



**HAL**  
open science

# How Young Children Understand Electric Circuits: Prediction, explanation and exploration

Esme Bridget Glauert

► **To cite this version:**

Esme Bridget Glauert. How Young Children Understand Electric Circuits: Prediction, explanation and exploration. *International Journal of Science Education*, 2009, 31 (08), pp.1025-1047. 10.1080/09500690802101950 . hal-00516232

**HAL Id: hal-00516232**

**<https://hal.science/hal-00516232>**

Submitted on 9 Sep 2010

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



**How Young Children Understand Electric Circuits:  
Prediction, explanation and exploration**

Journal:	<i>International Journal of Science Education</i>
Manuscript ID:	TSED-2007-0041.R3
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	conceptual development, explanation, reasoning
Keywords (user):	Electricity, Early Years



Running head: *How young children understand electric circuits*

**RESEARCH REPORT**

**How young children understand electric circuits:  
prediction, explanation and exploration**

## Abstract

This paper reports findings from a study of young children's views about electric circuits. Twenty-eight children aged 5 and 6 were interviewed. They were shown examples of circuits and asked to predict whether they would work and explain why. They were then invited to try out some of the circuit examples or make circuits of their own choosing.

Children expressed a variety of views about the connections needed in a circuit, offered different kinds of explanation and showed differing levels of competence in circuit making. The range of responses showed similarities to those of older students found in previous research. The relationship between practical competence, prediction and explanation was not straightforward. For example children with similar levels of practical competence made different predictions or offered different kinds of explanation. Analysis of the circuits children chose to construct suggested influences of existing competence and knowledge. In particular some children tested out circuit examples about which they had been unsure during the interview while others explored circuit connections more generally.

Findings underline the importance of drawing on a variety of evidence in assessing young children's understandings of electric circuits. They indicate that young children may offer views about electric circuits not unlike those of older children and adults with similar experience. Finally there was some suggestion that the interview procedure may have acted as an instructive stimulus in helping children to become more conscious of their own views and reflect on their thinking in the light of further evidence.

Deleted:

1  
2  
3 HOW YOUNG CHILDREN UNDERSTAND ELECTRIC CIRCUITS:  
4  
5 PREDICTION, EXPLANATION AND EXPLORATION  
6  
7

8 Introduction  
9

10  
11  
12 Background  
13

14 This paper presents findings from a study of five and six year old children's  
15 views about electric circuits. The study formed part of a wider investigation into  
16 young children's responses to classroom activities in electricity (Glauert, 2005),  
17 which sought to explore both the nature of children's explorations and evidence of  
18 their thinking in relation to simple electric circuits. The present study set out to  
19 investigate young children's views of the connections needed in a circuit (*how* to  
20 make circuits) and to probe their explanations for their views (*why* circuits need to be  
21 connected in particular ways). It sought to explore relationships between children's  
22 views of connections needed in a circuit, their explanations and the kinds of practical  
23 explorations they undertook with simple circuit components.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 The study was prompted by interacting professional and research interests in  
35 early years science and assessment practices in primary schools. In recent years there  
36 has been growing attention to children's learning in the early years of schooling in the  
37 UK. The recognition of the importance of this phase of education is reflected in the  
38 introduction of the Curriculum Guidance for the Foundation Stage (QCA 2000) and  
39 the large scale research undertaken by the Effective Provision of Pre-School  
40 Education (EPPE) Project (for example Sylva et al 1999, Sylva et al 2004). In  
41 addition science has become more fully established as part of the early years  
42 curriculum since the introduction of the National Curriculum in 1989 and the  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

*How young children understand electric circuits 4*

1  
2 inclusion of science in the Curriculum Guidance for the Foundation Stage (QCA  
3 2000) as part of the area of learning entitled Knowledge and Understanding of the  
4 World. While research is providing increasing evidence of young children's  
5 capabilities in science (Brown et al 1997, Siraj-Blatchford and Siraj-Blatchford 2002,  
6 British Educational Research Association 2003). The papers presented on 'emergent  
7 science' at recent conferences held by Bishop Grosseteste University College in 2006  
8 and the Association for Science Education in 2007 indicate growing research interest  
9 in this area. However much is still to be learnt about how thinking in particular  
10 domains develops and how best to support young children's progress. It is therefore  
11 timely to evaluate what young children might be gaining from the common science  
12 activities to which they are now being exposed. In particular given the emphasis on  
13 practical activity and children's enquiries in current guidance and policy on learning  
14 and teaching in science (DfEE 1999, QCA 2000) an examination of the kinds of  
15 interaction there might be between children's practical experience and their thinking  
16 about phenomena is of particular relevance to practitioners in the early years.

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33 The present study was also informed by the increased emphasis on the role of  
34 formative assessment in supporting learning and teaching in schools (Black et al  
35 2003, Clarke 2001, Stobart and Gipps 1997). This poses challenges for practitioners  
36 both in clarifying what they are looking for and in developing approaches to  
37 assessment that will provide insights into learning processes and useful information to  
38 inform teaching. The study of primary science carried out for the Wellcome Trust  
39 (Murphy and Beggs 2005) and the Ofsted report on science in primary schools  
40 (Ofsted 2005) suggest that formative assessment practices are still relatively  
41 underdeveloped in schools. In the early years there are particular considerations in  
42 developing and employing approaches to assessment sensitive to young children's  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2 thinking. Research in developmental psychology has drawn attention to the different  
3 responses children may make in different situations and the possible dangers inherent  
4 in adopting a single one-off approach to eliciting children's ideas. For example  
5 responses may depend on the context or whether they are child or adult initiated. (See  
6 for example Carey 1985 and Donaldson 1986.) There may be a mismatch between  
7 children's views expressed through their talk and actions (Karmiloff-Smith 1992 and  
8 Piaget 1977 and 1978). Or as Brown et al (1997) suggest there may be a difference  
9 between what children choose to say or do and their capabilities. For example,  
10 although research indicates young children are capable of developing knowledge  
11 through their practical enquiries (Metz 1998) or of offering explanations (Karmiloff-  
12 Smith and Inhelder 1974, Metz 1991), this may not be revealed without prompting. It  
13 is therefore important to collect a variety of evidence of their views and capabilities  
14 and to seek to elicit children's reasoning behind their views to aid interpretation of  
15 their comments and actions. The present study set out to develop productive  
16 approaches to investigating young children's thinking in electricity.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

#### Previous work in electricity

35  
36 Electricity was selected as a context for the research as it is a topic commonly  
37 addressed in early years settings. It offers opportunities for practical investigations  
38 and for children to demonstrate knowledge and understanding both through talk and  
39 activity. Students' understandings of electric circuits have been studied extensively  
40 over the last 20 years covering a wide range of age groups from primary to university  
41 level. However limited research has been carried out with the youngest children in  
42 primary school. A variety of methods has been employed from observations of  
43 practical activities to interviews and paper and pencil tests. The specific aspects of  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

*How young children understand electric circuits 6*

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

electricity addressed and methods selected have varied taking into account the age and experience of subjects. Studies have explored for example

- pupils' views about the properties and uses of electricity (Osborne et al. 1991, Solomonidou and Kakana 2000),
- connections in circuits (Asoko 1996, Osborne 1983, Osborne et al. 1991),
- models of flow of charge in an electric circuit (Asoko 1996, Osborne 1983, Shipstone 1984), and
- forms of explanation (Asoko 1996, Shepardson and Moje 1994).

