

Studien zur theoretischen und empirischen  
Forschung in der Mathematikdidaktik

RESEARCH

Cathleen Heil

# The Impact of Scale on Children's Spatial Thought

A Quantitative Study for Two Settings  
in Geometry Education

MOREMEDIA



Springer Spektrum

---

# **Studien zur theoretischen und empirischen Forschung in der Mathematikdidaktik**

## **Series Editors**

Gilbert Greefrath, Münster, Germany

Stanislaw Schukajlow, Münster, Germany

Hans-Stefan Siller, Würzburg, Germany

In der Reihe werden theoretische und empirische Arbeiten zu aktuellen didaktischen Ansätzen zum Lehren und Lernen von Mathematik – von der vorschulischen Bildung bis zur Hochschule – publiziert. Dabei kann eine Vernetzung innerhalb der Mathematikdidaktik sowie mit den Bezugsdisziplinen einschließlich der Bildungsforschung durch eine integrative Forschungsmethodik zum Ausdruck gebracht werden. Die Reihe leistet so einen Beitrag zur theoretischen, strukturellen und empirischen Fundierung der Mathematikdidaktik im Zusammenhang mit der Qualifizierung von wissenschaftlichem Nachwuchs.

More information about this series at <http://www.springer.com/series/15969>

---

Cathleen Heil

# The Impact of Scale on Children's Spatial Thought

A Quantitative Study for Two  
Settings in Geometry Education



Springer Spektrum

Cathleen Heil  
Lüneburg, Germany

Dissertation, Faculty of Education, Leuphana Universität Lüneburg, 2019

ISSN 2523-8604                      ISSN 2523-8612 (electronic)  
Studien zur theoretischen und empirischen Forschung in der Mathematikdidaktik  
ISBN 978-3-658-32647-0              ISBN 978-3-658-32648-7 (eBook)  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-32648-7>

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer  
Fachmedien Wiesbaden GmbH, part of Springer Nature 2020

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Responsible Editor: Marija Kojic

This Springer Spektrum imprint is published by the registered company Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden GmbH part of Springer Nature.

The registered company address is: Abraham-Lincoln-Str. 46, 65189 Wiesbaden, Germany

*... my methods of navigation have their advantage. I may not have gone where I intended to go, but I think I have ended up where I needed to be.*

*—Douglas Adams*

---

## Danksagung

Mein besonderer Dank gilt meiner Doktormutter Prof. Dr. Silke Ruwisch für ihre kontinuierliche fachliche wie auch persönliche Unterstützung während meiner Promotionszeit. Sie half mir mit sehr viel Geduld und Vertrauen, den richtigen Weg für mein Vorhaben und mich zu finden, ohne das Steuer an sich zu reißen. Das ist nicht selbstverständlich und gab mir die Freiheit, der es für meine Navigation durch den (wissenschaftlichen) Ideenschungel bedurfte.

Darüber hinaus danke ich meinem Zweitprüfer Prof. Dr. Andreas Büchter, der mir nicht nur einen kritischen Zugang zur Thematik ermöglichte, sondern mich stets konstruktiv unterstützte und den ich auch für den persönlichen Austausch auf Tagungen sehr zu schätzen lernte. Meine Dritprüferin Prof. Dr. Eva Neidhardt begleitete diese Studie ebenso fast von Anfang an. Sie brachte nicht nur wertvolle Ideen aus psychologischer Perspektive ein, sondern ermutigte mich stets, nach vorne zu schauen und weiter zu gehen.

Meine Eltern haben mich mit sehr viel Liebe auf meiner gesamten akademischen Laufbahn begleitet. Ich danke Ihnen für ihre uneingeschränkte und vielseitige Unterstützung, die mir stets Kraft gab, meine Ideen zu verfolgen.

Mein Dank geht ebenso an all die Kinder und helfenden Studierenden, die diese Studie nicht nur ermöglichten, sondern die Wochen der Datenerhebung zu einem ganz besonderen Moment für mich machten. Und an all diejenigen Menschen, die Ideen gaben, kritisch nachfragten, Freiräume schufen, Konferenzmomente mit mir teilten, mich mit Kaffee versorgten, mit Flurgesprächen erheiterten und den Feierabend einläuteten; die sich mit mir verliehen, gemeinsam neue Perspektiven einnahmen, Ideen unterstützten und sich weitere mit steter Neugierde anhörten; die aus der Heimat anriefen, Daumen drückten, Gästebetten zur Erholung bereithielten und Stunden am Telefon ausharrten; die Feierabende zu beschwingten Momenten und Heimkommen zu einer Herzensangelegenheit

machten; die Mut zusprachen, mein Gejammer ertrugen, Seiten dieser Arbeit korrigierten und mir beim Schreiben in Englisch halfen.

Das waren viele. Wie dankbar ich bin, mit euch an meiner Seite an genau dieser Stelle in meinem Leben zu stehen!



