

# **The relationship between the interdisciplinary activation of children's scientific concepts and their mastery of basic knowledges:**

## **A pre-study based on reaction times**

WANG Zhong; CUI Zhen; ZHANG Yi

*(Beijing Doers Education Consulting Co.,Ltd; Beijing Dongcheng District Qianmen Primary School ;Beijing Fengtai District Fengtai First Primary School)*

Note: the experimental datas and tests of this paper have been uploaded to the Scientific Data Bank (ScienceDB) for open access. The download address is:

<https://www.scidb.cn/en/detail?dataSetId=133e534429b7470aa7224725f2ef02c2>

**Abstract:** the activation of scientific concepts (such as association) is not only an important way for children to organize scientific knowledges, but also an important way for them to learn complex concepts (such as compound concepts composed of multiple knowledge points). Inspired by the details of a primary electrical lesson, we used the E-Prime software to study the activation of concepts inside and outside the electrical unit by students with different electrical knowledge levels (taking reaction time as the main index). The results showed that: ① the levels of basic knowledge was negatively correlated with the cross domain activation ability of concepts, that is, the worse the basic knowledge, the faster the cross domain activation speed ( $P < 0.05$ ); ② The better the basic knowledges, the closer the activation behavior is to science teachers. Conclusion: ① the poorer the basic knowledges, the stronger the cross domain association ability and the more active the thinking; ② The reason for this phenomenon may be human's thinking is patterned; ③ Therefore, there is a potential logical contradiction in the view that divergent thinking is the psychological basis of creativity.

**Key words:** Scientific concepts; Concept activation; Basic knowledges; Reaction times

One concept activates another (such as associating from one concept to another), which belongs to the organizational mode of knowledge representation, and it reflects the way of human brain to deal with a large amount of knowledge. And the activation of concepts such as association will produce new learning results: "association learning is an effect of individual behavior changes caused by the connection between different stimuli or events in the environment"(LV Xiaojing, Ren Xuezhong, 2018). Therefore, the activation of concepts plays an important role in children's learning. However, what factors affect the activation and invocation of such concepts? What is the main resistance? What is the "farthest transmission power" and "coverage" of this activation capability?

### **1. Origin of this study**

The research of this paper originates from a scientific lesson about electrical. In the first half of 2022, one of the authors of this paper reported the details of a lesson: in a class of "conductors and insulators", the teacher guided the students to explore the conductivity of the objects at hand through experiments, and asked them to divide these objects into "conductors" or "insulators". In the middle of the course, the teacher suddenly asked the students: "is the magnet a conductor?", and guide students to experiment and classify the magnet.

The uniqueness of this lesson detail is not whether the magnet is a conductor (at present, most of the magnet used in primary schools are made of ferromagnetic materials, so the magnet in this lesson is naturally a conductor), but "magnet" is not a concept of electrical unit. Take the textbook of Educational Science Publishing House,China (which was used in this lesson) as an example, the "magnet" belongs to the "MAGNET" unit of Grade 2, while the "conductor and insulator" belongs to the "CIRCUIT" unit of Grade 4 (Yu bo, 2020). Generally speaking, even if teachers see the magnet, it is difficult for them to associate with it in the direction of "conducting electricity", and they will not guide students to try so. (we conducted a survey on this issue among science teachers in Tongzhou District of Beijing by using the APP of "questionnaire star". Among the 57 valid questionnaires, only 16 mentioned that the magnet was involved in the last teach about "conductors and insulators", accounting for 28.1% of the valid questionnaires).

We investigated the background of the teacher, and learned that he was a post transfer teacher (i.e. the major he studied and the discipline he initially taught was not the subject of science), and he's basic knowledges of this discipline was relatively weak. From this, we wonder whether the

teacher's active imagination is related to his weak basic knowledges? In other words, it is the weakness of basic knowledges that make it easier for him to activate cross domain (different units) concepts without so many "rules and regulations" in his mind. Is that led him linked "conductivity" with "magnet"?

## 2. Reviews

The activation of concepts belongs to the representation and organization of knowledges. Previous studies have shown that the activation of concepts is not random, but has its internal laws.

For example, Collins and Quillian found in 1969 that people's reaction time to infer a sentence that spans two semantic levels (such as "canary is a bird") is shorter than three semantic levels (such as "canary is an animal"). For another example, Rips et al found in 1973 that people always respond more quickly to the sentence "robin is a bird" than "turkey is a bird". Rips et al believe that this is because "for most people, robin is a typical bird, but turkey is not" (Kathleen M. Galotti, 2017, p113).