The present study built on these findings and sought to extend knowledge in a number of ways. It set out to examine in detail what young children were gaining from their school experiences of circuit making by investigating not just their views about circuit connections but the kinds of explanations they offered for what is happening in a circuit. The nature of the interactions between children's explorations, predictions and explanations in electricity was of particular interest. The study sought to investigate how far the views of young children corresponded to those of older children and adults found in previous research. Finally it was hoped that the study might offer frameworks and approaches that could be employed in assessing young children's learning in electricity.



## Method

## Approach to data collection

An interview framework was devised to investigate children's views about electric circuits based on that employed in an earlier study (Glauert 2005). The approach to data collection was designed to provide children with a range of different opportunities to show what they knew and could do. The interview was divided into two parts. The first part of the interview was designed to probe children's views of the connections needed in a circuit and their explanations for their views. The second part provided an opportunity to study the nature of children's practical explorations of electric circuits. This made it possible to examine relationships between children's predictions and explanations offered in part 1 and their explorations undertaken in part 2. Interviews were audio recorded and fieldnotes made during both parts of each interview. Care was taken to include details of children's actions that might be helpful in interpreting children's responses. Further information is provided below.

In the first part of the interview children were shown examples of circuits, asked to predict if they would work and explain why. Children's predictions, explanations and actions were recorded on a prepared chart. The order of presentation of circuit examples was noted. This enabled details of children's talk to be checked on the audiotape of the interview if needed. It was anticipated this might prove useful in the subsequent analysis, particularly in the examination of children's explanations. The choice of circuit examples for the interviews was informed by Osborne et al.'s (1991) study of children's views of electric circuits, which included children aged five to seven. Their findings suggested critical differences between children's models of what makes circuits work dependent on their understanding of the number and nature

Deleted: a

*How young children understand electric circuits 8*

of the connections between the source of electricity, such as a battery, and the device.

Based on their work, six progressively more sophisticated models were distinguished as follows:

Model A      Everything works

Model B      a single connection only on the battery/device

Model C      2 connections (incorrect) – 1 connection only on the battery/device

Model D      2 connections (incorrect) – 2 battery connections,  
2 device connections (incorrect)

Model E      2 connections to both battery and device using two wires

Model F      2 connections to both battery and device (two wires not needed)

Model A assumes that a device will work even if there are no connections between the battery and the device. Models B to D recognise the need for the battery to be connected to the device but do not accurately represent the nature of the connections:

Model B assumes only one connection is necessary, Model D assumes two connections are required, both to the battery and the device but does not distinguish between the different poles of the battery or connecting points on the device, Model C assumes two connections are required on the battery and the device. The need for a connection from each pole of the battery to the device is recognised but the two connecting points on the device are not correctly identified. Model E accurately represents how the device and battery should be connected but assumes two wires are required. Model F also accurately represents how battery and device should be connected but acknowledges that the connections required can be achieved with one wire.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Differentiation between these models was accomplished using the rule assessment technique developed by Siegler (1976). Children were presented with a set of circuit examples designed to discriminate between models and asked to predict which would work. This made it possible to determine which characteristics of circuits were salient to them. Table 1 shows the set of circuit examples developed for the present study. Each circuit example was shown to each child on three separate occasions. Children's predictions were then compared with the patterns of performance attributable to each model indicated in table 2.

(Insert tables 1 and 2 about here.)

Responses to Circuit 8 are uncertain for models C and D as these models focus on children's awareness of the connections needed and not the number of wires required. Circuits 4, 5 and 6 designed to explore children's models of the specific connections needed are all constructed with two wires. (It would be possible to hold a 2 connections (incorrect) model and predict that circuit 8 with one wire would work.) It is important to note that although the models increase in sophistication, this does not simply translate into increased overall performance: some circuits, notably a complete circuit made by directly connecting one terminal of the device to one pole of the battery and using a single wire to connect the other pole to the other terminal, may be judged correctly by children with simple conceptions of circuits (Models A and B), and may be misjudged by children with more sophisticated models (Models C to E) .

It was considered that children's explanations for their predictions might provide additional evidence of their views of the connections needed in a circuit and in some cases their models of flow of charge. A precise correspondence was unlikely for two reasons. First, Shepardson and Moje (1994), who studied much older children, in the fourth grade, suggest that there are complex interactions between pupils'

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

knowledge of the connections needed in a circuit, their models of flow of charge and the nature of the explanations offered. Also work in developmental psychology suggests that during development children can show discrepancies between their procedural competence and their conceptual understanding (Rittle-Johnson and Siegler 1998). The discrepancy is not always in the same direction. In the case of arithmetic, some children show understanding of arithmetical principles that is considerably in advance of their skill in calculation whereas others show considerable proficiency in calculation but limited conceptual understanding (Dowker, 2005).

In the second part of the interview children were provided with a range of components (batteries, bulbs, motors and wires) and invited to make circuits of their own choosing. In particular it was suggested that they could try out any of the circuit examples shown in part 1 of the interview. The intention was to compare children's practical competence and reasoning shown in action through their explorations with more explicit views revealed through their predictions and explanations. Children were left to undertake their own explorations. However, on a few occasions, after repeated attempts to get devices to work, children asked for help. In these instances the researcher pointed out connections needed. Apart from this the only involvement of the researcher was to ask children if they wished to try out anything else. Careful fieldnotes were made of the sequence of each child's explorations to accompany the audiotape record. These included details of any circuit cards selected, drawings of circuits constructed, children's comments and any assistance given.

#### Participants

A Year 1 class of 28 children, consisting of 12 girls and 16 boys, aged five and six, participated. The class was in an inner-city school, which takes children from a

1  
2 wide range of ethnic, linguistic, and socio-economic backgrounds. The children had  
3  
4 studied electricity in the previous year. The teacher had provided opportunities to  
5  
6 explore making circuits with bulbs, motors and buzzers. They had received no further  
7  
8 teaching in electricity.  
9

#### 10 11 Procedure

12  
13 Children were interviewed individually. In the first part of the interview they  
14  
15 were shown examples of eight circuits made with a flat battery, with characteristics as  
16  
17 in table 1, and asked to predict if they would work if the battery were replaced with a  
18  
19 new one. The circuits were shown in photographs and also presented using practical  
20  
21 equipment. Children were encouraged to offer reasons for their predictions. In the  
22  
23 case of the circuits they thought would not work they were invited to suggest what  
24  
25 would be needed to make the circuit work. To assess consistency of response,  
26  
27 children were presented with each circuit three times. Three sets of photographs were  
28  
29 prepared of the eight circuits selected. Each set was mounted on card of a different  
30  
31 colour. Each set was taken in turn and the photographs presented in random order. In  
32  
33 the second part of the interview, children were invited to make circuits and  
34  
35 encouraged explicitly to try out any of the previously shown circuits that interested  
36  
37 them. Interviews were audio recorded. Children's responses to each circuit example  
38  
39 were recorded on a chart and field notes made of children's actions and comments  
40  
41 during both parts of the interview.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

*How young children understand electric circuits 12*

## Approach to analysis

*Children's predictions*

The number of correct predictions made by each child for each circuit was recorded and the results for the class ordered according to the number of correct predictions made. The number of circuits for which each child changed his/her predictions across the interview was noted. The pattern of prediction for each circuit was examined to determine whether changes in response represented improvement or decline in performance across the interview. Children's explanations were used to explore possible reasons for any changes in children's views.