---

## Abstract

Children's thought about space is influenced by their abilities to perceive, encode, and mentally manipulate spatial relations they experience and explore in everyday life. Geometry education in primary school aims to support children as they organize those experiences at an abstract level and develop cognitive abilities to consciously manipulate spatial information in different spatial settings, that is, their spatial abilities. Many studies have investigated children's abilities to mentally manipulate spatial relations in tabletop settings but not those required when the self is located or moving in real space. Addressing this gap in the literature, this study proposes map-based spatial tasks in real space and examines the relations of individual differences in the corresponding underlying cognitive abilities used to solve spatial tasks at both scales of space, small-scale and large-scale spatial abilities, in greater detail.

Using a correlational study design, this study investigates the relation between performances of 240 fourth graders on a mid-sized German university completing paper-based tasks in a classroom setting and map-based orientation tasks in a real space setting. The former test consisted of a subset of tasks that required the children to mentally manipulate object-based transformations and another asking the children to transform the imagined self. The latter test mimicked the practical use of maps such as indicating the direction toward unseen locations, finding one's position and viewing direction on the map, or navigating toward a pre-defined goal. The test also included tasks without a map that required the children to make inferences on directions to landmarks from survey knowledge acquired during movement in space.

Descriptive results revealed that paper-and-pencil tasks requiring multistep mental transformations of abstract and complex spatial information were appropriate means to measure individual differences in children's performances reflecting small-scale spatial abilities. Moreover, maps were found to be potentially powerful cognitive tools for teachers and researchers to stimulate and measure children's spatial thought in real space. By comparing different models in confirmatory factor analyses, the study showed that at both scales of space, spatial abilities should not be treated as an undifferentiated construct but rather be understood as multidimensional.

The results suggested that a two-factor model distinguishing between object manipulation and perspective transformation abilities might be an option to model small-scale spatial abilities. They also confirmed a three-factor model distinguishing between the abilities to make inferences on directions from survey knowledge and two subclasses of map use, namely the abilities to transform information from the map to the referent space, comprehension abilities, and the ones to use information from the referent space to reason about spatial locations on the map, production abilities.

The results of multivariate statistical analyses at the manifest and latent level indicated that children's spatial abilities at both scales of space are partially but not fully related. These results specify the degree of overlap between subclasses of small-scale and subclasses of large-scale spatial abilities, clarify the role of visuospatial working memory as a mediator when it comes to relations with abilities to use a map in real space, and emphasize the predictive role of particular spatial tasks. The results provide new insights regarding the similarities and differences between both classes of spatial abilities. The findings of this study contribute to the literature in the study of spatial thought in mathematics education and provide empirical evidence for the development of pedagogical interventions both in geometry education and beyond.

---

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>Part I Theoretical Background</b>		
<b>2</b>	<b>Conceptualizing Spatial Cognition</b> .....	<b>19</b>
2.1	Space in Cognition .....	20
2.1.1	Physical and Psychological Space .....	21
2.1.2	Spatial Cognition .....	23
2.1.3	Scale as a Psychological Construct .....	25
2.2	Spatial Representations and Spatial Behavior .....	30
2.2.1	The Concept of Representation .....	31
2.2.2	Palmer's Model of (Spatial) Representations .....	32
2.2.3	Liben's Model of Spatial Representations .....	34
2.2.4	Spatial Behavior .....	36
2.3	Encoding and Maintenance of Spatial Knowledge .....	39
2.3.1	Frames of Reference .....	40
2.3.2	Primary and Secondary Sources of Spatial Knowledge .....	44
2.3.3	The Architecture of Spatial Memory .....	45
2.4	Spatial Abilities .....	50
2.4.1	Definition of Spatial Abilities at Different Scales of Space .....	50
2.4.2	Conceptual Distinctions .....	53
<b>3</b>	<b>Understanding Spatial Abilities at Different Scales of Space</b> .....	<b>57</b>
3.1	Spatial Behavior at Different Scales of Space .....	58
3.1.1	Object Manipulation in Small-Scale Spaces .....	59

3.1.2	Map-Based Navigation in Real Space .....	61
3.2	Cognitive Analysis of Small-Scale Spatial Abilities .....	65
3.2.1	Representation of Small-Scale Spatial Information .....	67
3.2.2	Mental Transformations of Small-Scale Spatial Information .....	69
3.2.3	Maintenance of Small-Scale Spatial Information in Working Memory .....	79
3.3	Cognitive Analysis of Large-Scale Spatial Abilities .....	83
3.3.1	Understanding Maps .....	84
3.3.2	Representation of Large-Scale Spatial Information .....	85
3.3.3	Cognitive Processes of Map-Based Orientation .....	93
3.3.4	Maintenance of Large-Scale Spatial Information in Working Memory .....	104
3.4	Comparison of Spatial Abilities at Different Scales of Space .....	106
<b>4</b>	<b>Reviewing Empirical Findings of Spatial Abilities at Different Scales of Space .....</b>	<b>111</b>
4.1	The Dissociation of Two Subclasses of Small-Scale Spatial Abilities .....	113
4.1.1	The Psychometric Literature .....	114
4.1.2	The Individual Differences Literature .....	121
4.1.3	The Developmental Literature .....	122
4.2	The Dissociation of Two or More Subclasses of Large-Scale Spatial Abilities .....	129
4.2.1	The Psychometric Literature .....	130
4.2.2	The Individual Differences Literature .....	131
4.2.3	The Developmental Literature .....	136
4.3	The Relationship Between Small-Scale and Large-Scale Spatial Abilities .....	141
4.3.1	Studies Without Maps .....	142
4.3.2	Studies Involving Maps .....	144
 <b>Part II Empirical Study</b>		
<b>5</b>	<b>Design of the Empirical Study .....</b>	<b>149</b>
5.1	Research Questions, Latent Constructs, and Research Design .....	149

