

# Students\_Misconceptions\_in\_Understanding\_Acid\_Base\_Topics.. docx

*by*

---

**Submission date:** 12-Jun-2020 01:55PM (UTC+0530)

**Submission ID:** 1342454717

**File name:** Students\_Misconceptions\_in\_Understanding\_Acid\_Base\_Topics..docx (319.3K)

**Word count:** 5839

**Character count:** 33057

# Identifying Undergraduate Students' Misconceptions in Understanding Acid Base Topics.

S. Mubarak<sup>1a</sup>, Yahdi<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup> Chemistry Education Department, Universitas Islam Negeri Mataram, Indonesia

<sup>a</sup> correspondence address: Kampus UIN Mataram, Jl Gajah Mada Kota Mataram, NTB, Indonesia.

Email: syarif.almubarak@uinmataram.ac.id, cp: +6285239683146

## Abstract

Student misconception have become phenomenon in teaching and learning, especially in chemistry which consider as difficult subject. Main goal of this study was to identify undergraduate student's misconception profiles related to acid base concept in inorganic chemistry. This test conducted with 15 item three tier multiple choice test. Data identify descriptively and qualitatively. This test instrument judge as valid with CVR score 0,99 and mean 1,73. Meanwhile the reliability for this instrument vary for each tier combination for tier one only,  $r_{11}$  was give reliability score for 0,93, for combination tier one and tier two  $r_{11}$  score was 0,90 and for combination of all tiers  $r_{11}$  score was 0,81. Conducted test revealed that average percentage misconceptions in this test is 33.31% for all items. Highest misconception profile is 60,61% in item no.6 hard soft acid base concept. This include 15,15% misconception false positive, 9,09% misconception false negative, and 36.36% specific misconception.

## Introduction

Chemistry is difficult to learn (Orgill & Sutherland, 2008; Cartrette & Mayo, 2011). There are many reasons for students finding chemistry difficult to learn (Cardelini, 2012). One of the reasons is because Chemistry is complex subject that explores a number of abstract topics and concepts (Burrows and Mooring, 2015). One other reason is lack of understanding in macroscopic, microscopic and symbolic perspective in chemistry (Kidanemariam et al., 2013).

Students' success in chemistry courses and particularly in upper level courses is depend on prior knowledge and information they have learned in previous courses (Dickmann et al., 2019). Existing constructions that are at odds with accepted science can provide a shaky foundation for new concepts, and there are vast quantities of constructivist research within the science education literature, much of which deals with such incorrectly constructed scientific concepts, or misconceptions.

Some past decades, it was assumed that students don't have any preconceptions or knowledge in chemistry (Barke, et al., 2012). As students learn about the world around them formally through school education or informally through their everyday experiences, they often tend to form their own views (Gurel et al., 2015). Empirical studies, however, showed that learners have preconceptions for many topics and that these preconceptions don't match today's scientific concepts (Barke et al., 2012). The different form of students understanding and self-constructed conceptions have been called by a number of different terms such as "alternative conceptions" (Artdej et al., 2010; Hanson, 2019), "Alternative Framework" (Seligin, 2012), "Misconceptions" (Mubarak et al, 2016), "naïve conception" (Lachapelle et al., 2013), "children ideas" (Wee,

2012), "intuitive conceptions" (Lemmer, 2012), "intuitive science" (Russ et al., 2012), "conceptual difficulties" (Akram et al., 2014), "phenomenological primitives" (Ozdemir, 2013), and "mental models" (Sunyono et al., 2015).

Although some has presented an analysis of the subtle distinctions in the usage of these terms above, no consensus has been reached on the term of choice (Ozmen, 2004). For Simplicity, the term of misconceptions will be used in this study and it means any concept that differs from the commonly accepted scientific understanding of the term. Misconceptions is used when referring to students' incompatible ideas with scientific views (Arslan et al., 2012). Everyone can experience misconception (Suprpto, 2020) including students. Many sources of students' misconceptions have been identified, including: everyday experience (Daud et al, 2015; Wee, 2012), instructional language and terminology (Akram et al., 2014; Chrzanowski et al., 2018), textbook (Zajkov et al., 2017), teachers (Yates & Marek, 2014) and even the internet (Sesen, 2010). Misconception is a real factor that can affect student failure in academics (Sofianto et al., 2020).

In teaching process, teacher should be able to distinguish student who can understand the concept well, less understand, not understand and having misconception or mixture of alternative conception so then later we can prevent the problem correctly (Mubarak et al, 2016). Student who held misconception will have difficulties in accepting new concept and knowledge (Yangin et al., 2013). False concept and knowledge that has been strongly held by student will be considering as a true concept, then they will apply those concept that they think right into the new concept they accepted. later, student misconception will be difficult to eliminate (Daud et al, 2015).

