Scientific Explanation of Light through Phenomenon-based Learning on Junior High School Student

Abstract—Abstract. This study was intended to explore the improvement of scores that measure students’ scientific explanation of light through phenomenon-based learning. Students conduct an investigation and make an explanation about the phenomenon being observed. The study employed mixed methods with an embedded experimental model. The subject consisted of 28 students of eighth graders in junior high school 3 of Malang, Indonesia. Test, interview, and observation collected the data. Pre-test and post-test scores were analyzed with a paired sample t-test, N-gain score, and d-effect size. The data of pre-test and N-gain score were analyzed with product moment Pearson correlation test. The quality of scientific explanation was collected based on the component that consists of claim, evidence, and reasoning. The result showed that the average of students’ scientific explanation scores significantly improved from 1,39 in pre-test into 5,68 in post-test with ad-effect size of about 3,6 which was categorized as a strong influence and an average N-gain of 0,40 which was categorized as a medium. Students’ scientific explanation shifted significantly from invalid category to fully supported category. The benefits of learning for the improvement of scientific explanation have been obtained by the students equally.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Knowledge in science is built on the observation of phenomena to explain nature[1]. Scientists build knowledge are deeply committed to the data and evidence to develop a claim, make the argument and analyze evidence related to the theory[2]. Following the nature of science, one of the goals of science education in junior high school is engaging students to understand and apply knowledge about science, technology, art, culture related to the phenomena and visible events [3]. Students who have learned science are always expected to seek knowledge, to sort the knowledge based on the scientific truth, and persuasively communicate through discussion forums related to the science issues to be beneficial for society and environment[2].

The lack of factual knowledge cause light become one of the science topics that the students’ mastery of concepts is still on the low-level [4-7]. Students rarely use the knowledge to explain nature phenomenon so it is possessed only on the basic level and less meaningful[7]. Elementary Students assume that light is a source, effect, or circumstances, such as brights. Junior high school students think that light left in the mirror during reflection and the lens must be intact when forming an image [4] High school students have difficulties using ray diagrams to determine image position of the object that located in the water [6]. Undergraduate students have difficulties understanding the basic concepts of geometrical optics [7]. Therefore light is a topic that should be mastered by students from the beginning to support their understanding at the next level.

One of the ways to achieve the goal of science education is engaging students to investigate and use the knowledge to develop scientific explanations [2]. The scientific explanation consists of knowledge and a set of data obtained from the investigation, observation, or literature[8,9]. Through investigation, students can practice observing the phenomenon, collecting data and preparing scientific explanations based on the result of data interpretation obtained from the investigation [10]. The junior high school students are expected to draw up a scientific explanation either directly or in writing that consists of claim, evidence, and reasoning [11].

Developing a scientific explanation can facilitate students’ learning. Students acquire a deep understanding of the content being studied when devising and maintaining the claim[8,12-14]. They can express ideas explicitly when giving evidence to support the claim[15]. Students can communicate more convincingly by engaging in argument supported by empirical evidence[9,16]. They understand better the science ideas by restating explanation and asking questions about the less convincing explanation [11].

Students have difficulties formulating the scientific explanation. They do not know the purpose of writing the scientific explanation and consider that it consists of description and conclusion [13]. Students have difficulty linking evidence and theory [8]. They fail to compile...
scientific explanation because of the less understanding about the content.\textsuperscript{17}

The phenomenon can be used as a basis for preparing the scientific explanation. Students prepare practicing scientific explanations based on evidence by collecting, discussing and interpreting the observed data of phenomena\textsuperscript{[10,14]}. The scientists also used the phenomenon as the basis for generating a new theory. For example, Ibnu Sahl discovered the law of refraction by investigating the phenomenon of how curved mirrors and lenses bend and focus light\textsuperscript{[18,19]}. The phenomenon in natural science is defined as an event that can be observed or information systems relating to the matter, energy, space and time that logical and can be proved through investigation\textsuperscript{[20]}. It can be used as a source of information to build knowledge through direct observation\textsuperscript{[21]}. For example, Thomas Young investigated the direction of light propagation by observing the phenomenon of light directed at a single slit and forwarded to the double slit\textsuperscript{[1]}. Some previous researches have facilitated the students to develop a scientific explanation\textsuperscript{[8,15,22]}. Investigation activity can develop students' skills to construct a scientific explanation\textsuperscript{[15]}. Explicit learning can help students to develop their ability to justify claim using appropriate evidence and reasoning \textsuperscript{[8]}. Some of these studies have involved students in the investigation of the phenomenon in developing a scientific explanation.