5.1.1	Research Questions .....	149
5.1.2	Latent Constructs .....	151
5.1.3	Hypotheses .....	153
5.1.4	Research Design .....	156
5.2	Methodological Framework .....	158
5.2.1	Psychometrics .....	158
5.2.2	Structural Equation Modeling .....	164
5.2.3	Treatment of Missing Data .....	170
5.3	Planning of the Empirical Study .....	174
5.3.1	Location and Organizational Framework .....	175
5.3.2	Requirements Regarding the Sample and Testing Material .....	176
<b>6</b>	<b>Testing Material for Small-Scale Spatial Abilities</b> .....	<b>179</b>
6.1	Development of a Set of Paper-and-Pencil Tasks .....	180
6.1.1	Preliminary Considerations .....	180
6.1.2	Tasks Measuring OB .....	181
6.1.3	Tasks Measuring EGO .....	186
6.2	Pilot Study .....	198
6.2.1	Sample, Material, and Procedure .....	198
6.2.2	Preliminary Analysis .....	199
6.2.3	Detailed Analysis of All Measures .....	200
6.2.4	Confirmatory Factor Analyses .....	211
6.2.5	Implications for the Main Study .....	215
<b>7</b>	<b>Testing Material for Large-Scale Spatial Abilities</b> .....	<b>221</b>
7.1	Development of a Set of Map-Based Orientation Tasks .....	222
7.1.1	Preliminary Considerations .....	222
7.1.2	Conceptual Choices .....	223
7.1.3	Methodical Choices .....	224
7.2	Presentation of the Map-Based Orientation Tests .....	226
7.2.1	Tasks Measuring MapEnvSelf .....	227
7.2.2	Tasks Measuring SurveyMap .....	231
<b>8</b>	<b>Additional Testing Material</b> .....	<b>235</b>
8.1	The Corsi Block Test .....	235
8.1.1	Materials .....	236
8.1.2	Procedure .....	238
8.1.3	Scoring .....	239
8.2	PTSOT-C .....	240

8.2.1	Design of the Adopted Instrument .....	240
8.2.2	Framework for Item Construction and Analysis .....	242
8.2.3	Testing Procedure .....	244
<b>9</b>	<b>Data Collection .....</b>	<b>247</b>
9.1	Participants .....	247
9.2	Materials .....	249
9.3	Experimenters .....	249
9.4	Procedure .....	250
9.4.1	Testing Procedure for the Small-Scale Spatial Abilities Test .....	251
9.4.2	Testing Procedure for the Large-Scale Spatial Abilities Test .....	251
9.5	Documentation .....	253
9.6	Data Treatment .....	254
9.6.1	Encoding and Scoring .....	254
9.6.2	Treatment of Missing Data .....	254
 <b>Part III Results and Discussion</b>		
<b>10</b>	<b>Children's Small-Scale Spatial Abilities .....</b>	<b>259</b>
10.1	Analyses of Items and Measures .....	259
10.1.1	Summary of Item Analyses .....	260
10.1.2	Descriptive Statistics .....	262
10.1.3	Reliabilities .....	264
10.2	On the Dissociation of Two Subclasses of Small-Scale Spatial Abilities .....	265
10.2.1	Class Clustering Effects .....	265
10.2.2	Analysis of Pearson Correlations .....	266
10.2.3	Confirmatory Factor Analysis .....	267
10.3	The Role of Visuospatial Working Memory .....	272
10.3.1	Descriptive Analysis of Different Corsi Block Test Measures .....	272
10.3.2	Analysis of Pearson Correlations .....	275
10.3.3	An Extended Model Involving VSWM .....	276
10.4	Item Analysis for the PTSOT-C .....	277
10.5	Discussion of the Empirical Findings .....	279

<b>11</b>	<b>Children's Large-Scale Spatial Abilities</b>	287
11.1	Analyses of the Items and Measures	287
11.1.1	Detailed Analysis of Individual Measures	288
11.1.2	Summary: Psychometric Properties of All Items	305
11.1.3	Summary: Descriptive Statistics of the Measures	306
11.1.4	Reliabilities	308
11.2	On the Dissociation of Three Subclasses of Large-Scale Spatial Abilities	309
11.2.1	Analysis of Results From Multiple Imputation Procedure	309
11.2.2	Class Clustering Effects	311
11.2.3	Analysis of Pearson Correlations	312
11.2.4	Confirmatory Factor Analyses	313
11.3	The Influence of Visuospatial Working Memory	321
11.3.1	Analysis of Pearson Correlations	321
11.3.2	An Extended Model Involving VSWM	322
11.4	Discussion of the Empirical Findings	323
<b>12</b>	<b>Relations Between Children's Small-Scale and Large-Scale Spatial Abilities</b>	333
12.1	Results at the Manifest Level	333
12.1.1	Zero-Order Correlation Analysis	334
12.1.2	Semipartial Correlation Analyses	337
12.1.3	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses	341
12.2	Results at the Latent Level	352
12.2.1	Results From Structural Equation Modeling	353
12.2.2	Latent Regression Models	359
12.2.3	The Role of Visuospatial Working Memory	363
12.3	Discussion of the Empirical Findings	367
<b>13</b>	<b>Discussion, Limitations, and Implications</b>	375
13.1	Discussion of the Empirical Findings	376
13.1.1	Children's Individual Differences in Spatial Abilities at Different Scales of Space	376
13.1.2	The Relation Between Small-Scale and Large-Scale Spatial Abilities	379
13.1.3	The Role of Subclasses of Spatial Abilities	380
13.1.4	The Role of Visuospatial Working Memory	386
13.1.5	An Extended Model of Spatial Abilities at Different Scales of Space	388