Acid base is of the difficult and major topic in chemistry, including in inorganic chemistry. Study which shown high possibility to retain misconceptions in students as well as concept related to acid base chemistry such as neutralization (Cokelez, 2010), pH (Kala et al., 2013), and buffers and buffers problems (Orgill & Sutherland, 2008). Most of preliminary study was conducted to understand high school student (Amalia et al., 2018; Artdej et al., 2010; Chakraborty & Mondal, 2012; Cokelez, 2010; Mubarak et al., 2016) or teacher (Duran & Usak, 2015) conception profiles in acid base topic or in other context such Organic chemistry (Cartrette & Mayo, 2011). Since There is no specific report and study about misconception held by undergraduate student in understanding inorganic chemistry acid base topic, it is become important to understand undergraduate student conception profiles in understanding acid base topic in Inorganic chemistry so then later we can prevent the problem correctly.

To identifying student misconceptions, we can use three tier multiple choices since is the most common diagnostic test for identifying student science misconceptions (Soeharto et al., 2019). basic principle for this diagnostic test is considering that student already held some understanding in science concepts that had been teach (Treagust et al., 2002). Three tier tests are considered to be more accurately eliciting the student misconceptions, since they can detect lack of knowledge percentages by means of the confidence tiers. (Gurel et al., 2015). So then, the purpose of this study was to describe undergraduate chemistry student conception profiles in understanding acid base topic at inorganic chemistry subject by using acid base diagnostic tests (ABDT), a three-tier multiple choice diagnostic test to identifying.

## Methods

Research conducted in Islamic State University of Mataram (UIN Mataram). Thirty three undergraduate students and also prospective teachers at second year who enlisted in Inorganic Chemistry class and have involved in basic chemistry courses became the subject of this research. The method of the research is descriptive qualitative, and to obtain data about student conception profiles it was using acid base diagnostic test (ABDT), a <sup>3</sup>three-tier multiple choice diagnostic test.

Each item test in ABDT <sup>3</sup>consisted of three tiers. First tier is answer tier, a multiple choice with five options, one is for the correct answer and four others are distractors. Second tier is reasoning tier, a multiple choice with five options, one is for the correct reason and four others are distractors. The last tier is certainty level tier, a five scales range for certainty start from 1 as just guessing, 2 as really uncertain, 3 as uncertain, 4 as certain and 5 as really certain. This certainty of response index (CRI) can tell us about how much that the students certain about their answer and we can decide either the students held misconceptions or do not know the concept at all (Siswaningsih et al., 2019).

ABDT consists of 15 item tests composed of acid base theory, nature of acid base solution, Lewis acid base concept, intermolecular forces, hard and soft acid base concept, and super acid and super base concept. The blue print of ABDT item test displayed in table 1. <sup>1</sup>Students' answers to each item were considered correct when both the correct choice and reason are given with a high confidence. Similarly, students' answers were considered as misconceptions when a wrong answer choice is selected with an accompanied wrong reasoning and with a high confidence.

Table 1. The blue print of ABDT

Material	Learning Goal	Number of Test Item
Arhenius concept	understanding classic concept of acid base and how to apply it	1, 8
Bronsted Lowry concept	Understanding acid base strength and nonaqueous solvent	2, 9, 15
Lewis Acid Base Concept	Understanding Frontier orbital and acid base reaction and term of frustrated Lewis pair	3,4,10,11
Intermolecular forces	Understanding effect of hydrogen bonding in acid base concept	5, 12
Hard soft acid base (HSAB)	Understanding concept of hard soft acid base (HSAB) and its application	6,13
Super acid and super base	Understanding term of super acid and super base	7, 14

Student responses then analysed and interpreted to understand misconceptions held by students. Each student will give unique characteristic of misconception they held, <sup>1</sup> this helps the test users such that the obtained percentage of misconception is free from false positives, false negatives and lack of knowledge, since each requires a different remediation and treatment.

Data collection that used in this research including documentation, interview, survey and test. Interview conducted to collecting information about the instrument that being develop and in post conducted test researcher find that some student leaved the reasoning section remain blank. However, by conducting the interviews, it found that some of them had a good reasoning ability. The interview itself was constructed by cognitive interview approach which intended to evaluate, and to improve, self-report questions and measurement instrument (Willis, 2015). By conducting diagnostic interview, reason from misconception on students' answer can be analysed deeply (Sadhu et al, 2017). Questionnaires shared among student to understand their responses after doing the test. The result of this study presented as descriptive narrative form since the narrative text has been the most frequent form of displaying the qualitative data (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

Data analysis for this research including validity, reliability of the instrument, level of difficulties and discriminating power, questionnaires analysis, interpretation of three tier multiple choice response and student conception profile analysis. The validity for this instrument is measures by Content Validity Ratio (CVR) introduced by Lawshe (1975), content validity representing one of the validation kinds and can provide information about the representativeness and clarity of each item on the instrument (Medeiros et al, 2015). CVR is an approach of content validity to determine the suitability of the item with the measured domain by expert judgment. It is highly recommended to apply content validity while the new instrument is developed (Taherdoost, 2016). This validation step involves 5 experts. Content validity is essential examination to know whether the skill of reasoning chemistry reasoning ability and contained and given what is being measured in the integrated assessment instrument (Sadhu, et al. 2019). The product stated as valid by expert validators by CVR score 0,99 and mean score 1,73 which has met the valid instrument criteria. This mean that the item test has been suited with the topic of acid base in inorganic chemistry courses for second year university students.