Further studies found that the difference in activation was related to people's organizational law of concepts. For example, Wu Yanan and others proposed that children have two basic preferences for the organization of concepts: taxonomic relationship and thematic relationship. Taxonomic relationship is a taxonomic division of things / objects based on their inherent shared characteristics. For example, "pig" and "sheep" belong to the category of "mammal". And thematic relationship refers to the external relationship between things / objects in the same scene or event. For example, "Jungle" and "bird", "blackboard" and "chalk" all belong to the same scene (Wu Yanan et al., 2019). Wu Yanan and others believe that these two relationships are the two modes that children mainly follow in conceptual organization and activation. However, is there a master-slave relationship or competition between these two relationships? In response, Bi Yanchao and others used the semantic concepts of "doctor" and "teacher" (taxonomic relationship) and the semantic concepts of "doctor" and "stethoscope" (thematic relationship) as stimulation conditions, and used functional nuclear magnetic resonance (fMRI) to study the brain oxygen dependent signals of the participants. It was found that taxonomic representation was the main organizational dimension of neural representation, while thematic representation was embedded in but independent of taxonomic representation (Yangwen Xu, Xiaosha Wang, Xiaoying Wang et al, 2018).

All these studies show that people's organization and activation of concepts not only have

complex structures and laws, but also the structures have strict hierarchy. Then, if we regard the two relationships as two domains, it is obvious that cross domain activation of concepts is not easy. However, this is only our inference from the literature reviews. The specific entry point of this paper is not a hot point in previous studies.

In terms of research methods, it has been proved to be an effective method to use reaction time to measure the level of participants' conceptual activation. For example, Meyer and schvaneveldt used the spreading activation model in 1971 to study the conceptual activation of the participants. They found that if a letter string is a real word (such as "bread"), participants will respond more quickly to words that are semantically related to the word (such as "butter") than an unrelated word (such as "chair") or a nonexistent word (such as "rencl") (Kathleen M. Galotti, 2017, p112). In addition, Zhang Jijia and others have studied the relationship between the cultural differences of different ethnic minorities in China (Yi, Bai and Mosuo) and the activation of kinship vocabulary. That research adopted the reaction time method, "the reaction time of the elder kinship word pair, 'upper male and lower female' word pair is significantly shorter than that of 'upper female and lower male'" (Zhang Jijia, 2020).

To sum up, the cross domain activation of children's scientific concepts should not be arbitrarily, and their basic knowledges may be an important influence factor (may be a stumbling block). On the other hand, using reaction time to test the concept activation has been proved to be a feasible method.

### **3. The basic conjecture of this study**

Children's cross domain activation of scientific concepts may be affected by their basic knowledge levels and may be negatively correlated, that is, the worse the level of basic knowledge, the stronger their cross domain association ability and the faster their reaction speed.

## **4. Experimental designed**

### **4.1 Basic idea**

We use the pupils in one class with medium learning achievements and good intelligence to conduct basic knowledge test first, with the purpose of selecting the students with the highest and lowest scores and listing them in the "high score group" and "low score group" respectively. The

selection criteria was the scores of the two groups should be significantly different in statistic (using independent sample t-test, the standard was  $p < 0.05$ ). Then, as an experimental stimulus, the two groups were asked to complete the same set of questions containing both internal and external concepts of the electrical unit (represents in and across the domain) to obtain the reaction time data of the two groups of participants. Finally, the reaction time data of the two groups were processed to test whether there were significant differences between them (using independent sample t-test, the standard was  $p < 0.05$ ), and the conclusion of this paper was reached finally.

#### 4.2 Experimental process:




Figure 1

#### 4.3 Concept points and interrelations contained in electrical units:




Figure 2

Textbook version: Educational Science Publishing House,China (Yu Bo,2020).

4.4 Basic knowledge test questions: see "10.1 the basic knowledge test" for details.

Note: in order to ensure a certain degree of discrimination, the basic knowledge test questions are slightly more difficult.

#### 4.5 Reaction time questions

Serial number	Questions of the reaction time task	Whether out unit?	The concepts out of the unit
Q1	The battery has north and south poles and must not be reversed	N	——
Q2	Simple circuits generally do not contain electromagnets	Y	electromagnet
Q3	A magnet is a conductor	Y	magnet
Q4	There are both conductors and insulators in the bulb	N	——
Q5	A circuit is a closed loop	N	——
Q6	The short circuit is caused by water	N	——
Q7	A battery is the power source	N	——
Q8	If a computer is broken, probably because the circuit	Y	computer

	inside is not closed		
Q9	Purified water can conducts electricity	N	——
Q10	A simple circuit is like a "circle"	N	——
Q11	The filament can conduct electricity	N	——
Q12	There are closed circuits in an electronic watch	Y	electronic watch
Q13	There is no insulator in the circuit because it can conductive	N	——
Q14	When you send a message, an electric current flows through your cell phone	Y	cell phone
Q15	The circuit generally contains batteries	N	——

Table 1

See “4.3” above for whether the concept of the test questions is cross unit.

## 5. Experiment preparation and Implementation

### 5.1 Participants preparation

We selected 22 students from a fifth-grade class of a primary school in Dongcheng District of Beijing as the participants. At the same time, one of the authors, as an adult participant, was also collected reaction time data for comparison. The reason why fifth-grade is chosen instead of fourth-grade is that the fourth-grade learned the electrical knowledges online, not at school (because of the epidemic of Beijing), so the learning effect is difficult to guarantee.