---

13.2	Limitations .....	391
13.2.1	Basic Assumptions and Design of the Study .....	391
13.2.2	Experimental Setup .....	393
13.2.3	Methodology .....	394
13.2.4	Neglected Covariates .....	396
13.3	Implications .....	397
13.3.1	Implications for Research in Mathematics Education .....	398
13.3.2	Implications for Research in Psychology .....	404
13.3.3	Implications for Geometry Education in Primary Schools .....	406
<b>14</b>	<b>Conclusion .....</b>	<b>411</b>
	<b>Small-Scale Spatial Abilities Test .....</b>	<b>415</b>
	<b>Extra Tables .....</b>	<b>431</b>
	<b>References .....</b>	<b>439</b>



---

## List of Figures

Figure 1.1	Spatial and geometric abilities in geometry education . . . .	5
Figure 2.1	Relationship between physical space, spatial representation, its model and the corresponding representational theory . . . . .	34
Figure 2.2	Conceptual differentiation of spatial representations . . . . .	35
Figure 2.3	Assumed relationship between observed and intended behavior . . . . .	37
Figure 2.4	A classification of frames of reference . . . . .	41
Figure 2.5	Environmental and egocentric frames of reference with network of intrinsic frames of reference . . . . .	43
Figure 2.6	Multi-Store model of memory . . . . .	46
Figure 2.7	Model of working memory . . . . .	47
Figure 3.1	Free play in the sandbox, an everyday situation of manipulation of objects . . . . .	59
Figure 3.2	Two-dimensional depictions of spatial objects or configurations of those . . . . .	60
Figure 3.3	Three assumed sources of variance: encoding, maintenance in working memory, and making inferences by mental transformations . . . . .	66
Figure 3.4	Shepard-Metzler-mental rotation experiment . . . . .	71
Figure 3.5	Mental scanning experiment . . . . .	72
Figure 3.6	Update of relations between frames of reference during object-based and egocentric perspective transformations . . . . .	77
Figure 3.7	Chronometric profiles for object-based and egocentric perspective transformations . . . . .	79

Figure 3.8	Three theories on the architecture of cognitive maps . . . . .	89
Figure 3.9	The map-environment-self relation . . . . .	94
Figure 3.10	Visualization as a transformation of 2D visual information into 3D visual information . . . . .	98
Figure 3.11	A cognitive process model of updating the map-environment-self relation . . . . .	100
Figure 3.12	An information-processing description of small-scale spatial abilities . . . . .	106
Figure 3.13	An information-processing description of large-scale spatial abilities . . . . .	107
Figure 4.1	Two different cognitive processes in response to the same question . . . . .	113
Figure 4.2	Different pathways when studying the understanding of maps . . . . .	132
Figure 4.3	Possible relationships spatial abilities at different scales of space . . . . .	142
Figure 5.1	The partial dissociation ( <i>H1</i> ) and the mediation model ( <i>H3</i> ) . . . . .	155
Figure 5.2	The research design of this study . . . . .	156
Figure 5.3	Example of a map of latent abilities and item difficulties . . . . .	162
Figure 5.4	Three main steps of the multiple imputation method . . . . .	173
Figure 6.1	The task 2DMR . . . . .	183
Figure 6.2	The task Maps . . . . .	184
Figure 6.3	The task 3DMR . . . . .	185
Figure 6.4	The task PFT . . . . .	186
Figure 6.5	Classification of tasks measuring EGO . . . . .	187
Figure 6.6	The task Shoes . . . . .	190
Figure 6.7	The task LR . . . . .	191
Figure 6.8	The task Anna . . . . .	192
Figure 6.9	The task Ben . . . . .	193
Figure 6.10	The task Meadow . . . . .	194
Figure 6.11	The task Boxes . . . . .	195
Figure 6.12	The task Claudia . . . . .	196
Figure 6.13	The task Dirk . . . . .	197
Figure 6.14	Distribution of sum scores for LR . . . . .	201
Figure 6.15	Distribution and mapping of item difficulties in LR . . . . .	203
Figure 6.16	Sum scores for 3DMR . . . . .	204
Figure 6.17	Item 1 of 3DMR . . . . .	204