A. Scientific Explanation

Scientific explanation consists of explanations and arguments. The explanation is a statement that answers the question "how" and "why" of events, while the argument is an activity undertaken to justify claim using appropriate evidence and reasoning \textsuperscript{[8]}. There are several theories used to develop a scientific explanation, i.e., the covering-law models, causal-mechanical models, a unificationist account of explanation, and pragmatic theories of explanation \textsuperscript{[17,23]}

Covering-law models are also called the model of deductive-nomological models. The model proposed by Carl Hempel and Oppenheim in 1948. This model states that the explanation consists of two basic elements namely explanandum and explanans. Explanandum is a sentence that describes the phenomenon, while explanans is the class sentence that proposed to tell about phenomena. Explanandum is a result of explanans. Explanans consists of two subclasses. First, the subclass that states specific conditions and the second is the subclass that declares the common law. The scientific explanation is regarded as a meaning process based on the general law that applies to the phenomena. For example, use the law that light propagates on a straight path to explain the formation of shadows \textsuperscript{[17]}. The causal-mechanical model proposed by Salmon in 1971. According to this model, scientific explanations have to explain a natural structure of phenomena and consistent with a causal relationship. The scientific explanation aims to describe the causal interaction and fundamental mechanism. Causal interaction can be divided into the actual causal processes and pseudo-process. A genuine causal process is a physical event occurs and causes another event, while the pseudo-process is not a physical event and does not cause another event. For example, "a billiard ball strikes another ball and makes it moves" is a genuine causal process while the intersection of the shadows of these balls is a pseudo-process \textsuperscript{[17]}. Unificationist account of explanation is the idea put forward by Friedman in 1974 when discussing the relationship between scientific explanation and scientific understanding. The example of this model is the use of the law of gravity to explain the phenomenon of gravity and motion of objects in space. Friedman has a general view of the scientific understanding and suggests that scientific explanation should integrate various phenomena to become more comprehensive. This idea is clarified by Kitcher in 1981 to become the Unification explanatory theory. Kitcher argues that the explanation in science cannot be studied one by one, but it is a systematic overview of the natural order \textsuperscript{[17]}. Pragmatic theories of explanation put forward by van Fraassen in 1980. The theory argues that the admissibility of an explanation depends on the context, for example, the background knowledge of the audience. Someone who wants to construct an explanation must connect explanans on explanandum based on his or her understanding while the audience can judge and accept or reject explanations based on their prior knowledge. Explanations are prepared not only based on strong logical structure but also a psychological element. For example, better use Snell's law instead of using the Fresnel equation when discussing the phenomenon of refraction with junior high school students \textsuperscript{[17]}. The components of scientific explanation that originally used the term explanandum, explanans, and general law developed into four components consisting of a phenomenon, theory, data, and reasoning that are more familiar to students \textsuperscript{[17]}. The scientific explanation was also developed using a model of Stephen Toulmin in argument into four components consisting of the claim, evidence, reasoning, and rebuttal. The claim is the conclusion that can answer the problem. The evidence is support for a claim that can be the data from observations, measurements, or experiments obtained directly or from a database. The reasoning is a reason why the data are used to support the claim. The rebuttal is a full explanation used as opposed to another explanation why is considered incorrect \textsuperscript{[8,24]}. In this study, the scientific explanation component only limited to the claim, evidence, reasoning, and not to the rebuttal. These three components are set out in Table 1 \textsuperscript{[25]}.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Challenging the achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Claim</td>
<td>Give statement or conclusion that can be tested, which answers the question of &quot;how&quot; or &quot;why&quot;</td>
<td>Students make statement or conclusion that can be tested, which responded correctly for a question of &quot;how&quot; or &quot;why&quot; and consistent with the available evidence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evidence
Describing the scientific data which support the claim. The data source can be obtained by students from (but not limited to) the investigation, everyday observation, reading the material, numeric data, and output models.

Reasoning
Describe how or why the data support the claim, can use the ideas/scientific principles describing how or why the evidence can support the claim, can use the ideas/scientific principles appropriately and valid.