### 5.2 Instrument preparation:

E-Prime 2.0 was selected as the reaction time data acquisition software and SPSS 24.0 was selected as the data processing software. The stimulation presentation instrument was a REDMI pro14 Ryzen laptop (14 inches, 60.008 Hz).

### 5.3 The procedure of reaction time task

The stimulation of E-Prime software is divided into two procedures: exercises procedure and formal experiment procedure, and these two procedures need to be started respectively during the experiment. The former is to familiarize the participants with the use of the software. The programming ideas of the two are completely the same, and the difference in stimulus materials is the

only difference between the two.

First of all, the software will present the experimental instruction as a picture. After being understood by the participants, press the space bar to enter the stimulation task. At the first of the stimulation task is, the red fixation point "+" will appear in the middle of the screen for 250ms. Then the question number "question X" will be presented for 250ms, and then the stimulation materials will be presented. The stimulation materials for the exercise procedure are common sense questions like "you are a boy" or "you are a fourth-grade student". See section "4.5" for the stimulation materials for the formal experiment. There are 20 exercises and 15 formal experiment questions. All questions are presented in black letters on a white background, Chinese in bold letters (No. 36), all English letters and figures in Times New Roman letters (No. 36). After judging whether it is right or not, the participants need press J or F to answer and enter the next question (correct press J, wrong press F). The software will automatically jump to the next question after waiting for 5000ms for no answer. After the test, the screen displays the closing words: "the experiment is over, thank you for your participation!". After 3000ms, the program pops out and returns to the E-Prime 2.0 editing interface.

The procedure flow is such as the following figure.




Figure 3



#### 5.4 The work to prevent guess

In order to prevent the participants from guess the purpose of the experiment, we have done the following works:

- ① The stimulus materials of the reaction time test included not only the concepts within the unit, but also the concepts out of the unit (even the concepts out of the science textbook of primary schools, such as cell phone).
- ② Only told the participants about the test may involve electrical knowledges, but not the specific details and the purpose of the experiment;
- ③ All the 22 students were not informed of the existence of another test (reaction time task) when they participated in the basic knowledge test;
- ④ Since all the participants in the reaction time task came from the same class and know each other, they was likely to guess the experimental purpose according to the previous learning achievements of each other(They may guess that there are 2 groups of “high score” and “low score” in the experiment). Therefore, during the reaction time task, we disordered the order of high score and low score groups and randomly select them to complete the task, making it difficult for them to guess.
- ⑤ Although the adult participant knew the general purpose of the experiment, he had not seen the questions of the reaction time task.

The interview after the reaction time test showed that all participants (except adults) could not accurately state the purpose of the experiment.

### 6. Results and analysis

#### 6.1 About the basic knowledge test

Among all 22 students, we selected 3 students with the highest scores and 3 students with the lowest scores as the reaction time participants, accounting for 27.27% of all students.

The following tables shows the group statistics and independent sample test of the basic knowledge test (Tables 2 and 3). The effect size measured by Hedge’s  $g$  value, is 8.85, which is extremely significant (Cohen's method is used to calculate the sample effect size in this paper (c). If the sample number is less than 10, Hedges'  $g$  method is used (d), the same below). According to table 3, the comparison between the high score group and the low score group conforms to the homogeneity test, and the statistical difference is extremely significant (significance (two tailed) is 0.000, less than

0.01), meeting the selection criteria.

	Number of samples	Average	SD	SEM
High score group	3	82.6667	10.06645	5.81187
Low score group	3	13.3333	4.61880	2.66667

Table 2

	Levene test				Independent t-test				
	F	Significance	t	df	Significance (two tailed)	Average	SE	95% CI of interpolated	
						interpolation	interplation	Lower limit	Upper limit
EV*	1.362	0.308	10.843	4	0.000	69.33333	6.39444	51.57952	87.08715
Un-EV			10.843	2.806	0.002	69.33333	6.39444	48.16550	90.50116

Table 3

\*“EV” means the equal variance. Abbreviations are used because of insufficient table space, and the sames below

## 6.2 About total reaction times

“10.2 the data of total reaction times” shows the total reaction times and average correct rates of the 7 participants.

Table 4 and table 5 show the group statistics and independent sample test results of the total reaction time of the 6 participants. The effect size of the data is extremely significant ( $c = 0.91$ ). It easy to see that the reaction times of the high score group is significantly greater than that of the low, and the statistical difference of the data is extremely significant ( $P = 0.000$ ). It reflects that the activation of concepts of the low score group is easier and the thinking is more flexible.