The reliability measure by  $KR_{20}$  formula as applied by Mubarak et al (2016). The measurement of reliability was using combination of each tier. Reliability for tier<sub>1</sub>  $r_{11}$  score was 0,93, for combination tier<sub>1&2</sub>  $r_{11}$  score was 0,90 and for combination of all tiers<sub>1,2,&3</sub>  $r_{11}$  score was 0,81. This decreasing scores in reliability is in line with the finding of Dehnad, et al., (2014) which find that when the number of option increasing, the number of reliability decrease. The reliability will be accepted if  $r_{11}$  score >0,70, which mean this instrument is reliable and this instrument is good in revealing student misconception in inorganic chemistry acid base topics since all tier combination have higher score than 0,70.

Besides the instrument must be valid and reliable, the instrument must have a good level of difficulties and discriminating power. The level of difficulties and discriminating power were measured by varying the combination of all tiers. Level of Difficulties of item test vary in scale from 0,32 – 0,72 this means that ABDT was on moderate difficulty. Good diagnostic test is instrument with moderate difficulties (Mubarak et al, 2016). Fariyani, et al (2015) also choosing moderate difficulties

item for diagnostic test. The discriminating power score vary from 0,21 – 0,56, this means that the ABDT had proper ability to discriminate student ability in completing the test.

Figure 1. show how the combination of tier will affect the item difficulty in test, number of test item slightly increase to more difficult level as the number of tier increase.




Figure 1. Comparison Item Test Level of Difficulties Based on All Tiers Combination

In figure1, item tests are getting more difficult by addition of tier combination. This show that student getting more difficult in doing the item test. This inline with the result studied by Rodriguez (2005) that stated increasing the number of options also contribute in increasing the item difficulty in test.

figure 2. shows that for different combination tiers give different characteristic on item discrimination, which increasing number of tiers and options also contribute in increasing item discrimination ability.




Figure 2. Comparison Item Test Discriminating Power Based on All Tiers Combination

In figure 2, the ability of test item in distinguish high level performance student with low level performance student is getting better along with tier addition in instrument. Those two figures show to us, despite the test item being more difficult, but it gave us a better perspective to distinguish student ability in understanding the topic. This happen consider especially



because of addition of CRI, since the nature of the CRI is usually to distinguish students' error and misconceptions (Mukmin & Fa'ani, 2019).

Interpretation of three tier multiple choice response classified by answer combination pattern introduced by Arslan et al (2012) as shown in table 2. Certainty level is considering at high level if student choose 4 or 5 out of 5 scale and considering at low level if choose 3 or below out of 5 scale.

7

Table 2. All possibilities of responses

Answer patterns			Categories
Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3	
Correct	Correct	Certain	Scientific knowledge
Correct	Incorrect	Certain	Misconception (False+)
Incorrect	Correct	Certain	Misconception (False-)
Incorrect	Incorrect	Certain	Misconception
Correct	Correct	Uncertain	Lucky guess/lack of confidence
Correct	Incorrect	Uncertain	Lack of Knowledge
Incorrect	Correct	Uncertain	Lack of Knowledge
Incorrect	Incorrect	Uncertain	Lack of Knowledge

Scientific knowledge (SK) is condition where student responses show the condition that include all component of the validated response (Arslan et al, 2012) and an ability to unified and think all constituent entities, their structural relations and interaction in a holistic and systemic manner (Tumay, 2016). which mean contribute to an interrelated network of laws, theories, and concept.

Misconception (false positive) (MF+). is a condition which student show a correct response with poor reasoning ability. Bayrak (2013) state that this type of misconception indicates their learning is not meaningful learning, but superficial and rote learning. In some of the questions, students know the correct answers, but they do not have any idea why these are correct.

Misconception (false negative) (MF-) is a condition which student show a correct reasoning with false concept. This type of misconception happens because student carelessness (Syahrul & Setyarsih, 2015) or inattention in choosing test answer (Noble et al, 2012). In three tier test evaluation, content validity is additionally affirmed by calculating the percentage of false negative, it is recommended that the percentage of false negative should not exceed 10% (Arslan et al., 2012; Pesman & Eryilmaz, 2010).

Specific misconception (M) is condition which students show alternative conception that different with expert. This type of misconception indicated by their incorrect responses in both first and second tiers and having a high confidence level

(Arslan et al., 2012). This is also an indication of *Dunning-Kruger effect* that individual who are unsuccessful at a task lack the metacognitive skill that enable them to recognize their poor performance (Brandriet & Bretz, 2014a).

Lack of confidence (LC) is a condition which students show a correct response, but just lack in confidence level (Mubarak et al, 2016) or denoting uncertainty at CRI (Taslidere, 2016). Students, probably could not construct clear understanding since they had just learned the subject for the first time (Korur, 2015). Meanwhile, lucky guess (LG) is condition which the students show the correct responses but they choose just guessing as their option in CRI (Mubarak et al, 2016). Students in this case may have pseudo think indication that they can expressing the scientific concept with scientific reason just by their gut feeling and guess.