Figure 6.18	Item 5 of 3DMR .....	205
Figure 6.19	Person-item map for 3DMR .....	206
Figure 6.20	Sum scores for Claudia .....	206
Figure 6.21	Completely standardized solution of the confirmatory factor analysis in the pilot study .....	214
Figure 6.22	Comparison of estimates of performances in the latent standardized constructs OB and EGO in the pilot study .....	216
Figure 6.23	Snakes for the revised 3DMR .....	217
Figure 6.24	The revised task Claudia involving fixed positions .....	218
Figure 6.25	The task Emil .....	219
Figure 7.1	The university campus .....	222
Figure 7.2	The arrow-and-circle device used during pointing tasks .....	225
Figure 7.3	Campus map with routes of the treasure hunt in the main study .....	227
Figure 8.1	Design of the Corsi Block Test display .....	237
Figure 8.2	Adaption process of the PTSOT into the PTSOT-C .....	241
Figure 8.3	Analytical framework for one item of the PTSOT-C .....	243
Figure 10.1	Completely standardized solution of the confirmatory factor analysis estimator in the main study revealing two distinct subclasses of small-scale spatial abilities .....	269
Figure 10.2	Comparison of performances in OB with those in EGO measures in the main study .....	271
Figure 10.3	Completely standardized solution of the confirmatory factor analysis including two distinct subclasses of small-scale spatial abilities and visuospatial working memory .....	276
Figure 10.4	Sum scores for PTSOT-C .....	278
Figure 11.1	Sum scores for MapRot .....	288
Figure 11.2	Person-item map for MapRot .....	290
Figure 11.3	Sum scores for HP .....	290
Figure 11.4	Person-item map for HP .....	292
Figure 11.5	Sum scores for ActiveMapUse .....	293
Figure 11.6	Person-item map for ActiveMapUse .....	294
Figure 11.7	Sum scores for ActiveHP .....	295
Figure 11.8	Person-item map for ActiveHP .....	296
Figure 11.9	Sum scores for Dots .....	297
Figure 11.10	Person-item map for Dots .....	298

Figure 11.11	Sum scores for Dir .....	299
Figure 11.12	Person-item map for Dir .....	300
Figure 11.13	Sum scores for Disks .....	301
Figure 11.14	Person-item map for Disks .....	302
Figure 11.15	Sum scores for MentalMap .....	303
Figure 11.16	Patterns of missing values in the data set .....	310
Figure 11.17	Completely standardized solution of the confirmatory factor analysis revealing three distinct subclasses of large-scale spatial abilities .....	318
Figure 11.18	Comparison of standardized performances in tasks reflecting SurveyMap, Comp, and Prod in the main study .....	320
Figure 11.19	Completely standardized solution of the confirmatory factor analysis including three distinct subclasses of large-scale spatial abilities and visuospatial working memory .....	323
Figure 12.1	Completely standardized solution of the full SEM analysis relating two subclasses of small-scale spatial abilities to three subclasses of large-scale spatial abilities .....	355
Figure 12.2	Completely standardized solution of the reduced SEM analysis relating the class of small-scale spatial abilities to three subclasses large-scale spatial abilities ...	358
Figure 12.3	Completely standardized solution of the regression analysis with the two subclasses of small-scale spatial abilities predicting the three subclasses of large-scale spatial abilities .....	360
Figure 12.4	Completely standardized solution of the regression analysis with the three subclasses of large-scale spatial abilities predicting the two subclasses of small-scale spatial abilities .....	362
Figure 12.5	Standardized solution the parsimonious model including VSWM .....	363
Figure 12.6	Analysis of VSWM as a mediator in the relationship between Small and SurveyMap .....	365
Figure 12.7	Analysis of VSWM as a mediator in the relationship between Small and Prod .....	365
Figure 12.8	Analysis of VSWM as a mediator in the relationship between Small and Comp .....	366

---

Figure 13.1	Small-scale and large-scale spatial abilities in geometry education .....	389
-------------	--	-----

---

# List of Tables

Table 3.1	A Comparison of Small-Scale and Large-Scale Spatial Abilities .....	109
Table 4.1	THURSTONE'S (1950) Three Factor Model .....	115
Table 4.2	Summary of Studies Showing the Separability of Two Spatial Factors .....	117
Table 4.3	LINN AND PETERSEN'S (1985) Three Factor Model .....	118
Table 5.1	Cutoff-Values for a Very Good Model Fit .....	168
Table 5.2	Approximate Sample Sizes for Varying Indicators and Numbers of Latent Constructs in a SEM .....	177
Table 6.1	Classification of Tasks Reflecting OB .....	182
Table 6.2	Pairs of the Same Cognitive Demand in LR .....	191
Table 6.3	Sample of the Pilot Study .....	198
Table 6.4	Test Booklet for the Pilot Study .....	199
Table 6.5	Number of Missing Values to Solve a Task in 45 Minutes .....	200
Table 6.6	Descriptive Statistics for LR .....	202
Table 6.7	Summary of Items Statistics for LR .....	203
Table 6.8	Descriptive Statistics for 3DMR .....	205
Table 6.9	Summary of Items Statistics for 3DMR .....	205
Table 6.10	Descriptive Statistics for Claudia .....	207
Table 6.11	Choices for Pictures Two and Three if Picture F Is Chosen First .....	208
Table 6.12	New Scoring for Cruise .....	209
Table 6.13	Summary of Item Statistics of the Pilot Study and Observations for Revision .....	210
Table 6.14	Pairwise Pearson Correlations in the Pilot Study .....	212