	Number of samples	Average	SD	SEM
High score group	45	2829.2667	846.61297	126.20561
Low score group	45	2124.3111	719.63870	107.27740

Table 4

	Levene test				Independent t-test				
	F	Significance	t	df	Significance (two tailed)	Average	SE	95% CI of interpolated	
						interpolation	interplation	Lower limit	Upper limit
EV	1.327	0.252	4.256	88	0.000	704.95556	165.63906	375.78274	1034.12837
Un-EV			4.256	85.774	0.000	704.95556	165.63906	375.66366	1034.24746

Table 5

### 6.3 Reaction times about cross domain concepts

But is the conclusion above an illusion? We special selected and analyzed the reaction times of all five cross domain activation questions separately (see “10.3 the data of reaction times about cross domain concepts” for details)

Table 6 and table 7 show the group statistics and independent sample test results under this dimension. The effect size of the data is extremely significant ( $c = 1.07$ ). When completing the crossing domain activation task, the reaction times of the high score group is still significantly slower than that of the low, and the statistical difference of the data is extremely significant too ( $P = 0.008$ ). This not only confirms the results of the above total reaction time data, but also is the most direct key evidence of this study.

	Number of samples	Average	SD	SEM
High score group	15	2932.7333	893.53379	230.70943
Low score group	15	2153.2000	581.38777	150.11368

Table 6

	Levene test				Independent t-test				
	F	Significance	t	df	Significance (two tailed)	Average	SE	95% CI of interpolated	
						interpolation	interplation	Lower limit	Upper limit
EV	2.102	0.158	2.832	28	0.008	779.53333	275.24709	215.71524	1343.35143
Un-EV			2.832	24.052	0.009	779.53333	275.24709	211.51670	1347.54997

Table 7

#### 6.4 Eliminate the possibility interference that the habit of reading questions

However, there is still a problem left here: generally speaking, students with good achievements have a good habit of reading the questions carefully. Then, will the slower reaction time of the participants in the high group be related to their habit of reading the questions (that is, they spend more time on observe and thinking the questions)? In another word, is the good habit a possibility interference of this study?

We believe that the possibility of this factor is very small for the following reasons:

##### 6.4.1 Average accuracy

It can be seen from the data of total reaction times that the average correct rate of the high score group is lower than that of the low score group (0.49 for the high and 0.67 for the low). That is to say, suppose the extra time is spent on reading and understanding the questions, but it still does not more helpful of accuracy. Considering that all the participants in this group are students with good basic knowledge level, this is even more contradictory.

##### 6.4.2 Variances comparison of reaction times

Suppose more time is spent on reading the questions, then the reaction behaviors of high score group participants should be different from that of the low participants because they obviously need more inspect time. In that case, their reaction time variance should be significantly different from that of the low score group, so as to show the existence of more observation (reading) behaviours.

Previous studies have confirmed the value of this method. For example, Li Qing has studied the difference in the reaction times of mathematical excellent students and students with learning difficulties to problem representation when completing application problems. The following figure is one of the data tables in that paper, and SD is the variance ("single poor students" (单困) are students with learning difficulties only in mathematics, and "double poor students"(双困) are students with learning difficulties judged by both mathematics and Chinese). We used SPSS to calculate the statistical difference of reaction time(反应时) variance between the excellent students and the "double poor students" in this table (because the double poor students are involved in learning difficulties in reading comprehension naturally). As shown in table 8, the reaction time variances of the two showed

great difference ( $P = 0.000$ ) (Li Qing, 2009). The reading behaviors of people with different reading abilities is definitely different (Gao Xiaomei, 2010). Therefore, we can see the influence of reading behavior on the variance of reaction times.

表3-1-3 三类小学生各项反应正确频次及反应时

	学业类型	数字正确频次	数字反应时	关系词		变量词		其它	
				正确频次	反应时	正确频次	反应时	正确频次	反应时
<i>N</i>	学优	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31
	单困	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
	双困	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31
<i>M</i>	学优	7.48	257.94	6.94	271.70	3.13	306.65	.52	358.77
	单困	7.00	278.17	6.33	302.07	1.13	356.10	.83	387.77
	双困	6.84	288.29	5.10	279.58	.48	324.26	.29	432.54
<i>SD</i>	学优	.724	50.25	.964	52.63	1.45	55.30	.81	51.99
	单困	1.02	48.47	1.60	63.52	1.36	62.47	1.46	58.68
	双困	1.44	44.87	2.27	50.85	.68	64.27	.59	37.50
<i>Min</i>	学优	6.00	204.00	5.00	200.00	1.00	230.00	.00	.63
	单困	5.00	204.00	.00	217.00	.00	247.00	.00	295.00
	双困	3.00	222.00	.00	210.00	.00	30.00	.00	301.00
<i>Max</i>	学优	8.00	417.00	8.00	435.00	7.00	408.00	2.00	472.00
	单困	8.00	358.00	8.00	436.00	4.00	475.00	5.00	497.00
	双困	8.00	432.00	8.00	419.00	2.00	426.00	2.00	436.00

Figure 4

Levene test				Independent t-test					
F	Significance	t	df	Significance (two tailed)	Average interpolation	SE interpolation	95% CI of interpolated		
					Lower limit	Upper limit			

EV	1.532	0.283	14.343	4	0.000	158.0033	11.0157	127.4189	188.5878
Un-EV			14.343	3.307	0.000	158.0033	11.0157	124.7181	191.2886

Table 8

Table 9 shows the independent test results of the reaction time variances of the two groups of participants. From the results, we can not only see that there is no significant difference between the two groups of data, but also that they are almost identical ( $P = 0.797$ ). This reflects that there is not much difference in the behaviors of the two groups of participants in answering, and there is no evidence that they spend more time on reading the questions.