To examine models of the connections needed in a circuit that might underlie children's responses, their predictions were then compared with patterns of response associated with the different models of the circuit as shown in table 2. Both the overall number of predictions that matched each model and the more detailed pattern of predictions across the circuit examples were used in identifying the model(s) that most closely corresponded with each child's responses. A chart was constructed showing for each child how many of his/her predictions were consistent with each model. A score of 24 indicated a complete match. A score of 21 or more was taken to indicate a reasonably good match as the number of correct responses increases by at least 3 for each successive model (see table 2). Where a match of less than 21 was recorded a more detailed examination of children's predictions was used to identify possible models corresponding to children's responses.

*Children's explanations*

The analysis of children's explanations offered a further opportunity to consider the nature of their reasoning about electric circuits. It was possible to examine how far children's explanations were consistent with the models of the

1  
2  
3 circuit suggested by their predictions and to gain additional insights into the thinking  
4  
5 underlying their judgements. The categories used to analyse children's explanations  
6  
7 were based on those developed in an earlier study (Glauert 2005) and are shown in  
8  
9 table 3 with examples of explanations given in each category.

10 (Insert table 3 about here.)

### 11 *Children's explorations*

12  
13  
14 Children's explorations in the second part of the interview were studied to gain  
15  
16 further information about their practical competence, response to the interview  
17  
18 procedure and views about electric circuits. Field notes and audio recordings were  
19  
20 analysed to examine the nature of children's explorations. An initial review of  
21  
22 children's responses showed four common areas of activity

- 23 • Trying out circuit examples using the cards prepared for the interview
- 24
- 25 • Exploring circuits to make the bulb light
- 26
- 27 • Making the motor work
- 28
- 29 • Exploring batteries in a circuit e.g. changing battery connections or the number or
- 30
- 31 types of battery.
- 32
- 33

34  
35 General features of children's response were reviewed in relation to the four activities  
36  
37 commonly undertaken.

### 38 *Relationship between children's predictions, explanations and explorations*

39  
40  
41 Finally children's responses to the two parts of the interview were reviewed to  
42  
43 explore relationships between children's predictions, explanations and explorations. A  
44  
45 chart was constructed to summarise children's responses to the different parts of the  
46  
47 interview. From the first part of the interview the chart showed children's models of  
48  
49 the connections needed in a circuit and the nature of their explanations. From the  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 second part of the interview the chart indicated which of the four common activities  
4 children had undertaken and whether they were successful in making the bulb and  
5 motor work. This made it possible to examine patterns in responses across the class,  
6  
7 for example whether children with different models of the connections needed in a  
8  
9 circuit undertook different forms of exploration, or how far children's circuit  
10  
11 knowledge in action was reflected in their predictions and explanations.  
12  
13  
14

## 15 16 17 Results

18  
19  
20 Results for the two parts of the interview are presented in turn. First children's  
21  
22 predictions are reported. Any variation in children's predictions across the interview  
23  
24 and models of the circuit that might underlie their predictions are considered. The  
25  
26 kinds of explanations offered by children for their views are examined. Then the  
27  
28 nature of children's explorations in the second part of the interview is reviewed.  
29  
30 Finally relationships between predictions, explanations and explorations are  
31  
32 identified. In the presentation of results pseudonyms are used to protect anonymity.  
33  
34

### 35 Children's predictions

36  
37 One child predicted all the circuits would work giving a score of 6 out of a  
38  
39 total of 24 possible correct responses. Nine children made between 8 and 10 correct  
40  
41 predictions. They recognised the need for some connection between the battery and  
42  
43 the bulb. However their responses gave no indication of an awareness of the need for  
44  
45 a complete circuit and for two connections on the battery and bulb. The remaining 18  
46  
47 children with scores of over 11 made predictions that suggested a growing recognition  
48  
49 of the need for two connections between the battery and bulb. The two specific  
50  
51 connections required on each device were only substantially recognised by seven of  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2 these children. Predictions for circuit 8 (the complete circuit made with one wire)  
3  
4 were variable and did not necessarily improve with a growing recognition of the  
5  
6 specific connections needed in a circuit.  
7

#### 8 *Variation in predictions*

9

10 There was some variation in the predictions individual children made for each  
11  
12 circuit. Across the interviews as a whole there were 48/224 occasions when children  
13  
14 changed their predictions in relation to a particular circuit. The majority of changes  
15  
16 (33/48) were in the direction of improvement. This trend was reflected in relation to  
17  
18 all circuits except the complete circuits made with one or two wires. A more detailed  
19  
20 examination was undertaken of the responses of the four children Anna, Maruf,  
21  
22 Benedicta and Anil who showed the most variation in response to see if this suggested  
23  
24 what might have contributed to these changes in view. They had all changed their  
25  
26 views in relation to four circuit examples. With the exception of circuit 8 (the  
27  
28 complete circuit made with one wire), three of the children made changes in  
29  
30 predictions from an incorrect to a correct response. Comments suggested an  
31  
32 increasing awareness of the two connections needed on the battery/device for  
33  
34 example:  
35

36 *'No that needs one (connection/wire)' and 'need to move one wire'.* (Anna)

37  
38 *'Need another to stick'.* (Maruf)

39  
40  
41 *'They aren't stuck together in the right place'.* (Benedicta)

42 The changes in the predictions of the fourth child, Anil, were mostly in the opposite  
43  
44 direction, from a correct to an incorrect response. In explaining his first two  
45  
46 predictions for circuit 1 (one wire – incomplete) he said explicitly that another wire  
47  
48 was needed to join the battery and bulb holder. At the final presentation of this circuit  
49  
50 he said it would work. The reason for this was not clear, as he offered no explanation.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

*How young children understand electric circuits 16*

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

In response to the final examples of circuits 4 (two wires – one connection only on the battery) and 7 (two wires – correct connections), he explained his change in predictions by suggesting that a wire had to be connected to the bump on the positive terminal of the battery. This may have been a consequence of the way the circuits were presented. In some examples a crocodile clip was attached to this part of the battery and in his increasing attention to the details of connections he may have concluded this was essential. In relation to circuit 8 (the complete circuit with one wire) three of the children (Anna, Benedicta and Anil) initially said it would work but then decided two wires would be needed. The remaining child (Maruf) initially suggested another wire was needed. When shown the final example he said it would work but did not give any reason for this change in view.

In reviewing children's predictions alongside their explanations across the class as a whole a similar picture was obtained. In general the explanations offered for predictions did not suggest an arbitrary approach to response. They indicated some improvements in response as specific connections required were recognised. However they also revealed less productive changes in thinking for example that two wires are always required or that wires need to be connected to particular points on the battery terminal.

*Models of the connections needed in a circuit*

The predictions made by 23 children showed a reasonable match with one of the proposed models, as indicated in table 4.

