SENSE OF PLACE

Places are localities given meaning by human experiences in them. Sense of place refers to a set of meanings of and attachments to places that are held by individuals or by groups. The cultures and educational philosophies of American Indian and Alaska Native peoples reflect rich senses of the places that make up their traditional homelands. However, sense of place does not manifest itself in proportionate enrollments in undergraduate geoscience by American Indians and Alaska Natives. This is because mainstream geoscience teaching emphasizes global syntheses over exploration and in-depth understanding of places that have prior meaning for Indigenous students, and may even depict such places in culturally-inappropriate ways. Many teachers and researchers with experience in Native educational systems recommend a greater emphasis on the study of local places, synthesis of local cultural knowledge, and community-directed activities in science education. Such a "place-based" approach is used by a small number of school systems, nearly all outside of Native communities. Place-based geoscience teaching could potentially enhance science literacy among American Indian, Alaska Native, and other underrepresented minority students, and bring more of them into the geoscience profession. However, this hypothesis has not yet been rigorously tested. Empirical and descriptive studies of place attachment and meaning among different student populations, and clearer definition of place-based teaching, are prerequisite to more authentic place-based geoscience courses and programs. Five characteristics of place-based geoscience teaching are identified here and illustrated with suggestions for implementation in diverse educational settings.

ABSTRACT

Places are localities given meaning by human experiences in them. Sense of place refers to a set of meanings of and attachments to places that are held by individuals or by groups. The cultures and educational philosophies of American Indian and Alaska Native peoples reflect rich senses of the places that make up their traditional homelands. However, sense of place does not manifest itself in proportionate enrollments in undergraduate geoscience by American Indians and Alaska Natives. This is because mainstream geoscience teaching emphasizes global syntheses over exploration and in-depth understanding of places that have prior meaning for Indigenous students, and may even depict such places in culturally-inappropriate ways. Many teachers and researchers with experience in Native educational systems recommend a greater emphasis on the study of local places, synthesis of local cultural knowledge, and community-directed activities in science education. Such a "place-based" approach is used by a small number of school systems, nearly all outside of Native communities. Place-based geoscience teaching could potentially enhance science literacy among American Indian, Alaska Native, and other underrepresented minority students, and bring more of them into the geoscience profession. However, this hypothesis has not yet been rigorously tested. Empirical and descriptive studies of place attachment and meaning among different student populations, and clearer definition of place-based teaching, are prerequisite to more authentic place-based geoscience courses and programs. Five characteristics of place-based geoscience teaching are identified here and illustrated with suggestions for implementation in diverse educational settings.

SENSE OF PLACE

Places, which are spatial localities given meaning by human experiences in them, are integral to the knowledge systems and cultural identities of traditional American Indian and Alaska Native (AI/AN) peoples (Cajete, 1994, 2000; Kelley and Francis, 1994; Basso, 1996; Kawena Jey and Barnhardt, 1999; Deloria and Wildcat, 2001). Traditional indigenous ways of knowing and teaching imbue youth with a rich sense of place, a concept expressed in diverse and often amorphous ways (Shamai, 1991; Brandenburg and Carroll, 1995; Hass and Nachtigal, 1998; Williams and Stewart, 1998; Kruger and Jakes, 2003; Stedman, 2003). In this paper, sense of place will denote the meanings of and the attachments to a place held by a person or a group.

Place is distinguished from space by being socially constructed and local, rather than quantitatively described and universal (Tuan, 1977). In other words, people make places out of space (Brandenburg and Carroll, 1995), and a given locality or landscape can hold widely divergent meanings for different individuals or cultures (Gruenewald, 2003). The physical environment appears to play a major role in creating and shaping sense of place (Ryden, 1993; Stedman, 2003), and in some cases a physiographic province or ecosystem may coincide with a place (Williams and Patterson, 1996). If sense of place influences the ways that people observe and interpret natural phenomena, it must influence geoscience learning, and it merits study by geoscience educators.