	Levene test		Independent t-test			95% CI of interpolated			
	F	Significance	t	df	Significance (two tailed)	Average interpolation	SE interplation	Lower limit	Upper limit
EV	5.461	0.080	-0.275	4	0.797	-57.60112	209.15795	-638.31668	523.11444
Un-EV			-0.275	2.459	0.804	-57.60112	209.15795	-814.22216	699.01992

Table 9

## 6.5 Comparison with adult participant

As previously mentioned, we also collected data from one adult (one author of this paper) to investigate who had the activation pattern closer to that of adults in the two groups. Since the adult participant is a science teacher, and the knowledges of electricity and magnetism is the content that he needs to teach at ordinary times, we default that the basic knowledge score of the participant is full.

### 6.5.1 Total reaction times

Table 10-13 shows the group statistics and independent sample statistics of the total reaction times of high score group-adult and low score group-adult. It can be seen from the tables that, in contrast, the reaction times of the participants in the high score group is significantly closer to that of the adult (there is no significant difference between the high score group and the adult, and the difference between the low is extremely significant). It should be noted that the effect size of this part deviates:  $c_{h-a}$  (c of high score group-adult) = 0.33,  $c_{l-a}$  (c of low score group-adult) = 1.49. The reason for this effect size may be the amount of adult samples was too little (we only collected the data of one adult

person). Therefore, the result effect of high score group-adult should be applied with caution.

	Number of samples	Average	SD	SEM
High score group	45	2718.1556	882.58744	131.56837
Adult	15	2997.4000	749.14254	193.42777

Table 10

Levene test					Independent t-test				
F	Significance	t	df	Significance (two tailed)	Average interpolation	SE interplation	95% CI of interpolated		
							Lower limit	Upper limit	
EV	0.035	0.852	-1.099	58	0.276	-279.24444	254.10430	-787.88947	229.40058
Un-EV			-1.194	28.042	0.243	-279.24444	233.93276	-758.40204	199.91315

Table 11

	Number of samples	Average	SD	SEM
Low score group	45	2013.2000	647.97358	96.59420
Adult	15	2997.4000	749.14254	193.42777

Table 12

Levene test					Independent t-test				
F	Significance	t	df	Significance (two tailed)	Average interpolation	SE interplation	95% CI of interpolated		
							Lower limit	Upper limit	
EV	1.326	0.254	-4.899	58	0.000	-984.20000	200.88415	-1386.3133	-582.08669
Un-EV			-4.552	21.429	0.000	-984.20000	216.20532	-1433.2757	-535.12427

Table 13

### 6.5.2 Reaction times about cross domain concepts

Table 14-17 shows the statistical results of high score group-adult and low score group-adult when completing cross domain activation tasks. Consistent with 6.5.1, the high score group participants are still closer to the adult. At the same time, the effects of the two groups were extremely significant:  $c_{h-a} = 1.10$ ,  $c_{l-a} = 3.11$

In short, for the cross domains concept activation pattern, the better the basic knowledges is mastered, the closer the pattern is to the science teacher.

	Number of samples	Average	SD	SEM
High score group	15	2932.7333	893.53379	230.70943
Adult	5	3780.0000	426.77453	190.85937

Table 14

	Levene test		Independent t-test						
	F	Significance	t	df	Significance (two tailed)	Average interpolation	SE interplation	95% CI of interpolated Lower limit Upper limit	
EV	2.526	0.129	-2.017	18	0.059	-847.26667	419.98559	-1729.6237	35.09031
Un-EV			-2.830	15.049	0.013	-847.26667	299.42302	-1485.2896	-209.24378

Table 15

	Number of samples	Average	SD	SEM
Low score group	15	2153.2000	581.38777	150.11368
Adult	5	3780.0000	426.77453	190.85937

Table 16

	Levene test		Independent t-test						
	F	Significance	t	df	Significance (two tailed)	Average interpolation	SE interplation	95% CI of interpolated Lower limit Upper limit	
EV	1.062	0.316	-5.720	18	0.000	-1626.8000	284.42822	-2224.3615	-1029.2385
Un-EV			-6.700	9.447	0.000	-1626.8000	242.81972	-2172.1625	-1081.4375

Table 17

In summary, according to the data analysis, the cross domains concept activation reaction times of the participants with high scores in basic knowledge is significantly more than that of the participants with low scores, which shows that it is difficult to activate and invoke cross domain concepts, and the reaction time data of the two groups of participants have significant statistical



differences.