(Insert table 4 about here)

Further detailed analysis of the pattern of predictions of the remaining five children indicated that two children's responses showed characteristics of both models B and C, in indicating some recognition of the need for two connections. Two children gave

1  
2 responses corresponding to a mixture of models C and above in articulating the need  
3  
4 for two connections and beginning to identify the correct connections needed. The  
5  
6 final child's predictions corresponded most closely to model E.  
7

8 Overall the pattern of responses across the class suggested a range of views.  
9  
10 One child did not indicate the need for connections between the battery and bulb  
11  
12 (model A). About a third of the children (9) held a one-connection view (model B).  
13  
14 The remaining two thirds (18) showed some recognition of the need for two  
15  
16 connections (model C and above). However only five indicated an awareness of the  
17  
18 two correct connections required on the battery and device (model E) and only one  
19  
20 child recognised that these two connections could be achieved with one wire (model  
21  
22 F).  
23

#### 24 Children's explanations

25  
26 The children gave a range of kinds of explanation for their predictions. Many  
27  
28 commented on *how* to make a circuit, the components and connections needed. A few  
29  
30 indicated that they were beginning to think about *why* circuits were connected in  
31  
32 particular ways in discussing a path for electricity. One child referred to the power of  
33  
34 the battery. Some children gave a limited number of explanations. They were mostly  
35  
36 in the model B group. Appendix 1 provides full details of the categories of  
37  
38 explanations given by each child. It also shows their relationships with children's  
39  
40 practical competence and the models of the circuit that best matched children's  
41  
42 predictions.  
43  
44

45  
46 The explanations of the model B group (one connection) focused  
47  
48 predominantly on the components needed in a circuit. Children with the more  
49  
50 developed models of the circuit offered explanations that reflected an explicit  
51  
52 awareness of the connections needed for example  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Deleted: and

Deleted: to

*How young children understand electric circuits 18*

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

*'No, that's not connected to the battery'*. (Basil, model D) or

*'No that one has got to be there and that one has got to be there'* - pointing to the correct connections on the battery and bulb. (Cairo, model C) or

*'No, the light bulb needs one there'*. (Anna, model C).

Furthermore the explanations given by some the children whose predictions corresponded to more than one model of the circuit reflected the different levels of circuit knowledge shown in their responses to the circuit examples. For example *Joseph's* (model B/C) explanations referred not just to components (common for model B) but also to the connections needed, a form of explanation often associated with model C. A developing awareness of connections was expressed for example in commenting they had *'got to be properly'*. However the lack of reference to the specific connections is in contrast with the more explicit indications of the connections needed offered by children with more developed models of the circuit (as shown in the examples above).

While children's explanations generally provided evidence of their developing thinking about electric circuits in line with their predictions, the relationship between predictions and explanations was not always straightforward. For example while only a few children gave explanations that began to consider the path for electricity round a circuit, these responses were not confined to the groups of children with the most developed views of the connections needed. Two children in the model B group gave responses with words and gestures that suggested reference to the path for electricity.

*'You have to make a circle – electricity goes'* – moving his hand round and round a complete circuit. (Kendell, model B)

1  
2  
3        ‘Electricity goes through here and then through there and then makes the  
4  
5        *light work*’ - pointing round the circuit, from one battery terminal to the other.  
6  
7        (Javid, model B).

8  
9        Finally the analysis of children’s explanations for their predictions in relation  
10  
11       to the complete circuit made with one wire gave some further support for the  
12  
13       suggestion from children’s predictions that in focusing on the correct connections  
14  
15       needed children might develop an idea that two wires would be required to make a  
16  
17       circuit work. Half the children whose predictions corresponded to models C or D gave  
18  
19       some responses that indicated they thought the complete circuit with one wire would  
20  
21       work, mostly focusing explicitly on the connection between the clip attached to the  
22  
23       bulb holder and one of the battery terminals to justify their view. The remaining  
24  
25       children holding models C and D and all the children who gave predictions that  
26  
27       matched model E not only predicted that circuit 8 would not work but commented  
28  
29       explicitly on the need for two wires for example

30  
31        ‘*No, need another wire*’. (Benedicta, model E).

32  
33       They gave no explanations that focused on the complete circuit. Responses suggested  
34  
35       that in grappling successfully with the exact details of connections, as reflected in  
36  
37       their explanations, some children lost sight of the overriding idea of a complete  
38  
39       circuit. The one child whose predictions matched model F referred explicitly in her  
40  
41       explanations to the fact that the complete circuit with one wire was all ‘*joined up*’.

42  
43       Children’s explorations in the final part of the interview

44  
45       After a fairly demanding interview all children were still keen to participate in  
46  
47       follow up activities.  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

*How young children understand electric circuits 20**Trying circuit examples*

Most children (19/28) tried circuit examples. The actions and comments of some suggested a deliberate choice in selecting circuit examples about which they had been unsure or had changed their view during the course of the interview. The vast majority of circuits (95/98) were made accurately to match those shown on the cards, even by children in the models A and B groups. This indicated attention to the detail of connections and a level of practical competence not always reflected in children's predictions or explanations earlier in the interview. Over half of the children (10) who tried circuit examples were able to correct them easily. These often included examples for which they had made incorrect predictions in the structured part of the interview. In some instances children's talk during their circuit making offered further insights into what they were gaining from this experience. For example in correcting circuit 4, Javid (model B) said '*one has to be there ..won't work if not stuck on like that*' and Sarfaraz (model C) commented '*~~It does not work.~~ One has to be there. Now I know what to do*'. Several children commented that the complete circuit with one wire did work for example '*It did work – on and off*' – connecting and disconnecting the wire on the bulb holder (Nesha, model B). '*It works because that (the clip) is touching that one (the battery terminal)*'. '*It does work*' (Mariama, model E). It is possible that the interview procedure helped to focus attention on the detail of particular circuits and in some cases raised specific questions the children wished to pursue. This was also implied by the deliberate choice of circuit cards made by some children.

*Making the bulb light*

All the children tried to make the bulb light during this part of the interview. Most children (22/28) were able to light the bulb quickly and easily. A further two managed to light the bulb after further explorations. Only four were unable to light the

Deleted: i

Deleted: .

Deleted: o

Deleted: .

Deleted: n

1  
2 bulb without help, all four in the group who made predictions consistent with model B  
3  
4 (one connection). The success of the majority of the children in lighting the bulb  
5  
6 indicated that many children were competent in circuit making even if they did not  
7  
8 identify or articulate the correct connections needed in discussing the circuit  
9  
10 examples.

#### *Wider explorations*

11  
12  
13  
14 Six children undertook wider explorations. Five tried making simple circuits  
15  
16 using different numbers or colours of wires or making connections to different parts  
17  
18 of the battery or bulb. All of these children had either taken time to light the bulb or  
19  
20 had needed help to be successful, suggesting these explorations were characteristic of  
21  
22 children who were still exploring circuit connections. In contrast the sixth child,  
23  
24 (Eduardo, model C), who was very confident in circuit making, did not focus on the  
25  
26 connections needed but tried to find a way to get the bulb and the motor to work  
27  
28 simultaneously. Examples are shown in figure 1.  
29

30 (insert figure 1 about here.)  
31

#### *Making the motor work*

32  
33  
34 Most children (24/28) tried to make the motor work. The majority (17/24) were able  
35  
36 to do this quickly and a further five succeeded without help once they had located the  
37  
38 correct connecting points. Only two needed support to make the motor work. In  
39  
40 reviewing children's circuit making with the bulb and motor there was no strong  
41  
42 indication that one device caused more difficulty than another. In a few cases children  
43  
44 just needed time or help to find the connecting points on the motor.  
45

#### *Exploring batteries*

46  
47  
48 Just over half the class (15) experimented with batteries. Two children set out  
49  
50 to try different sizes of battery and two tried turning batteries round in their circuit.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

*How young children understand electric circuits 22*

Twelve explored adding more batteries in a circuit. Of these most (10) commented explicitly on the effects of further batteries in a circuit for example:

Sarfaraz said *'If you have three batteries it (the motor) will go fast'*.