B. Phenomenon-Based Learning in Science Education

Phenomenon-based learning uses a phenomenon as the learning resource [14,20,26]. Students can develop a causal explanation of the relationship between components in phenomenon [26]. Phenomenon-based learning facilitates students to learn about natural phenomena through a systematic process using the scientific method. The obtained data are interpreted to produce explanations that can develop into tested principles, laws, and theories [27].

Phenomenon-based learning engages students to observe and gather relevant experiences about the phenomenon being studied [14]. Students can use the knowledge that gained from observations to develop and test explanations related to the phenomenon. By arranging the explanation, the students have a better memory than getting it from the teacher [28].

The activities in the phenomenon-based learning are observing the phenomenon, arranging the initial explanation, conducting investigations, drawing up the final explanation, and giving reasons to support the claim. Students observe the phenomenon to study the concept in concrete terms to make it easier to understand the formal concept [29]. After the observations, the students construct an initial explanation as provisional estimates of the answer for the problems that will be investigated. Investigations are carried out to try and observe the phenomenon corresponding to the questions on the worksheet. This activity aimed to gain knowledge and to identify the relationships between the components in the phenomenon as materials to prepare the final explanation. The final explanation is based on the results of group discussions were carried out after the investigation. Developing scientific explanation can enhance students’ understanding of scientific ideas being studied. Phenomenon-based learning is concluded with a discussion of the scientific explanations that have been prepared. Students present a full explanation and the reasons why the evidence provided to support the claim. The explanation must be supported by the concepts and theories that can be maintained at a discussion forum. When giving reasons, and students have explicitly expressed his thoughts by connecting theory with the knowledge gained from observations [31,32]. The activities of phenomenon-based learning are presented in Figure 1 [33].

![Fig. 1. The Activities of Phenomenon-based Learning](image-url)
II. METHOD

This study used mixed methods with embedded experimental models[34]. Subjects consisted of 28 students of eighth graders in junior high school 3 in Malang academic year 2016/2017. The design of the study was using a one-group pre-test-post-test design to assess the changes in students’ scientific explanation score after an intervention [35]. The first step was to conduct preliminary observations and then intervened and proceeded with final observations. Preliminary observations carried out by interviewing the teachers, pre-test, and interviews with students. The intervention implemented by applying phenomenon-based learning on the topic of light for three meetings. Final observations carried out by the post-test and interviews with students. After all the data were collected, then we interpreted the data as a basis to conclude.

The research data consists of quantitative and qualitative data. The quantitative data were obtained from the pre-test and post-test score. The qualitative data were obtained from interviews, student discussion recording, worksheet response, description of pre-test and post-test response, and observation of learning by using videos and photos. A syllabus and lesson plans supported the learning. The syllabus was prepared based on curriculum 2013 and adjusted for research. The Lesson plans were created based on the syllabus and equipped with worksheets for investigation. The worksheets consisted of questions that led students to construct explanations based on the observed phenomena.

The research instrument consisted of four essay items. Instruments validated by two lecturers of experts to review the content, language, items conformity with indicators and the construction of a scoring rubric. After validated by the experts, the instruments tested empirically to 32 students of ninth graders. The result of the calculation of the product moment Pearson correlation showed a positive correlation between the score of items and the total score with Pearson coefficient values between 0.375 to 0.882. The difficulty level for four items indicated rigorous criteria with the value between 0.1 to 0.3 [36]. The reliability for four items was being classified on the common criteria with Cronbach’s Alpha value of 0.532. To test whether the rubric of scientific explanation was adequate to use, an assessment was done by two correctors. Cohen’s Kappa calculation results show that problems Number 1, 2 and 3 belong to the strong criteria and problem Number 4 belongs to the medium criteria being with Kappa values between 0.517 to 0.688 [37]. It can be said that the two correctors mutually consistent in determining a score that scientific explanation rubric is adequate to use [38]. The scientific explanation rubrics presented in Table 2 [25].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score /level</th>
<th>Description / indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fully Supported</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Two of the following supports the claim about the phenomena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence from patterns in the data table about the phenomena being investigated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Reasoning that connects the data and scientific principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially Supported</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>One of the following supports the claim about the phenomena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence from patterns in the data table about the phenomena being investigated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Reasoning that connects the data and scientific principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Or Incomplete either evidence or reasoning support the claim about the phenomena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsupported</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The claim leads to the phenomena without accompanied by evidence from patterns in the data table or scientific reasoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invalid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No claim indicating to the phenomena</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data were analyzed in the form of quantitative and qualitative data. Qualitative data were analyzed based on the quality of scientific explanations constructed by the students while answering pre-test and post-test questions, the description of learning observations, and worksheet response. Shifting the students’ responses from pre-test to post-test presented with cross-tabulation. Quantitative data were analyzed based on the scores of scientific explanation in the following order: (1) Presenting the data of pre-test and post-test score using descriptive statistics; (2) Conducting a normality test of pre-test and post-test score by using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov [39], (3) Conducting the difference test of pre-test and post-test score using paired sample t-test or Wilcoxon test [38] (4) Calculating individual N-gain score [40], (5) Calculating d-effect size [38]; (6) Conducting the normality test of N-gain score by using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov [39]; (7) Testing the correlation between individual N-gain score and pre-test scores by product moment Pearson correlation or Spearman Rank correlation test [38].