<sup>6</sup> Lack of knowledge (LK) is condition of being uncertain regardless of correct or incorrect responses to first and second tiers with a low certainty response index value indicate guessing. (Arslan et al, 2012). This low confidence case suggest they were aware that they were performing poorly or were possibly guessing (Brandriet & Bretz, 2014b), and <sup>6</sup> therefore had no understanding, or were confused about their understanding (Odom & Barrow, 2007).

## Result and Discussion

### Student Misconception.

Student misconceptions profiles in acid base in inorganic context is consider as high. Average percentage for all type misconceptions in this test is 33.13% for all items (see table 3.).

Table 3. Student conception profiles in acid base three tier multiple choices diagnostic test

Number of Item Test	Conception Profiles (%)						Total (%)
	SK	MF+	MF–	M	LG/LC	LK	
Q1	30,30	9,09	6,06	36,36	3,03	15,15	100
Q2	15,15	3,03	0,00	42,42	9,09	30,30	100
Q3	18,18	15,15	18,18	24,24	6,06	18,18	100
Q4	15,15	0,00	3,03	48,48	9,09	24,24	100
Q5	18,18	12,12	6,06	15,15	9,09	39,39	100
Q6	18,18	15,15	9,09	36,36	3,03	18,18	100
Q7	45,45	0,00	3,03	6,06	18,18	27,27	100
Q8	36,36	0,00	6,06	9,09	30,30	15,15	100
Q9	78,79	0,00	0,00	12,12	6,06	3,03	100
Q10	33,33	3,03	0,00	21,21	21,21	21,21	100
Q11	39,39	3,03	0,00	30,30	15,15	12,12	100
Q12	6,06	3,03	0,00	33,33	6,06	51,52	100
Q13	21,21	0,00	0,00	27,27	21,21	30,30	100



Number of Item Test	Conception Profiles (%)						Total (%)
	SK	MF+	MF-	M	LG/LC	LK	
Q14	52,52	0,00	0,00	3,03	33,33	12,12	100
Q15	18,18	0,00	3,03	30,30	27,27	21,21	100
Mean	29,70	4,44	3,63	25,05	14,55	22,63	100

Highest misconception profile is 60,61% in item no.6 hard soft acid base concept. This include 15,15% MF+, 9,09% MF-, and 36.36% M. This high percentage of misconceptions held by students caused by their confusion in understanding HSAB concept. Only 18,18% students are in SK category and the rest divided into LG/LC and LK. See figure 3 for test item questions.

6. Dengan menggunakan konsep asam basa keras lunak, manakah dari reaksi berikut ini yang memungkinkan memiliki konstanta kesetimbangan lebih dari 1? Perhatikanlah konsep asam basa keras lunak dalam menentukan jawaban anda pada tingkat pertama dan alasan pada tingkat kedua.

Pada pertanyaan di bawah ini pilihlah dengan memberikan tanda (X) pada salah satu point jawaban yang menurut anda benar dan tepat.

6.1. Asumsikan semua berada dalam fase gas atau larutan hidrokarbon pada suhu 25°C...

- $R_3PBr_3 + R_3NBF_3 \rightleftharpoons R_3PRF_3 + R_3NBr_3$
- $SO_2 + (C_6H_5)_3PHOC(CH_3)_3 \rightleftharpoons (C_6H_5)_3PSO_2 + HOC(CH_3)_3$
- $CH_3HgI + HCl \rightleftharpoons CH_3HgCl + HI$
- $[AgCl_2]^{-}(aq) + 2CN^{-}(aq) \rightleftharpoons [Ag(CN)_2]^{-}(aq) + 2Cl^{-}(aq)$
- $Pb(NO_3)_2(aq) + MgI_2(aq) \rightleftharpoons PbI_2(aq) + Mg(NO_3)_2(aq)$

6.2. Alasan berikut yang mendukung jawaban anda di atas adalah...

- Fosfina merupakan basa lunak dibandingkan amina. Sedangkan  $BBr_3$  merupakan asam lewis yang lebih lunak dibandingkan  $BF_3$  yang merupakan konsekuensi dari sifat keras lunak pada konstituen halogen. Oleh karenanya reaksi akan bergeser ke kiri menuju pasangan kompleks lunak-lunak dan keras-keras maka konstanta kesetimbangan lebih dari 1.
- Sianida merupakan basa yang lebih lunak dan lebih kuat dibandingkan dengan klorida, oleh karenanya sianida akan menggantikan basa yang relative lebih keras dari asam lewis lunak  $Ag^+$  dan konstanta kesetimbangan akan lebih besar dari 1.
- Iodide merupakan basa yang lebih lunak dibandingkan klorida, asam lunak  $CH_3Hg$  akan cenderung membentuk kompleks yang lebih kuat dengan iodide dibandingkan dengan klorida, dimana asam keras  $H^+$  akan memilih klorida yang merupakan basa keras. Oleh karenanya konstanta kesetimbangan lebih besar dari 1.
- Sulfur dioksida yang merupakan asam lewis lunak menggantikan asam keras t-butil alkohol dari basa lunak trifinilfosfin. Sehingga terbentuk senyawa kompleks lunak-lunak sehingga konstanta kesetimbangan kurang dari 1.
- Ion  $Pb^{2+}$  dan ion  $I^{-}$  merupakan pasangan keras-keras sedangkan ion  $Mg^{2+}$  dan ion  $NO_3^{-}$  merupakan pasangan lunak-lunak sehingga konstanta kesetimbangan lebih besar dari 1.