Raisha predicted the motor would *'go faster with two batteries'* and suggested *'the paper (on the spindle) might fly away if I had four'*.

Anna tried the light bulb with increasing numbers of batteries saying *'the light gets very strong'*.

They were able to link cause and effect in commenting on the relationship between the number of batteries and the performance of a device.

Relationship between predictions, explanations and explorations

The explorations undertaken by children in the final part of the interview gave further insights into children's practical competence in making circuits. This made it possible to compare children's practical competence, their views of the connections needed in a circuit and the kinds of explanations they offered. Looking across the groups of children who held different models of the circuit some overall differences could be observed in their practical explorations. The 16 children whose responses to the circuit examples indicated they were becoming consciously aware of the specific connections needed (model C onwards) were all very successful in making both the bulb and motor work. A high proportion of these children (13/16) undertook focused trials of particular circuit examples. Many (10/18) explored adding several batteries to a circuit, often commenting on the effects on devices. The wider explorations undertaken by one of these children (Eduardo) focused not on making a simple circuit, but on ways of connecting several batteries or devices in a circuit.

In contrast, the explorations of the 12 children whose predictions corresponded to models A and B (no connection and one-connection) suggested that

Deleted: circuit making

Deleted: s

Deleted: /D



1  
2  
3 some were still at an early stage of gaining practical competence in circuit making.  
4 Six of them had difficulties in making devices work. Five of these six tried out  
5 different connecting points on the battery and bulb or investigated changing the  
6 number and colours of wires in a circuit. No other children undertook wider  
7 explorations of this kind. In comparison with children holding two-connection models  
8 of the circuit, a smaller proportion of the children whose predictions corresponded to  
9 models A and B tried circuit examples (6/12) or experimented with batteries (5/12)  
10 and they made fewer comments on the results

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19 However a more detailed examination of the results indicated that practical  
20 competence was not always associated in a simple way with models of the circuit or

21 forms of explanation. Most children in the class (22/28) could make circuits  
22 independently showing in action a two-connection (correct) model of the circuit.

23  
24 However only six children could recognise and make explicit all the detailed  
25 connections required through their predictions and explanations. Thus in many cases  
26 (16/28) children's models of the circuit shown in action were in advance of those  
27 suggested by their predictions. For the remaining 12 children their models of the  
28 circuit indicated in their circuit making matched those suggested by their predictions.

29  
30  
31 That is, all six children who had difficulties making devices work held a one-  
32 connection model of the circuit and the six children with a two-connection correct  
33 model could make circuits successfully.

34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43 As discussed earlier in the paper, the relationship between children's  
44 predictions and explanations was also not straightforward. All children offered  
45 explanations referring to components. Explanations related to connections were more  
46 common in children whose predictions were characteristic of two-connection models  
47 of the circuit (models C-F). However half of the children with a one-connection  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

**Deleted:** the difficulties in making a circuit and wider explorations undertaken by half the children who held a model B view of circuit connections suggested these children were at an early stage of gaining practical competence in simple circuit making. These children tried a wide range of connecting points on the battery and bulb and a variety of circuit arrangements.¶

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

model also gave explanations referring to connections, including three children (Alexandre, Kingsley and Sabrina) who were not yet competent in circuit making. In particular Javid focused on connections in explaining his views in relation to 11/24 of the circuit examples. Finally, explanations referring to the power of the battery or path for electricity were not only offered by children holding the most advanced models of the circuit. Of the six children who gave these kinds of explanations, two held a one-connection model of the circuit, one of whom (Kingsley) had difficulty in making devices work in the final part of the interview. (Full details of children's practical competence, models of the circuit and the kinds of explanations they offered are provided in Appendix 1.)

**Deleted:** Children with the same level of practical competence made predictions characteristic of different models of the circuit and gave different kinds of explanation. Some children, though still grappling with the need for 2 connections on the battery/device, offered fairly sophisticated explanations for what is happening in a circuit. In contrast there were children with more developed models of the circuit who experienced greater difficulties in circuit making than those with less developed models. ¶

### Discussion and conclusions

The interview procedure provided a variety of evidence of young children's thinking about electric circuits. It enabled an examination of children's models of the circuit and the nature of their explanations for why circuits would or would not work. Though limited in scope, children's explorations in the final part of the interview gave some further indication of their developing thinking about electricity as well as their competence in making circuits. This made it possible to explore relationships between children's practical competence, predictions and explanations and consider the reasoning that might underlie children's responses.

#### Predictions

As in previous studies involving older primary and secondary age students, children made predictions in relation to the circuit examples characteristic of a range of models of the circuit. Almost all children appreciated the need for connections

1  
2 from the battery to the device. A number articulated a need for a complete circuit,  
3  
4 however only a small proportion identified all the specific connections needed. The  
5  
6 present study suggests that in the process of developing a more explicit awareness of  
7  
8 the connections needed children may develop a view that complete circuits can only  
9  
10 be made with two wires, particularly if they have had little practical experience of  
11  
12 circuit arrangements with one wire. The range and distribution of responses was  
13  
14 similar to that reported by Osborne et al (1991) for the infant children in their sample.  
15  
16 Findings also showed parallels with Asoko's (1996) study of older primary children  
17  
18 aged 8 and 9 in that while most children were able to identify the need for two  
19  
20 connections on the battery or device, many did not notice incorrect connections and  
21  
22 some thought that two wires would be necessary to light the bulb.  
23

#### *Questions of consistency*

24  
25  
26  
27  
28 Questions about the coherence of young children's thinking and the  
29  
30 consistency of the views they express in different contexts emerge frequently in  
31  
32 discussions of conceptual change and of children's enquiry processes (Kuhn 1989,  
33  
34 Osborne 1983, Osborne et al. 1991). In the present study some inconsistency was  
35  
36 found in children's predictions for the circuit examples. The analysis of patterns in  
37  
38 children's predictions and the nature of their explanations made it possible to study  
39  
40 this inconsistency in some detail. As illustrated in the examples discussed earlier, in  
41  
42 most cases children's explanations gave some indication of the thinking behind their  
43  
44 changes in view. Overall the analysis of children's explanations gave no suggestion  
45  
46 that children were responding in an arbitrary way to circuit examples. Children's  
47  
48 comments suggested that variations in predictions were the product of changes in  
49  
50 thinking, Siegler (2000) suggests that what he terms variability (rather than  
51  
52 inconsistency) is often predictive of change, indicating cognitive conflict or open-ness  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2 to new ideas. Indeed there were indications from children's follow up explorations  
3  
4 that variation might offer productive starting points for learning and teaching.  
5  
6 Findings from this study suggest this might be a fruitful area for further investigation.  
7  
8

#### 9 10 Explanations

11  
12 The study set out deliberately not just to probe children's views of the  
13  
14 connections needed in a circuit but to examine the nature of the explanations they  
15  
16 offered for their views. Children offered a range of explanations for their predictions.  
17  
18 Asking for children's explanations for their predictions gave further evidence of the  
19  
20 extent of children's knowledge of the connections needed in a circuit and in some  
21  
22 cases insights into their thoughts about why such connections are required. Across the  
23  
24 class as a whole all referred to components, and many talked about the connections  
25  
26 needed, drawing on generalisations that could be made from direct observation. In  
27  
28 addition four children offered explanations referring to the path of electricity. The  
29  
30 range of explanations children offered showed some similarities to those reported by  
31  
32 Asoko (1996), Gutwill et al. (1996) and Shepardson and Moje (1994), in their studies  
33  
34 of older children and adults. In Asoko's study there were children who offered  
35  
36 explanations that focused on components – the battery or wires. Explanations  
37  
38 referring to connections are widely reported by Shepardson and Moje (1994) and  
39  
40 Asoko (1996). Gutwill et al. (1996) in their work with high school students refer to  
41  
42 'topological perspectives' on the circuit, which focused on circuit details. All three  
43  
44 studies give examples of explanations that refer to the circular flow of electricity or  
45  
46 current round a circuit. The explanations offered by the few children in this present  
47  
48 study that focused on the path for electricity for example *'the electricity goes round*  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

*the wires'* show the foundations for this kind of explanation for what is happening in a circuit.