Table 6.15	Intraclass Coefficients for the Small-Scale Spatial Abilities Measures in the Pilot Study .....	212
Table 6.16	Comparison of Fit Indices for the Single- and Two-Factor Model in the Pilot Study .....	213
Table 6.17	Descriptive Statistics for Claudia and Emil .....	218
Table 7.1	Classification of Map-Based Orientation Tasks .....	223
Table 7.2	The Tasks MapRot and ActiveMapUse .....	229
Table 7.3	The Tasks Dots and Dir .....	230
Table 7.4	The Task Disks .....	231
Table 7.5	The Task Homepointing (HP) .....	232
Table 7.6	The Tasks MentalMap .....	233
Table 8.1	Proposed Scorings for the CBT .....	239
Table 8.2	Item Set Used in the PTSOT-C in the Main Study .....	244
Table 9.1	Description of the Sample for the Main Study .....	248
Table 9.2	Experimenters in the Main Study .....	249
Table 9.3	Documentation of the Map-Based Orientation Test .....	253
Table 10.1	Summary of Items Statistics for the Items Used the Main Study .....	261
Table 10.2	Descriptive Statistics of Measures in the Paper-and-Pencil Test .....	263
Table 10.3	Cronbach's $\alpha$ for the Small-Scale Spatial Abilities Measures in the Main Study .....	264
Table 10.4	Intraclass Coefficients for the Small-Scale Spatial Abilities Measures in the Main Study .....	266
Table 10.5	Pearson Correlations between the Paper-and-Pencil Measures .....	267
Table 10.6	Comparison of the Single-Factor and the Two-Factor Models in the Main Study .....	270
Table 10.7	Descriptive Statistics of All Scores Used for the Corsi Block Test .....	273
Table 10.8	Summary of Statistics for the CBT Items in the Main Study .....	274
Table 10.9	Correlations of Single Measures with the Two Measures of Visuospatial Working Memory Capacity .....	275
Table 10.10	Descriptive Statistics for PTSOT-C .....	278
Table 10.11	Summary Statistics for the PTSOT-C Items in the Main Study .....	279
Table 11.1	Descriptive Statistics for MapRot .....	288
Table 11.2	Summary of Items Statistics for MapRot .....	289

Table 11.3	Descriptive Statistics for HP .....	291
Table 11.4	Summary of Items Statistics for HP .....	291
Table 11.5	Descriptive Statistics for ActiveMapUse .....	293
Table 11.6	Summary of Items Statistics for ActiveMapUse .....	293
Table 11.7	Descriptive Statistics for ActiveHP .....	295
Table 11.8	Summary of Items Statistics for ActiveHP .....	296
Table 11.9	Descriptive Statistics for Dots .....	297
Table 11.10	Summary of Items Statistics for Dots .....	298
Table 11.11	Descriptive Statistics for Dir .....	299
Table 11.12	Summary of Items Statistics for Dir .....	300
Table 11.13	Descriptive Statistics for Disks .....	301
Table 11.14	Summary of Items Statistics for Disks .....	302
Table 11.15	Summary of Items Statistics for MMap, MFlag, MDisk ...	303
Table 11.16	Descriptive Statistics for the Measure MFlag .....	304
Table 11.17	Descriptive Statistics for the Measure MDisk .....	304
Table 11.18	Summary of Items Statistics for the Map-Based Orientation Test .....	305
Table 11.19	Descriptive Statistics of All Measures in the Map-Based Orientation Test .....	306
Table 11.20	Cronbach's $\alpha$ for the Measures in the Map-Based Orientation Test .....	308
Table 11.21	Descriptive Statistics of All Imputed Measures .....	311
Table 11.22	Intraclass Coefficients for the Measures in the Map-Based Orientation Test .....	311
Table 11.23	Pearson Correlations between the Measures in the Map-Based Orientation Test .....	312
Table 11.24	Pearson and Mixed Correlations between the Measures in the Map-Based Orientation Test .....	313
Table 11.25	Fit Indices for the Two-Factor Models of Large-Scale Spatial Abilities .....	315
Table 11.26	Fit Indices for the Three-Factor Models of Large-Scale Spatial Abilities .....	316
Table 11.27	Estimated Latent Correlations for the Three-Factor Model of Large-Scale Spatial Abilities .....	317
Table 11.28	Correlations of the Single Measures of Large-Scale Spatial Abilities with the Two Measures of Visuospatial Working Memory Capacity .....	322
Table 12.1	Pearson Correlations between Measures of Small-Scale and Large-Scale Spatial Abilities .....	335