Social scientists and humanists have long been interested in the diverse ways that people understand and form bonds to places. Geographers consider place to be a fundamental theme of their discipline (Tuan, 1977). Anthropologists and ethnographers investigate how places are embedded in cultures (Lamb, 1993; Feld and Basso, 1996; Lippard, 1997); architects and urban planners are concerned with constructed and inhabited places (Lyndon, 2001); environmental psychologists are interested in attachment to places as an aspect of human behavior (Altman and Low, 1992; Hay, 1998); and historians have shown how places have influenced human events (Schama, 1995) and knowledge, including the evolution and spread of scientific inquiry (Livingstone, 2003).

Land managers and planners have recently been encouraged to factor sense of place into their decision-making processes, adopting a more ecologically holistic, rather than economically-driven, approach to resource use and environmental-impact assessment (Kaltenborn, 1998; Williams and Stewart, 1998; Kruger and Jakes, 2003; Williams and Vaske, 2003). Such an approach requires a clear definition or even a quantification of sense of place, and this has led to the development of psychometric models and methods (Shamai, 1991; Kaltenborn, 1998; Williams and Vaske, 2003) that will be discussed in more detail below.

Field geoscientists develop rich senses of the places where they do their research; Rossbacher (2002) evocatively described this phenomenon as a definitive and appealing attribute of a geological career. Other geoscientists have argued that the intimate, intuitive, or spiritual knowledge of places acknowledged by many in the profession appeals to a fundamental human need for direct contact with the Earth, and should be brought to bear on current problems of scientific illiteracy and anthropogenic environmental degradation (Leveson, 1971; Savoy, 1992; Moores, 1997). Wherever else this need or desire to acknowledge "kinship with the Earth" exists outside of the geosciences or other field-based natural sciences, it remains strong in AI/AN cultures.

INDIGENOUS EXPRESSIONS OF SENSE OF PLACE

The science educator Gregory Cajete (Tewa) has written that Native people traditionally perceive themselves as embedded in a web of dynamic and mutually-respectful relationships among all of the natural features and phenomena of their homelands (Cajete, 2000, p. 178-180).
Hence geologic, physiographic, hydrologic, and climatic attributes of the places American Indians and Alaska Natives inhabit become inseparable components of their culture, regularly met in daily life (Rock Point Community School, 1982; Kawagley, 1995), and invoked in stories (Zolbrod, 1984; Morton and Gawboy, 2000), arts (Harjo and Strom, 1989; Ortiz, 1992; Willink and Zolbrod, 1996), and philosophy of nature (Aronilth, 1994; Semken and Morgan, 1997).

Cajete (1994, p. 47) describes the understanding of one’s physical surroundings as the first developmental step of Indigenous knowledge. AI/AN children seem to have such awareness early. Monhardt (2003) investigated how Diné children perceive science by asking a group of Diné students at an elementary school in southern Utah to draw pictures of scientists at work. Mainstream children who are given the same task overwhelmingly hew to the stereotype of the scientist in a white coat working in a laboratory (Barman, 1999).

However, a majority of the Diné students depicted scientists as working outdoors, and in many cases, among landforms characteristic of their Colorado Plateau homeland. Monhardt (2003) interpreted this as indicative of a strong attachment to place.

It could be concluded that sense of place would lead many AI/AN students to pursue studies and careers in the Earth and environmental sciences, but this has not been the case. Monhardt (2003) noted that whereas the young Diné students in her study strongly associated science with local geological landscapes, they did not see themselves as potential scientists working in these environments. Indigenous undergraduate and graduate enrollments in the geosciences and other natural sciences have been miniscule, even when compared to the small percentage of American Indians and Alaska Natives in the overall population of the United States (Geisler et al., 2000; Riggs and Semken, 2001; Ogunwole, 2003). This trend continues even as other underrepresented minorities have begun to earn advanced degrees in science in increasing numbers (Mervis, 2003). Hence AI/AN geoscience professionals remain scarce, while a host of environmental and resource-management issues calling for geoscientific input persist in their communities (Riggs and Semken, 2001). At the same time, the geosciences are undoubtedly poorer for the lack of intellectual contributions from the people who have been observing the natural phenomena of the Americas the longest (Suzuki and Knudtson, 1992; Semken, 1997; Deloria and Wildcat, 2001).