As suggested above, these explanations are different in nature. For some their explanations did not go beyond a description of circuit components. Others focused on generalisations that could be made from direct observation in referring to the connections needed. A small number offered explanations that went beyond what is observable in offering a dynamic view of electricity and considering how it travels in a circuit. Similar kinds of distinction are made by Metz (1991) in her categorisation of children's explanations for moving gears. She refers to three phases in the development of explanations '*the object as explanation*', '*connections as explanation*' and '*mechanistic explanations*'. Parallels can also be seen with the different kinds of reasoning identified by Driver et al (1996) in their studies of young pupils' images of science, *phenomenon-based reasoning*, *relationship-based reasoning* and *model-based reasoning*. For instance, explanations referring to components, such as the battery or the bulb, showed features of *phenomenon-based reasoning* in the lack of a clear separation between a description of the phenomenon and explanation. Explanations that highlighted the connections needed in a circuit were more characteristic of *relation-based reasoning*. Here distinctions between description and explanation were starting to be recognised. Children were able to identify key factors that would affect the functioning of a device. Finally the explanations of children who referred to the power of the battery or the path for electricity suggested the beginnings of *model-based reasoning*, in which description and explanation are more clearly distinguished and explanations involve the use of theories or models that go beyond experimental data.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

In summary, findings of the present study suggest that young children offer a range of explanations for what is happening in a circuit not dissimilar to some older children or adults. Their explanations are not confined to describing objects and events. Even at a young age there are children who notice patterns and relationships. In addition some are beginning to talk about mechanisms in offering explanations for phenomena and events. In the case of electricity this involves imagining entities and processes that cannot be observed directly.

### Explorations

The opportunities offered in the final part of the interview for children to undertake their own follow up explorations provided some indication of children's practical competence. The nature of children's explorations and their spontaneously offered comments gave additional insights into their developing thinking. There was some suggestion that the kinds of exploration children undertook were influenced by their developing thinking and practical competence and in some cases prompted by the interview procedure itself. In a number of cases children talked explicitly about their greater awareness of the connections needed as a result. Features of their explorations and investigations corresponded to those discussed in previous studies of children's self-directed enquiries (Metz 1998). In the 'wider explorations' undertaken by children who were not yet competent in circuit making, children adopted a trial and error approach in seeking to make the circuits work. Their enquiries had an engineering rather than a scientific structure and focus shown in an emphasis on trying to get devices to work. For example Alexandre tried connecting wires to different part of the battery and experimented with different coloured wires in his attempts to get the bulb to light. The strategies employed by the children in this study who tried out particular circuit examples were more focused and suggested a shift

1  
2 from just trying to make something work to seeking to identify the specific  
3  
4 connections needed with a tacit assumption that a general conclusion could be drawn,  
5  
6 more characteristic of a scientific frame for enquiry. These children were able to make  
7  
8 use of both positive and negative examples from practical experience in developing  
9  
10 their knowledge about simple circuits. The comments of some of them suggested in  
11  
12 addition that they were consciously aware of their views and were testing these out  
13  
14 deliberately. This observation is in line with previous studies of young children's  
15  
16 enquiry processes (Schauble 1990, Kuhn et al. 1992, Karmiloff Smith 1974) and with  
17  
18 the growing evidence of young children's capabilities and their concern to search for  
19  
20 explanations for phenomena and events (Brown et al 1997).  
21  
22  
23  
24

#### 25 Relationship between predictions, explanations and explorations

26 The range of data collected in the study also provided opportunities to explore  
27  
28 the relationship between children's predictions, explanations and explorations.  
29  
30 Findings suggested the relationship is not straightforward. Children with the same  
31  
32 levels of practical competence made predictions characteristic of different models of  
33  
34 the circuit, offered different views about the connections needed or gave different  
35  
36 explanations for what is happening in a circuit. Furthermore children who made the  
37  
38 same predictions provided different types of explanation for their views. The  
39  
40 interaction between children's predictions and explanations in electricity was  
41  
42 examined by Shephardson and Moje (1994) in their work with older primary  
43  
44 children. They highlight the ways in which understanding of circuit connections and  
45  
46 flow of charge are connected and influence each other in a positive way. However  
47  
48 they also found that while children may provide more accurate predictions and circuit  
49  
50 drawings as a result of teaching they might still give explanations that contradict a  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2 scientific view. These findings from studies of children's predictions and explanations  
3  
4 at different ages indicate it is therefore important that assessment techniques focus not  
5  
6 just on procedural understanding (how to make circuits) but also probe children's  
7  
8 understandings of why such connections are needed. More generally this underlines  
9  
10 the value of being able to draw on a variety of evidence in seeking to make sense of  
11  
12 children's views. Reliance on one form of evidence can lead to both underestimation  
13  
14 and overestimation of children's competence, knowledge and understanding.  
15

#### 16 17 Impact of the interview procedure itself

18  
19 The interview procedure developed for this study showed some success in  
20  
21 eliciting children's views, not always offered spontaneously. Children were keen to  
22  
23 offer predictions and most gave explanations for their views. In addition there was  
24  
25 evidence of children's pro-active approach to the interview process itself. Many took  
26  
27 charge of the cards showing photographs of electric circuits and checked their  
28  
29 responses were recorded accurately. The approach to data collection and analysis  
30  
31 made it possible to track any change or development in children's thinking across the  
32  
33 interview. Some children's actions and comments suggested they were becoming  
34  
35 more conscious of their own views and reflecting on their thinking in the light of  
36  
37 further evidence. The way the interview was constructed may have contributed to  
38  
39 this. In asking for predictions and explanations the interview process prompted  
40  
41 children to make their thinking explicit. The circuit examples deliberately exposed  
42  
43 children to a range of options, both positive and negative, designed to focus on key  
44  
45 features of the circuit. In some cases discussion of the circuit examples may have  
46  
47 acted as an instructive stimulus (Siraj-Blatchford and Siraj-Blatchford 2002)  
48  
49 prompting further development in the final part of the interview. How far the  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2 development of children's explorations and thinking may be influenced by the  
3  
4 interview procedure itself is a subject for further investigation.  
5  
6  
7