Table 12.2	First-Order Semipartial Correlations for OB and EGO with Individual Large-Scale Spatial Tasks .....	338
Table 12.3	First-Order Semipartial Correlations for OB and EGO with SurveyMap, Prod, and Comp .....	339
Table 12.4	Second-Order Semipartial Correlations for SurveyMap, Prod and Comp with Individual Small-Scale Spatial Tasks .....	340
Table 12.5	Second-Order Semipartial Correlations for SurveyMap, Prod, and Comp with OB and EGO .....	340
Table 12.6	Explained Variance and the Corresponding Cohen's $f^2$ in Large-Scale Spatial Tasks .....	343
Table 12.7	Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Dots .....	345
Table 12.8	Hierarchical Regression Analyses for MFlag .....	346
Table 12.9	Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for all Large-Scale Spatial Tasks .....	347
Table 12.10	Explained Variance and the Corresponding Cohen's $f^2$ in Small-Scale Spatial Tasks .....	348
Table 12.11	Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Boxes .....	349
Table 12.12	Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Emil .....	350
Table 12.13	Summary of Results of the Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses for All Small-Scale Spatial Tasks ...	351
Table 12.14	Models Tested During Structural Equation Model Analyses .....	353
Table 12.15	Confidence Intervals for the Standardized Latent Correlation Estimates .....	356
Table 12.16	Standardized Latent Correlation Estimates for Full SEM I to III .....	357
Table 12.17	Standardized Latent Correlation Estimates for Reduced SEM I to III .....	358
Table B.1	Revisions After Pilot Study in the Paper-and-Pencil Test .....	432
Table B.2	Small-Scale Spatial Abilities Tests for the Main Study .....	433
Table B.3	Large-Scale Spatial Abilities Tests for the Main Study .....	434
Table B.4	Different Methods to Study Unaided Large Scale Navigation and Learning .....	435
Table B.5	A Summary of Tasks That Measured Map-Based Navigation in Adults and Children .....	436

---

Table B.6	Summary of Literature Concerning the Relation Between Performances in Small-Scale Spatial Tasks and Tasks of Unaided Navigation .....	437
-----------	---	-----



*“Tracks,” said Piglet. “Paw-marks.” He gave a little squeak of excitement. “Oh, Pooh! Do you think it’s a – a – a Woozle?” “It may be,” said Pooh. “Sometimes it is, and sometimes it isn’t. You never can tell with paw-marks.” With these few words he went on tracking, and Piglet, after watching him for a minute or two, ran after him. Winnie-the-Pooh had come to a sudden stop, and was bending over the tracks in a puzzled sort of way. “What’s the matter?” asked Piglet. “It’s a very funny thing,” said Bear, “but there seem to be two animals now. This – whatever-it-was – has been joined by another – whatever-it-is – and the two of them are now proceeding in company. Would you mind coming with me, Piglet, in case they turn out to be Hostile Animals?”*

*(Winnie-the-Pooh by Milne & Rojahn-Deyk 1988, pp. 46–48)*

## Children and Space

Space plays an important role in children’s everyday life and behavior since it is subject to their experiences, observations, and activities. Starting in toddlerhood, children explore and interact with the space that surrounds them, first by crawling, then by touching objects of different sizes and shapes and observing their positions and locations in space. Later on, children begin to understand that these objects exist beyond their direct experience by reasoning about them and their visual-spatial characteristics. In other words, they develop a conception of space.

Seeking to understand the space they interact with, children commonly face two types of cognitive challenges: first, the perception of forms, colors, and structures and second, the handling of spatial relations. The first challenge typically refers to characteristics of objects that are mostly time-invariant. Successfully dealing with the second challenge, however, allows children to gain a deeper understanding of the space they explore, since spatial relations may change over time whenever an object is moved or the child moves. In the latter case, merely perceiving spatial relations is not sufficient, because children also have to cognitively engage with the spatial situation by mentally encoding and transforming it to keep track of or to anticipate changing spatial relations (D. H. CLEMENTS 1999). Hereby, children have to understand that relations between various objects and the self are organized in different spatial frames of reference, which constantly change over time (HERSHKOWITZ, PARZYSZ, & VAN DORMOLEN 1996).

Children's cognitive abilities of knowing where they are and where objects are located with respect to their surrounding environment and of drawing purposeful spatial inferences from those configurations, *spatial abilities*, are indispensable practical life abilities and are developed from toddlerhood to early adulthood (e. g., NEWCOMBE 1982). When children solve *spatial tasks*, spatial abilities enable *spatial thinking* during solving these, which can be described as reasoning about space by mentally manipulating a broad class of task-specific spatial information, that is, reasoning about relations between locations and configurations of objects and the self and how they can vary over time (NEWCOMBE & SHIPLEY 2015). Spatial tasks may differ in terms of the spatial information available, but reasoning about these pieces of information usually involves the construction of mental representations and subsequent inference processes in transformations of those (HEGARTY & WALLER 2005).

Whenever spatial abilities are developed only to a little extent, situations that require the safe handling of varying spatial relations may, as in the case of Winnie-the-Pooh and Piglet, become challenging. Indeed, spatial challenges located in real space such as the one experienced by Pooh and Piglet, seem to be particularly difficult since they require the spatio-temporal integration of information that is only partly perceived from different viewpoints while moving through space. This might not be the case for settings involving very limited spatial information such as written material, where all spatial relations can be observed from a single vantage point. Solving spatial tasks in both settings can be assumed to be enabled by spatial abilities, but it is not clear whether there are indeed different classes of spatial abilities required to master them or not. Gaining a deeper understanding of this relation is the primary goal of the present study.