### CULTURAL DISCONTINUITY WITH GEOSCIENCE

It is likely that many diverse factors limit the participation of American Indians and Alaska Natives in the geoscience community, including a lack of role models and mentors (American Indian Science and Engineering Society, 1995; Zappo, 1998; Mullens, 2001) and the absence of Earth science classes beyond the middle-school level, which is a problem common to schools throughout the United States (Barstow et al., 2002). However, the educators and researchers most directly engaged with the difficulties AI/AN students have in learning science nearly always cite some form of cultural discontinuity as a root cause. This theory holds that the practices and practitioners of mainstream or “Western” scientific research and education constitute an identifiable culture that is foreign to, and typically incompatible with, traditional indigenous norms and ways of knowing (Rhodes, 1994; Aikenhead, 1996; Nelson-Barber and Estrin, 1995; Kawagley et al., 1998; Deloria and Wildcat, 2001; Mullens, 2001). When Western scientific explanations and teaching methods are brought to bear on subjects that AI/AN students already understand from a traditional frame of reference (subjects that may include the physiography and natural history of their homelands), cognitive and even moral conflicts may limit or preclude any effective engagement with Western science. Aikenhead (1996, 1997) and Aikenhead and Jegede (1999) describe this phenomenon as a “cultural border” between lifeways and the science classroom that few Indigenous students negotiate successfully.

In the case of the natural sciences, differing values and meaning attached to places contribute to cultural discontinuity. Indigenous educators have cited as examples the Western scientific ideal of analytical detachment from the objects of study and the perception of scientists as conquerors and despoilers of nature (Kawagley, 1995; Kawagley and Barnhardt, 1999; Murray, 1997; Riggs, 1998). In some Native nations, geoscience may be associated with tragic historical experiences, such as military and Federal surveys into lands supposedly inviolable by treaty, often as a prelude to seizure and relocation (Brown, 1970; Savoy, 1992; Semken et al., 1996). It may also be linked in many minds to episodes of resource exploration, mining, and waste disposal in Indian country that occurred without concern for the spiritual value of places (Kelley and Francis, 1994, p. 149-152), and which left behind environmental and public-health degradation that outlasted any economic benefits (Churchill and LaDuke, 1992; Eichstaedt, 1994; LaDuke, 1999).

Other points of cultural discontinuity relating to places are symbolic. Geoscience textbooks and other mainstream teaching materials frequently invoke mechanical metaphors to describe Earth systems and processes (e.g., the internal and external “heat engines”; Keller, 1962; Press et al., 2004), whereas traditional indigenous knowledge describes geological processes as manifestations of living systems (Aikenhead, 1997; Haskell Indian Nations University, 2000; Morton and Gawboy, 2000) more akin to the Gaia model of Lovelock (1979). When places that hold prior meaning for AI/AN students are featured as "textbook examples," they are typically shown in column-sized images or sidebars, described only in terse captions, and identified by non-Native place names. These places may be depicted in unfamiliar, or even culturally-offensive, contexts involving mining, waste disposal, or public recreation.

