

5/25/1992 Continuation with emergence of task, example of the classification.

MR: So do you understand what you have to do?  
Jamie: Find out all these, we have to make up 8 different ecozones

MR: So you are trying to find 8?  
Jamie: 8 different ecozones  
MR: 8 different ones?

MR: So you are looking for 8  
Jamie: 8  
MR: 8? Or 8 different ones  
Jamie: 8 different ones, those kinds of fields  
MR: so how, did you have that the same or different than the other one?  
Jamie: this one is different, not quite as sandy, and a lot more of grass. This is not quite a forest, because this [behind arena] is a lot thicker than this [strip of coniferous]

Ted: yeah  
Jamie: So I circled that right here on this [map], a borderline of trees, it doesn't cover like the forest, it just covers the borderline  
Ted: yea, but we still have to write that in because that is a big one

In this dialogue, it doesn't become quite clear as to whether Jamie will be looking for 8 areas and then "make" them different as did most students. But it seems reasonable to assume that they used even small differences to distinguish areas which I would have classified as the same. Particular examples are those where Powell's, Main, and Creek Field are distinguished, though all of them share many of the same features. Also, Jamie's comment, "this one is different, not quite as sandy, and a lot more of grass" indicates that small differences make new classification categories. There are many unclassified zones between the fields, and between the classified zones in these maps.

For many students the classification schemes were linked to the "natural boundaries" on the pre-drawn maps. Thus, East, Main, Powell's, Walker Fields etcetera became zones, although all of them shared that they are used for one sport or another, all had grass, but may be different amounts of damage to it. Also, the students did not go back and forth to ascertain the distinction of their classifications.

Negative cases for the number of classifications are Erica/Dilraj, Andrea/Patrick, and (unknown). The former have 13 different classifications, but mainly use the fields as boundaries, merely putting labels on the various "natural", draw-in areas. The latter came up with a unique classification scheme by developing a total of 20 descriptors, 13 for the ground (1-13), 7 (A-G) for the kind and size of plants. In each of the "natural" the listed the reference numbers and letters for ground and plants such that a field was described by a label (4, 1, F, 10, 13).

(Unnamed) and Rod/Pat are negative cases for the "natural" boundaries. Each of their classification borders on another one, so that their classifications cover the whole school grounds, except for the school buildings.

On the topic of the emergence of tasks see also the notes from April 7, 1992, note about MB's reaction, and April 9, 1992

4/09/92 Followed Ted and Jamie. Their sampling seemed to be affected by the features of the map. Jamie couldn't see the lakeshore on the map, and for that reason, he didn't suggest it as an ecozone. The students picked major features and decided a priori that these would be different ecozones rather than sampling an area and then deciding if it was enough