## Spatial Abilities in Conceptions of Geometry Education

What is geometry? [...] There can be no doubt what I should then answer—geometry is *grasping space*. And since it is about the education of children, it is grasping that space in which the child lives, breathes and moves. The space that the child must learn to know, explore, conquer, in order to live, breathe and move better in it. (FREUDENTHAL 1973, pp.402–403, emphasis added)

Having had a range of spatial challenges in everyday experiences from infancy to toddlerhood, children have acquired an early spatial knowledge that they bring to school. The fact that spatial thinking is pervasive in the children’s everyday life does, however, neither imply that it is mastered without efforts nor that there is no need for spatial education at school. Geometry education in primary school typically focuses on organizing and structuring this implicit experience-based knowledge by fostering cognitive abilities that allow children to perform mental inferences on spatial information in various contexts of their everyday and school life (P. BRYANT 2009). School geometry can therefore be a means to help children using spatial objects and successfully navigate spatial situations encountered in an informal way, to help them to develop the abilities to analyze observed relationships and transformations in a formalized, mathematical manner, and ultimately, to develop a clear conception of space.

Undoubtedly, these ideas of geometry education at primary school are closely linked to the ideas of FREUDENTHAL (1971), who called for a geometry curriculum in which “geometry should be related to physical space [...] nobody can deny that we live in space, that we move in space, that we analyze space, to be better adapted to it” (p. 418). Freudenthal’s vision has been at the core of modern geometry classes in primary school and cited within the conceptual framework of international comparative studies (e. g., OECD 2004).

Spatial abilities have been generally acknowledged as important cognitive abilities contributing to geometry learning (P. BRYANT 2009; D. H. CLEMENTS & BATTISTA 1992; D. H. CLEMENTS 1999; HATTERMANN, KADUNZ, & REZAT 2015; HERSHKOWITZ ET AL. 1996; K. JONES & TZEKAKI 2016; PINKERNELL 2003; SOURY-LAVERGNE & MASCHIETTO 2015). As a matter of fact, they have been systematically incorporated into conceptions of geometry education and development of geometry curricula since the early 80s (SINCLAIR & BRUCE 2015). TAHTA (1980), for example, emphasized the role of spatial abilities by proposing that visual images are fundamental in mathematics education and that geometry in particular is all about becoming aware of imagery that “arises from a dynamic process of the mind” (p.6). In the German mathematics education literature, the role of spa-

tial abilities was emphasized by BESUDEN (1999a) who stated that “understanding geometry is primarily about understanding spatial relations and their interdependencies which is impossible without involving spatial abilities” (BESUDEN 1999a, p. 3, translation by the author)<sup>1</sup>. This idea was further supported in the study by WITTMANN (1999) and MAIER (1999b).

The idea that geometry education should engage spatial abilities has been embedded in the curricula of different countries worldwide. For example, The National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM 2000) has considered spatial abilities by emphasizing practices related to two core domains: first, using “visualization, spatial reasoning, and geometric modeling to solve problems” in real space while “building and manipulating mental representations of two- and three-dimensional objects and perceiving an object from different perspectives” (p.41) and second specifying locations and describing relationships of spatial configurations, that is, being aware of changing relative positions in space (p.42). Similar ideas, which partly specify the use of maps and construction plans, can be found in mathematics curricula for primary school in Australia (NEW SOUTH WALES BOARD OF STUDIES 2012), England (DEPARTMENT FOR EDUCATION 2014), Canada (MINISTÈRE DE L'ÉDUCATION ET DU DÉVELOPPEMENT DE LA PETITE ENFANCE 2016), or Germany (KMK 2004).

Despite this general consensus regarding the importance of spatial abilities in geometry education, the relationship between these abilities and geometry learning is less well understood (MULLIGAN 2015). Addressing this epistemological question about the cognitive nature of spatial and geometrical abilities and their relation in the context of geometry education, PERRIN- GLORIAN, MATHÉ, AND LECLERCQ (2013) proposed a basic model of spatial and geometrical thinking in the context of geometry education (Figure 1.1). They enlarged the theoretical framework of BERTHELOT AND SALIN (1993) who distinguished between spatial and geometrical knowledge and conceptualized teaching and learning of geometry as a problem-solving and modeling process that takes place in three types of spaces: the physical, geometrical and graphical one (PERRIN- GLORIAN ET AL. 2013). According to their model, spatial and geometrical abilities are closely related but not interchangeable and activities in geometry education involve the three spaces mentioned above.

According to PERRIN- GLORIAN ET AL. (2013), the physical space is the three-dimensional space of concrete action with objects and the space in which real problems and activities are defined. The geometrical space is the space of Euclidean axioms and formal deductions that serve as abstract-cognitive tools to solve a

---

<sup>1</sup>German original: „Geometrieverständnis ist vor allem die Einsicht in Beziehungen und Zusammenhänge, was ohne Raumvorstellung nicht denkbar ist.“