However, the most significant cultural discontinuity between Western geoscience education and traditional AI/AN teaching may be the difference in their philosophies. The desired outcome of a typical introductory physical or historical geoscience course is for students to understand the general principles and laws that globally govern the origin and evolution of Earth materials, structure, processes, and history. Commercial textbooks and related media reinforce this approach by presenting geoscience concepts in expository fashion and illustrating them by means of the most current, dynamic, or photogenic phenomena culled from around the Earth and other planets. The subject matter in mainstream physical geology is typically organized by materials and processes, often beginning with some of the most abstract or advanced scientific
PLACE-DISPLICED TEACHING AND LEARNING ARE SITUATED

Situated learning theory (Lave, 1988; Brown et al., 1989; Lave and Wenger, 1991) holds that all learning is a function of the sociocultural or environmental context in which it occurs, and thus knowledge and skills are most effectively taught in settings and through activities that authentically involve or engage such knowledge and skills. Place-based teaching is an example of a situated teaching method; others include case-based and problem-based teaching (see Lang, 1998, and Smith et al., 1995, for examples of these methods applied in geology). It is important to note that place-based and other situated teaching methods differ from other approaches in context, not in cognitive level. There is no reason why the knowledge and skills learning objectives for a place-based introductory course should be of lower order than those for a more catholic introductory course.

HOW EFFECTIVE IS PLACE-BASED TEACHING?

Advocates of place-based teaching for AI/AN students generally speak from deep knowledge of Indigenous cultures, experience in teaching Native students, and expressed intentions to help AI/AN people gain access to the community and benefits of Western science. Existing curricula and programs offer models for an undergraduate geoscience course in which local or regional geology determines topical content, AI/AN philosophies of education inform pedagogy, and indigenous or local place knowledge (e.g., aboriginal names, oral histories, community lifeways, local issues) adds meaning and relevance for students. Service-learning activities in support of community scientific literacy or environmental quality (Mogk and King, 1995; Liu et al., 2004, Sobel, 2004) may also be included. Sense of place, acknowledged and enriched in this manner, would provide scaffolding for construction of new geological knowledge.

This hypothesis has yet to be rigorously tested, particularly at the introductory undergraduate level, although the results of three recent studies are relevant. Lieberman and Hoody (1998) conducted a meta-analysis of the results of place-based educational programs (their label is "environment as the integrating context for learning" or EIC) at forty schools nationwide, well-distributed by grade and geography. Their study
combined qualitative and quantitative methods, including surveys of school characteristics, teacher knowledge and behaviors, student learning and attitudes, and student performance on state-mandated standardized tests; as well as regular school visits and interviews. Lieberman and Hoody concluded that a place-based EIC approach enabled K-12 students to learn scientific subjects more effectively than did a traditional decontextualized program, and yielded dividends such as enhanced student enthusiasm, greater appreciation for cultural diversity, and deeper understanding of community issues.

In quantitatively assessing the effectiveness of their field- and research-based introductory geoscience course in Utah, Huntoon et al. (2001) found strongly positive effects on students' knowledge of and attitudes toward geoscience in particular and science in general. However, as Huntoon et al. themselves noted, their sample size was small (only 15 students), and additional assessments in subsequent course offerings will be necessary before these results can be interpreted with confidence.

Riggs (2004) demonstrated that the most successful and persistent of the few geoscience education programs in AI/AN and Canadian First Nations communities made regular use of Indigenous knowledge and field-based learning.

**RESEARCH DIRECTIONS IN PLACE-BASED TEACHING**

Further research into sense of place in diverse student populations and the effectiveness of place-based geoscience teaching on student learning is needed. Place theory studies are now well established in environmental psychology and rural sociology, offering useful models for geoscience educators. Here two research questions are posed and briefly discussed in the context of relevant published work, mostly in social sciences.

**Can sense of place be characterized and measured for different communities of learners, including AI/AN students?**

- Practical application of place theory in environmental management, planning, design, or education calls for quantitative characterization of sense of place, and several investigators have published instruments developed for this purpose.