6.3. Seberapa yakin anda dengan jawaban dan alasan yang anda berikan?

- |                     |                   |         |          |                    |
|---------------------|-------------------|---------|----------|--------------------|
| 1. Hanya<br>menebak | 2. Sangat<br>ragu | 3. Ragu | 4. Yakin | 5. Sangat<br>yakin |
|---------------------|-------------------|---------|----------|--------------------|

Figure 3. Item test number 6. about HSAB concept

We can see student pattern in answering item no. 6 about HSAB concept in figure 4. Which is show how student response the question and how their certainty level in that response.




Figure 4. Students' Responses Pattern in All Tier for item number 6.

In Figure 4, we can see mostly students' who held misconception trapped by their prior knowledge about strong weak acid base concept and give high certainty about their answer. Meanwhile some students were able to choose a correct response for HSAB concept but they cannot give a correct reasoning for the concept. This can be happening because the HSAB concept is still new concept for them. This type of case happening because in understanding new concept student tend to mix their prior knowledge with new concept they accepted. The difficulties faced by students is consider as high since to give correct response to this item need at least three prior knowledge to understand by them such as chemical equilibrium, naming the ions and acid base concept. <sup>2</sup> In that case, students' chemical misconceptions about an emergent property may not derive from a failure to understand isolated entities, their properties and interactions or the parameter of the entities but from failure to think all constituent entities, their structural relation and interactions in a holistic and systemic manner (Tumay, 2016) which later will affect their learning process.

Second highest misconception profile is 57,58% for item no.3. in Lewis acid base concept. This include 15,15% MF+, 18,18% MF-, and 24.24% M (see table 4.).

Table 4. Student response combination pattern in item number 3.

Item Number	Conception Profile	Subject (%)	Student answer combination pattern
Q3	SK	18,18	(A-A-5); (A-A-4)
	MF+	15,15	(A-B-5); (A-C-4)
	MF-	18,18	(B-A-5); (B-A-4); (D-A-4)
	M	24,24	(B-B-5); (B-B-4); (B-C-4); (C-C-4); (E-E-4)
	LG/LC	6,06	(A-A-3)
	LK	18,18	(A-C-3); (B-A-3); (B-B-3); (B-B-2); (B-D-3); (E-B-5)

This item was asking about Lewis acid base concept in reaction of  $\text{BrF}_3 + \text{F}^- \rightarrow \text{BrF}_4^-$ , most of student (33,3%) think that Students' in this context reasoning that  $\text{F}^-$  ion only containing with one electron as if in  $e^-$ , which actually  $\text{F}^-$  ion act as pair electron donor. They are failed to think the configuration of ion microscopically that's why they mostly think that this type of reaction is Bronsted concept for acid base rather than Lewis acid base concept.

In interview after the test, was made sure that it was strongly a misconception, at this diagnostic interview student tend to defend their opinion and still believe that what they give in test was the correct responses. As example when student asked about why they think that  $\text{F}^-$  ion is the same one as  $e^-$  because in their personal representative of an  $\text{F}^-$  ion is ignoring the fact that  $\text{F}^-$  ion consisted of eight electron, which means they are lack in the microscopic aspect of chemistry. It is important to emphasize to student the three level of chemical representation, so that student will have a better conceptual understanding. It is needed some concern since no matter how small the differences are from scientific conceptions, the label is misconception (Nilsson & Niedderer, 2013).

There is positive and significant correlation between first and second tier correlate with their certainty level (figure 5.,  $r=0,67$   $n=33$ ,  $p<000$ ).




Figure 5. two tier score vs certainty level scatter-gram

This means that students with high score on first and second tier also have high confidence in their certainty level. The similar report also found in prior research by Pesman & Eryilmaz, (2010) and Mubarak et al (2016) that show positive and significant correlation between student scores and their certainty level. But some interesting issue that we can see in figure 5 is that students with high certainty level also dominated by student with low score for tier<sub>1&2</sub> which indicate of potential misconception to be occurred (Pesman & Eryilmaz, 2010), either that MF+, MF- or M type of misconceptions. It is recommended that the percentage of false negative should not exceed 10% (Arslan et al., 2012; Pesman & Eryilmaz, 2010). In this study the obtained percentage of false negative is 3,63% and false positive is 4,44%, which are in recommended values.

This finding, show some interesting aspect about student self-efficacy in their decision to choose the answer, reason and certainty level they give. Average percentage for lack of confidence in this test is 14.55% for all items. This low confidence case suggest they were aware that they were performing poorly or were possibly guessing (Brandriet & Bretz, 2014b).