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Description of Learning

Learning was implemented over three meetings and consisted of three sub-topics: (1) Reflection on a plane surface, (2) The concave mirror and the convex mirror, (3) The concave lens and the convex lens. The learning for each sub-topic is described as follows.
1) Reflection and Refraction on a Plane Surface

The reflection process cannot be separated from the process of refraction. When light hits the surface of a substance, some may be reflected, and the other may be refracted simultaneously. Students did preliminary activities by observing the phenomenon. They observed the laser beam directed to the small holes that were arranged in a straight line and winding. Almost all the students concluded that light propagates in a straightline. Then the students observed the laser beam that was directed into the fountain and made the initial explanation that the laser beam was trapped inside the fountain because of the refraction process.

Students investigated groups to practice preparing scientific explanations by answering the following two questions: (1) How large the angle of reflection compared to the angle of incidence when the light hits a plane mirror? Explain. (2) How large the angle of refraction compared to the angle of incidence when the light travels from air to the glass? Explain. To answer the first question, the students observed the phenomenon of a laser beam directed to a plane mirror and then measured the angle of incidence and the angle of reflection. To answer the second question, the students performed more complex activities: (1) Observing the phenomenon of a laser beam directed at the plane-parallel glass. (2) Measuring the angle of incidence and the angle of refraction. (3) Measuring the distance of the incident ray to the normal line and the distance of the refracted ray to the normal line. (4) Finding the relationship between the distance of the incident ray to the normal line and the distance of refracted ray to the normal line that has a constant value then calculating its average so they can find the value of the refractive index of the glass used in the experiments.

The group of students with absent Number 1, 4, 10, 13, and 20 did not know the concept of the angle of incidence and the angle of reflection. Students assumed that the angle of incidence is the angle formed by the surface of the mirror and the incident ray, and the angle of reflection is the angle formed by the surface of the mirrors and the reflected ray. Teacher improved students’ understanding and provide a printout of protractor scale to make students more easily to measure angles. Students can prepare claim adequately and provide evidence in the form of measurement data of the angle of incidence and the angle of reflection but did not give a reason. The example of explanation from students with Absent Number 23 is as follows.

The value of the angle of reflection equal to the angle of incidence. If the angle of incidence is 30°, the angle of reflection is also 30° and if the angle of incidence is 60°, the angle of reflection is also 60°.

Students had difficulties to answer the second question. When determining the relationship between the distance of the incident ray to the normal line and the distance of refracted ray to the normal line, students found two relationships that have a nearly constant value, i.e., the division and subtraction. The teacher led students to decide whether the division or subtraction which is the relation that represents the refractive index of the glass. Students claimed that the division is the proper relationship because it produces a value that has a smaller difference than a subtraction. Students can prepare claim adequately and provide evidence in the form of measurement data (see Fig. 2). Students cannot give a reason why the angle of refraction is always smaller than the angle of incidence when light travels from air into glass although they had discovered the value of the refractive index of the glass of ± 1.5 and knew the value of the refractive index of air that was listed on the worksheet.