Shamai (1991) constructed a seven-point ordinal scale intended as a measurement of sense of place, but which effectively measures place attachment, one of the two principal components of sense of place. The Shamai scale was developed empirically from a survey of Jewish high-school students in Toronto, using Likert-like scaled questionnaires, and intended to compare their feelings toward their city, their province (Ontario), and their nation (Canada); and to measure the influence of their school on these attachments. The ordinal scale developed reflects a spectrum of place attachment from obliviousness to complete commitment (Shamai, 1991, p. 349-350): not having any sense of place (0), knowledge of being located in a place (1), belonging to a place (2), attachment to a place (3), identifying with the place goals (4), involvement in a place (5), and sacrifice for a place (6). Shamai (1991, p. 353) found that the levels of attachment of the students to city, province, and nation were all positively correlated, indicating that attachments to places "nest" at different spatial or cultural scales need not dilute, and may in fact reinforce, each other.

Kaltenborn (1998) used a modified version of the Shamai scale, accounting more explicitly for meaning of place, to develop a typology of residents of the Svalbard archipelago according to attachment to their homeland. This study provided further confirmation that at least some components of sense of place can be measured empirically and compared among different individuals or groups.

Williams and Vaske (2003) addressed the important issues of validity and generalizability in measurement of place attachment. To be considered valid, a psychometric instrument should be a specific and accurate test of theory (e.g., a measure of place attachment rather than political opinion; this is called construct validity) and should show positive correlation only among variables hypothesized as related to the theoretical concept measured (e.g., perceived spiritual or economic value of a place would be expected to correlate positively with place attachment, but age or gender would not; this is called convergent validity). A generalizable place-attachment instrument can be used reliably for places and with study groups other than those for which it was initially designed. Williams and Vaske developed a 12-item Likert-scale survey to measure two dimensions of place attachment previously identified in theoretical studies (Williams and Roggenbuck, 1989): place dependence, the capacity of a place to support a person's activities or goals; and place identity, the emotional attachment to a place.

Williams and Vaske developed surveys for seven different public lands recreation sites and administered them to a total of 2819 university students and park visitors. They confirmed construct validity by factor analysis, convergent validity by correlating place attachment with familiarity and frequency of visitation, and generalizability by comparing place dependence and place identity data among the different localities identified in the survey. They also demonstrated that the two dimensions of place dependence and place identity are sufficient to reliably measure place attachment, using four to six items for each dimension. The Williams and Vaske 12-item survey has now been adapted for place-attachment research among different groups of geoscience students at Arizona State University and collaborating institutions (Semken and Piburn, 2004).

Stedman (2003) notes that quantitative place-attachment studies such as these have focused on one evaluative component of sense of place but not the other, the meanings of places. A more robust and more useful theory of sense of place will require descriptive research into the specific meanings that places have for different people and groups, how these meanings are created and evolve, the relationship between sense of place and behavior, and the influence of the physical environment on sense of place (Stedman, 2003, p. 826-827).

In the case of AI/AN cultures, research into place meanings (including but not limited to ethnogeological knowledge) is likely to require not only review of published work by Indigenous scholars and artists and anthropologists, but new ethnographic and cognitive research as well. Even if only published material is used, and certainly where any research involving student surveys, focus groups, or interviews with Elders is to be conducted, investigators should be fully sensitive to specific cultural constraints on use and protection of traditional knowledge (e.g., Smith, 1999; Assembly of Alaska Native Educators, 2000). Research involving students and community members may also require
Can the essential characteristics of place-based teaching be identified for purposes of curriculum development, implementation, and assessment? - As place-based teaching is offered as an alternative to tyrannies of mass marketing, standardization, and consequent decontextualization, it would be counter-productive to attempt to define its characteristics too globally. However, to design or assess a new place-based introductory geoscience course, or to vet existing courses for place consciousness, a common set of general attributes is useful. Toward this end, criteria identified by a number of pioneering workers (Maclvor, 1995; Lieberman and Hoody, 1998; Kawagley and Barnhardt, 1999; Cajete, 2000; Woodhouse and Knapp, 2000; Gruenewald, 2003) are distilled into five characteristics offered here as working guidelines. Although these are based mostly on work relating to AI/AN students, they suggest implementation strategies for place-based geoscience teaching in any context.

