation shortcomings of the maps' conceptual relationship semantics.

Suitable design optimizations will be identified following reviews of academic literature regarding cognitive processes involved in learning with node-link concept maps and principles of good information visualization; solicitation of opinions of students and teachers who make use of the concept maps regarding the strengths and weaknesses of their current designs; and an examination of similar large, online node-link concept maps whose designs are considered optimal. Design optimization work will likely draw on information visualization and cartographic theories regarding appropriate use of visual variables and visual hierarchy.

The improved designs will then be evaluated during a qualitative user study involving UT-ITC students who use the LTB in their educational and professional pursuits. During the user study, students will likely be asked to complete spatial analysis questions similar to those they are often required to complete during their studies. Effectively answering the questions will require interaction with the redesigned concept maps. The effectiveness of proposed design optimizations for learning will be evaluated with participant observation, think aloud, and questionnaire methods.

Proposed design optimizations evaluated to be conducive to learning may be permanently implemented in the concept maps following the completion of the thesis project. Information gained from the thesis research could be used to guide future design optimizations of similar node-link concept maps used for instruction about a variety of subjects, including cartography and beyond.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank in advance all of our questionnaire and user study participants for their help.

References

- Cañas, A. J. & Novak, J. D. (2014). Concept mapping using cmaptools to enhance meaningful learning. In A. Okada, S. Shum, & T. Sherborne (Eds.), *Knowledge cartography: Software tools and mapping techniques*, Second edition (pp. 23-45). Springer.
- Kriegelstein, F., Schneider, S., Beege, M. C., J., & Rey, G. D. (2022). How the design and complexity of concept maps influence cognitive learning processes. *Educational Psychology Review*, 30(1), 431-455.
- Lemmens, R. L. G.; Ronzhin, S.; Augustijn, P. W. M.; Verkroost, M. J. & Walsh, N. (2018). Space Education with The Living Textbook, A web-based tool using a Concept Browser. 2nd Symposium on Space Educational Activities, SSEA 2018
- Nesbit, J. C. & Adesope, O. O. (2006). Learning with concept and knowledge maps: A meta analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 76(3), 413-448.48.
- O'Donnell, A. M., Danserau, D. F., & Hall, R. H. (2002). Knowledge maps as scaffolds for cognitive processing. *Educational Psychology Review*, 14(1), 71-86.
- Rhem, Tony. (2019) Knowledge Graphs vs Knowledge Maps. *The Knowledge Management (KM) Depot*.
<https://knowledgemanagementdepot.com/2019/05/31/knowledge-graphs-vs-knowledge-maps/>
- Schroeder, N. L., Nesbit, J. C., Aguiano, C. J., & Adesope, O. O. (2018). Studying and constructing concept maps: A meta-analysis, *Educational Psychology Review*, 30(1), 431-455.