In English:
The angle of incidence > the angle of refraction. From the experiments:
1. the angle of incidence=45°, the angle of refraction=30°
2. the angle of incidence=60°, the angle of refraction=35°
3. the angle of incidence=75°, the angle of refraction=40°

Fig. 2. The example of student’s scientific explanation when light travels from air into glass

The investigation was continued by making a final explanation of the laser beam that trapped inside the fountain. The teacher asked questions about the behavior of light when propagating in the opposite direction, i.e., from the glass into the air, until the topic of total internal reflection process so the students can conclude that the laser beam was trapped inside the fountain due to a total internal reflection process.

2) The Concave Mirror and the Convex Mirror

Students did the preliminary activities by observing the phenomenon via video. Students watched a video of someone who cooked water using the parabolic solar cooker and someone who ripened food using the “Gosun” oven concave-shaped elongated. Students made an initial explanation that the rays on a concave mirror will be focused into a single point.

The students carried the exploratory activities by preparing the scientific explanation to answer the question “does the change of the object distance affect the properties and the distance of image if the object is in
front of a concave mirror or a convex mirror? Explain". To answer this question, they did the experiments with the following steps: (1) Finding the focus of concave mirrors by measuring the image distance of scenery to the screen. (2) Putting the candle as an object in front of the concave mirror (could be at a greater distance from the focus or more than twice the focus) and identifying image forming. (3) Changing the distance of the candle toward the concave mirror to find the image with different properties. (4) Putting the candle as an object in front of a convex mirror and identifying image forming. (5) Changing the distance of candle toward the convex mirror and see if the image is formed with different properties.

Students were less careful in preparing claims for the question relating to the concave mirror and a convex mirror that require more than one claim. Students only focused on the concave mirror so the claims that were arranged mostly stated that "the changes of the object distance affect the properties and the distance of the image". This claim only applies to the concave mirror and does not apply to the convex mirror. Students are still confused claiming although had observed properties of the image that is always unchanged (virtual, upright, diminished) when objects placed in front of a convex mirror with an arbitrary distance. Some students can provide the appropriate claim, giving evidence by spelling out the measurement data of image distance, but only gave a tautology reasoning. At the end of the lesson, the students concluded that the concave mirror is collecting rays, so the collected rays produce enough heat to ripen the food as the phenomenon was presented at the beginning of learning.

3) The Convex Lens and the Concave Lens

Students investigated groups to practice preparing scientific explanations by answering the question "does the change of the object distance affect the properties and the distance of image if the object is in front of a convex lens or a concave lens? Explain". To answer this question, students did the experiments with the following steps: (1) Finding the focus of a convex lens by measuring the image distance of scenery to the screen. (2) Putting the candle as an object in front of the convex lens (may be at the greater distance from the focus, or more than twice the focus) and identifying image forming. (3) Changing the distance of the candle toward the convex lens to find an image with different properties. (4) Putting the candle as an object in front of a concave lens and identifying image forming. (5) Changing the distance of candle toward the concave lens and see if the image is formed with different properties.

Students can arrange the appropriate claim although initially had experienced confusion when answering questions on a worksheet. The dialogue took place between teacher and students when a group had difficulties in finding the image of the concave lens. The phenomenon can be the basis for determining claims (Line 7), so the students can determine the claims appropriately (Line 13).

1. S: "On this question (based on experiments of the convex lens and a concave lens, does the change of object distance affect the properties and the distance of the image?) When we said yes, whether the reason is also mentioned, Ma’am?".
2. T: "Of course. Does the change of the object distance affect the properties and the distance of the image? ".
3. S: "We did not find the image formed by a concave lens, Ma’am?".
4. T: "That outside the lens, what if inside the lens?".
5. S: (Looking into the lens) "Yes, there are".
6. Q: "That is the image formed by a concave lens. If not formed outside the lens, it is mean virtual or real? ".
7. S: "Virtual". (Then the student see the image of a wall decoration through a concave lens) "So the properties are virtual, upright, and diminished. Oh, it means that the concave lens also has an image ".
8. Q: "Remember, what was the properties, virtual or real? ".
9. S: "Virtual, upright, diminished".
10. Q: "Try to change the object distance, are the properties fixed or changed?".
11. S: (Trying) "Fixed Ma’am. Virtual, upright, diminished ".
12. Q: "So, does the change of the object distance affect the properties of the images?".
13. S: "If the concave lens, no. If the convex lens, yes ".