FIVE ESSENTIAL CHARACTERISTICS OF PLACE-BASED GEOSCIENCE EDUCATION

1. Its content focuses explicitly on the geological and other natural attributes of a place - The scope and sequence of courses emphasize understanding of local stratigraphy, structure, geomorphology, climate, geologic history, and resources. Students learn to interpret Earth systems in the context of their surroundings rather than "covering" a textbook- or tradition-driven list of topics.

2. It integrates, or at least acknowledges, the diverse meanings that place holds for the instructor, the students, and the community - AI/AN ethnogeologic and other place knowledge is integrated or discussed, as appropriate, and the indigenous language and local place names are used in concert with mainstream geological terminology. Representations of place in the works of Indigenous or local artists (e.g., Harjo and Strom, 1989) can be incorporated; students and community Elders are invited to contribute their own place knowledge.

3. It teaches by authentic experiences in that place, or in an environment that strongly evokes that place - Students work in the field and with local geological and paleontological specimens as much as possible. Regional maps, cross-sections, and images have pride of place in the laboratory or classroom; labels and legends are multilingual; design of handouts, presentation graphics and online materials is influenced by landscape patterns, colors, and Indigenous artistic styles.

4. It promotes and supports ecologically- and culturally-sustainable living in that place - Courses include case-based or problem-based activities relevant to local environmental or economic issues, and presenting diverse perspectives on them. Service learning supports community science literacy or environmental quality. Content and pedagogy are sensitive to the cultural mores of the community. Faculty colleagues in Indigenous studies, Elders, or other cultural experts may be asked to review curriculum materials.

5. It enriches the sense of place of students and instructor - Geoscience teachers seek to gain expertise in indigenous language and knowledge from their students and colleagues, and they become interested in the cultural significance of their research localities. Their teaching encourages students to share geological knowledge of local places with their family, friends, and community; and to become practiced, life-long observers of geological and other natural phenomena in their home environment.

AN EXAMPLE FROM THE NAVAJO NATION

Tsé na’alkaah (literally, "rock study" in the Diné language) or Indigenous Physical Geology, a course based on the Colorado Plateau and Navajo culture taught by the author on the Navajo Nation, incorporates each of these characteristic attributes. The semester-long course is offered in two ninety-minute interactive lecture classes and one three-hour field or laboratory class per week. The content is presented as twelve modules that address different and important aspects of Plateau geology, climate, and environmental quality. Global plate tectonics, mountain-building, and magmatism are illustrated not only by processes now occurring in the active plate boundary to the west, but by the geologic stories from the Yavapai-Mazatzal, Ancestral Rockies, and Laramide orogenies and post-Laramide volcanism that built and shaped the Plateau. In the lab and in the field, students explore Paleozoic to Tertiary paleoenvironments and their regional legacy, such as redrock landscapes, fossils and fossil fuels, and groundwater basins. Sedimentary systems, dryland geomorphic processes, and the Colorado River drainage are prominent in the curriculum, just as they are on the Plateau.

In accordance with the fundamental Diné ethnogeologic principle of duality in nature (Semken and Morgan, 1997), which describes natural processes of change as interactions between a dynamic Earth (Nohosdzáán) and Sky (Yádúhil), the module sequence is represented as a cyclical intellectual path from the surface through the solid Earth, to Earth-Sky interactions, and finally to fluid-Earth and extraterrestrial processes. Figure 1 is a simplified graphic syllabus for the course illustrating its emphasis on the Colorado Plateau, the spatial and structural relationships among the twelve topical modules, and the cyclical representation of the course schedule.

To facilitate the use of Diné ethnogeologic terminology and place names, students and faculty collaborated to compile and publish a bilingual geological thesaurus (Blackhorse et al., 2003). The reader is referred to this paper (downloadable at http://semken.asu.edu) for translations of the Diné terms in Figure 1.