## **7. Discussion**

### 7.1 Try to explore the reason

But why did this happen? It may be helpful to explain the phenomenon of this experiment that if people's thinking is patterned

Gobet and Simon (1996) tested the proficiency of Professional Chess League Champion Gary Kasparov when he playing with 4-8 chess masters at the same time. They found that despite the tremendous pressure, Kasparov performed almost as well as when he faced only one player on the tour. The two researchers believe that Kasparov's advantages are more from his ability to recognize (chess) patterns. Lesgold et al. (1988) compared the performance of five expert X-ray researchers and residents when diagnosing X-rays. They found that compared with any resident, an expert can pay more attention to the specific details on the X-ray film, give more assumptions about the causes and consequences, and combine many symptoms for analysis. However, Glaser and chi (1988) found after reviewing some studies similar to the above that experts only excelled in specialized fields. In other words, their knowledges have the characteristics of domain specificity (Kathleen M. Galotti, 2017, p181).

The patterning of thinking has also been confirmed in the field of cognitive neuroscience. Li Kuncheng and others used BOLD-fMRI to scan 9 participants when they in the task of naming pictures with different complexity (one or three words). The results showed that "the increase in the complexity of vocal naming leads to a more concentrated trend of brain activation". Li Kuncheng and others believe that this phenomenon "reflects the highly patterned of human brain in information processing" (Yang Yanhui, Lu Chunming, Li Kuncheng et al, 2008).

If it is said that people's thinking is patterned, it will help to explain the phenomenon of the result of this experiment: because people's thinking is patterned, the better the basic knowledges, the stronger the fixation of this mode, and the harder the cross mode (domain) thinking is naturally. On the contrary, if the basic knowledges is weak and the thinking mode is not established, the fetters of thinking will naturally be much less.

Of course, the above is only inference, and whether it is so still needs more targeted researches.

### 7.2 Divergent thinking and creativity

The experimental results of this paper easily reminiscent of the relationship between divergent thinking and creativity.

As Liu Chunlei and others put it: "it can be said that there is no very objective definition and evaluation standard for creative thinking yet" (Liu Chunlei, Wang Min, Zhang Qinglin, 2009). For a long time, there has been no clear and accepted conclusion in the debate on creativity. On its psychological basis, various schools have its own views, but the most influential ones are Wolfgang Köhler's insight learning and J.P. Guilford's divergent thinking theory. After studying the feeding behavior of the chimpanzee "Sudan", Köhler proposed that insight is a way for people or animals to reconstruct existing knowledges on solve new problems: Although Sudan knows that it can get the hanging bananas by boxes or sticks, Köhler did not teach it can use the combination of the two when the banana is too high. This method is obviously the product of its reconstruction and combination of the previous two methods (Philip G. Zimbardo, 2017, p117). Gilford's theory holds that divergent thinking is "thinking in different directions, reorganizing the information stored in the current information and memory system, and generating a large number of unique new ideas" (Liu Chunlei, Wang Min, Zhang Qinglin, 2009). As far as divergent thinking is concerned, Gilford believes that divergent thinking has the characteristics of fluency, versatility and uniqueness. It is worth noting that the "versatility" in it contains the meaning between cross domain thinking and activation (Liu Wei, 1999).

However, if the psychological basis of creativity is really divergent thinking, combined with the experimental results of this paper, we may find a contradiction: in order to make students more creative, we should focus on cultivating their divergent thinking, but in this way, we should avoid letting students master more basic knowledges. And this is obviously against common sense——almost no creation is not based on a large number of basic knowledges. Therefore, the results of this experiment may point out that there is a potential logical contradiction in the statement that divergent thinking is the psychological basis of creativity.

Of course, this paper only discusses the relationship between cross domain concept activation and the levels of their basic knowledge, not a targeted study of creativity. Therefore, the discussion in this part is only a circumstantial evidence, which is not enough to serve as a direct theoretical support.

## **8. Deficiency and improvement**

Conducting research during the epidemic is the biggest challenge of this study.

Since the middle of March 2022, Beijing has started to isolation of epidemic (COVID-19). At the end of April, to comply with the requirements of the municipal government, the pupils of the whole city began to study at home. This unexpected situation brings two main problems to this study: first, the running in degree of the test questions is insufficient. In order to ensure the reliability and validity, both the basic knowledge test and the reaction time test must undergo several rounds of running in—especially the pre-test. However, students studying at home make it impossible for us to find suitable participants to carry out the pre-test. Finally, all participants underwent only one round of pre-test (the participant of the reaction time pre-test only one adult). Therefore, there is a possibility of systematic bias in the reliability and validity of the test questions in this study. The second is the problem of too few samples. At the end of June, primary schools in the city resumed classes, and the experiment could continue. But then the students faced the final examination stage soon. In order not to disturb the students' examination, we can only use the week before the summer vacation to carry out the experiment (the reaction time test is only allowed in one lesson). We tried our best, but only 22 participants were found. So the number of samples is limited. Therefore, there is a possibility that the number of participants in this study is too small and the conclusions may have biased.