Investigation activities followed by constructing the final explanation. Students can provide the appropriate claim, giving evidence by spelling out the image distance measurement data and provide support in the form of ray diagram or comparison of measurement results with calculations via an equation.

B. Description of Data and Discussion

The scientific explanation in this study was analyzed using a scientific explanation rubric [25]. For scoring, scientific explanations were categorized into levels 0 (invalid), level 1 (unsupported), level 2 (partially supported), and level 3 (fully supported). The statistics descriptive of students' scientific explanations score pretest and post-test are presented in Table 3. The results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality test suggested that pre-test and post-test score data are not normally distributed with a significance value of 0.000 for pre-test and 0.002 for post-test scores [39]. The Wilcoxon test results show that the pre-test and post-test scores significantly differed with Asymp.sig. values of 0.000,38

| TABLE III. STATISTICS-DESCRIPTIVE OF STUDENTS’ SCIENTIFIC EXPLANATIONS SCORE |
|---------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| Number of Data (N) | Pre-test | Post-test | N-gain score |
| Average | 1.39 | 5.68 | 0.402 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.133 | 1.219 | 0.111 |
| Skewness | 0.779 | -0.515 | -0.996 |

Based on the Wilcoxon test results and the average score of pre-test and post-test score in Table 3, it can be concluded that there was a significant improvement in the score of scientific explanation after the lesson implemented. How large the improvement can be seen
from the average of individual N-gain score of 0.402 which was included in the medium category. The frequency distribution of students’ N-gain score is presented in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N-gain score</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(&lt;g&gt;) ≥ 0,7</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0,7&gt;(&lt;g&gt;)≥ 0,3</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(&lt;g&gt;) &lt; 0,3</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How strong the influence of learning in improving student scores can be seen from the value of d-effect size. The result of the calculation of d-effect size showed that the role of learning belonged to the high category with the d-effect size of 3.6 [38]. It can be concluded that phenomena-based learning had a strong influence in improving students' scientific explanation score.

Table 4 shows that all the individual N-gain scores were positive. It was used as the assumptions to determine the usefulness of learning experienced by students. A correlation test was done to determine the relationship between pre-test scores and individual N-gain scores. The result of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality test showed that the data of pre-test scores and N-gain scores were not normally distributed, so the Spearman Rank correlation test was conducted. A correlation test result showed that there was no significant correlation between the score of pre-test and N-gain score with significant value 0.413> 0.05. It showed that students who had low pre-test scores got the same improvement as students who had high pre-test scores. This result was confirmed by the calculation of the N-gain average score equal to the average of the individual N-gain score (g = g) of 0.40. It was concluded that the students obtained the benefit of learning equally.

1) Problem Number 1: Reflection on the Plane Mirror

Given the figure of a house plan, students were asked to explain how to put two plane mirrors that can be used to see the front door (Point A) from the kitchen (Point B) (see Fig. 3). Percentage of students who were at the bottom two levels decreased from 100% in pre-test to 89% in post-test (see Table 6). The percentage of students who were at the top two level increased from 0% in pre-test to 11% in post-test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ΣPre-test score</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΣPost-test score</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-gain score</td>
<td>0,2</td>
<td>0,6</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>0,4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The change of scientific explanation can be seen through the N-gain score of each item presented in Table 5. There was the improvement of scientific explanation scores for each item. The most significant improvement occurred in question Number 2. The students' responses to each item were described as follows.

1) Problem Number 1: Reflection on the Plane Mirror

Given the figure of a house plan, students were asked to explain how to put two plane mirrors that can be used to see the front door (Point A) from the kitchen (Point B) (see Fig. 3). Percentage of students who were at the bottom two levels decreased from 100% in pre-test to 89% in post-test (see Table 6). The percentage of students who were at the top two level increased from 0% in pre-test to 11% in post-test.
3 & 2. The light at Point A is directed to the mirror at Point 2, from the mirror at Point 2 reflected to mirror at Point 3 then to the eye.

Fig. 4. Example of Students’ Scientific Explanation in Pre-test for Problem Number 1

Students who were in the invalid category in pre-test indicated that they did not know to construct a claim of the reflection on a plane mirror. Most students in the unsupported category gave the right claim but did not give evidence and reasoning to support the claim. Students supported the claim with an analogy of a plane mirror position to the principle of a periscope but did not spell out how is the principle of the periscope. Other students supported the claim by giving the reasoning in the form of light propagation process but did not spell out how the direction toward the mirror so the light can get to the observer (see Fig. 4). Based on the interview, the student got the difficulties in determining the angle and the position of the mirror.