#### 8 Implications

9  
10 Findings suggest it is important not to underestimate young children. They add  
11  
12 to evidence that from a young age children try to explain phenomena and events and  
13  
14 may offer views not dissimilar to some older children or adults. Though young  
15  
16 children may lack experience, they are capable of range of forms of reasoning. As  
17  
18 found in previous studies of older primary age children (for example Smith et al  
19  
20 (1993) or Smith et al (2000)), there were examples of young children who could  
21  
22 think abstractly as well as concretely and search for patterns or causal mechanisms. In  
23  
24 early years science curricula there has been a tendency to focus on processes of  
25  
26 observing and describing on the grounds that this is developmentally appropriate  
27  
28 (Metz 1995, 2004). This tendency is reflected for example in early levels of the  
29  
30 National Curriculum (DfEE 1999) or in the Early Learning Goals (QCA/DfES 2000).  
31  
32 While observing and describing are relevant and important priorities for learning and  
33  
34 teaching with young children, this study reinforces the view that limiting attention to  
35  
36 these processes runs the danger of failing to capitalise on young children's  
37  
38 capabilities.  
39

40  
41 There are a number of implications for assessment in electricity. The study  
42  
43 offers frameworks for assessing children's developing knowledge and understanding  
44  
45 in electricity. Findings underline the importance of using a range of approaches to  
46  
47 assessment. They suggest there are complex relationships between practical  
48  
49 competence, predictions and explanations so that reliance on one form of assessment  
50  
51 may misrepresent children's knowledge and skills. In early years settings, assessment  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

*How young children understand electric circuits 32*

1  
2 information is often based on observation of children's talk and actions. However the  
3  
4 responses of children in this study illustrate the value of encouraging children to  
5  
6 explain their thoughts and actions. Not only were children able to offer explanations,  
7  
8 but their explanations gave insights into their developing thinking.  
9

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For Peer Review Only

## References

Asoko, H. (1996). Developing scientific concepts in the primary classroom: Teaching about electric circuits. In G. Welford, J. Osborne, and P. Scott (Eds.) *Research in science education in Europe: Current issues and themes* (London: Falmer Press), 36-49.

BERA (2003). *Early Years Research: Pedagogy, Curriculum and Adult Roles, Training and Professionalism*. Southwell, British Educational Research Association.

Black, P., Harrison, C. , Lee, C., Marshall, B., & Wiliam, D. (2003). *Assessment for learning: putting it into practice*. Maidenhead, Open University Press.

Brown, A. L., Campione, J.C., Metz, K.E. and Ash, D.B. (1997). The Development of Science Learning Abilities in Children. In K. Harnqvist and A. Burgen (Eds.) *Growing up with Science* (London: Jessica Kingsley, Academia Europaea), 7-40

Carey, S. (1985). *Conceptual change in childhood*. London, MIT Press.

Clarke, S. (2001). *Unlocking formative assessment: practical strategies for enhancing pupils' learning in the primary classroom*. London, Hodder and Stoughton.

Department for Education and Employment (1999) *National Curriculum: handbook for primary teachers in England; key stages 1 and 2*. London, Stationery Office.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 Donaldson, M.L. (1986). *Children's explanations: a psycholinguistic study*

6  
7 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

8  
9  
10 Dowker, A. (2005). *Individual differences in arithmetic* (Hove:Psychology Press).

11  
12  
13 Driver, R., Leach, J., Millar, R. & Scott, P. (1996). *Young People's Images in Science.*

14  
15 Buckingham, Open University Press.

16  
17  
18 Glauert, E. (2005). Making sense of science in the reception class. *International*

19  
20 *Journal in Early Years Education*, 13(3), 215-233.

21  
22  
23 Gutwill, J., Frederiksen, J. and Ranney, M. (1996). Seeking the causal connection in

24  
25 electricity: shifting among mechanistic perspectives. *International Journal of*

26  
27 *Science Education*, 18(2), 143-162.

28  
29  
30 Karmiloff-Smith, A. and Inhelder, B. (1974). If you want to get ahead, get a theory.

31  
32 *Cognition* 3(3), 195-212.

33  
34  
35 Karmiloff-Smith, A. (1992). *Beyond Modularity A Developmental Perspective*

36  
37 *on Cognitive Science* (Cambridge Massachusetts, The MIT Press).

38  
39  
40 Kuhn, D. (1989). Children and Adults as Intuitive Scientists. *Psychological Review*,

41  
42 96(4), 674-689.

43  
44  
45 Kuhn, D., Schauble, L. and Garcia-Mila, M. (1992). Cross-Domain Development of

46  
47 Scientific Reasoning. *Cognition and Instruction* 9(4), 285-327.

48  
49  
50 Metz, K.E. (2004). Children's Understanding of Scientific Inquiry. Their

51  
52 Conceptualization of Uncertainty in Investigations of Their Own Design.

1  
2 Cognition and Instruction, 22(2), 219-290  
3

4  
5 Metz, K. E. (1998). Scientific Inquiry Within Reach of Young Children. In B. J.  
6 Fraser and K. G. Tobin (Eds.) *International Handbook of Science Education*.  
7 (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers), 81-95.  
8  
9

10  
11 Metz, K. (1995). Reassessment of Developmental Constraints on Children's Science  
12 Instruction. *Review of Educational Research* 65(2), 93-127.  
13  
14

15  
16  
17 Murphy, C. and Beggs, J. (2005). *Primary Science in the UK: a scoping study. Final*  
18 *report to the Wellcome Trust*. Available at:  
19 [www.wellcome.ac.uk/assets/wtx026636.pdf](http://www.wellcome.ac.uk/assets/wtx026636.pdf).  
20  
21

22  
23  
24 Office for Standards in Education (2005). *Annual report of Her Majesty's Chief*  
25 *Inspector of Schools 2004/5: Science in Primary Schools*. Available at:  
26 <http://liveofsted.gov.uk/publications/annualreport0405/41.12.html>  
27  
28

29  
30  
31 Osborne, J., Black, P., Smith, M. and Meadows, J. (1991). *Primary SPACE Project*  
32 *Research Report: Electricity* (Liverpool, Liverpool University Press).  
33  
34

35  
36 Osborne, R. (1983). Towards Modifying Children's Ideas about Electric Current.  
37 *Research in Science & Technological Education* 1(1),73-82.  
38  
39

40  
41 Piaget, J. (1978). *Success and Understanding* (London:Routledge and Kegan Paul).  
42

43  
44 Piaget, J. (1977). *The Grasp of Consciousness* (London:Routledge and Kegan Paul).  
45

46  
47 Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (2000). *Curriculum guidance for the*  
48 *foundation stage*. London, QCA/DfEE.  
49

50  
51 Rittle-Johnson, B., and Siegler, R.S. (1998). The relation between conceptual and  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2 procedural knowledge in learning mathematics: A review. In C. Donlan (Ed.),  
3  
4 *The development of mathematical skills* (Hove: Psychology Press), 75-110.  
5  
6  
7 Schauble, L. (1990). Belief Revision in Children: The Role of Prior Knowledge and  
8  
9 Strategies for Generating Evidence. *Journal of Experimental Child*  
10  
11 *Psychology* 49(1), 31-57.  
12  
13  
14 Shepardson, D. P. and Moje, E.B. (1994). The Nature of Fourth Graders'  
15  
16 Understandings of Electric Circuits. *Science Education* 78(5), 489-514.  
17  
18  
19 Shepardson, D. P. and Moje, E.B. (1999). The role of anomalous data in restructuring  
20  
21 fourth graders' frameworks of understanding electric circuits. *International*  
22  
23 *Journal of Science Education* 21(1), 77-94.  
24  
25  
26 Shipstone, D. M. (1984). A study of children's understanding of electricity in simple  
27  
28 DC circuits. *European Journal of Science Education* 6(2), 185-198.  
29  
30  
31 Siegler, R.S. (1976). Three aspects of cognitive development. *Cognitive Psychology*,  
32  
33 8, 481-520.  
34  
35  
36 Siegler, R. S. (2000). The Rebirth of Children's Learning. *Child Development* 71(1),  
37  
38 26-35.  
39  
40  
41 Siraj-Blatchford, J. and Siraj-Blatchford, I. (2002). Discriminating between Schemes  
42  
43 and Schema in Young Children's Emergent Learning of Science and  
44  
45 Technology. *International Journal of Early Years Education* 10(3), 205-214.  
46  
47  
48 Smith, C. L., Maclin, D., Houghton, C. and Hennessey M.G. (2000). Sixth-Grade  
49  
50 Students' Epistemologies of Science: The Impact of School Science  
51  
52 Experiences on Epistemological Development. *Cognition and Instruction*  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 18(3), 349-422.  
4