The reason why the experiment should be completed in a hurry is because of the uncertainty brought by the epidemic: once large-scale isolation still occurs in the next half of the year, the research plan may be forced to be shelved for half a year again, and the previous experimental design and preliminary work may face the situation of overturn. Therefore, the title of this paper is "pre-study", it means that this paper is not a complete study. We also do not recommend the conclusion of this paper as conclusive evidence, but only as a reference.

And the conclusion of this study does not exclude another possibility: the reaction time of the high score group is larger, which is because the high score and low score students have completely different reading and semantic processing modes. There have been many previous studies on the differences of reading patterns under different cognitive levels. For example, Gao Xiaomei found in her reading study on children aged 3-6 (it is obvious that the cognitive levels of children aged 3 are different from those of children aged 6) that with the increase of age, the single visual pattern is decreasing, while the combined visual pattern is increasing (Gao Xiaomei, 2010). That is to say, there is a correlation between cognitive level and reading (specifically, this study can be analogized as

reading the questions of reaction time). Then, can the reaction time still reflect the activation of concepts? Obviously, to answer this question, we need the help of eye movement research. In the future, we will try to explore this phenomenon from this perspective.

## **9. Conclusion**

To sum up, the experiment shows that children's interdisciplinary activation ability of scientific concepts is negatively related to their mastery of basic knowledges. That is, the worse the basic knowledge levels, the stronger the cross domains association ability and the more flexible the thinking. We believe that the fundamental reason for this phenomenon may be that the human brain has a tendency to information processing patterning. Based on this result, this study believes that there may be a potential logical contradiction in regarding divergent thinking as the psychological basis of creativity.

As for the science teacher who triggered this study, we think the supposition cannot be excluded that his weak basic knowledge level led him associated “conductors” with "magnet”.

## **10. Appendix**

### 10.1 The basic knowledge test

Your class


Your name

1. Choice questions

1.1 Which of the following are not part of the POWER SOURCE: ( )

A Socket B Bulb C Dry cell D 5# battery

1.2 The “?” should be connected to: ( )



1.3 Connect the positive and negative electrodes of the battery directly without passing through any bulb or other electrical appliances: ( )

A It is a “simple circuit”

B It is a common connection method of batteries

C Attention should be paid to whether there is poor contact

D Probably will fire and explosion

1.4 Which of the following are not necessary components of a simple circuit: ( )

A Battery B Controller C Wireway D Bulb

1.5 Which is the correct: ( )

A To prevent electric shock, the FIRST thing need to do before changing the bulb is to wear rubber gloves.

B If the positive and negative electrodes of the battery are reversed, the direction of the current in the circuit will also move in the opposite direction

C A simple circuit should include at least three components: battery, light bulb and switch

D Insulators are not NECESSARILY COMPLETELY non-conductive

2. The bulbs in the following circuits cannot be lit. Try to find and mark the problems (assuming all electric components are good)



2.1



2.2



2.3



2.4



2.5

3. Try to draw the flow direction of electricity in the circuit in Fig. 2 with an arrow as shown in Fig. 1 (the arrow in Fig. 1 represents the flow direction of electricity)




Fig.1



Fig.2



Number of participants	High/low score group	Question number	Reaction times(ms)	Accuracy
1	High	Q1	2223	0.40
		Q2	1571	
		Q3	1367	
		Q4	2550	
		Q5	1602	
		Q6	2176	
		Q7	1654	
		Q8	3541	
		Q9	1992	
		Q10	2325	
		Q11	1751	
		Q12	1628	
		Q13	2513	
		Q14	2433	
		Q15	1594	
2	High	Q1	2953	0.53
		Q2	2665	
		Q3	2069	
		Q4	3603	
		Q5	2723	
		Q6	3074	
		Q7	3352	
		Q8	4489	
		Q9	3139	
		Q10	3475	
		Q11	5000	
		Q12	2849	
		Q13	3698	

		Q14	3422	
		Q15	2453	
3	High	Q1	2554	0.53
		Q2	4298	
		Q3	2654	
		Q4	2700	
		Q5	2830	
		Q6	3541	
		Q7	2669	
		Q8	3793	
		Q9	4115	
		Q10	3089	
		Q11	2803	
		Q12	3222	
		Q13	3983	
		Q14	3011	
		Q15	2171	
		Average accuracy of high score group		0.49
4	Low	Q1	2912	0.60
		Q2	2988	
		Q3	1551	
		Q4	2892	
		Q5	1088	
		Q6	1502	
		Q7	1520	
		Q8	2267	
		Q9	2204	
		Q10	1858	
		Q11	2904	

		Q12	2189	
		Q13	5000	
		Q14	1655	
		Q15	2606	
5	Low	Q1	1394	0.53
		Q2	1770	
		Q3	1198	
		Q4	2643	
		Q5	1950	
		Q6	1513	
		Q7	1513	
		Q8	3133	
		Q9	1842	
		Q10	1437	
		Q11	1187	
		Q12	2100	
		Q13	1742	
		Q14	1527	
		Q15	2633	
6	Low	Q1	2634	0.87
		Q2	2861	
		Q3	2053	
		Q4	1803	
		Q5	2307	
		Q6	2029	
		Q7	1384	
		Q8	2689	
		Q9	3089	
		Q10	2368	