The quality of students’ scientific explanation improves from unsupported categories to partially supported in post-test. Interviews showed that students had understood the principle of reflection on a plane mirror, but they still have difficulties in drawing the rays on the mirror at an angle so they cannot find the angle of incidence. Students in the partially supported category give incomplete evidence and reasoning. They described the propagation of light and mentioned the angle of incidence but did not show the propagation of light using the diagram (Fig. 5). Students do not come to fully supported category because they cannot give evidence and appropriate reasoning.

Table VII. Refractive Index Data of Substances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Substance</th>
<th>The refractive index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>air</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>water</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>ethyl alcohol</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>oil</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>glass</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 6. Refraction of Light Passing Two Different Mediums

In English:
I chose to place a mirror at points 2 and 3. The door will be visible in the mirror at point 2 from corner 45° and reflected by mirror 2 to mirror 3 with the same angle. Mirror 3 will reflect the light to the eye with the same angle.

Fig. 5. Example of Students’ Scientific Explanation in Post-test for Problem Number 1

2) Problem Number 2: Refraction in Plane Surface

Given the refractive index data table of some substances (Table 7), students were asked to explain correctly whether true or not the two refraction figures of light passing through two different mediums (Fig. 6). The percentage of students who were at the bottom two levels decreased from 96% in pre-test to 11% in post-test (see Table 8). The percentage of students who were at the top two levels increased from 4% in pre-test to 89% in post-test.

Fig. 7. Example of Students’ Scientific Explanation in Pre-test for Problem Number 2

In English:
The figure Number i is correct because the light that was passing through the air is not refracted but only continued

Students in the invalid category in pre-test compiled improper claims and reasons (see Fig. 7). It indicates the students’ had not known refraction on a plane surface. Interviews showed that students could not understand the question because they did not know about the concept of the incident ray, the refracted ray, the normal line, and the refractive index.
Table 8 shows the improvement of students in the partially supported category that indicates most students already know the principle of refraction in post-test. Students have understood the relationship between the distance of incident ray and the distance of refracted ray toward the normal line to the refractive index both of the medium so the students can apply it to support the claim. Students in the fully supported category gave reasoning by using the principle of refraction when the light passes through a different mediums and provided evidence by calculating the ratio of the distance of incident ray and the refracted ray toward the normal line equal to the ratio of refractive index both of the medium to support the claim (see Fig.8).

![Diagram](image.png)

(a) In English:
Light passes through the air (less dense medium) to the oil (more dense medium), so the refracted ray lies closer to the normal line

(b) In English:
Light passes through the water (less dense medium) to the glass (more dense medium), so the refracted ray lies closer to the normal line

Fig. 8. Example of Students’ Scientific Explanation in Post-test for Problem Number 2

Table 8 shows that almost all of the students were in the invalid category in the pre-test. The students made wrong claim to determine the position of the image (see Fig. 10). They had a wrong concept by comparing the refractive index of air with the refractive index of the water to calculate the value of refraction and determining

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Partially Supported</th>
<th>Fully Supported</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Invalid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsupported</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially Supported</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully Supported</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage (%)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the position of the image based on the value of refraction. The students understood that the refraction is the bending of light when passing through a different medium but the students only gave a wrong reason. Students in the unsupported category constructed claim appropriately without providing evidence and reasoning, they only guessed an answer without a rationale.

### TABLE 9. Cross-tabulation of Students’ Scientific Explanation Score for Problem Number 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Invalid</td>
<td>Unsupported</td>
<td>Partially Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invalid</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsupported</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially Supported</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully Supported</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 10. Cross-tabulation of Students’ Scientific Explanation Score for Problem Number 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Invalid</td>
<td>Unsupported</td>
<td>Partially Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invalid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsupported</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially Supported</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully Supported</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In English:

**Fig. 10. Example of Students’ Scientific Explanation in Pre-test for Problem Number 3**

**Fig. 11. Example of Students’ Scientific Explanation in Post-test for Problem Number 3**

1) **Problem Number 4: The Formation of the image on a Concave Mirror**

### TABLE 10. Cross-tabulation of Students’ Scientific Explanation Score for Problem Number 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Invalid</td>
<td>Unsupported</td>
<td>Partially Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invalid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsupported</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially Supported</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully Supported</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In English:

a. Yes, it goes away
b. Yes, it is diminished
c. It is not visible
d. When we look in the spoon because the spoon is a convex lens so when we keep the spoon from our face, our images grow smaller and away

Fig. 12. Example of Students’ Scientific Explanation in Pre-test for Problem Number 4

Students were asked to explain how does the image of object changes if the object distance turned away from the concave mirror. The percentage of students who are at the bottom two levels decreased from 100% in pre-test to 57% in post-test (see Table 10). The percentage of students at the top two levels increased from 0% in pre-test to 43% in post-test.

Table 10 shows that most of the students were in the invalid category in the pre-test. It indicates that the students did not know the process of the formation of images. Students made a claim based on the experience gained from everyday life. Students gave a reason by comparing image on a concave mirror with an image on a spoon (see Fig. 12).

Table 10 shows that the percentage of students in the invalid category and unsupported category shifted to the partially supported category in post-test. Based on interviews, the students in the unsupported category still have difficulties in calculating the distance and magnification of the image when the object was at an infinite distance. Other students in the unsupported category have been able to collect the data but can not interpret the data and use the data as evidence for determining the change of image when the object moved away from the concave mirror. Students in the partially supported category calculated and interpreted the data appropriately so they can answer questions and provide support for their claims but their reasoning was still tautologies, so there were no students in the fully supported category (see Fig. 13).

Fig. 13. Example of Students’ Scientific Explanation in Post-test for Problem Number 4

Before learning, students’ scientific explanations were in invalid, unsupported and partially supported categories. Students were in the invalid category because they did not know to make claims related to the given problem. Students in the unsupported category can construct claims appropriately but do not provide support for claims that had been prepared because they did not have knowledge related to the problem and they just guessed the answer. Students in the partially supported category knew to support the claim, but it was incomplete because limited to the experience gained from daily life.

There was an improvement in the quality of students’ scientific explanations after the learning was done. Students can make an explanation until the fully supported category when answering the posttest problem. The invalid category declined and moved to a higher category in answering all given problems. This increase occurs because the students practice composing a scientific explanation of the relationship between the angle of incidence and the angle of reflection based on the angle of reflection phenomenon on the plane mirror. Students also practiced constructing an explanation of the relationship between the angle of incidence and the angle of refraction.
based on the refraction phenomenon of the plane-parallel glass and constructing explanation about the influence of the object distance to the properties and the distance of the image if the object is in front of a concave or a convex mirror. Phenomena can motivate students to make explanations [42]. Phenomena also can help students to make claims through observation, search for evidence and provide reasoning through measurement and investigation activities. The investigation of phenomena produces data patterns that can be used as evidence and materials to construct conclusions so cancultivate students’ thinking and reasoning. The learning that gives students more opportunity to observe directly can cultivate students’ critical thinking skills [43]. Critical thinking skills are needed in building scientific explanations [44].

IV. CONCLUSION

The scientific explanation improved after phenomenon-based learning on the topic of light. Improvement occurs in all given issues. The quality of students’ scientific explanations increased toward the higher category. This increase occurred because students practiced composing a scientific explanation of the relationship between the angle of incidence and the angle of reflection of the plane mirror. The relationship between the angle of incidence and the angle of refraction in the plane-parallel glass, and the effect of the object distance to the properties and distance of the image if the object placed in front of a concave mirror or a convex mirror. When developing a scientific explanation, students practiced developing claims based on observed phenomena during the investigation. Students also practiced searching for evidence based on data collected through investigation.

Students’ scientific explanation have increased toward the higher category after phenomenon-based learning was implemented. The increase can be seen from the N-gain score of 0.40 which was included in the medium category and the d-effect size of 3.6 which was included in the high category. The increase was due to the phenomenon of helping students to make claims, seek evidence and provide reasoning through observation and investigation activities. There was no significant relationship between pretest score and the N-gain score of students’ scientific explanation so it can be concluded that the benefits of learning in developing scientific explanation obtained by students equally because every student got the same opportunity to practice preparing a scientific explanation and observing the phenomenon during the investigation.
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