In lieu of exercises in a standard laboratory manual, Tsé na’alkaah students learn rock, fossil, and soil interpretation using specimens collected from the Plateau and Southern Rockies. A new website with place-based textual and graphic course materials is under development at Arizona State University; in the meantime students still use a textbook for background reading. However, they also purchase and regularly work with two inexpensive local maps: a U.S. Geological Survey 1:100,000 topographic quadrangle, and the American Association of Petroleum Geologists Southern Rockies highway geologic map.

Tsé na’alkaah students have addressed issues of environmental and cultural sustainability by researching and giving local presentations on groundwater contamination from Cold War-era uranium mining and...
milling on the Plateau, flyash disposal at nearby coal-fired power plants, and soil erosion and dune reactivation exacerbated by the ongoing multi-year regional drought.

PLACE-BASED GEOSCIENCE TEACHING IN CULTURALLY DIVERSE EDUCATIONAL SETTINGS

Implementation of a place-based geoscience course may be relatively easy in places where students share a common cultural heritage and attachments to the land, such as Tribal colleges located on Native homelands. However, increasing numbers of AI/AN undergraduates are pursuing degrees at larger regional universities (Riggs and Semken, 2001; Auffret, 2003), many of which have improved their efforts at recruiting and retaining minority students. In these academic environments, a handful of Indigenous students in a lecture-format introductory-geology course may be sprinkled among heterogeneous ranks of students, many of whom may come from other places far away.

Can teaching based on sense of place suit natives and newcomers equally well? It is known that tourists and other visitors can develop strong attachments to places far from their homes. Williams and Stewart (1998) remarked that "it is not the possessors of meanings that are local, but the meanings themselves (p. 19)." Teaching that deliberately enriches a local sense of place can potentially stimulate the interest of all students in the physical attributes of those places, and in geoscientific ways of interpreting them. Where the physiography or cultural geography the aboriginal inhabitants knew has been obliterated by urbanization or other changes, geoarchaeology combined with mapping and visualization technologies can be used to recreate them (e.g., Lubick, 2004). EarthScope, a comprehensive geophysical and geological study of North America, promises a wealth of new subsurface structural detail and clues to the assembly of the continent as it progresses from west to east in the "lower forty-eight" and thence to Alaska (EarthScope Education and Outreach Committee, 2003). These data can potentially enrich place-based curricula anywhere in the United States. Where a diversity of cultures now resides, such as the urban areas along both coasts and the Great Lakes, or in the Southwest, place-based teaching can integrate the local knowledge garnered by successive immigrant groups as they became established (Riggs, 2003).

Students, having obtained geological knowledge and skills through study of local places, can also be challenged to research the geology of their own hometowns, or of other places important to them (Pestrong, 2000). This is a capstone activity in the large-enrollment, Arizona-based physical-geology laboratory course at Arizona State University (Reynolds
Geoscience teachers are encouraged to use sense of place no matter where or whom they teach.

**GEOLOGICAL MEANING SITS IN PLACES**

As described in a celebrated study by Basso (1996), the Ndee (Western Apache) people of the mountainous semi-arid Transition Zone of west-central Arizona link important allegorical stories to the places where they are said to have occurred, and regularly recount these stories for teaching and counseling. Descriptive place names (e.g., Coarse-Textured Rocks Lie Above in a Compact Cluster, Line of White Rocks Extends Up and Out) have long since become shorthand for the lessons they exemplify, and are central to Ndee cultural literacy. As explained by the late Dudley Patterson, an Ndee Elder, ‘Wisdom sits in places. It’s like water that never dries up. You need to drink water to stay alive, don’t you? Well, you also need to drink from places. You must remember everything about them. You must remember what happened at them long ago. You must think about it and keep thinking about it!’ (Basso, 1996, p. 127).

Geological meaning also sits in places. Geoscience teachers are challenged to investigate, implement, and assess place-based teaching as a means to enhance the scientific literacy of all students and the diversity of the geoscience community.
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