		Q11	1584	
		Q12	2473	
		Q13	2033	
		Q14	1844	
		Q15	1725	
		Average accuracy of low score group		0.67
7	Adult	Q1	2624	0.67
		Q2	3770	
		Q3	3942	
		Q4	3000	
		Q5	2240	
		Q6	3522	
		Q7	2073	
		Q8	4389	
		Q9	2354	
		Q10	2387	
		Q11	2419	
		Q12	3255	
		Q13	3410	
		Q14	3544	
		Q15	2032	

---

### 10.3 The data of reaction times about cross domain concepts

---

Number of participants	High/low score group	Question number	Reaction times(ms)
1	High	Q2	1571
		Q3	1367
		Q8	3541
		Q12	1628

---

			Q14	2433
2	High		Q2	2665
			Q3	2069
			Q8	4489
			Q12	2849
			Q14	3422
3	High		Q2	4298
			Q3	2654
			Q8	3793
			Q12	3222
			Q14	3011
4	Low		Q2	2988
			Q3	1551
			Q8	2267
			Q12	2189
			Q14	1655
5	Low		Q2	1770
			Q3	1198
			Q8	3133
			Q12	2100
			Q14	1527
6	Low		Q2	2861
			Q3	2053
			Q8	2689
			Q12	2473
			Q14	1844
7	Adult		Q2	3770
			Q3	3942
			Q8	4389

---

**Special thanks:** Science Teachers in Tongzhou District, Beijing, who completed the teachers' Questionnaire (see "1. The origin of this study" for details).

## Reference

- Yu Bo. (2020). *Compulsory education textbooks "SCIENCE" (Volume VIII)*. Educational Science Publishing House, China (Chapter 2).
- Kathleen M. Galotti. (2017). *Cognitive Psychology: In and Out of the Laboratory*. China Machine Press (Chapter 7).
- Philip G. Zimbardo. (2017). *Zimbardo's General Psychology*. China Machine Press (Chapter 6).
- Lv Xiaojing, Ren Xuezh. (2018, Nov). Development of associative learning and model representation of its process. *Abstracts of the 21st national psychological Academic Conference*. Beijing, BJ.
- Li Qing. (2009). Research on problem representation of applied problems of children with mathematical learning difficulties in primary schools based on pass theory. *East China Normal University*, 86-87
- Gao Xiaomei. (2009). A study of eye movement in Chinese children's picture book reading. *East China Normal University*, 3-256.
- Zhang Jijia, Fu Ya, Wang Bin. (2020). Gender culture influence on spatial and weight metaphors of kinship words: Evidence from Bai, Yi, and Mosou nationalities. *Acta Psychologica Sinica*, 52, 440-455
- Wu Yanan, Shi Lei, Qu Yunpeng et al. (2019). Two preferences of children's conceptual organization: taxonomic relationship and thematic relationship. *Psychological Research*, 12(4), 300-309. <https://doi.org/10.3969/j.issn.2095-1159.2019.04.002>.
- Liu Chunlei, Wang Min, Zhang Qinglin. (2009). Brain mechanism of creative thinking. *Advances in Psychological Science*, 17(1), 106-111.
- Zhang Jijia, Li Degao, Duan Xinhuan. (2010). On the conceptual connection and development of children. *Ludong University Journal (Philosophy and Social Sciences Edition)*, 27(5), 93-99. <https://doi.org/10.3969/j.issn.1673-8039.2010.05.020>
- Yang Yanhui, Lu Chunming, Li Kuncheng et al. (2008). Neural mechanism of utterance speech expression with different complexity: a BOLD-fMRI study. *Journal of Medical Imaging*, 2008(06), 664. <http://doi.org/10.3969/j.issn.1006-9011.2008.06.025>.
- Liu Wei. (1999). Guilford's theory and method on creative ability research. *Journal of Beijing Normal University (Social Sciences)*, 1999(5), 41-48.
- Ye Pingzhi, Ma Qianru. (2012). Characteristics and rules of creative thinking development of children aged 2-6. *Studies in Early Childhood Education*, 2012(08), 36-41. <http://doi.org/10.3969/j.issn.1007-8169.2012.08.006>
- Yangwen Xu, Xiaosha Wang, Xiaoying Wang et al. (2018). Doctor, Teacher, and Stethoscope: Neural Representation of Different Types of Semantic Relations. *Journal of Neuroscience*. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2562-17.2018>
- Sohu.com. (2020). *Lin Chongde: in the era of core literacy, where is the breakthrough in cultivating creativity?*. Retrieved from [https://www.sohu.com/a/437792873\\_100020578/](https://www.sohu.com/a/437792873_100020578/). Accessed August 24, 2022.