Determining the conceptual understanding level of students can be considered to be the first step of a longitudinal study aiming to promote the engagement of students in learning process (Saricayir et al., 2016).

## Conclusion

Subject of acid base has important role in chemistry education. Concept of acid and base in chemistry are interrelated (Bayrak, 2013) when student have difficulties in understanding this concept, they will experience difficulties in other related chemistry subject. <sup>2</sup> In that case, students' chemical misconceptions about an emergent property may not derive from a failure to understand isolated entities, their properties and interactions or the parameter of the entities but from failure to think all constituent entities, their structural relation and interactions in a holistic and systemic manner (Tumay, 2016) which later will affect their learning process.

Finally, result of this study clearly suggest that a number of <sup>4</sup> students did not acquire a satisfactory understanding of several acid base chemistry concepts, including acid base theory, strong weak acid base concept, hard soft acid base concept and dissociation of strong and weak acid base. It is important for us to understand that this result also coming from student prior knowledge, which is they learn in their senior high school. So, strengthen their understanding of acid base concept in early stage will be very helpful and then in higher level should emphasize on how they adapt with the new concept that they learn. It is also important for emphasizing the role of chemical representation in build holistic chemistry conceptual understanding since discovering, identifying, changing the misconception in chemistry is difficult and challenging for us as it our responsibilities as an educators to be aware of students' conceptions.

By adding certainty tiers to the items, evidence emerged that students were generally unaware of what they do not know. It is important for us to improve our way to maximize the meaningful learning for students and acknowledge how student intention in make decision in their answers and tackles their carelessness in solving the problems. Since we can measure student certainty and correlate that with their self-efficacy it's important for next researchers to identify the effect and impact of metacognition in overcoming student misconceptions profiles.

## References

- Akram, M., Surif, J. B., & Ali, M. (2014). Conceptual difficulties of secondary school students in electrochemistry. *Asian Social Science*, 10(19), 276-281.
- Amalia, F. R., Ibnu, S., Widarti, H. R., & Wuni, H. (2018). Students' mental model of acid and base concepts taught using the cognitive apprenticeship learning model. *Jurnal Pendidikan IPA Indonesia*, 7(2), 187-192.
- Arslan, H. O., Cigdemoglu, C., & Moseley, C. (2012). A three-tier diagnostic test to assess pre-service teachers' misconceptions about global warming, greenhouse effect, ozone layer depletion, and acid rain. *International Journal of Science Education*, 34(11), 667-1686.
- Artdej, R., Ratanaroutai, T., Coll, R. K., & Thongpanchang, T. (2010). Thai grade 11 students' alternative conceptions for acid-base chemistry. *Research in Science & Technological Education*, 28(2), 167-183.
- Barke, H. D., Harsch, G., & Schmid, S. (2012). *Essential of chemical education*. Heidelberg: Springer.
- Bayrak, B. K. (2013). Using two-tier test to identify primary student's conceptual understanding and alternative conceptions in acid base. *Mevlana International Journal of Education*, 3(2), 19-26.
- Brandriet, A. R., & Bretz, S. L. (2014a). The development of the redox concept inventory as a measure of students' symbolic and particulate redox understanding and confidence. *Journal of Chemical Education*, 91(8), 1132-1144.