5 Smith, J.P., diSessa, A.A., and Roschelle, J. (1993). Misconceptions Reconceived: A  
6 Constructivist Analysis of Knowledge in Transition. *The Journal of the*  
7 *Learning Sciences* 3(2), 115-163  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 Solomonidou, C. and Kakana, D.M. (2000). Preschool Children's Conceptions About  
13 the Electric Current and the Functioning of Electric Appliances. *European*  
14 *Early Childhood Education Research Journal* 8(1), 95-107.  
15  
16

17  
18  
19 Stobart, G. & Gipp.s, C. (1997). *Assessment: a Teacher's Guide to the Issues.*  
20 London, Hodder and Stoughton Educational.  
21  
22

23  
24  
25 Sylva, K., Melhuish, E. C., Sammons, P., Siraj-Blatchford, I. & Taggart, B.(2004).  
26 *The Effective Provision of Pre-School Education (EPPE) Project: Technical*  
27 *Paper 12 - The Final Report: Effective Pre-School Education.* London: DfES /  
28  
29 Institute of Education, University of London.  
30  
31  
32

33  
34 Sylva, K., Siraj-Blatchford, I., Melhuish, E., Sammons, P., Taggart, B., Evans, E.,  
35 Dobson, A., Jeavons. M., Lewis, K., Morahan. M., & Sadler. S. (1999),  
36 *Technical Paper 6 - The Effective Provision of Pre-School Education (EPPE)*  
37 *Project: Characteristics of Pre-School Environments.* London: DfEE /  
38  
39 Institute of Education, University of London.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Appendix 1. Categories of explanations offered for predictions: relationships between practical competence, models of the circuit and explanations (n=28)

<u>Child</u>	<u>Made circuits success-fully</u>	<u>Model</u>	<u>Components</u>	<u>Connections</u>	<u>Power from battery</u>	<u>Path for electricity</u>
<u>Rasheed</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Aisha</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Alexandre</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Elaben</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Javid</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>Kingsley</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>Nesha</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Nita</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Raisha</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Sabrina</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Joseph</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>B/C</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Kalvin</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>B/C</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Anna</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Cairo</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Eduardo</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Motur</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>



<u>Omar</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Sarfaraz</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Zarah</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Maruf</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>C/D</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Anil</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>C/D/E</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Basil</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Benedicta</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Deji</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>Mariamamma</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Raymond</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>Tara</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Prima</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>

Key: Yes = made device work, Time = took time to make device work, No = could not make device work without help.

Some children gave more than one explanation for some predictions. As a result the total number of explanations can exceed the number of circuits (24).

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



**Deleted:** Appendix 1. Categories of explanations offered for predictions (n=28)¶  
Child ... 11

For Peer Review Only

Table 1

Table 1. Circuit examples

Example	Circuit characteristics
1	One wire only – incomplete circuit
2	Two wires – gap in the circuit
3	No wires
4	Two wires – complete circuit but one connection only on the battery
5	Two wires – complete circuit but one connection only on the device
6	Two wires – complete circuit, two connections on the device but incorrect
7	Two wires – complete circuit, correct connections
8	One wire only – complete circuit, correct connections

Table 2

Table 2. Number of correct responses predicted by consistent use of each model of the connections needed in a circuit. (Each circuit was presented 3 times.)

Model	Predicted response to each circuit example								Total correct
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
A	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	6
B	0	0	3*	0	0	0	3	3	9
C	3*	3*	3	0	0	0	3	0-3	12-15
D	3	3	3	3*	3*	0	3	0-3	18-21
E	3	3	3	3	3	3*	3	0	21
F	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3*	24

## Key

1= correct response

0= incorrect response

- circuits designed to distinguish between successive models

Table 3

Table 3. Number of children whose predictions matched each proposed model of the connections needed in a circuit (n=28)

Model	Model description	No. children
A	Everything works	1
B	1 connection	9
C	2 connections (incorrect) 1 connection to battery/device	7
D	2 connections (incorrect) wrong connections	1
E	2 connections (correct) two wires needed	4
F	2 connections (correct)	1
No clear match to any model		5

Table 4

Table 4. Categories of explanation

Category	Examples of explanations in each category
Components	Needs new bulb/battery
	Needs wire(s)/got wires
Connections	Gap/not attached/not touching/joined
	Wrong/missing connections
	Correct connections
	Joined circle
Power from the battery	No power
	Not so much power
	Is giving power
Path for electricity	No path for electricity
	Power/electricity cannot go that way
	Metal not touching/plastic/glass blocks
	Electricity goes all round the wires

Acknowledgements

Particular thanks are due to the children who participated in this research and to their teacher for facilitating and supporting my work with the children. I am very grateful to Eileen Carnell, Richard Cowan, Shirley Simon and two anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments on earlier drafts of this article.

23/1/08

Deleted: 26/9/07

For Peer Review Only


## Appendix 1. Categories of explanations offered for predictions (n=28)

Child	Model	Components	Connections	Power from battery	Path for electricity
Rasheed	A	6	0	0	0
Aisha	B	9	0	0	0
Alexandre	B	23	1	0	0
Elaben	B	5	1	0	0
Javid	B	3	11	0	3
Kingsley	B	14	2	0	1
Nesha	B	19	0	0	0
Nita	B	6	0	0	0
Raisha	B	23	0	0	0
Sabrina	B	9	3	0	0
Joseph	B/C	7	5	0	0
Kalvin	B/C	11	0	0	0
Anna	C	15	9	0	0
Cairo	C	8	11	1	0
Eduardo	C	17	4	0	0
Motur	C	7	7	0	0
Omar	C	8	16	0	0
Sarfaraz	C	10	10	0	0



Zarah	C	2	15	0	0
Maruf	C/D	18	6	0	0
Anil	C/D/E	9	15	0	0
Basil	D	5	14	0	0
Benedicta	E	13	10	0	0
Deji	E	7	12	0	4
Mariamamma	E	12	10	0	0
Raymond	E	8	9	0	1
Tara	E	9	16	0	0
Prima	F	5	18	0	1

Some children gave more than one explanation for some predictions. As a result the total number of explanations can exceed the number of circuits (24).



Examples of the circuits made during children's wider explorations. Labels for images as follows

Top left - Alexandre (model B)

Top right - Sabrina (model B)

Bottom left - Kingsley (model B)

Bottom right - Eduardo (model C)

204x292mm (150 x 150 DPI)