Trend Task: Spiders

NEMP Access Task

Approach: Team Task

Focus: Planning information gathering and appropriate questions

Resources: A3 recording sheet, 2 instruction cards, 2 A4 answer sheets, highlighter pen

Questions / instructions:

In this activity you are going to start planning a study on spiders.

You are going to do a brainstorm about spiders, which means writing down all of the ideas and information you know about spiders.

Give out A3 sheet and pen.

This piece of paper is for you to write down everything you know about spiders. Remember to write down everyone's ideas. Here is a card to remind you what you have to do.

Read instruction card to team. Stand back and allow sufficient time.

Spiders Brainstorm

- 1. Choose someone to write.
- 2. Write down everyone's ideas.
- 3. Make sure everyone says their ideas.
- 4. Tell the teacher when you have finished.

Now you are

going to work in pairs to decide what other

information you might need for a study on spiders. After that, I want you to write four questions about spiders that would help you to search for the information you need. These are questions that you don't know the answers to. This card will remind you what you have to do.

Read card to team.

You have about five minutes to make up your questions.

Assign students to pairs – students 1 and 2; and students 3 and 4. Give each pair an answer sheet, pencils and instruction card. Allow about five minutes.

Now you are going to work together as a group again. Show and read your four questions to each other. After that, decide on three of the best questions that will help you to find the information for your study. Use the highlighter pen to mark them.

Allow time for the group to identify three questions.

Now read to me the three questions you highlighted.

Brainstorm process:		
Involvement –	year 4	
all members contributed substantially	61 (60)	
3/4 or 2/3 members contributed substantially	36 (33)	
1/4, 2/4 or 1/3 members contributed substantially	3 (7)	
Acceptance –		
all ideas received constructively	77 (67)	
majority of ideas received constructively	20 (26)	
half or less of ideas received constructively	3 (7)	
Rejection – no member had all or most of their ideas rejected	92 (87)	
one member had all or most of their ideas rejected	6 (11)	
two or more members had all or most of their ideas rejected	2 (2)	

	% response 2005 ('01)	
	year 4	
Selection of final three questions:		
Collaboration –		
decisions made by consensus,		
involving constructive dialogue	23 (16)	
decisions made by consensus, quick agreement without much discussion	54 (48)	
decisions made without consensus,	34 (40)	
through initiative of one or two members	20 (25)	
decisions made after disagreement, with		
disagreements clearly not resolved (at least one person unhappy about decision)	3 (11)	
(at least one person unhappy about decision)		
Questions selected:		
First Question –		
gave relevant "new" information,	40 /53	
potentially very rich in detail/depth	43 (57)	
gave relevant "new" information, but likely to be quite succinct	52 (41)	
(eg. single fact)	`	
gave irrelevant information or information	F (0)	
already available in brainstorm	5 (2)	
Second Question –		
gave relevant "new" information, potentially very rich in detail/depth	47 (43)	
gave relevant "new" information,	(11)	
but likely to be quite succinct	51 (54)	
(eg. single fact)		
gave irrelevant information or information already available in brainstorm	2 (3)	
Third Question –	, ,	
gave relevant "new" information,		
potentially very rich in detail/depth	47 (50)	
gave relevant "new" information,	FO (47)	
but likely to be quite succinct (eg. single fact)	50 (47)	
gave irrelevant information or information		
already available in brainstorm	3 (3)	
Total score: 6	15 (24)	
5	29 (19)	
4	28 (38)	
3	25 (16)	
0–2	3 (3)	

Commentary:

A high proprotion of the groups made their decisions in a positive, collaborative way. Almost half developed either two or three strong questions suitable for rich information. Performance was a little weaker in 2005 than in 2001.