- Brandriet, A. R., & Bretz, S. L. (2014b). Measuring meta-ignorance through the lens of confidence: Examining students' redox misconceptions about oxidation numbers, charge, and electron transfer. *Chemistry Education Research and Practice*, 15(8), 729-746.
- Burrows, N. L., & Mooring, S. R. (2015). Using concept mapping to uncover students' knowledge structure of chemical bonding concepts. *Chemistry Education Research and Practice*, 16, 53-66.
- Cardelini, L. (2012). Chemistry: Why the subject is difficult? *Educacion Quimica*, 242, 1-6.
- Cartrette, D. P., & Mayo, P. M. (2011). Students' understanding of acid/base in organic chemistry context. *Chemistry Education Research and Practice*, 12, 29-39.
- Chakraborty, A., & Mondal, B. C. (2012). Misconception in chemistry at IX grade and their remedial measures. *Indian Streams Research Journal*, 2(7), 1-9.
- Chrzanowski, M. M., Grajkowski, W., Zuchowski, S., Spalik, K., & Ostrowska, E. B. (2018). Vernacular misconception in teaching science – types and causes. *Journal of Turkish Science Education*, 15(4), 29-54.
- Cokelez, A. (2010). A Comparative study of French and Turkish students' ideas on acid – base reactions. *Journal of Chemical Education*, 87(1), 102-106.
- Creswell, J. W. & Creswell J. D. (2018). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches fifth edition. Los Angeles, LA: Sage.
- Daud, N. S. N., Karim, M. M. A., Hassan, S. W. N. W., Rahman, N. A. (2015). Misconception and difficulties in introductory physics among high school and university student. *Educatum Journal of Science Mathematics and Technology*, 2(1), 34-47.
- Dehnad, A., Nasser, H., & Hosseini, A. F. (2014). A comparison between three-and four-option multiple choice questions. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 398 – 403.
- Dickmann, T., Opfermann, M., Dammann, E., Lang, M., & Rumann, S. (2019). What you see is what you learn? The role of visual model comprehension for academic success in chemistry. *Chemistry Education Research and Practice*, 20, 804-820.
- Duran, M., & Usak, M. (2015). Examining the pedagogical content knowledge if science teacher who have different teaching experience about acids and bases. *Oxidation Communication*, 38(1A), 540-557.
- Fariyani, Q., Rusilowati, A., & Sugianto. (2015). Pengembangan four tier diagnostic test untuk mengungkap miskonsepsi fisika siswa SMA kelas X. *Journal of Innovative Science Education*, 4(2), 41-49.
- Gurel, D. K., Eryilmaz, A., & McDermott, L. C. (2015). A review and comparison of diagnostic instruments to identify students' misconception in science. *Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science & Technology Education*, 11(5). 989-1008.
- Hanson, R. (2019). The impact of two-tier instruments on undergraduate chemistry teacher trainees: An illuminative assessment. *International Journal for Infonomics*, 12(4), 1920-2928.
- Kala, N., Yaman, F., & Ayas, A. (2013). The effectiveness of predict-observe-explain technique in probing student understanding about acid-base chemistry: A case for the concepts of pH, pOH and strength. *International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education*, 11(3), 555-574.
- Kidanemariam, D. A., Atagana, H. I., & Engida, T. (2013). The place of philosophy of chemistry in reducing chemical misconceptions. *African Journal of Chemical Education*, 3(2), 106-117.
- Korur, F. (2015). Exploring seven-grade students' and pre-service science teachers' misconception in astronomical concept. *Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science & Technology Education*, 11(5), 1041-1060.
- Lachapelle, C. P., Hertel, J. D., Jocz, J., & Cunningham, C. M. (2013, April). *Measuring students' naïve conceptions about technology*. NARST Annual International Conference, Rio Grande, Puerto Rico.
- Lawshe, C. H. (1975). A quantitative approach to content validity. *Personnel Psychology*, 28(4), 563-575.
- Lemmer, M. (2012). Nature, Cause and effect of students' intuitive conceptions regarding changes in velocity. *International Journal of Science Education*, 35(2), 239-261.
- Medeiros, R. K. S., Junior, M. A. F., Torres, G. V., Vitor, A. F., Santos, V. E. P., & Barichello, E. (2015). Content validity of an instrument about knowledge on nasogastric intubation. *Bioscience Journal Uberlandia*, 31(6), 1862-1870.
- Mubarak, S., Susilningsih, E., & Cahyono, E. (2016). Pengembangan tes diagnostik three tier multiple choices untuk mengidentifikasi miskonsepsi peserta didik kelas XI. *Journal of Innovative Science*, 5(2), 101-110.



- Mukmin, M. I., & Fa'ani, A. M. (2019). Identification of students' misconceptions in proving onto and one-to-one function in abstract algebra using certainty response index. *International Journal on Teaching and Learning Mathematics*, 2(1), 1-6.
- Nilsson, T., & Niedderer, H. (2013). Undergraduate students' conception of enthalpy, enthalpy change and related concept. *Chemistry Education Research and Practice*, 15(3), 336-353.
- Noble, T., Suarez, C., Rosebery, A., O'Connor, M. C., Warren, B., & Barnes, J. H. (2012). "I never thought of it as freezing": How students answer questions on large-scale tests and what they know about sciences. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 49(6), 778-803.
- Odom, A.L., & Barrow, L.H. (2007). High school biology students' knowledge and certainty about diffusion and osmosis concepts. *School Science and Mathematics*, 107, 94-101.
- Orgill, M., & Shuterland, A. (2008). Undergraduate chemistry students' perceptions of and misconceptions about buffer and buffer problems. *Chemistry Education Research and Practice*, 9, 131-143.
- Ozdemir, O. F. (2013). Transfer and conceptual change: The change process form the theoretical perspectives of coordination classes and phenomenological primitives. *Instructional Science*, 41, 81-103.
- Ozmen, H. (2004). Some student misconceptions in chemistry: A literature review of chemical bonding. *Journal of Science Education and Technology*, 13(2), 147-159.
- Pesman, H., & Eryilmaz, A. (2010). Development of three tier test to assess misconceptions about simple electric circuit. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 103, 208-222.
- Rodriguez, M. C. (2005). Three option are optimal for multiple-choice items: A meta-analysis of 80 years of research. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 24(2), 3-13.
- Russ, R. S., Lee, V. R., & Sherin, B. L. (2012). Framing in cognitive clinical interviews about intuitive science knowledge: Dynamic student understanding of the discourse interaction. *Science Education*, 96(4), 537-599.
- Sadhu, S., Ad'hiya, E., & Laksono, E. W. (2019). Exploring and comparing content validity and assumptions of modern theory of an integrated assessment: Critical thinking-chemical literacy studies. *Jurnal Pendidikan IPA Indonesia*, 8(4), 570-581.
- Sadhu, S., Tima, M. T., Cahyani, V.P., Laka, A. F., Annisa, D., & Fahriyah, A. R. (2017). Analysis of acid-base misconceptions using modified certainty of response index (CRI) and diagnostic interview for different student levels cognitive. *International Journal of Science and Applied Science: Conference Series*, 1(2), 91-100.
- Saricayir, H., Ay, S., Comek, A., Canziz, G., & Uce, M. (2016). Determining students' conceptual understanding level of thermodynamics. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 4(6), 69-79.
- Seligin, D. (2012). Alternative framework, attitudes toward science and problem learning: A pilot study. *Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 2(2), 28-41.
- Sesen, B., A. (2010). Internet as source of misconception: "Radiation and radioactivity". *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, 9(4), 94-100.
- Siswaningsih, W., Nahadi, & Widasmar, R. (2019). Development of three tier multiple choice diagnostic test to assess students' misconception of chemical equilibrium. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 1280, 032019.
- Soeharto., Csapo, B., Sarimanah, E., Dewi, F. I., & Sabri, T. (2019). A review of students' common misconceptions in science and their diagnostic assessment tools. *Jurnal Pendidikan IPA Indonesia*, 8(2), 247-266.
- Sofianto, E. W. N., Irawati, R. K., Akmalia, H. A., & Apriani, R. R. (2020). The analysis of heat - temperature misconception and integration with Al Quran. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 1422, 012022.
- Sunyono., Yuanita, L., & Ibrahim, M. (2015). Mental model of students on stoichiometry concept in learning by method based on multiple representation. *The Online Journal of New Horizon in Education*, 5(2), 30-45.
- Suprpto, N. (2020). Do we experience misconceptions?: An ontological review of misconceptions in science. *Studies in Philosophy of Science and Education (SiPoSE)*, 1(2), 50-55.
- Syahrul, D. A., & Setyarsih, W. (2015). Identifikasi miskonsepsi dan penyebab miskonsepsi siswa dengan three tier diagnostic test pada materi dinamika rotasi. *Jurnal Inovasi Pendidikan Fisika*, 4(03), 67-70.
- Taherdoost, H. (2016). Validity and reliability of the research instrument: How to test the validation of a questionnaire/survey in a research. *International Journal of Academic Research in Management*, 5(3), 28-36.
- Taslidere, E. (2016). Development and use of a three-tier diagnostic test to assess high school students' misconceptions about the photoelectric effect. *Research in Science & Technological Education*, 34(2), 164-186.



- Treagust, D. F., Tan, G., & Chia. (2002). Development and application of a two-tier multiple choices diagnostic instrument to assess high school student's understanding of inorganic chemistry qualitative analysis. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 39(4), 283-301.
- Tumay, H. (2016). Reconsidering learning difficulties and misconceptions in chemistry: Emergence in chemistry and its implications for chemical education. *Chemistry Education Research and Practise*, 17, 229-245.
- Wee, B. (2012). A cross-cultural exploration of children everyday ideas: Implication for science teaching and learning. *International Journal of Science Education*, 34(4), 609-627.
- Willis, G. B. (2015). Analysis of the cognitive interview in questionnaire design. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Xie, R. (2018). Investigating the content validity of the Junior Middle School entrance English testing. *Journal of Education and Development*, 2(1), 45-54.
- Yangin, S., Sidekli, S., & Gokbulut, Y. (2014). Prospective teacher misconceptions about classification of plants and changes in their misconception during pre-service education. *Journal of Baltic Science Education*, 13(3), 105-117.
- Yates, T. B., & Marek, E. A. (2014). Teachers teaching misconceptions: A study of factor contributing to high school biology students' acquisition of biological evolution-related misconceptions. *Evolution: Education and Outreach*, 7(7), 1-18.
- Zajkov, O., Zajkova, S. G., & Mitrevski, B. (2017). Textbook caused misconception, inconsistencies, and experimental safety risks of a grade 8 physics textbook. *International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education*, 15, 837-852.

# Students\_Misconceptions\_in\_Understanding\_Acid\_Base\_Topics.

## ORIGINALITY REPORT

12%

SIMILARITY INDEX

9%

INTERNET SOURCES

9%

PUBLICATIONS

2%

STUDENT PAPERS

## PRIMARY SOURCES

1

[mafiadoc.com](http://mafiadoc.com)

Internet Source

3%

2

[pubs.rsc.org](http://pubs.rsc.org)

Internet Source

2%

3

Dušica D. Milenković, Tamara N. Hrin, Mirjana D. Segedinac, Saša Horvat. "Development of a Three-Tier Test as a Valid Diagnostic Tool for Identification of Misconceptions Related to Carbohydrates", Journal of Chemical Education, 2016

Publication

2%

4

[pt.scribd.com](http://pt.scribd.com)

Internet Source

1%

5

[epdf.pub](http://epdf.pub)

Internet Source

1%

6

[www.tandfonline.com](http://www.tandfonline.com)

Internet Source

1%

7

Submitted to Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia

Student Paper

1%

8

Essentials of Chemical Education, 2012.

Publication

1%

9

[files.eric.ed.gov](http://files.eric.ed.gov)

Internet Source

1%

Exclude quotes Off

Exclude bibliography On

Exclude matches < 1%